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Livy and Sallust were regarded in the first century as the leading exponents of profoundly different styles of historiography. Quintilian, who mentions the pair to be the greatest of Roman historians, expresses more than once the liberality of their styles (2.5.39, 13.3.155-6).

Moreover he quotes the judgment of another historian, Servius Sulpicius, that they were "more than mere copy-strikers" (26.1.186). Livy’s facility to the style of Sallust is indicated by Servius the Elder (quaeis, 3.1.196).

Sallust not only transfers the style of Egyptian into Latin (Dem. 134.13; Vell. 2.56.1, Quat. 10.2.116, Vell. 7.77). In writing in a manner which is unpretentious, brief (Herm. 1.1.13, Dem. 134.17, Quat. 4.2.45, 6.3.12, 10.2.45), and lucid in exposition, just as he goes back to old Latin for some of his vocabulary (Quat. 2.1.29, Front. 300.18, Aug. 36.3), so in his avoidance of rhetorical effects (with the notable exception of chiasmus and antithesis) he recalls the master’s style of the early annalists (3.1 n., 39.1 n.). His sentences lack the careful intricacy which is a mark of the rhetorical prose of the time (1.2 n.).

His argument, on the other hand, was always clear in the precision with which he is able to introduce changes of subject (31.1 n.), in his lack of attention to rhythm, and in his use, after the manner of the annalists, of old word-forms (continuous, p. 23).

Livy’s conception of historical style was more like that of Cicero (see esp. 2.26.21 which contains both of antithesis). His writing is periodic, full (3.2 n., 77.1 n.), highly rhetorical (3.2 n., 39.1 n.), and free of artificial word-forms.

Livy and Sallust were regarded in the first century as the leading exponents of profoundly different styles of historiography. Quintilian, who mentions the pair to be the greatest of Roman historians, expresses more than once the liberality of their styles (2.5.39, 13.3.155-6).

Moreover he quotes the judgment of another historian, Servius Sulpicius, that they were "more than mere copy-strikers" (26.1.186). Livy’s facility to the style of Sallust is indicated by Servius the Elder (quaeis, 3.1.196).

Sallust not only transfers the style of Egyptian into Latin (Dem. 134.13; Vell. 2.56.1, Quat. 10.2.116, Vell. 7.77). In writing in a manner which is unpretentious, brief (Herm. 1.1.13, Dem. 134.17, Quat. 4.2.45, 6.3.12, 10.2.45), and lucid in exposition, just as he goes back to old Latin for some of his vocabulary (Quat. 2.1.29, Front. 300.18, Aug. 36.3), so in his avoidance of rhetorical effects (with the notable exception of chiasmus and antithesis) he recalls the master’s style of the early annalists (3.1 n., 39.1 n.). His sentences lack the careful intricacy which is a mark of the rhetorical prose of the time (1.2 n.).

His argument, on the other hand, was always clear in the precision with which he is able to introduce changes of subject (31.1 n.), in his lack of attention to rhythm, and in his use, after the manner of the annalists, of old word-forms (continuous, p. 23).

Livy’s conception of historical style was more like that of Cicero (see esp. 2.26.21 which contains both of antithesis). His writing is periodic, full (3.2 n., 77.1 n.), highly rhetorical (3.2 n., 39.1 n.), and free of artificial word-forms.
Livy and Sallust were regarded in the first century as the leading exponents of fundamentally different styles of historiography. Quintilian, who considered the pair to be the greatest of Roman historians, emphasizes more than once the diversity of their styles (2.5.19, 10.1.101-2). Moreover he quotes the judgment of another historian, Servilius Nonianus, that they were 

rare ... magnis quam similis (10.1.102). Livy's hostility to the style of Sallust is attested by Seneca the Elder (contr. 9.1.13f.).

Sallust set out to transfer the style of Thucydides into Latin (Sen. contr. 9.1.13, Vell. 2.36.2, Quint. 10.1.101, Gell. 2.27). He writes in a manner which is unperiodic, brief (Sen. contr. 9.1.13, Sen. enist. 114.17, Quint. 4.2.45, 9.3.12, 10.2.17), and lacking in concinnitas. Just as he goes back to old Latin for some of his vocabulary (Quint. 8.3.29, Suet. gramm. 15, Aug. 36.3), so in his avoidance of rhetorical effects (with the notable exception of chiasmus and antithesis) he recalls the austere style of the early annalists (3.2 n., 29.1 n.). His sentences lack the careful interconnection which is a mark of the rhetorical prose of the time (1.2 n.). An archaic roughness can also be seen in the abruptness with which he is apt to introduce changes of subject (31.1 n.), in his lack of attention to rhythm, and in his use, after the manner of the annalists, of old word-forms (see below, p. 51).

Livy's conception of historical style was more like that of Cicero (see de orat. 2.54, tractus orationis lenis et aequabilis). His writing is periodic, full (1.2 n., 23.1 n.), highly rhetorical (3.2 n., 29.1 n.), and free of archaic word-forms.
Sallust found an imitator in L. Arruntius, who wrote a history of the Punic War: Sen. contr. 114.17 L. Arruntius, vir mense frualitatis, qui historias belli Punicini scripsit, suum Sallustianus et in illud genus nitens. But his style was often criticised (Sen. contr. 9.1.14, Sen. exist. 114.17, Quint. 4.2.45, 6.3.29, 10.2.17, Suet. grum. 10.2, 15.2, Cell. 10.26.1). Our evidence suggests that historians of the early imperial period tended rather to be of the Livian school. Curtius constantly imitates Livy (see 2.1 n., 14.2 n., 30.2 n.). Servilius Nonianus, according to Quintilian (10.1.102), was minus pressus quam historiae auctoritas postulat. Such a remark could not be made of a Sallustian style; but Livy was noted for his verbosity (Quint. 10.1.32, Suet. Cal. 3.v.6). Servilius, Aufidius Bassus, and Fabius Rusticus are all described by Tacitus as endowed with eloquentia (Dial. 23.2, Agric. 10.3). Tacitus twice assigns the same quality to Livy (Agric. 10.3, 4.31.3). Moreover at Agric. 10.3 Fabius and Livy are explicitly linked as eloquent historians. We have no testimony concerning the historical style of Pliny the Elder, but if, as is likely, it resembled that of the rénae in the Natural History, it bore no resemblance to the Sallustian manner but was deeply influenced by contemporary rhetoric.

Tacitus advertises himself as first and foremost a Sallustian. He does not merely imitate Sallust, but contrives by well-chosen phrases to evoke specific Sallustian characters and situations. His reminiscences of Livy, however, are casual (13.2 n., 26.1 n., 26.2 n., 30.2 n.). Though he undoubtedly enriched his vocabulary from Livy and
his successors (see below p. 7), he rarely suggests a parallel between a Livian situation and one of his own (but see 35.2 n. on Agric. 38.1).13

Like Sallust, Tacitus avoids periods of the Ciceronian and Livian kind, though there are occasional examples in speeches (17.1 n.) and military chapters.14 He writes with Sallustian brevity,15 inconcinnity,16 and rapidity. He achieves rapidity partly by means of asyndeton (1.2 n., 8.1 n., 33.2 n., 36.1 n.), a device which is very common to Sallust but rare in Livy outside official contexts and speeches (36.1 n.). His habit of including accumulations of asyndeton in speeches and passages of vivid description is manifestly influenced by Sallust (8.1 n., 36.1 n.).

In the Annals, if not the Histories,17 Tacitus resembles Sallust in the sparing use which he makes of various rhetorical devices. He largely avoids three types of hyperbaton (substantive separated from a simple attribute by a verb; verbal substantive separated from its verb; and examples with the pattern abab, such as that at 1.10.1 simulatum Pompeianarum gratiam partium) which are frequent in rhetorical prose and Livy, but very rare in Sallust and the annalists (3.2 n., 29.1 n.).18 Figura etymologica is more common in the historical works than has been supposed, but is rarer than in Livy (8.2 n.). At least one type of homoeocytoton is avoided (36.1 n.). Certain devices are disproportionately frequent in speeches (see below, p. 12). A number decline steadily throughout the Annals in narrative (see below, p. 35). Particles are seldom used to link sentences, except in speeches (1.2 n., 44.3 n.). Antithesis is frequent, as in Sallust, but Tacitus takes care to vary the
construction of the two members (14.5 n.). Moreover two of the most
striking kinds of antithesis become rarer in the course of the Annals
(see below p. 35). It has recently been contended that Tacitus' liking
for antithesis is so great that he introduces it even where it has no
point; but this view has been refuted. In imitation of Sallust
chiasmus too is used frequently, but double chiasmus of the kind seen,
for instance, at 3.4.1—miles cum amis, sine insignibus magistratus,
populus per tribus is very unusual. Seneca the Elder criticises a
tricolon with double chiasmus as characteristic of the new rhetoric:
contr. 2.4.12 hanc controversiam cum declamaret, Maximus dixit tricolon
tale, qualia sunt eaque basilicae infectant... accusatur pater in ultimis
annis, nego in prinds adoptatur, in mediis abdicatur filius.

In vocabulary Sallust and Livy have much in common. Livy had no
doubt been influenced by Sallust, and both writers must have drawn on
the annalists. Even before Sallust it is probable that many words and
phrases had established themselves as standard in historiography.

Claritudo (= claritas), for instance, is found twice in Cato (orig.
63,83) and once in Sisenna (45), as well as in later historians. Sallust
(Jug. 2.4) and Tacitus (II.75.2) have it in a phrase (summa claritudo)
in which Sisenna had used it. At the time of Cato the word seems to have
been in use (Plautus has it but avoids claritas), but in Sisenna it was
probably an archaism. Cupido occurs once in Calpurnius Piso (36) and
twice in Sisenna (25,104), and then in Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus.
Amicor, which is Plautus alternates with the compound adipiscor, is
used by both Pannius (9) and Sisenna (94) before Livy. *Concio* (= *concito*), a word favoured by Livy and Tacitus (17.2 n.), is found twice in Sisenna (41, 48). *Virile auctor*, a phrase first used by Plautus, had a long life in historiography. It occurs in Sempronius Asellio (?), Sisenna (60), Sallust, Livy, Tacitus, Suetonius, Fronto, and Ammianus. *Necessitudo*, which in the sense 'necessity' is preferred to *necessitas* by both Sallust and Tacitus, earlier occurs in Sempronius Asellio (?), probably as an archaism. Plautus uses *necessitas* exclusively. Finally, it is worth noting that *gisco*, which is particularly common in Tacitus, is already found in Sempronius Asellio (?), in a Tacitean phrase (triv. *Idida giscentum*; cf. 15.4.1). The vocabulary of history probably started to become fossilized at the end of the second century B.C., for it is then that an archaizing tendency becomes apparent. Sisenna and Claudius Claudianus seem to have taken over from Geta words no longer current in their own day.

But although Tacitus inherited a large stock of historiographical phraseology common to various authors, it is often possible to detect his debt to Sallust. Sometimes he uses a word which could only have come from Sallust (att. *attimo* 25.2 n.). He also at times shows a knowledge of Sallustian usage so intimate that it must have been derived from close study. Thus, although *cesan* and *nesan* are found in many writers, only Tacitus and Sallust use the two words in such a way that they do not overlap (20.4 n.). Again, the distinction in usage between *cuncta* (adjectival) and *omia* (11.2 n.), *servitium* and *servitus* (15.3 n.),
tolero and pereo (merfendo) (1.2 n., 24.1 n.), and enim and nam (27.3 n.) is the same in Tacitus as in Sallust. Finally, although anxius (for the everyday sollicitus) is common in both Livy and Sallust, Tacitus was more familiar with Sallust’s use of the word, for he does not have the frequent Livian expression anxius curia, but uses the Sallustian anxius enim twice (2.1 n.).

Sallust was criticized for his borrowings from Cato (Quint. 8.3.29, Suet. Aug. 86.3, 186.15). Tacitus accordingly avoids or uses sparingly various Sallustian words and usages which savour of early Latin.

Atque, for example, is used before consonants very frequently in old Latin (in Ennius’ translation of Euhemerus, Cato’s speeches and Origines, and also Claudiaus Quadrigarius) and Sallust, but only rarely by Tacitus (38.2 n.). Sallust was influenced by Cato’s use of the word (38.2 n.). Tacitus temporarily experiments with the usage, but then discards it (below, p. 53). The frequentative duco, which occurs in old Latin (Plautus, Ennius, Terence) and Sallust, is used by Tacitus only once in the Historiae (II.100.2). It does not appear again until late Latin. It was obviously a highly recherché term resurrected by Sallust. Similarly torpido (= torpor), which was taken up by Sallust from Cato (see Gell. 11.2.6), occurs in Tacitus only once in the Historiae, in a reminiscence of Sallust (III. 63.2, cf. Sall. hist. 1.77.19). Prosapia, a word described by Quintilian as insulam (8.3.26) and excessively archaic (1.6.40), and mentioned by Cicero as an archaism (univ. 11), is used by Sallust (Aug. 85.10) in a phrase (veteria prosapiae)
which is probably from Cato (cf. orig. 29 veteris unusanis), but is avoided completely by Tacitus. Finally the old frequentative poll iditor (Plautus, Terence) is used twice by Sallust but not at all by Tacitus.

Tacitus' indebtedness to Livy's vocabulary is harder to estimate. A usage apparently derived from Livy may also have occurred in the lost Historiae of Sallust, a work which is likely to have left an even greater impression on Tacitus than the Catiline and Jugurtha. Moreover the influence of Livy on various imperial genres was so great (see below, n. 39) that, even assuming that a Livian word or usage had not been employed by Sallust, it may already have been common in literary or historiographical prose by the time of Tacitus. Nevertheless it is certain that the Livian tradition, if not Livy himself, was the source of many of Tacitus' words and expressions. For some apparently non-Sallustian words and usages found in Livy and Tacitus, and usually one or more intermediaries, see on praebec = do 5.1 n., litteria acirc 6.1 n., ompter 10.1 n., siste 14.2 n., evulco 14.3 n., concio 17.2 n., accio 21.1 n., verbal compounds in stren = stren 23.3 n., anuio + substantival object 25.1 n., oro + substantival object 25.2 n., peremular 26.1 n., sipo + object 29.2 n., obvis 30.2 n., peremuro 35.1 n., adjectival compounds in stren 38.3 n., senecta invalidus 40.1 n. Peremular was almost certainly taken directly from Livy. 30

No writer, however artificial, can remain unaffected by contemporary usage. Current developments in educated prose have left their mark on Tacitus. See on defunctus 3.3 n., oro 19 n., affectus 27.3 n., the
The remaining influence on Tacitus' vocabulary was poetry. A poeticising tendency in Roman historiography can be traced back to the annalists.\footnote{Hofius Antipater, according to Pronto, was a diligent imitator of Ennius: p. 62N ... Ennius emone studiose emulatur L.} Godius. Some of Tacitus' poeticisms have a special purpose. At 22.2 dapes is intended, with the expression hunc illum numine deum destinari (see note ad loc.) to evoke in irony a Virgilian situation. Again, at 10.1 mentis inope is used in reference to Nero's state of mind because the description of a parricide's guilty conscience was a conventional poetic (tragic) ténes. In ἐκφάσεις Tacitus sometimes accumulates epic (particularly Virgilian) words, following the model both of earlier historians such as Livy, and of contemporary rhetorical writers (see below, p. 14, and on 30, pass.). But many other poetic words scattered throughout the historical works seem intended merely to impart a general poetic colour. See on sēdes patria 12.3 n., vēlo (metaphorical) 20.4 n., remet 25.2 n., rāvinunt arma 31.2 n. Virgil is the poet most often recalled,\footnote{It is natural that a writer in an artificial genre should attempt to surpass his predecessors stylistically. Seneca gives some examples of extensions which L. Accuritus made to Sallustian usage (enist. 114.17-19).} but post-Virgilian poeticisms are also traceable (vēlo 20.4 n.).\footnote{Seneca gives some examples of extensions which L. Accuritus made to Sallustian usage (enist. 114.17-19).} It is natural that a writer in an artificial genre should attempt to surpass his predecessors stylistically. Seneca gives some examples of extensions which L. Accuritus made to Sallustian usage (enist. 114.17-19).
Tacitus' main innovation was to increase the solemnity of historical style. This he achieved by exercising greater selectivity than his predecessors. Words of high style which had been used by earlier historians, but not to the exclusion of equivalent words of lower stylistic level, in Tacitus often completely or almost completely displace their synonyms. See, e.g., on anxius 2.1 n., validus 5.1 n., clam (gen. plur.) 6.2 n., onerrior 10.1 n., imperito 10.3 n., roor 14.3 n., luxus 15.2 n., concio 17.2 n., verbal compounds in praec = praeter 23.3 n., ore (= rore) 25.2 n., saevus 30.3 n., ardus 31.4 n., sileo 36.1 n., Cf. on genitus, ortus 21.1 n., infensus 23.1 n. The following words, which are not discussed in the Commentary, also outnumber their synonyms more markedly in Tacitus than in earlier historians: munia (minera), sileco (= cresco), fidus (= fidelis), oh (= uostrae), modicus (= marvis), juvens (= adulescens), juvena (= adulescentia), repente (= sobito), equido (= cupititia), grator (= gratulator), minitor (= minor).

We do not know how selective imperial historians after Livy had been. But we do have a useful guide in Pliny the Elder. Pliny, himself an historian, shows a liking for historiographical usages in the Natural History. Occasionally he concurs with Tacitus in eliminating a commonplace word which had been used by previous historians (see on saevus 30.3 n., sileo 36.1 n.). In such cases he may reflect contemporary historiographical practice. But where he does not have as marked a preference for an elevated word as Tacitus, there is an increased
possibility that Tacitus' exclusiveness is original.

A special reason for Tacitus' selectivity may be suggested. In the first century there tended to occur a breakdown in the stylistic divisions between genres. The new rhetorical prose of Seneca the Younger is full not only of poetisms but also of words and phrases which are mainly historiographical. 39 Pliny's letters, in contrast to those of Cicero, contain many poetisms. 40 Columella's work on agriculture, unlike that of Varro, is composed in an affected style marked by archaisms and poetisms. See also above on the style of Pliny the Elder. Sallust and Livy had merely to give their prose an archaic/poetic tinge in order to distinguish it from that of the lower genres. But Tacitus was forced to discard many ordinary words entirely to achieve the same effect.

Tacitus' exclusiveness may have seemed monotonous to a Roman reader. An archaism will be more arresting if used for effect only in special contexts (see 31.4 n.). His well-known tendency to drop artificial words and constructions in the course of the Annals (see below, pp. 29 ff.) may in part have been inspired by a desire to avoid monotony (see below, p. 30).

Tacitus also extends the range of employment of various words (Boetticher, Lex. Tac., LIII ff.), and admits freely uses of words and constructions which had previously been found only sporadically. See on the omission of ae in acc. c. infin., below p. 39, per 2.1 n., praeeeo 5.1 n., simul 6.1 n., exterreo (active) 8.2 n., super 9.3 n.,
Also worth mentioning is his habit of giving an old phrase a new twist. See on naufragio intercepta sit 3.3 n., a Tacis occitus historian 21.1 n., long et caedibus 26.1 n., cuod contra veritit 31.1 n.

The style of Tacitus is not uniform, but varies slightly according to subject matter. The rules of stylistic propriety taught in the rhetorical schools, though directly applicable only to oratory, would inevitably leave their mark on an historian. The diverse components of an historical work (e.g. speeches, annalistic matter, battle descriptions, political narrative, rhetorical set-pieces of various types) could scarcely be handled in an unchanging style. Of extant histories that of Livy shows the greatest stylistic variety. Alongside material treated in a periodic style, Livy gives details of elections, portents, new buildings etc. in the jejune manner of the Annales Maximi. His speeches differ in some respects from the narrative. Battle accounts often combine the simple style of official Roman military reports with an epic vocabulary. In laws, prayers, carmina etc. various highly archaic words not found in the narrative are used (see on perduellis 29.2 n.).

The components of Tacitus' Historiae and Annals are more closely harmonised than those of the Ab urbe condita. However, the types of style which Tacitus uses are sufficiently marked to deserve consideration. Although Cato quoted his own speeches verbatim in the Origines (Cic. Brut. 89, Liv. 45.25.3, Gell. 6.3.7, 13.25.15), ancient historians...
usually either rewrote or invented the speeches of their characters. But it was not unusual for a writer to give a speech a few stylistic touches designed to set it off from the narrative. In Xenophon's Hellenica the speeches of Spartans have a dialectal colouring. The speeches in Sallust, though composed in a predominantly Sallustian style, contain some words which are either avoided or rarely used in the narrative (see on quidem 1.2 n., copito 6.1 n., omina 11.2 n., servitum 13.3 n., fero and perfero 1.2 n., 24.1 n., enim 27.3 n.). They also have numerous accumulations of asyndeton which are apparently intended to raise the emotional level (36.1 n.).

Tacitus employs a more balanced sentence structure and a greater profusion of rhetorical devices in speeches. The correlatives neque ... neque (see below, p. 43), et ... et (below, p. 53) and vel ... vel46 are all more common in speeches than narrative. Clauses and phrases, often absolute, which are unexpectedly appended to the main body of a sentence are a feature of the narrative but comparatively rare in speeches.47 Polyptoton (20.4 n.), hyperbaton of the type comprising a substantive separated from its attribute by esse (3.2 n.), combinations of synonyms (see below, p. 35), the intensive superlative (see below, p. 37), asyndeton (36.1 n.), antitheses with parallelism of construction (14.3 n.), clausal parallelism (see below, p. 36), and the separation of a verbal substantive from its verb (29.1 n.) are all disproportionately frequent in speeches, particularly those of the Annals.

In vocabulary the speeches share much with the narrative. Words
which a contemporary orator would probably not have used are common (see 43.3 n. for examples from the speech of the lawyer C. Cassius Longinus). Nevertheless Tacitus partially or completely replaces various recherché words with mundane terms which are rare or avoided in narrative. See on the use of femo and perfero for tolero 1.2 n., 24.1 n., cosito for reratu 6.1 n., deorum for deam 6.2 n., omnis (adjective) for cuncta 11.2 n. (cf. 1.3 n.), immens for imperito 9.3 n., meato at II. 47.1 for moer 14.3 n., servitus for servitium 13.2 n., possum for quor 20.4 n., roco for oro 25.2 n., and enim for non 27.3 n. Quibus is preferred to quis in direct speeches (13 : 2), timeo to metuo (6 : 1), and the substantial use of omnes (plural) to that of cuncti (11 : 3). Also, a number of particles are largely confined to speeches (1.2 n., 44.3 n.).

R. Syme (334 f.) has found some genuine Senecan usages in the speech of Seneca at 14.53 f. It is possible that there are occasional authentic reminiscences in the speeches given to other well-known personages. But Tacitus makes no overall attempt to differentiate the language of one person from that of another. Seneca's speech is written for the most part in a Tacitean style. Moreover barbarians and members of the lower classes use much the same vocabulary as senators. The common soldier Vibulenus, for instance, employs the favourite Tacitean archaism ob (1.22.2), and also interficie, a word of high style which is avoided by the freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis.

At the other stylistic extreme are the ἐνθάξωσις which Tacitus occasionally inserts in the narrative. These contain conglomeraions of
high-flown and often poetic words, some of which are alien to Tacitus' ordinary historical vocabulary.

According to rhetorical theory, it was permissible even in oratory to write up ἐκφράζεις in a colourful style. For an ἐκφράζεις in Cicero's speeches, see Ver. 4. 107 (see 14.1 n.). But it is not until the early imperial period that the device becomes common in ordinary prose. Some standard topics which could be made into ἐκφράζεις were storm scenes, battle accounts, descriptions of natural scenery, eulogies of people and places, and mythological details.

In Roman historiography elevated descriptions of various kinds had long been commonplace. Sisenna, for instance, included a storm scene in his history: frg. 104, quito mare persubhorrescere aquosuscis fluctus in se pervolvebant ac societ. In Livy a good example of an ἐκφράζεις is the account of the second battle of Fidenae (4.33), which has a number of epic touches.

It is natural that Tacitus, as the inheritor of both the rhetorical and historiographical traditions, should have elaborated certain passages in a highly poetic style. The description of Suetonius Paulinus' attack on the Druids is discussed in full in the commentary (30). Other notable ἐκφράζεις are at Agric. 38 (the aftermath of the battle of Mons Graupius), 1.65 (incident during the retreat of Cæcina), and 2.23 (storm).
The historical works are interspersed with personal comments by Tacitus on the events which he is narrating. The style of these comments is comparable with that of the speeches. Tacitus tends to lapse into usages uncharacteristic in the narrative.

Particularly noteworthy is the sentence introducing the reflection on the monotony of the subject matter available to an imperial historian: 4.32.1 Veneraque eorum gaeo retulit comen rem parve forsitan et levia memoratus videre non nescius sum. There are only 4 other instances of the hackneyed parvus (Tacitus prefers modicus) in the Annals, of which 3 stand in opposition to magnum and the other is in the expression parvi libei; levia alone would have been sufficient, for it is sometimes a substitute for parvus in Tacitus (17.1 n.). On the frequency of combinations of synonyms in speeches, see above, p. 12. Similarly forsitan (for the more artificial fortasse) is found only twice elsewhere in the Annals, once in a letter of Tiberius. 67 Finally note the polyptoton (retulit ... referam), a device used predominantly in speeches by Tacitus (20.4 n.). Lofsteadt's explanation of the use of parvus in this passage ('von unbedeutenden Dingen die Rede ist') is unacceptable.

At the beginning of the digression on fata (6.22.1) Tacitus uses haec esse talia for haec atque talia, which is exclusively preferred elsewhere in the Annals. 68 In the next sentence there is an instance of demicue, a particle found mainly in speeches in the historical works (1.2 n.). It is also used at 4.11.1, in a rhetorical question put by
Tacitus to the reader.

*Infinitus*, the ordinary educated equivalent of *immensus* and *inreus*, which are used with frequency only in the higher genres,\(^6^9\) occurs 4 times in the minor works, at 3.53.4 in a letter of Tiberius, and in the sentence (written in the first person) in which Tacitus announces his intention of digressing on the origin of law: *ad nos admonet, ut de principiis iuris et cuius media ad hanc multitudines infinitas ac varietatem legum perventum sit, altius disserat.*

*Hercule*, which is usually found in speeches (1.2 n.), is used at 12.4.3.2 to introduce a comment by Tacitus on Rome's dependence on exports from Africa and Egypt: *at hercule clem Italia legionibus longinquas in provincias commatus portabat, nec nunc infestuditate laborat, sed Africam notius et Aegyptum evertas, navibusque et casibus vitiae Romani nantissa est.*

Of the two instances in the Annals of inversion of verbal substantive and verb with accompanying hyperbaton (a usage common in rhetorical prose, particularly the later speeches of Cicero), one is in a speech, and the other is in a Tacitean comment (29.1 n.).

Finally, note that the only example of *saltatem* in the historical works which is not in a speech occurs in a speculation by Tacitus on the motives of Tiberius in a certain situation (1.2 n.).

Livy usually completes his narrative of each year with some chapters containing miscellaneous material apparently drawn from the *Annales*, *Maximi*,\(^7^0\). These annalistic chapters probably reproduce the style of
17. the **Annales**. They usually consist of a series of short sentences (e.g. 31.50.1 ff.), of which many start with *et* (e.g. 31.4.7 bis, 31.50.2, 31.50.4, 32.7.13, 32.7.24, 33.25.3, 33.53.7). They are remarkable above all for their striking sequences of repetitions (e.g. 31.4.2 *creati*, 4.3 *creati*, 4.4 *creati*, 4.7 *creatus*, 4.4 *facti*, 4.5 *facti*, 4.6 *instauratim*, 4.7 *instauratim*; see further 47.2 n.). Sometimes repeated words are accompanied by different demonstrative adjectives (e.g. 4.30.4 *his consulibus ... eos consules*), a device which is also found in a passage of Gallius (4.5) which we know derives ultimately (probably via Verrines, Flaccus) from the **Annales** (NRR I, p. 4 *illam statuam ... ex statuam*). Certain formulas - at least one of which contains an archaic usage otherwise foreign to the style of Livy (48.1 n.) - recur (e.g. *creati consules ...*, *praetores exinde facti*, *mortuus ... suffectus*).71

**Tacitus**' annalistic chapters are usually assimilated in style to the main narrative. At 2.41.1, for example, one verb is made to serve for the description of a number of dedications. But contrast Liv. 34.53.3 *dedicat sunt*, ib. *dedicavit*, 4 *dedicavit*, 5 *dedicavit*, 7 *dedicavit*. Again, at 15.22.2 *defunctus* (which Tacitus always uses for *mortuus*, 3.3 n.) is introduced in a context in which Livy would have used *mortuus*: *defunctaque virgo Vestalis Lælia, in cuius locum Cornelia ex familia Cossonorum captæ est.*

But occasionally Tacitus imitates the old annalistic style. At 6.10.3 the obituary of L. Piso the Pontifex has a succession of three short unconnected sentences, each with its verb at the end: 72 *patrem ei censorium*
fulisse memoravi: notae ad octogesimum annum processit; decus triumphale in Thracia meruerat. Two annalistic chapters in book 15 contain short sentences introduced by *et* (15.22.2, 47.2). In chapter 47 of the present book a temporal expression is repeated in a manner which can be closely paralleled from the annalistic sections in Livy (47.2 n.). In chapter 17 a carelessness appropriate to annalistic style is observable (see notes ad loc.). Finally, the use of *magnificentia* at 15.32 in reference to a gladiatorial show (*spectacula gladiatorum idem anno habuit rari magnificentia ac unio*) is reminiscent of Livy's formulaic method of describing the production of games (e.g. 33.25.1 *ludi Romani eo anno... magnificentius quam alios facti*; 33.42.9 *ludi Romani et separat magnifice sunt et iter toti instaurati*).

Battle descriptions were familiar to the Romans from official reports, epic, and rhetorical exercises as well as from the historians. Tacitus' battles naturally bear the stamp of his unique style, but it is possible at times to detect in them the stylistic influence of official, epic, and rhetorical accounts.

Tacitus avoids in battle scenes the jejune style which E. Fraenkel has shown to have been characteristic of official military reports, but his indebtedness to official practice can be seen in the disproportionate frequency with which he uses the ablative absolute. The incidence of the ablative absolute in Caesar, whose *Commentarii* undoubtedly owe much in style to official reports, is about 10 times that in Cicero. At the time of Plautus the construction is scarcely

From a later period an instructive passage is Cic. Att. 4.16.5a, where Cicero has obviously fallen into official style: a 0. fratre et a Caesare accipi a.d. VIII Kal. Nov. littera datae a litoribus Britanniae proxime a.d. VI Kal. Octobres, confecta Britanniae, obsidibus accepits, nulla praeda imperata tamen pacium exercitu ex Britanniae ressortant.

The following table shows the distribution of the ablative absolute in Tacitus.76

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Examples per page</th>
<th>Examples per page</th>
<th>Examples per page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall</td>
<td>Ann. 4 3.5</td>
<td>Ann. 12 4.6</td>
<td>Ann. 15 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously the construction is unusually common in military chapters.79

The best example of a rhetorical battle description in the Annales is the account of Poppeius Sabinus' Thracian campaign (4.46 ff.).
passage is marked by asyndeton, parallel phrases and clauses, anaphora, antithesis, isocolon, and chiasmus. Note, e.g., at 49.3 the asyndeton ballatorem, imbellium, equi armamenta, and sanie odora contactu, and the anaphora cuos vulnera, cuos sitiis; and at 51.1-2 the anaphora nunc ... nunc, the asyndeton prorsa detrahere, the parallel clauses detrahare talia, pellere ubonibus, the chiasmus incerti iactus, vulnera improving, and the isocolon with accompanying antithesis aliis in audacia, aliis ad formidinem.

For a striking instance of a battle described in epic style, see chapter 30 of this book and notes.
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61. Quint., l.c. For some mythological details handled by Cicero in an elaborate style in the philosophica, see 14.1 n.

62. Observe the poetism caecum (VII III. 44.70 ff.), and the double compound persubhorrescere, which does not seem to be found elsewhere.

63. Ogilvie, Livy, 585.
64. Ogilvie and Richmond, ad loc.

65. Syme, 357, and Koestl. ad loc. It is worth noting that the whole phrase placidus sequor (23.3) is Virgilian (Aen. 8.96). On placidus as the high-flown equivalent of tranquillus, see 5.1 n.
66. Löffel, Perspicinatio, 71 ff.
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68. Wolfflin, Philol. 25 (1867), 134.
69. See the table at XII. VII. 1450. 30 ff.
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72. Syme, Ten Studies, 66.
73. Ogilvie, Ilios, 29.
75. Proenkauf, o.c.; A.D. Leeman, Grammatica Ratio I (Amsterdam, 1963), 176.
76. Leeman, l.c.
78. Examples per page have been calculated from the edition of Fuchs, which has no separation at the bottom of each page. The following chapters have been taken as: 1. 23-5, 27, 46-52, 56, 73; 12. 12-18, 27-40, 43-5, 49-50, 50-5; 13. 5-9, 35-43, 53-7; 15. 1-17, 21-31.
79. An attempt has been made by H. Fuchsler, Der Ablatheit Absolutos bei Tacitus (Stuttgart, 1951) to show that the ablative absolute declines in frequency after the Historiae. His statistics are selective.
Two factors undermine the conclusion suggested by the table.

First, the minor works and the various books of the *Histories* and *Annals* are of uneven length (*Annals* 13 is scarcely more than two-thirds the length of 1; hence it has slightly more examples per page: 4 : 3.7). Secondly, the frequency of the construction depends to a considerable extent, as seen above, on the nature of the subject matter. Unlike *Annals* 1 and 13, *Hist. IV* is mainly military; therefore it has a large number of ablative absolutes.

Again, the *Dialogus* consists largely of speeches, whereas the *Agricola* contains some military material (in the direct speeches of the *Histories* and *Annals* (34 pages) there are only 33 examples of the construction).
II. STYLISTIC CHANGE IN ANNALES 11-16

It was argued by E. Lofstedt that, although Tacitus progresses towards greater artificiality of diction in the first half of the *Annales*, he returns in the later books, and particularly after 12, to a more 'normal', 'classical' style. This view, hitherto widely accepted, has recently been called into question by F.R.D. Goodyear. Goodyear points to the limitations of the change after book 12, to evidence for linguistic and stylistic continuity in 13-16, and to the fact that words are discarded not merely after book 12, but continuously throughout Tacitus' writings. He allows that 'it was in the nature of Tacitus' whole development to move towards greater simplicity', but sees this movement as a feature not merely of the last half of the *Annales*, but rather of the whole work.

Eriksson's thesis will here be questioned along different lines. It will be shown with new evidence that, although Tacitus undoubtedly drops, or to some extent turns away from many artificial, poetic, and archaic usages in the later *Annales*, he simultaneously replaces numerous ordinary words and usages with elevated equivalents. Perhaps the only development which is consistently maintained in 11-16 is the movement away from rhetoric.

It has recently been observed that there are similarly conflicting patterns of stylistic development in *Livy* while various archaisms and poetisms are discarded after the first decade, others, previously avoided or used only rarely, are taken up in the later decades. It is
probable that any long work will show diverse modifications of style, so diverse are the influences to which its author is likely to be exposed.

Some factors which may have led to conflicting changes in the Annals may tentatively be suggested:

(1) A desire for variation may have induced Tacitus to eliminate certain words, both artificial and commonplace, and to take up others, of varying stylistic levels, in their place. Since he had to narrate numerous events of the same kind in the historical works (e.g. battles), it is plausible that he should have sought to avoid monotony by constant alterations of vocabulary. The ancient critics were prone to point out words which individual writers had used to excess. Archaisms and artificial words in particular could easily fall through overuse.

(2) It is a phenomenon of language that words may be picked up, often subconsciously, from the speech of others or from works read. A writer who acquires a word in this way will often use it repeatedly for a while at the expense of previously preferred synonyms, and then either drop it or use it more sparingly. A subconscious taste may obviously be developed for words of varying stylistic levels. It is possible that some of the words, both ordinary and artificial, which increase in the later Annals had insinuated themselves into Tacitus' vocabulary unnoticed, from any of a variety of sources. Ergo, e.g., may well belong to this category. It is used only 15 times in Annals 1-14, but no less than 12 times in book 15 (from chapter 20 onwards).
It is no longer possible to place Latin words in any but the most general stylistic classes (e.g. archaisms, vulgarisms, colloquialisms, poetisms). The Romans themselves had some of our own categories (e.g. archaisms), but they also classified words according to various qualities which are all but lost on the modern reader (e.g. euphony, 'meaningfulness'). An archaising historian such as Tacitus who discards an archaism or artificial word may be motivated not by an impulse to 'normalize' his vocabulary but rather by a feeling that the 'normal' term to which he turns has some particular quality which makes it preferable to the corresponding archaism. If we knew more about the tone and quality of Latin words, we would perhaps find that many of the apparently conflicting changes in the later Annals had as their common inspiration Tacitus' desire to maximize the effectiveness of his language.

The assessing of stylistic change within a work involves problems of method, some of which must briefly be mentioned. It will be convenient to point out a few of the faults of procedure to which Eriksson in particular was prone.

Eriksson saw the normalization of Tacitus' style as consisting in a movement towards a more 'Ciceronian' vocabulary. However, many words which Cicero employs had fallen out of use between the late Republic and the end of the first century A.D. If the language of the later books of the Annals is more 'normal' than that of the early books, it will show a closer affinity with the ordinary educated usage of the early
Empire. The existence of a type of Latin used by the educated in
everyday speech in the late first century A.D. is attested, indirectly,
by Quintilian. We are particularly fortunate in the survival of
Seneca the Elder's Controversiae and Scaenae and ps. Quintilian's
Declamationes Minorae, for both writers seem only to have used words
which were in educated use. Neither has certain words which we know
from ancient testimony to have been archaic or affected at the time;14
both avoid completely many words15 which are used frequently by known
archaisers (often to the exclusion of their synonyms) and at least
occasionally (alongside their synonyms) by writers of artificial prose;16
and both often show similarities in their choice of words with Cicero
and Caesar: there is naturally some continuity in the educated usage
of the late Republic and of the early Empire.

Seneca occasionally heightens his style,17 but only in ἐκφράσεις
which, according to rhetorical theory, could contain usages proper to
history and poetry.18

Two other useful guides to first century educated usage are
Quintilian (Inst. Grat.) and Petronius (excluding the speeches in the
Cena Trimalchionis),19 but both must be used in conjunction with the
Elder Seneca and ps. Quintilian, for Quintilian occasionally adopts
mild archaisms20 and anachronistic Ciceronianisms,21 and Petronius
writes up some passages more elaborately than others.22

(2) Much of Eriksson's evidence consists of archaic, poetic, or
artificial words which occur only once or twice in the first 6 books of
the *Annals* and never again; or, conversely, of 'classical' or 'normal' words which occur only once or twice in the last 6 books. Against such evidence must be set the numerous examples, not mentioned by Eriksen, of (1) archaisms, etc. which are found only in the later books (once or twice), and (2) ordinary words which are found only in 1-6. Moreover isolated deviations from a norm scarcely provide sound proof of stylistic change, even if they happen to be clustered in one section of a work (see (3) below).

(3) It is not justifiable to compare the distribution of two synonyms unless they are freely interchangeable. One, or both, may be restricted to contexts of certain types. *Servitus*, e.g., is found predominantly in speeches in the historical works, but its archaic synonym *servitium* is used in the narrative as well. Again, two words may differ slightly in usage, though identical in sense. There is, for instance, a clear distinction in Tacitus between *senectus* and *senecta*, and between *dismittus* and *dissimulatio*. Sporadic abnormalities of the type mentioned above (2) are especially likely to have been introduced for a definite reason. Even if the writer's motive is not apparent, it is unsafe to assume that he did not have a particular effect in mind.

(4) An increase in the incidence of a word is not significant unless the word has an interchangeable synonym which itself decreases in frequency, increases at a slower rate, or remains constant. If it has no synonym, its frequency will obviously depend solely on the subject matter.
There follows a collection of new evidence bearing on the problem of the later *Annals* and also of all convincing earlier evidence, some of which does not seem to have been noticed. Examples of stylistic change which, broadly, is of the opposite kind to that noted by Eriksæn have, for convenience, been given separately. However, it is almost certainly an oversimplification to suggest that there are merely two developments - a movement towards, and one away from a more 'normal' style - taking place side by side in the *Annals*. It is probable that the words and usages which are discarded and taken up are of a great variety of types. But, as seen above, it is not possible now to classify words or usages with any accuracy. We can only correct Eriksæn's one-sided picture by providing some generally conflicting evidence.

The view of Goodyear and of R.H. Martin, that changes of taste are not confined to the last hexad but are constantly occurring, will be confirmed repeatedly.

Rhetoric and sentence structure will be treated separately.

**Rhetoric, Phrase and Sentence Structure**

Various rhetorical devices diminish in frequency in the course of the *Annals*, but none, it appears, increases. There is not simply a sharp change of taste in either 11 or 13; rather, modifications are observable even within the first hexad (particularly after 1). Tacitus probably reacted against the excesses of contemporary rhetoric, as manifested above all in the Younger Seneca.
0. Meebš noted a decrease in the incidence of anaphora in 11-16, after a surprising rise from Historiae to Annals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Historiae</th>
<th>Annals 1-6</th>
<th>Annals 11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. Jax convincingly demonstrated that combinations of synonyms (or near synonyms) decline progressively from the minor works through to the end of the Annals. Within the Annals they are at their most frequent in the first 3 books:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Historiae</th>
<th>Annals 1-3</th>
<th>Annals 4-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tricola with members of ascending length, groups of qualified substantives of ascending length, and combinations of 2 substantives or adjectives - all characteristic of rhetorical prose - were shown by E. Lindholm to decline in the later books. Each phenomenon seems to be most common in book 1.

Two of the most striking kinds of antithesis - those in which (1) two or more words in one clause or phrase are balanced by two or more contrary words in another clause or phrase (double antithesis) (e.g. 1.2.1 tuta et praeaeutia quam vetera et periculosae mallet); and (2) two or more antithetical pairs of words are juxtaposed (e.g. 1.70.3 nihil strenueus ab imitavo, saepe e ne imprudenti, consilia a casu differe) - diminish in the narrative portions of the later Annals. In books 1-3 I have noted 45 instances of the two devices in narrative, but in 13-15 (of comparable length) only 14.
There is a marked diminution of asyndeton in the third hexad.

Examples of the type comprising 2 or more unqualified words in juxtaposition are distributed thus:\n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ann.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in Book 1 the device is more numerous than in the whole of the third hexad, and that in 11-12 it is more frequent proportionately than in 13-16, but less so than in the first hexad.

Asyndeton bimembra of the type consisting of two substantives with qualifying or dependent words undergoes a similar decline:\n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-6</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>13-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallelism of phrases and clauses is particularly frequent in Annals 1, but thereafter decreases:\n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ann.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution in narrative is as follows:

| 86 | 61 | 40 |

The decline apparent in 4 is more marked by 14.

Hyperbaton, in its many forms, is a distinctive feature of the rhetorical prose of both the Republic and early Empire. Tacitus, however, probably following Sallust (who in turn appears to have been following the early annalists) uses it only sparingly. Examples
comprising a substantive separated from a short attribute by a verb (a common type) are about twice as frequent in the first 6 books of the *Annales* as in the last 6 (but there is not a high incidence in either section).\(^4^5\)

The intensive (as distinct from the relative) superlative, a usage employed to excesse in much rhetorical prose (e.g. by Cicero and Velleius)\(^4^6\) is found disproportionately often in speeches in the historical works. Of the 30 examples which occur in narrative in the *Annales*, about two-thirds are in the first 6 books.\(^4^7\)

Although Tacitus' sentence and phrase structure is not noticeably different in the later books of the *Annales*, it does undergo simplification in a few respects. I have found no evidence of any compensatory tendency towards greater complexity.

C. Wetzell\(^4^8\) and in particular C. Stuhl\(^4^9\) showed that ellipse of *esse* diminishes in 11-16. It has been possible to confirm their conclusion with some new evidence.\(^5^0\)

The placing of prepositions in anastrophe drops sharply in 13-16, as Goodyear has demonstrated with convincing statistics:\(^5^1\)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1-5 & 11-12 & 13-16 \\
65 & 65 & 100 \\
218 & 96 & 129 \\
\end{array}
\]

A. Kohl\(^5^2\) has recently found slight evidence for a decline from 13 onwards in the frequency of the appended clause, a marked
characteristic of the Tacitean sentence. However, Kohl is at pains to emphasise that his figures are not conclusive.

Finally, note that indirect commands introduced by ut precede the verb on which they depend (the less usual position) more often in the first hexad than later.\footnote{53}

\textbf{Word Choice, Syntax}

Evidence which conflicts with the thesis of Eriksson is given first.

Wölfflin was the first to find signs of a continuation throughout the \textit{Annales} of Tacitus' movement towards the stylistically more ornate. He showed that quasi, which is rare in the first hexad, becomes frequent later, particularly after 12, at the expense of tempus;\footnote{54} that the form vinculum is driven out after book 1 by the older vinclum;\footnote{55} that the use of quidam in combination with substantives - amplitude characteristic rather of the oratorical style\footnote{56} - diminishes from hexad to hexad;\footnote{57} that variants of the traditional pair adversus/secundus become increasingly common after the start of the \textit{Annales};\footnote{58} and that the archaising dyhine (= deinde) is twice as frequent in the last 6 as in the first 6 books.\footnote{59}

Similarly R.B. Steele noted an increase in the incidence of the archaic/poetic usage quo + subj. (without a following comparative) for final ut\footnote{60} in 11-16: 61
Z. Kucera found that Tacitus shows a greater tendency to admit incomeminitus of expression in the later books.  

Finally, Eriksson himself conceded that the highly artificial use of cognomen for nomen increases in II-16.  

To this evidence add the following:  

The omission of se in oratio obliqua: the omission of the subject accusative in the accus. c. infin. construction occurs at least occasionally in most writers and is common in historians other than Velleius. Tacitus' liking for the usage increases as he advances. In the minor works he rarely admits it; but in the Annals in particular it becomes very frequent:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>minor works</th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most authors omit se (but not sum, etc.) considerably more often with the future active than with other tenses of the infinitive. In the Histories Tacitus rarely omits it with tenses other than the future; in the Annals, however, he becomes progressively less restrictive:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>se omitted with future active infinitive</th>
<th>with other tenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>10 (77% of all instances)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann. 1-6</td>
<td>14 (67%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>19 (55%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
litterae, epistula: on this pair, see 6.1 n. The former had become obsolete during the first century A.D.; epistula was by the time of Tacitus the word in regular use. The distribution of the two in Tacitus is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>minor works</th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>litterae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epistula</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that epistula still predominates in the Historiae, but has been eclipsed by the first hexad of the Annals. Its elimination is complete by the last 6 books, for the 2 remaining examples are formulaic and could hardly have been avoided: 15.35.2 quin [innobiles] habere, quos ab epistulis et libellis et rationibus appellat; 16.8.1 praeferretque rationibus et libellis et epistulis libertas.

sons, insons, nocens, innocens: on the archaisms sons and insons, see 44.4 n. In the later Annals they tend to displace nocens and innocens. In the first hexad the latter are preferred in the proportion 2:1; but in 11-16 sons and insons predominate by almost 4:1;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nocens, innocens</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sons, insons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ludicrum, ludi: ludicrum is used for ludi mainly by historians. Tacitus has it only twice in the first hexad, but 12 times in 11-16. Ludi does not show a comparable increase. It is above all in the third
hexad that *Ludicum* comes into favour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-5</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>13-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>lēgo</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>delico</em></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures are sufficiently large to indicate a clear change of taste.

In books 1-12 *lēgo* and *delico* tend to occur in clusters, a phenomenon probably due to unconscious association. *Delico* is found twice in successive chapters in two different places in Annals 1 (58, 59; 64, 65); 3 times in 8 chapters in 2 (40, 43, 47); twice in successive chapters (47, 48); 3 times in 4 chapters (74, 75, 76) and twice in 5 chapters (52, 56) in 1: 4 times in 2 chapters (2, 3) and 6 times in 9 chapters (41-49) in 6; and twice in the same chapter (66) in 12. *Lēgo* is found twice in 5 chapters (43, 47) in 1; twice in 5 chapters (42, 52)
in 2; 3 times in 6 chapters (30, 32, 35) in 3; and twice in the same chapter (16) in 4. 73

exterreo, terrreo: exterreo is another artificial compound. 74

It is comparatively rare in the Historiae, but by 11-16 is more than 3 times as frequent as terrreo:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>terrreo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exterreo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No allowance has been made here for those instances of exterreo which are not synonymous with terrreo but have the sense 'frighten away'; 75 they are not numerous enough to alter the general picture presented by the table.

See further below, p. 55 on compound verbs.

super + abl. (= de): the archaism super (= de) is used predominantly with res as object in the late Republic and early Empire (perhaps a formalistic usage preserved in the official language and taken over from there by archaisers). 76 The further Tacitus advances in the Annals, the greater his tendency to use it with words other than res (cf. the increasing boldness with which he omits se in omittio oblique):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>super with words</td>
<td>1 (20% of 6)</td>
<td>6 (4.5%)</td>
<td>11 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other than res</td>
<td>all instances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
quando = quoniam: an artificial usage rarely found in the ordinary prose of either the Republic or early Empire. It is infrequent at the start of the Annals, but outnumbers quoniam in the later books:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ann. 1-4</th>
<th>5-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quoniam</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quando</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that a change of taste takes place after book 4.

simul = et, simul ... et: on this highly unusual usage, see 6.1 n. It is about twice as frequent in 11-16 as in 1-6 (17:5). 78

neque ... neque: correlative neque ... neque becomes progressively less common after the first 3 books of the Annals: 79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minor works</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the narrative it is distributed thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variants neque ... aut and nee ... aut, which are frequent in poetry, are fairly evenly distributed throughout the historical works. 61 The diminution of neque ... neque is therefore genuine.

Nec ... nec is about as common in the minor works (13 times) and in Historiae I (7 times) as neque ... neque, but it is thereafter all but dropped. It occurs 3 times in the rest of the Historiae, and only
3 times in the whole of the Annals. Necus was a word of higher style than nec.\textsuperscript{32}

The use of the final infinitive with verbs for \textit{ut + subj}: there are about 20 verbs which are used both with \textit{ut} and the final infinitive in the historical works.\textsuperscript{33} The distribution of the two constructions with these is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ut</td>
<td>20 (2:1)</td>
<td>24 (1:1)</td>
<td>10 (1:3:6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The progressive rise of the infinitive construction throughout the Annals is obvious. Note, e.g., the change in the construction used with the following verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ut infin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{persello}</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{amidac}</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{hortor}</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are in all 2 instances of the final infinitive with verbs in the minor works, 22 in the Histories, 31 in Annals, 1-6 and 50 in 11-16.\textsuperscript{84}

\textit{amnis, flumen}: by the Ciceronian period at the latest, \textit{amnis}, which had once been in regular use, was obsolete.\textsuperscript{85} Tacitus prefers

\textit{amnis, flumen}:
Finally, see the Commentary on *conius*, *maximae/zonae*us*, 37
*testificar*, 38 and *onus* (= *pons*). 39

The most striking examples which have been noted of stylistic
change of the opposite kind are the gradual diminution of *neque*, 50
of *e* before consonants, 51 and of the third declension accusative plural
form *-is*, 52 and the sudden discarding of *ni, foem*, 53 and *quin 54* after
12. It has also been shown with some plausibility that *nurum* (= *nurus*),
*adversum* (= *adversus*), *obsidium* (= *obsidio*), *necessitudo* (= *necesitatio*),
*loci* (= *locus*), postponed *unio, forum, adiaco, addiaco* (= *adiaco*), 55
*poletico* (= *poletio*), 56 and *ante* (= *ante*), 57 decline in the later
books, and that *correlative cum ... cum* 98 and *timor tuae* 59

Some of this evidence requires further comment:

*adversum, adversa*: it is possible that the increase of *adversa*
in the later books (see below) does not reflect a change in Tacitean usage
but is due to scribal inconsistency or to a change of scribes.

However, the authenticity of the general picture presented by H
is strongly supported by the fact that 30 of the 64 instances of
*adversa* attested in the *Annals* are before vowels (a disproportionately
high figure), but only 18 of the 80 of *adversus*. It is highly likely
that Tacitus tended to observe such a distinction between the two words. 
Note, for instance, that he also uses verum disproportionately often before vowels. 100

Moreover there is at least one idiom in which adversus occurs a number of times to the virtual exclusion of adversus: that seen, e.g.; at 1.23.5 adversus asperantia (adversus governs a plural present participle which has the -is accusative form). 101

The distribution of the two words is as follows (Eriksen's figures are inaccurate):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ann. 1-2</th>
<th>3-6</th>
<th>11-14</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adversus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adversus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tacitus does not simply move from one form to the other after 6; rather, his usage fluctuates constantly. Note in particular the rise of adversus in 15-16.

If examples found before vowels are considered separately from those before consonants, similar fluctuations are observable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ann. 1</th>
<th>2-6</th>
<th>11-14</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adversus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| before vowels
| adversus | 5      | 1   | 9     | 3     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ann. 1-2</th>
<th>3-6</th>
<th>11-14</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adversus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| before consonants
| adversus | 15     | 7   | 33    | 8     |
Adversum is an archaism. Sallust probably took it over from Cato's *Origines*, where it is attested, and Tacitus from Sallust. Sallust has it only in the *Galliarum*.

ex: the decline in the frequency of *ex* before consonants which show in 13-16 is certainly a genuine stylistic change, for *ex* continues to predominate until the end of the work in certain apparently formalistic expressions (above all before proper names: *a numero, a provincia, a domo, a superiori, a convicio, a praecentibus*). Conversely *ex* is preferred as well in the early as in the late books in certain other expressions (especially those denoting origin and cause: *Lex, Tac. 532: cf. ex diverso, ex parte, ex modo, ex dimitate, ex uero*).

quique: it was maintained by Eriksen that examples of *quique* occupying second position in their clause are less common in the second half of the *Annales* than in the first. But more detailed examination of the evidence shows that Tacitus' changes of taste are more numerous than Eriksen allowed. *Annales* 1 reveals a closer affinity with the *Historiae* than with some of the later books of its hexad; all but 1 of its 10 examples are in the initial position. In books 2-4 the postponed use is slightly more favoured than the initial (15:10), but in 5-12 it falls off markedly (3:13). In 13 and 14 it disappears completely (initial use 17 times), but in the last 2 books it returns (6:10).
femide: this word declines most strikingly after the first two
books of the *Annals* rather than in the third hexad (as asserted by
Kirkerson).

The third declension accusative plural in -is: the observation
of O.C. Tingdal that -is undergoes a continuous diminution in the *Annals*
seems to have gone unnoticed. There are twice as many instances in I as
in any other book:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ann. 1</th>
<th>2 3 4</th>
<th>5 6</th>
<th>11 12</th>
<th>13 14</th>
<th>15 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11 13 12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 5 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This decline is similar to that of other usages in Tacitus, a fact which
suggests that it may be genuine; inconsistent copying could hardly be
expected to produce such a regular pattern. Moreover, the ending frequently
recurs in certain words, not only in both halves of the *Annals*, but also
in the *Histories*. While it is unlikely that scribes repeatedly
introduced it in the same words by accident, it is highly probable that
Tacitus considered it more appropriate in some words than in others.

Note also the idiom mentioned above in which present participles ending
in -is are governed by *adversus*.

Some new evidence can be added to the above:

*inveg. ad*: these and the other copulative particles are not
completely interchangeable in sense and usage, but they overlap to a
considerable extent. A writer's choice is governed above all by
Aulus is a word of high style. It has been shown, for instance, to be particularly characteristic of those speeches of Cicero which are composed in the grand style.

In the early and less elaborate speeches, and in the colloquial and technical works, it is far outnumbered by et; but in the Ann. Foem., c.g. it is more frequent than both et and nisi. Tacitus uses it more often in the first half of the Annals than in the second:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the proportion of instances of estus used as a copulative to those of copulative at is tabulated in the three sections of the Annals, it is seen that estus declines continuously:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3,5</td>
<td>1/5,1</td>
<td>1/7,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

num as a particle introducing single indirect questions, num was obsolete by the first century A.D. It is gradually dropped by Tacitus in favour of the current word an:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imperius, nascius: Tacitus' use of this pair - of which the latter was already archaic by the late Republic - provides a striking example
of fluctuating taste. *Ignarus* is preferred markedly in the *Histories*, and to a lesser extent in *Annals* 1-2. In 3-5 however, *necius* comes into favour. *Ignarus* regains the ascendancy in 6-14, but in the final two books *necius* again increases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-14</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ignarus</em></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>necius</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the return of a more artificial word in books 15-16, see on *adversum* and postponed *quiue* above, and see Gerbar and Cref, *Lex. Tac.* 91b on *necue* in 16.

**-tissel:** the syncopated forms of the perfect infinitive active and the pluperfect subjunctive active of first and fourth conjugation verbs and also of certain analogous second and third conjugation verbs were in regular use under the early Empire; the full forms were archaic. The full forms fall off slightly but perceptibly after the first few books of the *Annals* (in the *Histories* they are rarely used). The proportion of contracted to uncontracted forms in various sections of the *Annals* is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ann. 1-3</th>
<th>4-12</th>
<th>13-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1/3.3</td>
<td>1/2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tacitus seems to have become uneasy about archaic and artificial word forms in the later *Annals*. A number decline (cf. *adversum, iurare*,


Qui, entire, -is), but none increases. In the late Republic and in the
Augustan period there had taken place a movement to eliminate anomalous
forms, largely perhaps under the impetus of analogists such as Julius
Cæsar. 117 Virgil and Livy, both show greater hesitancy in admitting old
forms than their predecessors Lucretius and Sallust. 118 Of the forms
mentioned above, for instance, adversus, adverset and qui is all frequent
in Sallust's later writings, 119 but largely or completely avoided by
Livy. 120 Tacitus seems to have moved slightly away from the Sallustian
practice towards that of Livy (and probably that of other modern
historians, such as Ausilius Cæsara and Servillius Nonianus). However,
he undertook no systematic removal of old forms from his vocabulary:
only qui is abruptly discarded.

The nominative use of the ab urbe condita construction: This
unusual construction (see e.g., i.42.1 nova nescius Augusti aversus,
interfecta Tiberti ausus negationes vos factat), for which it is simpler
to use a substantive (e.g., here enaded) with a dependent genitive, is
strikingly frequent in the early books, but is all but excluded from the
later. 121 It is possible that Tacitus dropped it because it had become
an obtrusive mannerism of his style.

Ad + gerundive: with a selection of examples Wolf'slin 122 showed
that often when ad + gerundive appears in the Annales instead of the
archaising dative of purpose with the gerundive, Tacitus was compelled to
use it by the requirements of sense, euphony, or variation.\textsuperscript{123}

The following table shows all examples in the \textit{Annales} of those instances of \textit{ad} + gerundive for which the active of the gerundive could apparently have been substituted without difficulty:\textsuperscript{124}

\begin{tabular}{ccccccccccccccc}
\end{tabular}

The change in the later books is clear;\textsuperscript{125} note too that Tacitus' practice in book 1 has not altered greatly from that in the \textit{Historiae} (on which see Wölflin, l.c.).

tutor, tuetur: both Plautus and Terence always have \textit{tutor} for \textit{tuor} (in the sense 'guard'; Plautus occasionally has \textit{tuor} = 'see'), but by the late Republic the frequentative was no longer in use, except in the past participle \textit{tuatur}, which provided a substitute for the avoided past participle of \textit{tuor}.\textsuperscript{126} In Cicero's speeches there are almost 90 examples of \textit{tuor}, but only 7 of \textit{tutor}, of which 5 are in the form \textit{tuatur} and another is needed in polyptoton: \textit{Phil. 4.2 aut rea publicam libertatemque vestram suo studio ... tuatur est et tutatur.}\textsuperscript{127}

In the letters, where \textit{tuor} is used more than 100 times, the sole example of \textit{tutor} is a past participle. In the \textit{rhetorica} \textit{tutor} occurs twice, once as a past participle and once as a present infinitive. It is only in the \textit{philosophica} that Cicero has \textit{tutor} more than once in forms other than \textit{tuatur}. \textit{Tutor}, however, still predominates (118:8).\textsuperscript{128}

Under the Empire Vitruvius, Seneca the Elder, Seneca the Younger,
Petronius, Quintilian, and pa. Quintilian (apoc. min.) et al. avoid tater completely.

Before Tacitus the only writers of prose who used tater with any freedom are Sallust (6 times; tauer twice) and, in particular, Livy (over 100 times). In the first decade Livy employs it scarcely less often than tauer (20:23); in the third, however, tauer predominates by almost 2:1 (58:30), in the fourth, by almost 3:1 (61:21), and in the fifth, by about 4:1 (31:8).

In Tacitus *tater* is at its most frequent in the first hexad; it then declines to the position which it had had in the *Historiae*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>II-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tater</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tauer</em></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*atque before consonants:* for a full discussion of this usage in Tacitus and others, see *Introduction*, p. 6, and 38. 2 n.  

*et ... et:* in the later books of the *Annales* Tacitus admits correlative *et ... et* (*et ... et ... et*) a number of times in the narrative, but in the first hexad he restricts it largely to direct speeches. The distribution of the construction is thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 11 instances in 1-6, 9 are in direct speeches, one is in an
indirect speech and the other is in a philosophical digression.\textsuperscript{130} 
In 11-16 however, there are 6 examples in ordinary narrative.\textsuperscript{131} 
Similarly in the\textit{ Histories} 15 of the 19 instances are in narrative.\textsuperscript{132} 

Against the increase of the correlatives \textit{et ... et} and \textit{aut ... aut} in the later\textit{ Annals} must be set the decrease of \textit{neque ... neque} (see above).

Repeated (but not correlative) \textit{et ... et}: this usage is rare in 1-12, but is no less frequent in 1-3 than in the last named:

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Hist. & I-II & IV-V & Ann. & 1-3 & 4-12 & 13-16 \\
\hline
36 & 11 & 33 & 6 & 31 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note that it decreases at the end of the\textit{ Histories}; but is taken up again at the start of the\textit{ Annals}.

\textit{struo, extruo}: the compound seems to have been the word in ordinary use in the early Empire.\textsuperscript{133} In the\textit{ Annals} it gradually displaces \textit{struo}:

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
& minor works & Hist. & Ann. & 1-3 & 11-16 \\
\hline
\textit{struo} & - & 8 & 12 & 3 \\
\textit{extruo} & 5 & 9 & 5 & 12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Another artificial simple verb which is all but eliminated by a compound is \textit{adipiscor} (see above, p.45).

It is an indication of the complexity of stylistic change in the\textit{ Annals} that, while the commonplace compounds \textit{extruo} and \textit{adipiscor}
drive out *struig* and *aciscor* in the later books, *delito* and *extreme*, both of which are more artificial than their simple verbs, also become proportionately more common (as shown above, p. 42). It is possible that Tacitus had developed a liking, conscious or otherwise, for the emphatic form of compounds, regardless of their stylistic level. The following, of various kinds and quality, are found only or mainly in 11-16:13 (Figures in brackets show number of occurrences)


(As tellis), *extinesco* (3), *exceto* (2:5), *exhillo* (gena prono: 1),

*exulco* (de outis: 1), *conservo* (1), *comprobo* (1), *camineto* (2),


*conlauto* (1), *consuluto* (1:2), *constituto + infin. (1), *concorer* (2:4),

*coniendo + infin* (1).

On *perpetuo* and *perito*, see 38.1 n.

The number of compounds confined to or predominating in 1-5 is strikingly smaller: *occido* (4), *permunio* (2), *percol* (1), *permutumio* (1),

*verteardo* (1), *cadrenNESco* (1), *contertio* (1), *exatio* (2), *inunesco* (1),

*deco* (2).
Clearly there is no general process of normalisation at work in the later annals. Not only are artificial words and usages taken up as others are dropped; but even those discarded sometimes return. Tacitus emerges as a writer always dissatisfied with his own style. On the one hand he constantly strives after greater originality and dignity of expression; but at the same time he tires frequently even of remote and colourful words and usages. Hence the annals show a remarkable diversity of stylistic modifications.
Notes

3. For favourable reactions to the dissertation of Eriksson, with whose name the theory is most commonly associated, see Koestermann, Gymn. II (1935), 322 ff.; Holmberg OII 56 (1935), 177 ff.; P. Aalto, Eros 51 (1953), 58; Klingner, Hermes 83 (1955), 167 n.1; Syme, 739
5. o.c., 28.
6. For brief remarks on which, see Syme, 739; Goodacre, o.c., 26f.
8. See Quint. 10.2.16 and Tac. Dial. 23.1 on esse videatur in Cicero; on criticism of Cicero's usage of exempla, see Landgraf, S. Rosc., 86 and references; on tems on Cato, see Larousse, Stylistique, 263, and reference.
9. See P. Spitte, De Tac. in commodis emuntis natione (Götting., 1866), 120 n.l.
10. See, e.g., Quint. 1.6.40, 8.2.12, 8.3.26, 8.3.47ff., Cell. 11.7.1.
11. See, e.g., Quint. 8.2.9, 8.3.16. The epithet significans as applied to words apparently mean 'expressive', 'meaningful'.
12. See, e.g., on sicarius 8.5 n., testificor 12.3 n., orq 23.2 n.
affectio 27.3 n.; contemptio 27.3 n.; silens 36.1 n.; condemn 41 n.

13. 1.6.45 ergo consuetudines sermonis vocabo consensus auditorum. Quintilian has stated (1.6.3) that current usage (consuetudo) should be the guide in speaking; the language of earlier ages should be avoided (1.6.43). He then explains what he means by 'usage': not the speech of the uneducated (1.6.44f.), but that in which the educated concur.

14. e.g. recor, proles (Quint. 8.3.26), the third person plural perfect form -ere (Quint. 1.5.43f.; see below, n. 17, for its use by Seneca), the uncontracted forms of the imperfect subjunctive of first and fourth conjugation verbs and of the perfect infinitive (Quint. 1.6.17, 1.6.21), dapes (= decem) (Quint. 1.6.18) (see 6.2 n.).

15. Examples will be found in the Commentary to illustrate both this and the following observation.

16. e.g. Seneca the Younger.

17. e.g. 2.1.2ff. Note, e.g. egera (2.1.10). 58. 13.3 n.

18. See Quint. 10.1.33 licet tarnen nobis in figuris inconspicuum exhiberet historicum nonnullorum nitorem; see also on mirum, 14.1 n., and above, p. 12.


20. e.g. recor (2.16.9, 11.3.3, 12.10.5), which he describes (see above, n. 14) as 'tolerable'.

21. See below, 35.2 n.

22. e.g. 99.3.
23. e.g. (1) adusque 14.58.4, alimonium = alimentum 11.16.3, audentia =
   audacia 15.53.2, audens = audax 15.58.4, citus = sito 12.12.3,
   12.11.1, 13.38.3, dido 11.1.2 (see Lex. Tac. s.v. 'fama' for
   alternatives), diutinus = diuturnus 14.18.2, dismus + gen. 15.14.1,
   diusterno = divide 11.12.2, funus = oadaver 13.17.3, 15.71.1 (see
   Norden, Aen. VI, 176), genero 15.23.1 (see Fraenkel, Horace, 293 n.3),
   illo = illuc 15.60.4, intorques 14.36.3 (see note ad loc.), imultus =
   ad loc.), obteto = partiro 16.5.3, partio = partior 12.30.2, perneo
   = pervenio 14.58.4, popularis = populus 12.16.1, 14.24.4,
   praevalidus = validissimus 15.20.1, meritor 16.34.2, regno trans.
   13.51.1, rastero = 'revel' 15.74.1, rebelio = dissimo 12.52.2,
   immensus (see 8.1 n.), co infinitas = infinitor 15.2.3, nereo = merco
   15.69.2, subvecto = subvecho 15.43.3; (2) eligo = galigo (see Philol.
   25 (1867), 108), honesta atque inhonesta (without variation : see
   Philol. 26 (1867), 151), firmus = validus (see 5.1 n.), apparatus =
   paratus 2.69.2, capillus 4.57.2 (see Trunkle, Wien. Stud. 81 (1968),
   123), oadaver 1.22.2, 2.18.1 (see Norden, Aen. VI, 176), consimilis
   3.13.2, satietas 1.49.2, firmitas 4.63.1, tacceo = siliceo 4.60.2
   (see 36.1 n.), tacitus = silens 2.43.3, adpropinquo = propinquus
   6.50.2.

   Synonyms of or alternatives to all the above occur in the
   opposite section of the Annals.
24. See 13.2 n.
25. See 40.1 n.
26. See 43.3 n.
27. The quality of earlier evidence has been decided according to the principles listed above. It will be seen that almost all examples of normalisation presented by Eriksson have been considered unconvincing.
28. 'Quibus and quia in Tacitus', CQ 82 (1968), 144-146.
29. Über den Gebrauch der Anaphora bei Tacitus (Bolzano, 1914), 26, 33, 43.
30. 'In componentibus synonymis quae ratio exhibita sit in Taciti Germaniae et Agricolae', Studi in onore di Ugo Stucky Paoli (Firenze, 1955), 431.
32. Jax was careful to distinguish between examples found in narrative and those in speeches. In books 4-6 2 out of 14 examples are in speeches, but in 13-16 7 out of 20 (including 5 out of 6 in 16).
33. Stilist. Studien zur Erweiterung der Satzglieder in Lat. (Luna, 1931), 189, 195f., 204f.
34. Linthom gives statistics for only a selection of books.
35. In contrast to certain other early imperial writers, Tacitus is sparing in his use of the more vivid forms of antithesis, particularly
in the *Annals*: see J. Müller, *Beitr. z. Krit. u. Erkl. d. Tac.HI* (Innsbruck, 1869), 29f. Rarely are the two parts of an antithesis balanced in construction: see 14.3 n.

36. All examples of antithesis given at *Her.*, 4.21 are of the first type.

37. Throughout the *Annals* speeches are more antithetical in sentence structure than the narrative. In 1-3 they contain about 31 examples of the two devices, and in 15-16, about 10 (see n.36).

38. **Narrative:** 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 1.7.1 bis, 1.16.2, 1.24.3, 1.27.1, 1.31.4, 1.51.3, 1.53.5, 1.95.6, 1.61.2, 1.63.2, 1.70.1, 1.70.3, 1.72.2, 1.74.1 bis, 1.80.2, 1.81.2 bis, 2.4.2, 2.17.3, 2.19.1, 2.59.4 bis, 2.64.2, 2.65.1, 2.66.1, 2.68.1, 2.68.2, 2.72.2, 2.87, 2.88.3, 3.1.4, 3.15.1, 3.19.2, 3.21.1, 3.24.2, 3.25.1, 3.26.1, 3.29.2, 3.32.4, 3.39.4, 3.66.1, 4.15.1, 4.15.6.1, 4.15.6.2, 4.15.7.1, 4.15.8.2, 4.15.9.1, 4.15.10.1, 4.15.11.1, 4.15.12.1, 4.15.13.1, 4.15.14.1, 4.15.15.1, 4.15.16.1, 4.15.17.1, 4.15.18.1, 4.15.19.1, 4.15.20.1, 4.15.21.1.

**Speeches:** 1.11.3, 1.19.2, 1.25.3, 1.28.3, 1.46.3, 1.58.3, 1.59.6, 2.5.3, 2.10.1, 2.31.2, 2.71.1, 2.80.2, 3.6.3, 3.16.3, 3.17.4, 3.18.2, 3.34.3, 3.47.1, 3.50.2, 3.53.3, 3.59.3, 3.59.4, 3.59.5, 4.12.5, 4.12.6, 14.56.1, 14.56.2, 15.14.1, 15.2.3, 15.6.2, 15.20.1, 15.21.1.

39. 1.2.1, 2.2, 4.4, 7.1 bis, 7.5, 7.7, 9.5, 11.3, 11.4, 13.1, 17.4 bis, 21.2 bis, 32.3, 33.2, 35.1 bis, 41.3, 42.4, 44.5, 45.2, 49.1, 51.1, 51.3, 53.2, 59.6, 60.2, 61.1, 63.4, 64.1, 67.2, 68.1, 68.5, 70.2, 70.3 bis, 71.2, 74.2.

2.5.3, 13.1, 14.3, 15.3, 17.2, 17.4, 19.1 ter, 20.1, 23.4, 25.2, 27.1,
30.2, 33.1, 33.3, 35.3, 41.2 bis, 48.1, 55.5, 56.2, 64.2 bis, 65.2, 67.1, 71.1, 73.1, 73.3, 82.1.

3.1.4, 2.2, 17.2, 18.4, 22.1, 26.1, 33.3, 33.4 bis, 55.2 bis, 67.2.

6.1.1, 2.2, 3.3, 5.4, 6.2, 8.4, 8.5, 8.3, 37.3, 43.3, 46.3, 48.1, 48.2, 49.2, 49.3 ter, 50.4, 51.1, 57.3, 60.2, 63.1, 67.4, 68.3, 69.1, 69.3, 70.2 bis, 74.3.

5.7.1.


12.1.1, 6.1, 12.1, 17.2, 22.1, 28.3, 34, 34 bis, 36.3, 37.2, 39.2, 48.2, 51.3, 64.1, 64.3 bis, 65.2.

13.1.1, 3.3, 16.4, 18.1, 18.2, 42.4, 44.3, 46.1, 57.2, 57.3.

14.6.1, 31.3, 33.2, 36.1, 47.1, 55.3.

15.12.3, 19.2, 27.3, 34.2, 45.1, 54.1 bis, 55.1.


40. 1.6.3, 8.3, 10.2, 11.1, 13.5, 19.2, 34.4, 35.1, 40.4, 41.2, 42.1, 56.1, 59.1, 59.3, 61.2, 68.4.

2.5.3, 10.1, 14.2, 21.1, 25.1, 33.5, 37.4, 41.1, 43.5, 44.2, 55.5, 55.6, 66.3.

3.2.2 bis, 33.3, 34.5, 61.1, 75.1.

4.1.1, 6.3, 6.4, 12.3, 13.1, 34.5, 42.2, 45.2, 52.1.

5.1.3, 9.1.

6.29.4, 32.4, 44.1, 48.1, 47.3.
11. 17.1, 23.4.
12. 10.1, 19.2, 20.1, 45.2.
13. 2.3, 3.1, 27.1, 34.2.
14. 1.2, 23.5, 60.4.
15. 5.1, 19.2, 20.3.
41. On which in general see No. - Sz., 726ff.
42. The figures comprise examples of parallel finite clauses (e.g. 2.19.1 nunc eum volui, arma iacent) and of parallel phrases or word-groups within finite clauses (e.g. 1.2.1 militem duxit, populum opponens... pellit).
43. No. - Sz., 689 ff.
44. 7.2 n., 29.1 n.
45. 7.2 n.
46. Some words (e.g. pulchra) are used by Cicero almost exclusively in the superlative in the speeches.
47. Narrative: 1. 8.6 bis, 1.13.6, 1.49.1, 1.62.1, 1.73.1, 2.17.2, 2.37.1, 2.43.2, 2.53.3, 2.56.1, 2.64.2 bis, 2.75.1, 3.37.2, 3.58.2, 4.67.2, 4.68.4, 6.4.1, 6.7.1, 6.23.2, 6.33.1, 11.36.4, 13.74.4 bis, 12.44.1, 14.9.1, 14.33.2, 14.51.2, 16.9.2.
Speeches: 1. 22.1, 1.25.3 bis, 1.34.4, 1.49.2, 1.62.2, 2.33.2, 2.63.1, 2.70.1, 2.71.1 bis, 3.17.2, 3.23.1, 3.34.6, 4.5.5, 4.14.3, 4.34.2, 4.39.2, 4.56.2, 6.22.2 (indirect quotation), 11.24.7, 12.33.3, 12.53.2, 13.2.3, 13.42.2, 13.49.1 (Tacticean consent), 13.50.1 (thoughts of Nero presented in an indirect question), 14.40.4, 14.49.2, 16.31.1, 16.31.2.
49. Da usu verbi substantivi Tacitius (Leipzig, 1876).

50. See 5.1 n.

51. c.c., 30.

52. Der Satzachtrag bei Tacitus (Münch., 1960), 118.

53. See 5.3 n.

54. Philol. 24 (1866), 118. 

55. Nuni is the word preferred by the imperial archaisers Fronto and Apuleius: see No. - Sz., 596.

56. The former appears again only once, in 13. See Philol. 25 (1867), 104.

57. See en velut, 37.1 n.

58. Philol. 27 (1869), 116.

59. ib. 25 (1867), 125.

60. On quo see No. - Sz., 675 ff.


62. Über die tact. Incensimiliät (Chthys, 1852).

63. c.c. 13.

64. See e.g. F. - St. I, 700 ff.; L. Verb., Sprat., II, 262 ff.; No. - Sz., 362.

65. See E. Lupus, Der Sprachgebruch des Cornelius Nepos (Berlin, 1876), 2, referring to S. Fritsch, Über den Sprachgebruch des Valerius Paternalis (Amst., 1876), 15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>20.1, 39.2, 41.1, 41.2, 45.2, 50.3, 51.4, 52.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.2, 16.2, 32.2 bis, 61.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.3, 20.2 bis, 25.1, 36.2, 54.3, 75.1, 77.1, 80.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>7.4, 8.4, 9.4, 10.2, 17.1, 17.3, 19.4, 23.3, 28.2, 32.3, 34.3, 35.4, 35.5, 37.1, 60.1, 69.2, 70.5, 79.3, 80.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>17.5, 35.1, 40.2, 40.3, 50.2, 53.1, 63.2, 69.2, 70.1, 70.5, 79.1, 82.1, 82.2, 93.2, 93.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 7.2, 13.4, 14.4, 16.3, 22.4, 33.3, 44.4, 47.2, 49.1, 59.2, 59.3, 72.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>1.1, 2.1, 3.3, 10.2, 12.3, 20.1, 25.1, 39.2, 39.4, 40.3, 40.4, 40.5, 57.3, 59.3, 60.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>9.1, 9.2, 10.2, 10.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>5.2, 6.2, 7.1, 14.3, 19.3, 22.2, 31, 44.4, 45.1, 47.1, 47.3, 65.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>13.1, 16.4, 19.2, 32.2, 36.1, 38.3, 42.3, 42.4, 46.2, 49.4 bis, 56.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>14.1, 3.1, 6.2, 7.1, 7.2, 8.1, 8.4, 11.2, 29.1, 35.1, 36.1, 48.2, 48.4, 52.3, 55.5, 58.4, 60.1, 61.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15.4, 6.1, 10.4, 17.2, 27.2, 29.1, 35.3, 36.3, 42.2, 43.2, 49.3,
51.2, 52.1, 55.1, 57.1, 59.3, 60.2, 61.3, 62.1 bis, 64.2, 67.4,
68.2, 69.3.
16.3.2, 4.4, 24.1, 25.1 bis, 25.2.

67. See, e.g., L. Kühna, Die Hauptpunkte der Livischen Syntax
(Berlin, 1872), 109; H. Lindgren, Studier Curtians (Upsala, 1933),
56. See also the examples quoted from Cicero and Caesar by
J. Lebreton, Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Ciceron (Paris
1901), 377 ff.

68. I.50.3, II.2.2, II.32.2, III.13.3, III.20.2 bis, III.77.1, IV.14.4,
IV.19.2, IV.56.3.
1.7.4, 1.19.4, 1.25.3, 1.35.4, 2.71.5, 2.79.1, 2.83.3, 3.14.4,
3.47.2, 3.58.2, 3.72.2, 4.40.3, 5.5.1, 6.58.2.
11.25.3, 11.30.2, 12.7.1, 12.29.1, 12.45.1, 12.47.1, 13.11.3, 13.38.3,
13.42.4, 13.56.1, 14.1.2, 14.29.1, 15.3.4, 15.29.1, 15.42.2,
15.43.2, 15.52.1, 16.21.1, 16.28.2.

1.6.4, 2.58.1, 2.63.1, 3.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.39.2, 4.39.4.
11.3.2, 11.17.1, 12.47.3, 13.30.1, 13.46.2, 13.49.4, 14.35.1,
16.25.1.

70. See L.S. s.v. 'Iudicer'.

71. See 33.1 n. Lex was also falling out of use, but retained a limited
currency.
72. See Philol. 25 (1867), 103.

73. Unconscious repetitions are likely to occur in any composition, particularly one of extended length. For examples from Livy, see Giles, CE 6.6 (1951), 364.; cf. Trankle, Wien. Stud. 61 (1968), 121 (on hiscerc). Repetitions of a word otherwise absent from a writer's vocabulary are of particular interest (see on importio, 21.3).

74. See 8.2 n.

75. 8.2 n.

76. See 9.3 n.

77. No. — Ss., 607 do not sufficiently emphasize the rarity of the word in this sense in ordinary prose.

78. See Lex.Tac. 1563.

79. The figures given by Lörstedt, Roman Literary Portraits (Oxford, 1958), 165, are inaccurate (64 times minor works and Historiae, 8 times Annales).

80. See TII. 11. 1558, 122.

81. See Lex. Tac. 923b, 935b. Nec .... aut is preferred in the Historiae (22.5), nec aut in the Annales (26.10). Of the 80 instances of neque ... neque and nec ... nec in the historical works, 14 are found in direct speeches. But of the 60 instances of neque (nec) ... aut, only 4 are in direct speeches.

82. Lörstedt, Synt. 1, 532 ff.
83. *admoner, adde, c OPT, cohoret, de, deba, hortor, impellor, incepto, inane, moza, mene, opo, pena, percalle, postulo, suadeo, sulpico, uygco. I omit *permitto as a special case (see 12.4 n.)

84. See *Lex. Tac. under the words mentioned above and also under accino, admissor, ac-Smcer, ambio, conter, ochter, decumico, descor, expresso, impo, incumbo, inliego, instr, nitor, suntic, prasonto, prasscribo, scrivo.


86. 34.2 n.

87. 6.1 n.

88. 12.3 n.

89. 9.3 n.


91. See Goodyear, o.c., 30.


94. See *Eriksson's Index*, s.v. Cf. 22.1 n.

95. See *Eriksson's Index*, s.v. Cf. 22.1 n.

96. See *Syme*, 739 n.7.

97. See *Brakman, Lem. 53* (1925), 175ff., 183ff.

98. See *Wolfcin, Philol.* 25 (1867), 124.

99. See *Eriksson's Index*, s.v.
100. Cf. Wölflin's remarks on dem and deinde (Philol. 25 (1867), 105.)

101. Cf. 1.36.2, 4.25.3, 4.51.1, 6.1.2. The only similar example of adversus is at 15.10.1.

102. See TIL I, 590, 63ff.

103. See Lohstot, Synl. II, 291.

104. A usage found frequently in Pliny the Elder (Thes. ant.) and Tacitus' Annals, but elsewhere rarely; on Tacitus, see Wölflin, Philol. 25 (1867), 120.

105. e.g. omnis (6 times Annals, 7 times Historiae), tria (3 times Annals, twice Historiae), pluris (4 times Annals), partis (3 times Annals), resistit (twice Annals), insignis (twice Annals), ingenuitas (twice Annals), hostis (twice Annals), hostis (3 times Historiae), pontifex (twice Annals). See Tingdal, l.c.

106. Euphony, e.g. is one factor which might lead a writer to repeat the form in certain words. At 13.21.1 ff. Collinus quotes and discusses a remark of Valerius Probus that in deciding between -em and -em a writer should be guided by his ear.

107. KÜ - St. II, 53; on Tacitus, see L. Kienia, Die Konjunktivartikel 'et, que, atque' bei Tac., Flin., Sen. (Tübingen, 1906), 17ff.; 21ff. (on atque in Tacitus).

108. KÜ - St., l.c.; cf. G. Ruten, De particularum copulativarum usu et vetores Romanorum scriptores usus (Marburg, 1893), 2.


110. Gotzes (see n. 31), 112; Ruten, o.c., 4.
111. The following statistics are not exhaustive, but comprise the examples of the two words linking pronouns, substantives, and adjectives.

112. See 44.1 n.

113. See 10.3 n.

114. In the minor works there are no uncontracted forms, but 22 syncopated. In the Histories there are only 5 uncontracted forms (I.70.2, II.70.2, III.84.4, IV.41.3, V.21.2), but 49 syncopated. However, in Index 1-5 uncontracted forms predominate by 60 : 16, and in 11-16 by 43 : 16.

115. Uncontracted forms: 1.5.1, 1.6.2, 1.7.1, 1.10.2, 1.25.3, 1.64.5, 1.52.1, 1.79.2, 1.80.2, 2.2.1, 2.22.1, 2.22.2, 2.26.1, 2.31.3, 2.45.3, 2.46.2, 2.59.1, 2.70.1, 3.51.1, 3.52.1, 3.9.1, 3.16.1, 3.22.1, 3.31.4, 3.31.7 bis, 3.34.6, 3.36.3, 3.37.1, 3.49.2, 3.52.2, 3.61.1, 3.61.2, 3.67.2, 3.75.1, 4.8.3, 4.16.2, 4.28.2, 4.30.2, 4.31.4, 4.34.2, 4.39.3, 4.40.1, 4.55.2 bis, 4.62.1, 4.64.3, 4.65 bis, 4.70.4, 5.7.2, 6.8.2, 6.9.2, 6.29.2, 6.43.1, 6.48.1 bis, 6.50.4, 11.5.1, 11.10.3, 11.20.2, 11.21.2, 11.22.6, 11.30.2, 12.36.2, 11.37.1, 12.5.3, 12.6.2, 12.22.1, 12.25.2, 12.36.1, 12.40.1, 12.60.1, 12.69.1, 13.6.3, 13.9.3, 13.15.1, 13.19.3, 13.26.3, 13.30.1, 13.40.2, 13.42.1, 13.42.4, 13.43.5, 13.53.1, 14.2.1, 14.10.3, 14.11.4, 14.20.2, 14.23.1, 14.62.3, 15.3.2, 15.10.3, 15.15.1, 15.42.1, 15.45.3, 15.52.3, 15.61.1, 15.61.3, 15.65, 15.67.4, 15.68.1, 16.14.2, 16.18.2, 16.22.1, 16.26.2.


118. On archaic forms as a characteristic of the style of Sallust rather than that of Livy, see Tränkle, _Mnemosyne_ 81 (1968), 133. On Virgil's sparing use of archaic forms, see H. Lazanus, _Mus. Lat._ 4 (1947), 126ff. Sallust was probably following the anomalous tradition in using unusual forms: see, e.g., the fragments of Caecilius.

119. On _uisa_ in Sallust, see Wölflin, _Philol._ 25 (1867), 105; Löffelhardt, _Syst._ II, 290; on _adversam_, see _Syst._ II, 291; _avisset_ seems to be used without exception in the Sulpicius, but in the Catiline there are isolated instances of _visset_.

120. On _uisa_ in Livy, see Tränkle, _o.c._ 127; on _adversam_, see _Lexicon_ 655; _avisset_ is hardly ever used by Livy.

121. See 14.3 n.

122. _Philol._ 25 (1867), 114.

123. Eriksson (25), in his discussion of the frequency of the two constructions, disregarded Wölflin’s remark. Since he merely tabulated all occurrences without reference to their contexts, his
statistics are of little value.

124. The instances included in the table are: 12.1, 1.5.1, 1.7.7, 1.23.1, 1.41.2, 1.64.2, 1.71.1, 1.71.2, 1.76.4 (adapted: 6.3.2, 6.46.5, 6.68.2, 6.69.4, 11.2.1, 12.6.1, 12.10.1, 13.8.3, 14.5.1, 14.23.1, 14.39.3, 14.39.1, 14.46.3, 15.52.3, 15.56.2, 15.58.2, 16.14.1, 16.39.3, 16.22.1, 16.24.1 (adapted: 16.32.3) (in the following passages it has been possible to see a reason for the avoidance of the dative + gerundive: 2.6.3 (variation), 2.4.3.4 (Hölflein, L.c.), 2.7.1 (ad dicendum causa; this phrase is always used by Tacitus instead of the dative with the gerundive), 3.39.2 (Hölflein, L.c.), 5.39.2 (ad dicendum ... causa), 3.39.1 (variation), 5.49.2 (ad dicendum testimonium), 5.55.4 (Hölflein, L.c.), 5.57.4 (euphony), 4.16.4 (Hölflein, L.c.), 4.16.1 (used with impello, which always takes ad rather than the dative in Tacitus), 4.18.2 (Hölflein, L.c.), 4.73.1 (clarity), 5.11.1 (variation), 11.37.2 (dicendum ad causa), 12.14.1 (extendem ad fidem; Tacitus avoids fides in the dative with a gerundive, but uses ad fides with a gerundive a number of times), 13.5.1 (ad causa orandam), 13.31.2 (ad retinendum ... fidei), 13.38.3 (variation), 13.39.1 (clarity), 14.26.1 (Hölflein, L.c.), 14.51.1 (clarity), 15.39.3 (dicendum ad causa).

125. The figures are only approximate, for Tacitus’ intentions may sometimes escape a modern reader; nevertheless it is reasonably certain that the classical construction is used more freely in the
second half of the *Annals* (with the change at 6).

126. *Kroba-Schmalz*, a.v. 'tucor'.

127. The remaining instance in the speeches is at *Beast*. 50.

128. *Sometimes* *tutor* is found in passages of heightened tone in the
philosophers. It occurs in the *Sonnium Scipionis* (cap. 6.13)
in a passage describing the abode reserved in heaven for *patrisae
conservatorum*; at nat. 2.20, in a simile which also contains *armis*;
at nat. 2.127 near the archaism *torpeiro*; and at *Tusc*. 1.32, in a
passage similar in spirit to cap. 6.13 (above).

129. Counting only forms in which both words are used: *tutaba(n)tur*,
tutabor, tutundur, tutum, tutu(n)tur, tuture(n)tur, tuturi,
tutatus, and the corresponding forms of *tucor*.

130. The latter 2 examples are at 3.6.1 and 6.22.3. For the others,
see *Lex., Tac.* 394-5.

131. 11.28.1, 12.30.1, 14.27.1, 15.15.2, 15.39.1, 15.69.3.

132. The 4 examples in speeches are at I.15.1, I.37.5, I.52.4, III.36.2.
For the remainder, see *Lex., Tac.* 1.6.

133. See 12.4.1. Only literal examples of the two words are dealt with
here.

134. The simple verb corresponding to each occurs at least once in the
*Annals*

1-6.

135. Even the view argued in such detail by *Wolfflin*, that *Tacitus* moves
between *Histories* and *Annals* towards a more artificial style, is to
some extent an oversimplification. A few archaisms (*nunc*, *is*
accusative plural) have been seen above which are used in the *Histories* but rejected in the *Annals*. 
III. WERE THE LATER BOOKS OF THE ANNALS REvised?

It was first suggested by E. Koestermann, in a review of Erikkson's Studien zu den Annalen des Tácitus,⁠¹ that Tácitus may not fully have revised the later Annals. More recently Syme has argued this view in some detail.² It has been shown by Goodyear³ that lack of revision should not be invoked as a cause of stylistic normalisation in the later books (if such normalisation could be proved: see above). Nevertheless, the question whether 13-16 received the final touches deserves to be considered in its own right. Some further stylistic arguments can be adduced.

Although Tácitus strives after variatio more than most writers,⁴ he sometimes inadvertently admits repetitions⁵ which have no special point.⁶ Sporadic repetitions of this type may be dismissed as inevitable in any writer, even the most painstaking. However, in the later books of the Annals there also occur some striking accumulations of repeated words, phrases, and constructions.

One such accumulation is found in the opening chapters of the present book. Deprehendo is used twice in the same sentence at 7.6 with no change of sense. Donec is repeated in adjoining sentences at 8.1 and 8.2. Excepio is used at 4.2 and 4.4. of Nero's welcome to Agrippina. The historiographical expression facinus naturae, elsewhere found only twice in Tácitus (1.45.2, 2.66.1), is used at 7.1 and again in the next chapter (8.4).⁷ Venio occurs twice with the same subject
in chapter 8 (2.4), funusor + abl. twice within a few lines in 12 (3.4)
(in different phrases), the characteristically Tacitean vocabulum
(= nomen) twice in 15 (1.5), and ario twice in successive sentences in
17 (1). Eptdo is found at 6.2 and then a few lines later at 7.1 (both
times in reference to Agrippina's escape from the first attempt on her
life) and again at 10.2. plautus is used absolutely at 3.2 and 4.1,
in both places expressing decisions taken by Nero concerning the method
to be adopted in disposing of Agrippina. Conficio (= intericiio)
occurs at 5.3 (describing the death of Saccurnia, who is mistaken for
Agrippina), and at 6.2 (describing the death of Agrippina herself), but
only twice elsewhere in the whole of Tacitus. incipitamentum afferre
(nosotros else in Tacitus) is found at 14.3 and 21.3. Hactenus (1.3),
an infrequent word in Tacitus, proccus (3.5), propinus (2.5), and
nuctor (1.5) are all used twice in 7. Impomio, used nowhere else by
Tacitus, is found at 16.2 and 21.3 (see ad loc.)

Note too the following: ignarus (3.3, 5.2), grauer (a very rare
word) (9.1, 10.2), summus (subst.) (7.5, 10.2), nucio (6.1, 7.2),
exstrux (12.4, 13.2, 19.2), examiner (rare in Tacitus) (5.1, 12.2),
permistro (7.4, 11.1), infensus (10.2, 11.1), extruxus (6.2, 8.2),
respicio (7.3, 8.4), lumen (6.1, 8.3), visco (6.2, 8.4), exilium (3.2,
7.6, 9.2, 16.2), opprior (7.1, 10.1), medium (1.1), meditatio (2.2),
immanitus (2.2, 11.3) (only once elsewhere in the Annals), lumen (11.2,
13.2) (comparatively rare in Tacitus for the more recherché reperi),

Equally remarkable are the repetitions in the account of the
Pisonian conspiracy (15.48 ff.). In 59 there are 3 examples of dat
in anaphora, of which 2 are in successive sentences (3 bis; cf. 1).
In the same chapter adverbial adversus (-a) also occurs 3 times (2, 4, 5);
overall in 4,5-6 it is used no less than 11 times (cf. 44.3, 50.5, 58.3,
62.2, 63.1, 64.3, 64.3, 68.2, 68.3). Ventilo is found at 52.1 and again
at 53.1; in the former passage it is superfluous (cretro ventitubat).
The commonplace construction ad + gerundive, for which Tacitus usually
has the dative of the gerundive, is used twice in 66 (1,2) a short
chapter, and also at 55.3, 56.2, and 58.3. Interrogo an occurs twice
in 61 (2,3), caedes twice in successive sentences at 52.1, and deors
three in successive sentences at 51.1. There are 3 negative final
clauses (introduced by ne) in 64 (1,2,3), another at the beginning of
the next chapter (51.1), and two in successive sentences in 52 (2-3).
At 50.4 in adjoining sentences there are two examples of the same kind
of hyperbole (consilium adsummaeat, radibiae ac deterius; radia
astitissae libertas ac cervos). Relative clauses in which the relative
pronoun stands in agreement with a word in its own clause (e.g. 50.3
quem vita femina locutum ...) are found at 59.4 and 59.5, in successive
sentences, and also at 56.2, 58.2, and 66.1. At 74.1 there are 3
successive relative clauses in the same sentence.9 The expression
vocare sepulchrum, for which in the Annales Tacitus often substitutes
vocare patres (1,2 n.) occurs at 72.1 and again at 73.1. In the same
passages are also found the similar ablative absolutes contione...
habita (72.1) and oratiae ... habita (73.1) Consci, with abstract subject, is used at 45.1, 54.1, 55.1, and 66.3; edo at 56.3, 58.1, and 60.4; visando at 61.1 and 63.3; conqueror (unaccusam in Tacitus) at 60.3 and 61.1; orare (ordo) at 56.4, 51.2, 52.1, 60.3, and 73.1; metaphorical traho at 67.1 and 69.2; manus with the genitive (conjunctio, conspirationis) at 54.3 and 56.2; ut ... tradidere at 53.2 and 54.3, form at 49.3 and 49.4, retine at 50.2 and 50.4, and ex in the sense 'in accordance with' at 70.2 and 72.1. In 50-52 secuta is found 4 times (50.1, 51.2, 51.3, 52.2), but its synonyms not at all. Finally quasi (tuncum) followed by an adjective or participle is used at 50.2, 52.2, 53.2, 59.4, and 74.3.

In chapter 17 of book 16 grandis, a slightly colloquial word admitted by Tacitus only a few times in the later Annales, is found twice within a short space (4, 5). It is excessively used. Scribo occurs twice in successive sentences (5, 6). Intercicio is used in sections 2 and 4 and twice in 6. In 4-5 there are 2 examples in successive sentences of appended ablative absolutes taken up by relative clauses (4 conjonctionis, scientia finitur, accipitales Lucani liiteris; quas inspectas Nero ferri ad eum inmissit; 5 exsolvit Venus, scriptum codicillis, quibus grandam pecuniam ... erogabat). Finally, in 4 and 6 there are two instances of introductory relative pronouns standing in agreement with participles in their own clause (4, quas inquireat; 6 quae composita).
In the same book a few chapters later there occurs an unusually inept piece of writing: 2a.1 codicillos ad Neronem compositum, requires objecta et exasperatur adseverans, si notitia criminum et coriam diluendi habuisset. Notitia criminum is superfluous (cf. requires objecta), as is diluendi. Tacitus could have written, with no loss of sense, requires objecta et exasperatur adseverans, si coriam habuisset. There is a similarly obscene sentence early in book 14: 15.3 vix artium necesse est moris retinatur, accidet inter certainam vitiornm judicia aut modéstia aut cunctaem probi moris reservatur.

A full stop could have been placed after vitiornm, and the remaining words omitted. Judicia .... moris needlessly reproduces the idea contained in modéstia, and reservatur is a repetition of retinatur.

There are a number of repetitions in the first 16 chapters of book 3 (only one chapter, however, has more than one repetition), but otherwise the first 13 books contain no accumulations at all comparable with these seen above, even though long sections of narrative with uniform subject matter (in which repetitions are more likely than in short accounts of miscellaneous items) are not uncommon (e.g. the matinies in book 1, the campaigns of Germanicus in book 2). A good example of the care which Tacitus was capable of devoting to a passage is provided by the first 10 chapters of book 1, in which there are over 20 different words and expressions denoting death and killing.

It is unlikely that any part of the Annals has come down to us in a totally unrevised form. We may assume that Tacitus wrote a number of
drafts of a work so intricate in structure. Even the opening of
book 14, despite its repetitions, is obviously not a rough copy, but
an artistic composition describing the tragic death of Agrippina.
Apparently the later books (14-16) were revised either less carefully
or less often than the earlier. There seems no other explanation for
the virtual absence from the earlier books of accumulated repetitions.
It would be natural if Tacitus bestowed less care on final polishing
as he drew near the end of a long work.
Notes

2. Tac. 740 ff. (especially 745).
6. According to rhetorical theory it was artistic to repeat a word in a different sense (Landgraf, B. Krag., 20); see also 29.4 n. on polyptoton (the use of two different forms of the same word in juxtaposition or near-juxtaposition).
7. The repeated use of words such as facinus and ecclesi in a passage of this kind is to be expected. But the repetition within a short space of a rare and striking phrase is more unusual.
9. On Tacitus' reluctance to allow more than one relative clause in a sentence in the historical works, see 17.1 n.
10. Löfstedt, Synt. II, 266.
12. 3.1.3 acredienter, 1.4 exprassa; 3.3 acrediderim, 4.1 credenre; 6.2 amisam, 6.3 amissem; 12.5 objecta, 13.1 obiciendis, 13.2 obiecere; 14.1 ne... quidera bis; 14.1 visus est, 14.2 videtur; 17.4 concederetur, ib. concessa, 18.1 concessit; 18.1 **accepserat**; ib. exaudit.
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1.1-2 The short speech of Poppea, though containing some characteristically artificial usages (e.g., **returru**, 2 n.), has a few touches which distinguish the style from that of plain narrative (see on *saltum*, 2, and on the asyndeton, ib.).

1.2 *saltum*: there are 7 examples of *saltum* in the historical works, all but one of which are, like that here, in speeches. The exception (6.38.3) is in a Tacitean speculation. Comments by Tacitus often contain usages more appropriate to speeches than to narrative (see *Introduction*, p. 15).

Many other particles are either disproportionately infrequent or confined largely to speeches in the *Historiae* and *Annales*. Such words probably savoured of rhetorical/oratorical prose, in which care was taken to underline emphasis and express explicitly the connection between sentences. Tacitus relies rather on a flexible word order to convey his emphasis.

Particularly striking is the virtual absence from the *Historiae* and *Annales* of *saltum*, for its usual function (the pointing of contrasts and antitheses) is one which could constantly have been exercised. It occurs 23 times in the *Dialogus*, but only 5 times in the historical works in textually unquestionable passages, all of which are in speeches.¹ *Hicquod* (12 times *Dialogus*) is found 7 times in speeches in the historical works, once in the narrative (1.7.5), and once marking the intrusion of Tacitus as commentator on the affairs which
he is narrating (12.43.2; see Introduction, p. 16). "Certe" (6 times minor works) occurs 10 times in speeches, but only twice (4.5.1, 11.53.2) in narrative. "Piane" (4 times), "verbo" (4 times), "neaneg" (twice), "impe" (5 times) and "atque" (once) are all restricted without exception to speeches. Of the 11 examples of "purpuse", only 8 are in narrative, and of these 4 are in books I-III of the histories (II.5.1, II.61.1, III.9.4, III.83.2) and the other is in a digression (4.6.3). "atque" is found 77 times in the Histories and Annals and 16 times in the Dialogues. Since the historical works are more than 15 times as long as the Dialogues, the comparative frequency of the word in the latter work is remarkable. Moreover, 7 of the examples in the historical works are in speeches and 19 are in an expression particularly favoured by Tacitus (at... atque) (Lex. Tac. 13.22.61). "Denique" (27 times historical works) is used 17 times in speeches, once in a philosophical digression (6.22.1), and once in a rhetorical comment by Tacitus (4.11.1). "cuius" (also here in Poppaea's speech, 2) is found 13 times in speeches, but only 5 times (always in Histories I-III) in the narrative (Lex. Tac. 150.7a fin.). "Minimi, profecto, suntaxat and utique are all confined to the minor works. Of the 3 instances of omne 2 are in speeches (6.6.1, 11.11.3).

On vero, see 44.3 n.

Sallust also shows a certain restrictiveness in his use of particles, but is less fastidious than Tacitus. "Autem, e.g., is found 17 times in the Catiline and Jugurtha, 6 times in direct speeches. In the latter work of the 7 instances of the word are in speeches, but in
the Catiline only 2 of the 9. **Quidem** is strikingly rare (10 times Cat. and Jug.), and in about 75% of cases is in speeches. Of the 3 examples of **eunte** 2 are in speeches, as are 5 of the 7 of **quidam**, 7 of the 17 of **vere**, 7 of the 13 of **practic**, 3 of the 6 of **minim** and the single case of **largo**. **Hercule, atque, and neque** are avoided completely. However **animo, bene, corru, prorsus and denique** are usually found in narrative.

Livy, whose sentence structure is more influenced by contemporary rhetoric, stands apart from Sallust and Tacitus. Note, e.g., that Packard gives almost 5 columns of examples of **autem**, most of which are in narrative.

Tacitus' avoidance of particles is comparable with that of the poets. See Axelsson, *Ungot. Wort.*, e.g., 47f., 86f., 92, 92ff., 103f.

1.2 **inimicas patrem, iram populi:** according to tradition, the one hundred senators created by Romulus were called *patres* (Sall. Cat. 6.6, liv. 1.8.7, Cic. *rep.* 2.23, 2.24). The term may once have been current for *senatus*, but by the end of the Republic it had certainly fallen out of ordinary use. In Ciceronian prose it occurs once in a quotation from a warning issued by the *harmapius* in official style (Har. resp. 40); a number of times, mainly in the *republic*, in passages dealing with the ancient Roman (usually regal) senate; and 6 times in laws in the *De legibus* (3 times, as here, opposite *populus*; 3.10 bis, 3.40). It is never used by Cicero in reference to the senate
of his own day.\textsuperscript{7}

The historians (particularly Livy and Tacitus) use \textit{patres} frequently, no doubt because of its archaic flavour. Tacitus does not have it as often as \textit{senatus}, but he shows a greater liking for it in the \textit{Annales} than in the \textit{Historiae}. In the later work it is commonly found in expressions in which earlier \textit{senatus} had been exclusively or almost exclusively preferred.

Thus vocare \textit{patres} (1.7.3, 2.28.3, 11.4.1, 12.7.3.1, 13.5.1, 16.24.2), \textit{patrum consilium} (2.85.4, 5.5.4, 11.25.1, 12.69.2, 14.60.1, 16.22.1), \textit{patrum auctoritas} (4.14.3, 13.4.1), \textit{consilium patrum} (1.7.1), \textit{consensus patrum} (15.73.3), \textit{judicium patrum} (3.32.1), \textit{cogitatio patrum} (4.19.3), \textit{patres decessant} (2.52.5, 2.62.1, 3.47.3, 4.15.2, 16.26.2) and the antitheses \textit{patres/miles} (\textit{item}) (13.1.1, 14.11.1) and \textit{patres/causa} (\textit{item}) (1.7.1, 4.74.3) are all used in the \textit{Annales} only, while the equivalent expressions with \textit{senatus} are found either in the \textit{Historiae} as well as the \textit{Annales} or in the \textit{Historiae} alone.

Similarly the antithesis \textit{patres/populi} of the present passage occurs 6 times in the \textit{Annales} (cf. 3.10.2, 4.2.3, 12.41.3, 13.17.3, 15.73.1), but only once in the \textit{Historiae}. \textit{Senatus/populus} is about twice as frequent proportionately in the \textit{Historiae} as in the \textit{Annales} (16:13).

The overall figures for the distribution of \textit{patres} and \textit{senatus} are:
The relative rarity of patres in the *Historiae* is obvious.

The words *injuriae patrum, iram populi* are arranged in the alliterative pattern absb (on which see Ho.-Sz., 702; it is frequent in e.g., Lucretius, Virgil and Cicero). There are only a few definite examples of alliteration of this type inTacitus, most of which are in special contexts: 

*...Brigantes iama duce exercere coloniam, exsequere castra; II.27.1 haud proinde id damnum Vitellianor in seum conculcit quam ad moderatum compositum* (in an antithesis); 

*III.50.2 Antonius ducit esse aequo Vitellio virens, ambiguum, si deliberarent, acris, si demerissent* (in antithesis in a speech); 

*1.29.2 situ tres legiones utrumque legatos procubuisset; 1.70.3 nihil strenuum ut irruave, simulac ab imprudenti ... differe* (storm description); 2.20.3 strenue ... aequ in virtute, salus ex victoria (in a sententia); 14.56.2 non tua moderatio si reddideris pecuniam, nec quies, si relinqueras principia ... in ore omnium versus situr* (in antithesis in a speech: note the homoeoteleuton (*-cris*). 

There are 2 striking examples of alliteration in Poppea's speech (see below, on *filio infestum ferre, 1.2*). It is unlikely that both were accidental.
Asyndeton bimembra of the type consisting of two substantives with qualifying or dependent words (adjectives or genitives) (as in inujrias vatum, iron rumili) is frequent in the Annals (over 60 times), and especially in the early books (on its decline in the later books, see Introduction, p. 36). In the Dialogus, however, where it could easily have been introduced in a large number of places (qualified pairs of substantives linked by copulative particles are common there) it is used only once (9.1), and in the Histories it is still rare (16 times).

Tacitus' liking for the device is an idiosyncrasy derived neither from Sallust (who is other respects provides the model for Tacitian asyndeton: 36.1 n.) or other historians, nor from non-historiographical prose.

In Cicero tricola comprising three qualified substantives are fairly frequent, but asyndetic pairs of qualified substantives are as rare as examples of asyndeton bimembra formed of two unqualified words (on which, see 36.1 n.). In the pro Sestio, e.g., note 133 diacessu meo, lactu vestro: 143 virorum fortium, marnorum hominum. Cr., ib. 17, 19, 49, 63, 88, 125, 144, 145 bis, for tricola of the same kind.

Livy usually places two qualified substantives in asyndeton if their adjectives are numerals: e.g. 42. 1.4 duodecin milia sociorum pedium, sescenti equites (cf. e.g. 42.35.5). Otherwise he rarely does so.

In pa. Quintilian (de ci min.) there are about 8 qualified asyndetic
pairs of substantives in 225 Tacitean pages (p. 64.27, 68.13, 89.19, 144.17, 153.12, 203.7, 207.22, 210.15), a low incidence in comparison with 16 examples in 44 pages of Annals 1.

Some other writers who admit the usage at least as sparingly as the above are Sallust, Quintilian, Seneo the Elder, Seneo the Younger and Pliny the Younger.

More than half the examples in the last 6 books of the Annals are, like that here, in speeches (for the tendency of Tacitus and other historians to put asymmetrical into the mouths of their characters, see 36.1 n.; the rapidity of the construction probably helped to convey a heightened emotional tone); in the first head, however, a higher proportion of instances are in the narrative (about two-thirds).

1.2 Filio infestum ferre: on the sensitivity of the Romans to triple alliteration of this kind, see 30.3 n.

The letter f was considered to have a particularly harsh sound.

At or. 163 Cicero describes in an inguvissima littera and criticises its use by an old poet in a long alliterative series: sed proximus (versus) inquinitus inguvissima littera:

finis crucifera et efficiens arva Asiae tenet.

Of. the remarks of Quintilian at 12.10.29: nam et illa, quae est sexta nostranae, non humana voce vel omnino non voce petivi inter discrimina dentium efflenda est: quae, etiam cum vocalen proxima accipit, quasse quodam modo, utique quoties aliqua consonantium
frangit, ut in hoc into 'frangit', multo sit horridior (the letter had an almost inhuman sound, even when followed by a vowel).

Tacitus seems to have been at pains to avoid the letter in triple alliteration. Whereas p starts only about 4.5 times as many words as t in the Lexicon Taciteum, it is found in triple or multiple alliteration about 12 times as often in the Annals (37:3); similarly g starts only twice as many words yet is used in alliteration 7 times as often (21).15

The other 2 examples of t in triple alliteration in the Annals (both followed by vowels) are: 2.75.1 anxia sui et infelici fecunditate fortunae totiens obnoxia (in a description marked by pathos); 11.13.2 lige lata saevitiam creditoris coecuit, ne in mortem parentis pecunias filiae familiarium fremori darent (in a law). The present example is appropriate in an abusive speech.

Another letter largely avoided by Tacitus in triple series is l, the littera canina; the only example in the Annals is at 2.24.3, at the end of a storm description (l begins slightly more words in Tacitus than t).

1.2 Fero: the word most often used (almost 70 times historical works) by Tacitus in this sense is the rarer tolero (on which see 24.1 n.). In the Annals 15 of the 20 instances of fero and perfero with this sense are, like fero here, found in speeches.
1.2 *coniuic*: used here for variation: cf. *matrimonium* 1, *nuptiae* 2. On *coniugium*, see 27.2 n.

1.3 *cupidentibus omnibus*: by the early imperial period *cunctus*, which had enjoyed some currency in ordinary educated prose at the end of the Republic (see below), had all but fallen out of use. It is avoided completely by Seneca the Elder, and used only once by *Pl.* Quintilian (at 33.19, almost alongside *omnia*), once by Petronius (101.11), and 9 times by Quintilian (in most places for variation near *omnia*). In historians and artificial writers, however, it is more common. Livy has it 37 times, Pliny the Elder 50 times, Curtius 23 times, Columella 21 times, Valerius Maximus 31 times, Pliny the Younger 19 times, Suetonius 35 times and Seneca the Younger 32 times. In Tacitus there are only 4 instances in the minor works (3 *Agricola*, 1 *Dialogus*), but 178 in the historical works.

In the ordinary prose of the late Republic *cunctus* is predominantly adjectival. In the speeches Cicero has it only twice as a substantive (both times *pro* *adv. sen* 24, *leg. agr.* 2.23 - close to *omnia*, perhaps for variation), but almost 90 times as an adjective; in the letters twice as a substantive (* Att. 2.21.3, fam. 8.4.2*), and 12 times as an adjective; and in the rhetoric once as a substantive (*de inrv. 2.3*), and 3 times as an adjective. In the philosophical works the substantive use is proportionately more frequent, but is nevertheless outnumbered (8:13).
All but 20 of the adjectival instances in the speeches are collective singular (= notus), as are 9 of the 12 in the letters, 2 of the 3 in the rhetoric, and 7 of the 13 in the philosophiae. Many are found in recurring phrases, of which a number, both singular and plural, have an official or technical appearance (e.g. c.ordo, senatus, naffrasia, sententiae, &c.).

Caesar and the writers of the ps.Caesarian corpus have 15 examples of the word, 12 of which are adjectives; 6 of the latter are singular.

In the artificial prose of the Empire, however, notus is used above all as a plural substantive (more often neuter than masculine). Curtius avoids the adjectival use completely (substantival 23) and Livy has it only 6 times (subst. 51), Valerius Maximus 11 times (subst. 20), Seneca the Younger twice (subst. 30), Pliny the Younger twice (subst. 17), Suetonius 7 times (subst. 26) and Tacitus 35 times (subst. 143). Pliny the Elder is exceptional in admitting the word as an adjective over 50 times (mainly in the expressions notum animalia and n. senex).

Moreover the adjectival use as it appears in Tacitus (see II.2 n. for details), Valerius Maximus and Pliny the Elder, its three main exponents at this period, is markedly different from that in Cicero. In Tacitus 34 of the 35 instances are plural (usually neuter: II.2 n.), as are all but 1 in Valerius Maximus and 1 in Pliny.

But if the use made by Cicero and Caesar of notus must be distinguished from that of artificial imperial authors, there are
distinct similarities between the practice of Sallust and Plautus on
the one hand and that of the later writers on the other. Sallust
has 30 examples of the substantival use compared with 10 of the
adjectival; of the latter, 16 are plural. Plautus has the
substantival use 12 times, but the adjectival only twice.

Sallust, moreover, uses the word in various phrases and
phrase-types in which it reappears under the Empire. Particularly
noteworthy is his cunctis ... consultantibus (hist. frg. 2.67.P;
cf. 2.67.c cunctis ... praequentibus). ablative absolutes comprising
the and a present participle (as in the present passage) are very
common in imperial prose. Tacitus, e.g., provides 9 examples (Agric.
41.3, I.47.1, III.46.3, 2.29.1, 2.75.1, 4.64.3, 5.7.1, 12.8.1, as well
as that here; cf. I.83.3, III.42.2), Livy 22 (see Packard), Valerius
Maximus 6 (3.2.17, 3.7 ext.2, 6.4.1, 6.1. absolv., 9.19.ext.1, 9.3.4),
Seneque the Younger 2 (clitn. 1.34.7, dial. 6.26.7), Curtius 1 (6.6.17),
Pliny the Elder 3 (2.162, 6.91, 26.13), Pliny the Younger 2 (exst.
2.10.10, pan. 64.1) and Suetonius 14 (see Howard and Jackson).20

Of also the following: cunctae agent (Sall. Cat. 4.2.2, Liv.
33.11.5, Sen. benef. 7.2.2, Curt. 4.1.31, 4.3.23, Tac. IV. 76.2,
13.57.1, 15.3.1, Suet. Tib.69); quae cuncta (Sall. on Lep. 5, Col.
1.8.9, 1.8.20, 2.12.3, 3.12.5, 7.6.6, 8.5.12, Tac. Agric. 5.3,
II.35.2, 1.11.4, 4.7.1, 6.5.2, Plin. epist. 9.30.3); ree cunctae
(Sall. Cat. 6.1, Jug. 2.1, Val. Max. 4.4.9, Col. 12.59.5, Plin. epist.
2.6.3); cunctae parrare (Sall. Jug. 23.1, 73.1, Liv. 8.25.2); cuncta
miscere, permiscere (Sall. Jug. 5.2, Tac. 1.53.2, II.23.5, III.73.2; IV.29.2, 4.51.2); 
cuncti mortales (Sall. Cat. 51.12, Sen. benepl. 1.13.3); cuncta portendere (Sall. Jug. 92.2, Liv. 1.55.4); cuncta 
ignes (Sall. Jug. 93.4, Val. Max. 1.8.extension; Sen. dial. 8.4.2).

Some of the above correspondences may be accidental, or may represent direct borrowing from Sallust; but in particular the 
expressions cuncta agere, cune cuncta, and cunctis with the present 
participle appear to have been more generally formulaic.

It is of note that cune cuncta is found not only in Sallust and 
later writers, but also in Plautus (Pass. 189). Moreover Plautus' 
cuncta ... processentur (Hist. 734) can be paralleled in Sallus: 
(Jug. 55.5), and his cuncta præveniant (Hist. 424) in Seneca (epist. 
107.2) and Tacitus (IV.52.2).

It would seem that the imperial use of cunctis belongs to a 
linguistic tradition stretching back to the artificial prose of the 
Republic and beyond to early Latin. As a substantive the word had 
apparently all but fallen out of general use at some time after Plautus, 
but been handed down - often, perhaps, in formulas (see further below) - 
in the archaising tradition. The unusual frequency with which Cicero 
allows the substantival use in his philosophica may be attributed to 
his greater readiness to admit artificialities of vocabulary in those 
works. As a plural adjective the word appears to have retained a 
limited currency until the end of the Republic (a number of the 
Ciceronian examples, however, were probably taken directly from
officialese), after which it survived only in the archaizers.

The singular collective adjectival use, which is so disproportionately frequent in Cicero, may well have been a peculiarity of certain technical vocabularies (official, legal, military) on which Cicero had cause to draw. On the unmistakably official/technical character of many of the recurring expressions in which it is found, see above. In the ordinary prose of the Empire it is completely replaced by totus and universus.

It was maintained by Wolfflin (Philol. 25(1887):107) that cuncta tends to replace omnia from Historiae to Annales. However, a statistical comparison between the two words is almost impossible, for, as used by Tacitus, they are by no means fully interchangeable. Many examples of cunctus (especially those in the neuter plural substantive form) are in formulaic phrases or phrase-types (some of which have been seen above) from which omnia is largely excluded in both the Historiae and Annales. To prove conclusively a change of practice between the two historical works it would be necessary to show that any increased incidence of cuncta in the later was due not to the chance accumulation there of formulas in which Tacitus would, in the Historiae as well, have avoided omnia, but to the gradual acquisition by cuncta of specific uses previously reserved for omnia. There is no evidence to show that cuncta encroached upon omnia in the latter way.

The following formulaic uses of cunctus may be added to those
given above: 15.37.4 inditum imperatori flammam, missi ssumisse:
dos et genitalia torus et facies mutiales, cunctae suntque spectatae
(cunctae summaritiae: the components of the preceding list: cf. III.86.1, 1.2.1, 1.9.5, 1.31.4, 1.68.5, 4.25.2, 12.33, 12.65.2, 15.11.2, 15.19.2.
The only genuinely comparable example of cuncta is at 13.42.4, in a
speech: crimen, periculum, cuncta potius toleraturum); IV.68.1 cuncta
in detestus audita (cf. 2.32.1 cuncta ... in detestus adferuntur;
3.44.1 cuncta ... in mades credita; 14.39.3 cuncta ... in mades
relata; 15.30.1 cuncta in mades attollens (there is a similar example
of cuncta at III.13.1)); cuncta complere, implere (III.61.2, 12.47.4;
cf. Cic. repp. 6.17, Liv. 2.17.2, 5.37.8, 9.24.12; Curt. 3.13.10);
cuncta consumpti (3.69.3; cf. Cic. nat. 2.87, Val. Max. 1 praef.;
Sen. dial. 7.8.4, 13in. nat. 2.2; cuncta turbare, disturbare (IV.2.2;
cf. Cic. nat. 2.12, Curt. 3.8.26, Suet. Cali. 10.4, Tit. 5.1);
cuncta vertere, convertere, (III.44, 2.32.1; cf. Sen. nat. 3.13.1);
cuncta transire (IV.14.1, cf. Sen. exist. 77.12); cuncta evanish
(IV.19.3, V.17.1; cf. Sall. Jun. 63.1); cuncta agere et vertere
(1.2.3; cf. Liv. 40.49.1); cuncta explorare (V.1.2; cf. Sall. Jug. 35.5);
cuncta patrare, perticarie (IV.65.4; cf. Sall. Cat. 53.4); cuncta ... 
opportunum (III.20.2; cf. Sall. hist. frg. 1.106); cuncta infecta, infensa
facere (3.74.2; cf. Liv. 9.13.11); cuncta tractare (1.31.1, 4.15.2);
cuncta flucre (III.48.3, 11.9.2); III.77.2 cuncta vari formidinie
implicabantur (cf. 1.70.3 cuncta vari violentia inolvebantur); 6.11.2
(cunctis ... praesposuit (cf. 6.52.4 cunctis ... praesfeicit); IV.78.1
cuncta pro hostibus erant (cf. V.17.1 cuncta mox prospera et hosti contraria; 1.64.2 cuncta pariter Romanis adversa; 3.39.2 cuncta prospere acta; 15.36.1 cuncta ... prospera); cuncta hostilia (I.65.2, III.42.2, III.46.2, V.26.2); cuncta pati (III.31.1; cf. Sen. epist. 85.28); cuncta cernere (IV.34.4; cf. Curt. 8.13.16); cuncta festinare (6.50.4; cf. Sall. Jug. 73.1); cuncta ... solita (IV.3.3, IV.68.5);
1.71.1 cuncta ad decorum ... composita (cf. 3.1.3 cunctis ad tristitiam compositis); III.84.1 cuncta validissimarum urbis excidiis reperta (cf. V.13.4 cuncta expugnandis urbis reperta; 3.5.1 cuncta a maioribus reperta); 4.64.3 cunctis circum flagruntibus (cf. 15.39.1 cuncta circum hauriuntur; Curt. 4.10.13 incendio cuncta praeciperet; 7.5.3 incendio cuncta torrentur; Liv. 2.17.2 incendioque cuncta complet; 26.13.7 cuncta bello ardere. 11.1; Plin. nat. 2.239 cuncta conflagrarent).

It is likely that the proportion of examples of cunctus in special combinations in both Histories and Annals is very high indeed. The word should not, in Tacitus at least, be regarded as a mere synonym of omnis (see further Introduction, p. 13 on Tacitus' preference for the substantival use of omnis in speeches).

Moreover, Wöfflin was not justified in considering the neuter substantival use of cunctus apart from the masculine. The proportion of both neuter and masculine examples of cunctus to those of omnis is fairly uniform throughout the historical works.
Notes

1. At II.20.1 it has ἀν in the text, and quaque in the margin. Heubner (ad loc.) has shown convincingly that quaque is the correct reading. At 13.25.3 it has τοῦ (i.e. tōn), which was retained by Crelli, Kitter and Jacob, and changed to ταυτον by Petersen (followed, e.g., by Halm, Furneaux, and Fisher) and to ταυτα (taking τοῦ as a corruption of τοῦ) by others (including Koestermann). ἄν is impossible, for though in Tacitus it constantly precedes (e.g. Anno 35.4, II.26.1, III.20.1, V.6.3, 2.4.1, 12.25.2, 12.35.2, 12.39.1, 12.66.1, 15.14.2, 16.25.1; see Lex. Tac. a.v., passim), it never follows a proper name which is the subject of its sentence. ταυτα is also unlikely. Julius Benedictus and Nero are not contrasted pointedly enough to justify the antithetical (and most common) use of the word (see Lex. Tac. 130a); and the looser (introducitory) use (Lex. Tac. 130a) is found in only a few passages in the minor works and seems hardly likely to have been admitted superfluously in one place only in the narrative of the annales. Read ταυτα: despite the incident, Nero nevertheless continued his activities.

2. I.15.4, 1.64.1, II.53.2, III.5.3, IV.14.3, IV.59.4, 1.22.1, 1.42.2, 1.51.4, 1.38.1, 2.35.2, 3.35.3, 3.69.2, 3.73.3 (indirect construction), 4.8.3, 4.28.3, 4.31.5, 4.35.2, 4.40.5, 4.56.1, 5.5 (indirect construction), 5.6.2, 6.5.1, 6.8.1, 6.22.2 (indirect construction), 11.15.2, 11.28.1, 12.20.2, 13.20.3, 14.53.2, 14.54.1, 14.55.4, 15.2.3, 15.71.2 (indirect construction), 16.9.2, 16.17.6, 16.35.1.
I. 1.32.2, III.38.3, III.66.2, IV.66.4, IV.8.3, IV.32.3, IV.58.5,
IV.61.2, I.26.2, I.28.4, II.10.1, III.21.4, I.24.4.2 (quasi-speech),
I.58.4, I.61.4, II.22.5, II.23.2.

2. The precise reference of the title is unclear, as is its connection,
   if any, with another sense borne by patres from an early period, viz.
   'patricians': see, e.g., I.6.11, Tab. 12.1, Liv. 4.1.1, Cic. rep. 2.63,
   cf., e.g., Sall. Cat. 33.3, Cic. Brut. 54, 56, Flacc. 8 bis, Samar. 9.21.3,
   ad Brut. 1.5.4, Tac. 1.27.1, cf. Teiss. Hall. on Liv. 4.1.1.

3. ex. 1.67, 2.1bis, 2.20, 2.23, 2.25, 2.35 bis, 2.38, 2.50, 2.56,
   leg. 3.19, 4.24, Tusc. 4.1. Occasionally also in the Republic the
   word appears in general philosophical passages on forms of govern-
   ment (without reference to particular states), perhaps under the influence
   of the specific material (i.e., the early Roman state) constantly
   discussed in that work: see 1.48, 1.49, 3.37.

4. 3.9, 3.10, (4 times), 3.40.

5. Only at har. resp. 4.3 it is used in application to the senate of
   relatively modern times (the Gracian period), and even there it is
   in an historical example.

6. In certain contexts this expression may have survived in official
   senatorial terminology. Note the following apparently formulaic
   Livian instances: 8.22.8 ex auctoritate patrum populi ... bello fieri
   iussit; 8.29.6 bello ex auctoritate patrum populi ... iussit;
   10.45.7 ex auctoritate patrum iussu populi bellum ... indiciun est;
   7.17.9 sine auctoritate patrum populi iussu. Cf. 8.21.10 ex auctoritate
natum latum ad ponendum ...; 27.6.7 ex auctoritate patrum ad pleban
latum.

9. Not all the examples collected by W. Renz, Alliterationen bei Tacitus
(Ashaffenburg, 1905), 26f. can be accepted.

10. It is standard practice in prose of all kinds to use pairs of ablative
absolutes and of qualified descriptive ablatives or genitives
asymptotically. I have omitted such examples from consideration in
this note. It is also usual after a proper name to place
appositional pairs in asymtoton (e.g. Cic. Sen. 32 G. Marium,
terraeque hostium, open subsidiumque rursum); examples of this type
have also been omitted here.

11. I.30.3, II.22.1, II.56.1, II.70.3, II.77.1, II.93.2, II.99.2, II.12.3,
III.37.1, III.63.2, III.77.1, IV.33.3, IV.20.3, IV.64.2, V.6.4, V.15.2.

12. 11.17.1, 11.23.4, 12.10.1, 12.19.2, 12.20.1, 13.27.1, 14.63.5, 15.5.1,
15.20.3.

13. In speeches: 1.6.3, 1.10.2, 1.42.1, 1.59.3, 2.5.3, 2.14.2, 2.21.1,
2.33.3, 2.37.4, 3.33.3, 3.34.5, 3.61.1, 4.34.5, 6.47.3.

14. p: 1.3.2, 1.7.3, 2.14.3, 1.64.4, 2.25.1, 2.62.1, 2.82.1, 3.20.2, 3.35.1,
3.43.1, 4.15.2, 6.44.1, 11.29.3, 11.25.4, 11.31.1, 12.14.3, 12.25.2,
12.35.1, 12.57.1, 13.7.1, 13.16.1, 13.17.3, 15.29.2, 13.35.2, 13.37.3,
15.53.2, 15.54.4, 15.74.3, 16.22.3.

15. o: 1.7.3, 1.28.3, 1.65.7, 1.70.5, 2.40.1, 2.75.1, 3.54.1, 4.6.1, 6.7.2,
15.23.4, 15.32.1, 15.65.1, 15.71.4.

16. 1.17.3, 1.20.1, 1.4.6.3, 3.5.3, 3.6.2.2, 4.34.5, 12.11.3, 12.64.2, 15.42.2, 14.35.2, 14.64.1, 15.31, 16.28.2 bis.

17. 2.10.2 (variation), 5.3.5, 3.4.6 (variation), 4.2.6 (variation), 5.10.122 (variation), 10.1.69 (variation), 10.3.2, 12.2.5 (variation), 12.10.23.

18. Seneca has the word more often in his tragedies (51) than his prose.

19. At Dial, 8.3, in the expression *ad summum cumtur*, which is elsewhere found only in history (Livy 40.49.1, Tac. 1.2.3). The context at Dial, 8.3 is quasi-historiographical.

20. It is possible that the idiom was in use in certain phrases in the official language, and that it had been taken over from there by artificial writers and extended in its range of employment. In Livy it is often found in quasi-official contexts (e.g. 4.13.12, 4.48.10, 5.47.10, 6.29.1, 23.22.4, 37.16.3, 37.52.6, 45.11.7), particularly in the expression *ad summum cumtur* (e.g. 4.13.12, 4.48.10, 5.47.10, 6.29.1, 37.16.3, 37.52.6), which is used a number of times of the unanimous approval given to a measure (e.g. *cunctis suffratis, cunctis sententiis*) by the senate or other body. Note too the context at Val. Max. 8.1. absol. 3 (*ad summum cumtur*) and 3.2.17 (*cunctis ... consentibus*).

21. It is possible that not all these phrases were formulaic. In the last two cases in particular Tacitus may have deliberately imitated Sallust and Livy.
2.1 ardore retinendae Agrippinam potenti age: Koestermann, following Ritter deleted Agrippinam.

Hyberbaton usually places emphasis on the word which precedes the enclosed word or words: 1 e.g. II.31.1 erith, quo ecceiam (the famum, Vitellius iungitionissimam meruere (highlighting the antithesis);
1.28.1 nam luna clara recente orelo visa languescere (it is paradoxical that the moon should fade though the sky is clear); 2 1.39.1 interea lerati ab senatu regressum is aram aram Ubiorum Germanium adumit
(cf. 37.3 Germanicus superiores ad exeritum profectus); 1.75.3 Propertio Celeri praestorie venium ordinis ob paupertatem potestas de seis cesterium barbatis sat, satis commotio potestas al augustian esse
(Poerptius' poverty was inherited rather than due to his own extravagance); 3.10.3 ob externas ca victorias accorari dictitas,
domesticam nulla tristitia opemion (antithesis); al.

Here there is a clear contrast between retinendae and infringi in the preceding sentence (1.3 cunctibus cunctis infrnigil potestiam matres): everyone wanted to see Agrippina's power destroyed, but she was determined to retain it. The text should therefore remain unchanged.

See further 3.2 n. on Tacitus' use of hyperbaton.
2.1  

per vinum et cepulas incallescent: a slight variant of the Livian vinum incallescere (1.57.8, 39.42.10), which Tacitus himself has used twice earlier (IV.29.1, 11.37.2); cf. Curt. 5.7.5

incallescent maro; 8.1.22 incaluescat maro; Hor. Carm. 3.21.12 maro caluisse. The expression vinum et cepulas is a traditional combination, by no means confined to history (Cic. Phil. 3.20, Sall. Jug. 76.6, Nep. Fel. 3.1, Liv. 8.16.9, Sen. Cist. 12.8, Curt. 8.3.8, Stat. Silv. 4.5.6).

It is characteristic that Tacitus should have substituted per + accusative for Livy's instrumental ablative vinum. In the historical works the modal and instrumental uses of per are exploited to an extent unparalleled in extent pre-Tacitian prose. In various phrases and phrase-types in which his predecessors exclusively or almost exclusively have the ablative, Tacitus admits per as well as the normal construction.

Silentio, e.g., is common at all periods with modal force ('in silence', 'silently') in conjunction both with verbs such as attendere, audire, and praeferri and with those denoting actions (e.g. 2. Alex. 61.2, Sall. Cat. 1.1, 53.6, Jug. 106.4, Sen. condr. 10.2.9, Sen. Dial. 4.11.8, Cist. 14.4, Curt. 4.13.33, 6.2.7, Quint. 2.3.1, 5.12.25). Tacitus himself uses modal silentio a number of times, but in 6 places (5 of which are in the Annals) he replaces it by per silentium (II. 74.1, 2.39.4, 4.53.1, 11.37.4, 14.10.1, 16.25.2). Cf. e.g. Cic. Cist. 1.56
vos attenditis et auditis silentio: Tac. 1.34.3 silentio haec val
munnure modico audita sunt: II.74.1 ut praemunam sacramentum et
fausta Vitellio œratis praeventa per silentiam audirent. There is
only one comparable example of *per silentium* in prose before Tacitus,
and that is a special case: Liv. 25.23.16 armati tendi agrum *per*
silentium co deducti (the juxtaposition of *silentio* and the adverb *co*
would have been confusing). There is no other evidence to suggest
that Livy provided the model for Tacitus' use of modal/instrumental
*per*.

With verbs of killing the instrumental ablative *veneno* is
widespread in pre-Tacitean prose (e.g. 14 times in Cicero's speeches,
7 times in Valerius Maximus: 2.5.3, 2.6.8, 6.3.6, 6.5.1, 8.1. adn.1,
9.1.9, 9.2. ex.6), but *per venenum* is nowhere found. Tacitus, however
at 12.52.2 writes *per venenum extinguitus aestas*, and at 14.65.3, *creato
per venenum matre*. With the former example, cf. 3.19.3 veneno aut
fama extingit. The expression *per gaudium* (modal) at 5.1 below for *gaudio* cannot
be paralleled before Tacitus in prose: *paucitantem filii et recuperatam
matras gratiam per gaudium membrand.* For *gaudio*, see, e.g., Cic.
Cicero. 14.

A favourite Tacitean phrase is *per artem(-teg)* with instrumental
force (Lex. Tac. 1093b). It is almost completely avoided by earlier
writers (found only once: Vitr. 2.1.7), in whom ars is frequent with
the same sense (e.g. Cic. Verr. 4.103, har. resp. 19, Est. 120, Petron. 102.15, 152.6, quint. 9.2.27, 9.4.116, 10.2.12).

Promissis (instrumental) is not uncommon before Tacitus with, e.g., commiser, excitare, impellere and inducere (for examples from Cicero's speeches, see Mayquet, III, 799b). With verbs of this kind Tacitus uses per promissa as well as the ablative (Lec. Tuc. 1211a-b).

Cf. the following pairs: II.30.2 tempitata Othonislocum ade per conlocium et promissa/1.75.1 promissis similis ac minia temetabantur; 2.67.1 Flaccus ... per incentia promissa quamvis ambiguum et sedet
sua res tantam perdit ut .../11.29.3 hostiones ac promissis ...
permult delationem subire.

Instrumental per does not appear to occur before Tacitus with
impello, with which the ablative is common (Mon. VII.1.539.36ff.).
But note 1.83.1 per turbas et sectas faciendum ad civile bellum
impellendur.

Finally, cf. Cic. Balb. 57 si ad om retinendum seditunca praecipe
elicere non possumus (cf. 22, Tuc. 5.20); Tuc. 4.30.3 delatores ...
per præcisionem eliciscibuntur.

2.1 temulentus: habitus was the everyday word, temulentus an archais.3
The latter alone is used by Tacitus in the historical works (11 times;

of: eribius, Germ. 23).4 Livy also avoids eribius (temulentus 3 times),
and Curtius has it only once (temulentus 6 times).\textsuperscript{5}

Of the non-archaising prose writers Cicero has ebrirri 13 times, temulentus 3 times, Seneca the Elder ebrirri 9 times, temulentus twice, Petronius ebrirri 13 times, temulentus never, Seneca the Younger ebrirri 35 times, temulentus twice and Quintilian ebrirri twice, temulentus only in a quotation of Caecilius (see below).

Most of the sporadic instances of temulentus in ordinary prose are in special contexts. Caecilius uses the word with the poetical sopor in an elaborate descriptive passage (ap. Quint. 4.2.123); the stylistically pretentious Vitruvius has it in an account of a miraculum (8.3.20); one of the Ciceroian examples (Gent. 20) may have been introduced for its soporific effect in an alliterative passage of abuse (tempestates impendentes intueri temulentus);\textsuperscript{6} and both instances in the Elder Seneca are in an expression which, since it is also found in the Younger Seneca in only a slightly changed form, may have been either traditional or derived from a work or saying well known in the first century: Sen. \textit{contra} 9.2.4 inter temulentos reliquias suntuosissima carne; 9.2.4 \textit{inter} temulentos ebrirrum reliquias humanum overtitur opus; Sen. \textit{exist}. 47.5 alius reliquias temulentorum (torto)subditus colligit.\textsuperscript{7}

\textbf{2.1} Senecam contra maloebas inlecebras subscidit a femina nativissae:
on Tacitus' use of *femina* to place strong emphasis on the sex of the person referred to (in contrast, explicit or implied, with *vir*) see 35.2 n.

2.1 *saimi sue periculce et infemia* *Neroniae anxii*: *anxii* is synonymous with *solicitius*. Both can mean either 'providus', 'diligent', 'cautus' etc., or, more commonly (as *anxii* here), 'trepidus', 'sensus', 'plenus angoris', etc. The following selection of passages illustrates the similarity between the two words and their derivatives in this second sense:

*sensus a* *solicitius* *totae civitatis* (Cic. *dom. 96*).

*si valere est suspense et anxii vivere* (Flin. *Hist.* 3.17.3; cf. 6.4.4).

*solicitii ... verantur* (Flin. *can.* 80.2; cf. B.Cass. 8.34.1).

*est enim suspense et anxii de eo ... verior cania* (Flin. *Hist.* 6.4.30).

*est ... metus futurae aegritudinis solicitii* expectancy (Cic. *Tusc.* 5.52).

*ipse valere, si valere est suspense et anxii vivere, expectantem*
in horas timentemque pro capite amicissimo, quidquid accidere homini potest (Plin. epist. 3.17.3).

et medici quidem secunda nobis pollicentur: superest ut promissis deus admuat tamenque me hac sOLLICITUDINE exsolvat ... nunc enim nihil legere, nihil scribere aut adsidenti vacat aut anxio libet (Plin. epist. 1.22.11).

anxium me et inquietum habet petitio Sexti Eruci mei. adficiar cura et, quam pro me sOLLICITUDINEM non adii, quasi pro me altero patior (ib. 2.9.1).

est enim suspensum et anxium de eo quem ardentissime diligas. interdum nihil acire. nunc vero me cum absentiae tum infimitatis tuae ratio incerta et varia sOLLICITUDINE exerret (ib. 6.4.3f.).

quarta restat causa, quae maxime angere atque sOLLICITATM habeant nostram aetatem videtur (Cic. Cat. mai. 66).

With the present passage, cf. Cic. Cat. 4.1 video vos non solum de ventro ac rei publicae verum etiam, si id depulsum sit, de meo periculo esse sOLLICITOS.
Tacitus provides over 30 examples of *anxius* in the historical works, but only 3 of *sollicitus*, of which 2 are found very early in *Histories* I (8.2, 14.2) (where uncharacteristic usages abound), and the other in a direct speech (IV.58.1), in an antithesis used elsewhere in imperial prose (*sollicitio/necior*; cf. Plin. *ep.*, 6.5, Quint. 11.3.151).

The reason for Tacitus’ preference was undoubtedly stylistic. Under both the late Republic and early Empire *anxius* is favoured only by certain archaizers (e.g. Sallust, 9.3); in ordinary prose *sollicitus* predominates markedly. Note the practice of the following imperial writers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sollicitus</th>
<th>anxius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seneca the Elder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintilian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps. Quintilian (<em>decl. min.</em>)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps. Quintilian (<em>decl. mai.</em>)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single example of *anxius* in Seneca the Elder (*cont.*, 2.1.12) is in a high-flown passage containing various archaisms and poeticisms (e.g. *forens* 10, *amic* 13, *mercidus* 13).

Tacitus has the word once in the *Dialogus* (13.1), in a speech by
Maternus which is likened in style by Secundus to poetry (14.2): 
aduentior et noctem quam oratorum simillor oratio.

2.2. 

Dominatio: dominatus, the preferred word in the ordinary prose of the late Republic (in Cicero's early speeches dominatus only is used, but in the later it is gradually replaced by -tius; see the table at Til V.1.1873) was not in use in the first century A.D.; it is almost completely avoided not only by non-artificial writers, but even by historians and archaising (see the table, l.c.). The only example in Tacitus is in the ablative singular form (6.34.2 a Fastico dominatus), as are the only 2 in Livy (24.4.2, 30.33.10). Substantives in -tius are especially common in the ablative singular, and many are confined to that case alone; in Tacitus there are no fewer than 49 which are admitted in no other case. Clearly Tacitus, like Livy, felt that dominatus, though for some reason unacceptable in all other forms, could be used in the case in which words of its kind were particularly appropriate.

Dominatio is exceptional in the historical works in that it is practically the only substantive in -tio which Tacitus constantly uses when presented with a choice between the formations -tus and -tio. See 27.3 n. for a full discussion of his use of substantives in -tus and -tio.
Notes


Disjunction does not always create a special emphasis. Various examples of the device in Tacitus have a formulaic character: e.g. those consisting of (1) the words hunc quo + substantive (e.g. 1.42.4, 4.20.2, 15.2.1; cf. Fraenkel, Leserobben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos (Rome, 1968), 53); (2) a partitive genitive separated from the word on which it depends (very frequent; cf. Cic. Deiot. 1); (3) a relative or interrogative pronoun separated from its adjective (e.g. I.6.2, 3.16.2).

At I.4.2 (Titus inde Vinicius invaserip; cf. 15.16.3) hyperbaton is introduced to create enépistrophe of the introductory adverb.

2. The highly appropriate emphasis achieved by the hyperbaton gives strong support to the assertion of Lipsius (clamore penna).

3. On the use of the word in early Latin, see Shipp on Ter. Andr., 229.

4. See Syme, 343 n.2.

5. The examples of temeritatem in Curt. 8.1.18 and 9.10.28 are in reminiscences of Liv. 9.17.17. All 3 passages describe the same event (the advance of Alexander's drunken army through India). On Curtius' stylistic dependence on Livy, see Schanz-Hosius II, 599.
6. The context at red. sen. 13 is similar.

7. The only other example of the word in Seneca the Younger (epist. 85.27) has apparently been used for variation immediately after ebrius and inebriari.

8. For animus, see III. II. 203.11ff.; for sollicitus, cf., e.g. Plin. epist. 1.4.2, 1.19.4, Quint. 3.11.22.

9. Animus is not found in either Caesar or the speeches of Cicero. In the letters of the latter it occurs once (sollicitus 85 times), in combination with sollicitus (att. 2.24.1). It is not uncommon for words which are not established fully in ordinary usage to be supported by more commonplace synonyms (e.g. in Flautus the only examples of nature are both alongside the regular Flautine term ingenium: Foc. 302, Trin. 572. The one instance of animus in the Caesarian corpus (B.Afr. 71.2) is also coupled with sollicitus).

In Cicero's philosophy, which contain many literary and archaic words avoided in the speeches, animus is used as often as sollicitus (9 times).

Livy, unlike Sallust and Tacitus, prefers sollicitus (40.17). He repeatedly has animus in the expression animus audus (see Packard).

10. See, e.g., F. Cooper, Word Formation in the Roman Como Plebeius (New York, 1895), 19.
Tacitus' account of the murder of Agrrippina has a number of close verbal similarities with that of Suetonius (Nero 34). Both writers probably used the same source. Of the following:

1 Tac. 3.1 interfecerat constituere.
   Suet. Nero 34.2 perdere statuit.

2 3.2 praesumendo remedio invenit corpus
   Suet. Nero 34.2 antibiota praemanitam.

3 3.3 cuius (navis) pars ipso in mari per artem soluta ...
   Suet. Nero 34.2 solutae naves.

4.3 naufragio intercetae sit.
   Suet. Nero 34.2 naufragio ... perirent.

5 4.1 illae matrem elicet.
   Suet. Nero 34.2 incendit haece litteris ecevit.

6.1 quo rumore reconciliationis aliciae.
   Suet. Nero 34.2 reconciliationem simulata.

7.4 tracto in longam convivium.
   Suet. Nero 34.2 protractavit convivium.

8 4.4 artius oculis et pectore haerens.
   Suet. Nero 34.2 papillas quaeque exosculatus.

9.4 prosequitur absente.
   Suet. Nero 34.2 hilare prosecatu.
(10) 5.1 ruero tectum loci.
Nero 34.2 camerae ruina.

(11) 6.2 misitque libertam Agennam, qui mutiaret ...
evasisse graven casum.
Nero 34.3 L. Agennam libertam eius salvam et
inculcum cum gudio mutiante.

(12) 7.1 adpertur evasisse.
Nero 34.3 nandoque evasisse eam comparit.

(13) 7.1 mutius patrati racinoris opperienti.
Nero 34.3 opperisca coeporum exitum.

(14) 7.2 pavor exanimis; cf. 10.1 mentis inops.
Nero 34.3 inops consili.

(15) 7.6 audito venisse ... mutius Agennam, .. gladium...
dum mandata perpet. abisset inter pedes eius, tum quasi
deprehensus vincula iniici inebet, ut exitum principis
militam matrem et padere deprehensae scalaris spatia
mortem impulsione constringeret.
Nero 34.3 L. Agennam .. salvam et incolumem .. mutiamente,
abiecit clam iuxta paltone ut percussorem sibi
subornatum arripit constringique iussit, matrem occidi,
quasi deprehensum crimen voluntaria morte vitasse.
(16) 9.1 cæsarei castra exanimem Nero et fœnum

corporis laudaverint, sunt qui tradiderint, sunt qui

abuant.

Nero 34.4 ad vicendam interfectas cauaver discursisse.
contractasse membra, alia vituperasse, alia laudasse.

(17) 16.2 cum prima centurionum tribunusque adulatio

ad spem firmavit.

Nero 34.4 cuanquem et militum et senatus populique

gratulationibus confirmatur.

Some of the differences in phraseology between the two groups of

passages emphasise certain features of Tacitus' style. Where

Suetonius has the Greek words antidotic (2) and camera (10), Tacitus

prefers the native remedia and the paraphrase tectum loci: the

standard expression for destruction by shipwreck (nautico nautico incurrit) is

found in Suetonius but varied slightly by Tacitus (4), in keeping with

his liking for the unusual; the simple verb ludi, coupled with the
typically Tacitean in longum (see Darringer on 1.69), is used by Tacitus

instead of the compound protrah (7); rectus (8) and naten exanimem
(16) are the Tacitean equivalents of Suetonius' less elegant papillas

and cadaver,5 and the euphemistic haerent of evasualtus (6); the

historiographical formula utratit facinoris (see Fröbisch, Wien. Stud.
81 (1968), 126) corresponds to Suetonius' cooptorum exitum (13),
Tacitus has the simple verb *firmo* and the archaism *gratur* (see H. Hintz, 123) where Suetonius writes *confirmo* and *gratulatio* (17). Tacitus, in his customary manner (Introduction, p. 39), omits the subject accusative *eum* which Suetonius has with the infinitive *evviisse* (12); the stock Tacitean phrase *per actum* (see 2.1 n.) is linked with *soluta* to give a virtual equivalent of Suetonius' *salutatis* (3); Tacitus uses the Virgilian exagera casus where Suetonius has the hackneyed *salvam et incolumem* (11); and, finally, *vincla inicia* with the archaic form *vincla* is preferred by Tacitus to Suetonius' *constriang* (15).

Unlike Tacitus and the historians, Suetonius often reproduces source material verbatim. He seems to have been more concerned to reorganise what he derived from earlier writers than to unify it stylistically: hence the combination which his style presents of historiographical archaism, ordinary words normally avoided by historians, and even vulgarisms. It is not unlikely that in various cases above his choice of words is similar to that which he found in the *Imaginarius*. If so, a comparison of the corresponding Tacitean and Suetonian passages gives some idea of the manner in which Tacitus rewrote his sources.

A few specific instances of Tacitean rewriting can be conjectured with some probability. The stock expression *naufragio perire* (see 3.3 n.) which is found in a diversity of writers, is genuinely varied only by
Tacitus in extant prose down to this time; it is therefore highly likely to have occurred in the source as well as in Suetonius. Suetonius' *parillla... exsuscitatus* is far too specific to have been derived from a general phrase in the *imnotas* such as Tacitus' *pectori haerens*; Tacitus must have generalised words which he found offensively explicit. The sentence *aspecebit... absumt* (16) is also probably a generalisation of a more detailed description (cf. Suetonius). Finally, *in longum in combination with traho* has the marked appearance of a translation of *protraho*; the latter may well have been in the source. In the same phrase Tacitus may also have deliberately substituted the rarer *convictus* for *convivium*.

On the other hand, unless the common source was written in a style uncharacteristic of other historiographical prose, in one or two cases Tacitus rather than Suetonius probably preserves the wording of the original. It is likely that the Greek *antidotis* (and perhaps also *cumriae*, which, however, was of longer standing in Latin) was introduced by Suetonius for a Latin word in the *imnotas*.

3.2 *ministros temptare orhum videbatur mulieris usu acelorum adversus insidias intentas*: a common word-pattern in the historical works: the substantive *ministros* is separated by a verb (and in this case one or two other words) from its attribute, which comprises several words.
(mulieris ... intentae). With the present example, cf. e.g. 1.54.2
numequent obtinemat effusus in amores Astyllis; 3.1.1 insulans advehitur
liturn Galabrine contra sitam; 4.72.1 tributum iis Doricum insserat
medicum pro angustiis remis; 4.21.2 Elagam ... secreti sermons
inconsuvs adversus maiestatem habitis; 4.47.1 ad hostem devit,
compositum iam per angustias salutum; 6.1.2 locuti antes vocabula
reperta sunt sellariorum et spultriumm; 11.33 Item procuratorii
praefecto baud satia fidabant, ad honesta ac prava iusta levi;
12.31.3 locum curvae deligere securit agresti aegre et aditu angusto;
13.39.1 per montes ducabantur praecipitata nostra insigni;
11.2.1
itinera sola diei patignia mitisabantur, sedem alumnus gravior
militi tolerantis; 11.26.2 in Buriam abesssit, morte Lusiius legati
vacuum ac sibi pervissum; 14.65.1 dissonae voces respondebant numerum
aut aestatem aut assum ... minorem; 14.63.2 recentior Iulius memoria
obversabatur a Claudio nulce; 15.37.3 lupanaria adiectam industrihis
smannis completa; 15.50.4 immaculata corido patientes, magis cerper,
comitibus adversa.

The same pattern is also found fairly frequently in Sallust, but elsewhere seems to have been comparatively rare, even in history. Tacitus probably picked up the mannerism directly from Sallust. Cf., e.g., the following Sallustian instances: Cat. 3.4 animus aspernabatur
insolens rebus arturn; 29.1 ven ad senatum refert, iam antem volui
rumoribus exsercitas; Jug. 44.1 exercitus ei traditur e So. Albino
proconsuliter inermis, neque coriculi neque laboris ratione;

Metellus considam Thalam magna gloria separat, haud dissimiliter
situm sanitumque; 94.3 in castellum pervenient, describunt ab ea parte.

When an attribute consists of only one or two words, however, both Tacitus (in the historical works) and Sallust,13 in marked contrast to writers of more rhetorical prose, such as Cicero and Livy, show little readiness to divide it from its substantive by a verb.14

The verb which is most frequently found between a substantive and a simple attribute, in Tacitus and rhetorical writers alike, is esse. In the Annales, Tacitus has 19 examples of the word with a subjunctive function, of which 14 are in speeches.15

Verbs other than esse provide the separating element about as many times in the more conventionally rhetorical Dialogus (13)16 as in the whole of the Annales (12),17 which are almost 10 times as long. In the latter work three-quarters of the examples of the usage are in the first 6 books. There is usually emphasis, both in the Dialogus and the Annales, on the word preceding the verb.

At c.14.4 below, Koestermann, with no manuscript authority, reads donis subsecit ingenibus for subsecit, donis ingenibus (M). It is obviously not justifiable to introduce into a passage which presents no difficulties as it stands a type of hyperbaton which is rare throughout the historical works, and particularly in the later books of
Tacitus and Sallust also admit only very sparingly various other types of hyperbaton which are common in rhetorical prose. Their restrictiveness probably places them in a long historiographical tradition, for surviving fragments suggest that the early annalists used hyperbaton with caution (in comparison with the early orators). It is of note that Coelius Antipater in the preface (addressed probably to the scholar J. Helius) of his history of the Punic War stated that he would not employ hyperbaton in his work unless it were necessary (Cic. or. 69; 230). Perhaps Coelius was attempting to justify to Helius his excessive use of the device according to the literary accepted canons of the historical genre, for we know from Heg. 4.16 (quo in vitio...addidit) that he failed to fulfill his claim.

Livy obviously broke away from the annalistic/Sallustian tradition (see further 29.3 n.).

3.3. *nueritiae* Neronis educator: Tacitus seldom has one genitive dependent on another. Here *nueritiae* and *educator* together perform the function of a single word (the Greek term *paideiakos*$^{2}$, which Tacitus avoids; cf. Suet. Nero 35.2 *Aniocius paideiakos sum*). The expedients adopted by Tacitus to avoid the double genitive construction are sometimes observable. The fossilised expression*

--

$^{2}$ The Greek term *paideiakos* means "educator" and is used by Tacitus to avoid the double genitive construction.
ire derm, for instance, which occurs 6 times when ire is in cases other than the genitive (Lex. Tac. 264; see 6.2 n.), is twice replaced by caelastic ire when ire is required in the genitive (IV.54.2, 1.30.3). So rex Parthorum (V.9.1, 2.58.1, 15.1.1) becomes Parthi reus at 2.57.4. Genus mortuam, a variant for the classical genus humanum, is never used when genus is in the genitive case; genus humanum, conversely, is used only in the genitive (Lex. Tac. 497a). At 6.27.1 monini has an accusative object: unus amnis.

Tiburtem equitem Romanum plurium mnsimint. Elsewhere in Tacitus, however, it always takes the genitive of personal objects (Lex. Tac. 616b). At 3.19.2 - is finis qui utuliscenda Germanici morte - the expected genitive of the gerundive (or gerund) may have been replaced by the ablative because of the dependence of Germanici on morte (see Mipp. - Andr. ad loc.). Note finally 11.29.1 Ambiante cardis molitor: 14.62.2 externae reaex palinor.

With the present passage, cf. 13.2.1 rectores imperterritae
inventa.

3.3 et si naufragio interiecta siti: the only other variant for the formula naufragio perire (interire)²³ found down to at least the time of Suetonius is at Rep. Hann. 8.2 - alii naufragio, alii a servolis insius interrectum cur scriptum relignant - where the verb interrectum
has been chosen under the influence rather of the nearer expression *a servolis ipsius* than of *naufragio*.

3.3 Defunctae: Tacitus docs not use mortuus either in the minor or historical works, except at 13.58 where the subject is non-personal (mortuis ramalibus). The literary euphemism defunctus is preferred, both as a finite verb and participle. On the spread of defungor in this sense (first in Virgil; Norden, Aen. VI, 223) in ornate imperial prose, see Krebs-Schmalz, s.v.

Mortuus remained the more usual term both in popular speech and less artificial prose. Petronius, for instance, has defunctus only twice, both times in speeches of the poet Eumolpus (111.2, 141.3), but mortuus 15 times, 11 times in speeches of the freedmen in the Cena Trimalchionis (45.11, 62.5, 62.10, 65.10 bis, 66.8, 71.3, 71.8, 74.17 bis, 78.3). Seneca the Elder uses mortuus 17 times, defunctus not at all; ps. Quintilian (deol. min.) mortuus 14 times, defunctus once; and Quintilian mortuus 4 times, defunctus once.
On the question of sources, see Koestermann 2.1 n. and the literature referred to there.

Note that both aim arm with the verb of killing.


Camara is used once in the Historiae, unavoidably: III.47.3 Fabricatio rempete navibus: camarae vacant. On Tacitus' avoidance of Greek words, see further 3.3 n.

On cadaver, a word largely avoided both by Tacitus and the poets, see Norden, Agr. VI, 176; Axelson, Unsort. Wort., 436. Fabrica is not in itself a vulgarism (used by Virgil: agr. 19.805), but Tacitus would probably have found the expression fabrica exsuscultatus too explicit for his taste (see further below).

Cf. Gesst. 4.405; see H. Schmeus, Tacitus und Nachahmer Verstel (Bamberg, 1897), 42.

Note however that at 13.31.1 Tacitus appears to be criticizing his source for including material not consonant with the dignity of history. It is not impossible that the historical works of Pliny the Elder, if he is the Ignatius, like his Natural History, were composed in a style compounded of archaism and technical language.

No particular emphasis is sought thereby. The pattern is rather a traditional historiographical mannerism (see below). The attributive
phrase often virtually performs the function of a relative clause.

9. Note the different order at 11.31.4: neo arduum videbatur exscindere coloniam nullis munimentis saevian.


11. See Ahlberg, Esdras 11 (1911), 99, 101 f. for examples and discussion.

12. It is used occasionally by Cicero (e.g. inv. Papu. 4, 32, S. Reca. 26, Mil. 7, Phil. 1.10, 2.94), but proportionately far less often than by Tacitus. I have noted for instances in Livy.

13. See Ahlberg, o.e., 95.

14. Hyperbaton of this kind is found 17 times, for instance, in the first 50 chapters of Cicero's inv. Papu., and 12 times in Livy 40, cha. 1-10. On its frequency in the Khet, see G. Geiss, Sprachliche Beobachtungen zum Acter ad Herennium (Breslau, 1935), 32. It is used 3 times in the example given at Her. 4.12 of the grand style, and twice in that of the swollen style (4.15), but not at all in the passages illustrating the genus mediocris (4.13) and genus dissolubus (4.16).

15. Speeches: 1.6.3, 1.7.3, 1.53.2, 1.59.5, 1.65.2, 3.10.1, 3.12.5, 3.33.4, 4.40.1, 12.42.1, 13.27.1, 14.59.1, 14.60.3, 15.66.2; other contexts: 1.46.1, 3.35.2, 12.36.1, 14.40.1, 14.49.1.

17. Anm. 1.35.5, 1.39.6, 2.21.1, 2.37.5, 2.70.1, 3.30.2, 4.22.2, 4.34.1, 4.55.3, 13.4.2, 15.67.3, 16.5.2.

18. On Tacitus, see further 29.1 n., and Düsser Synt., 92, on 1.19.1 simulato Pompeianarum cration partium (pattern a b a b); on Sallust, see Horden, Ant. Itur., 203 n.1 (inaccurate) and particularly A. A. Ahlberg, 'De traiectionis figura ab antiquissimis prosae scriptoribus latinitis exhibitis', Francisc 11 (1911), 88-106 (comparing the practice of Sallust with that of the earlier annalists).

19. See Ahlberg, o.c., 91 ff.

20. See Peter, Heinr. I, CXXV.

21. On the usage in general, see no. - 82, 65.

22. On Tacitus' avoidance of Greek words, see Volfflin, Philol. 26 (1867), 141; Hepp - Andr. 14.15 n.

23. Cic. Deiot. 25, div. 1.55, 2.14, 2.30 (intering), Tusq. 1.107, Act. 12.2.1, 12.20.2, Caes. div. 3.27.2 (intering), Liv. 4.2.41.5, Ascon. in div. p.12, Quint. 7.3.33, ps. Quint. decl. min. 157.6, Sust. Jul. 89, Aug. 274, Nero 34.2, Cf. Cic. Fia. 44 verit in mari, Fac. 33, vet. 3.85.
4.1 dictitans: the use of dictito in the present participle, with an accompanying accusative and infinitive, is a stock historiographical method of quotation. All examples of the word in Velleius are present participles, as are 20 of the 23 in Tacitus and 19 of the 19 in Livy (III 7.1.1098. 22ff.). Cicero, conversely, uses only forms other than dictitans.

Dictito is found mainly in the Annals (30 times).

4.2 proranturium. Nisenum inter at Baesium locum: anastrophe of this kind (the preposition is placed between two coordinated substantives) is common in the historical works. Elsewhere in prose it occurs a few times in Caesar¹ (perhaps an anachronistic archaism preserved in the commentarii)² and Livy (24.3.3), but is otherwise largely avoided (see III. VII.1.2127.28ff.).

In the minor works when continued with the accusatives, inter always precedes both (Ann. 2.4.1, Corn. 23.2.46.2); in the Histories it occasionally stands in anastrophe (Lex. Tac. 664a), but usually retains its more normal place (II.14.2, II.17.1, II.17.2, II.23.2, II.43.1, III.9.1, III.29.2, III.60.2, III.79.2); finally, in the Annals it becomes as frequent in anastrophe (Lex. Tac., l.c.) as in the initial position (1.39.4, 2.7.3, 2.16.1, 2.22.1, 2.63.6, 11.20.2, 12.56.1, 12.63.1).³
Unconscious association seems to have led to the repetition of one construction or the other in certain passages. In the classical position inter is found in clusters between chapters 14 and 23 of Historiae II, between chapters 7 and 22 of Annales 2, and towards the end of Annales 12 (see above for references). Similarly in anzotropa it occurs 4 times in 20 chapters of Annales 4 (see Lax. Enc., 1.6.). With the present example of cf. 9.1 below: viam Misen, proxier et villam Caesaris dictatorem. Cf. also nexus at V.8.2 and inter at V.19.2.

4.4 *alia constiit*: from Annales 12 onwards Tacitus has *constiit* exclusively (9 times: 12.17.2, 12.43.2, 13.16.4, 13.35.1, 14.25.2, 15.16.1, 15.67.3, 16.3.2) for the more usual *constat*, but in the minor works and Historiae he almost always prefers the latter (10:1) (Dial. 16.5, 16.4, 25.1, 39.5, Aprig. 13.2, 41.4, I.16.3, I.41.3, III.29.2, IV.69.2; cf. III.75.1). Neither word is frequent in the first 11 books of the Annales (constat: 1.13.6, 11.51.1: constiit: 2.73.4).
Notes

1. *Civ. 3.6.3, Gall. 6.36.2.* In the latter passage the preposition follows a relative (perhaps the most common kind of anastrophe: see Landgraf, *S. Rom.,* 221).

2. On the kinship between *commentarii* and *annales,* and on the isolated archaisms in *Cassar,* see Eden, *Cicota* 40 (1952), 77, 83ff., 88ff., 92ff.

5.1 *placido mari*: a stock phrase in poetry (since Ennius) and the more artificial genres of prose.\(^1\) In ordinary usage from Cato through to at least the end of the first century A.D. the corresponding expression was *tranquillum more*.\(^2\) The stylistic difference between the two is well illustrated by *Sen. dial. 5.1.5; sic tranquillum more dicitur, cum leviter moveatur aequus in unum partem inclinatur. itaque si legeris:*

*cum placidum ventis atarat mare,*

*acito illud non atara, sed sustulit et dici tranquillum, quia necesse hoc necesse illo impatere faciat.* Seneca has twice written *tranquillum* for the quoted *placidum* (note in particular the paraphrase *dici tranquillum* after the quotation). Clearly the two words were synonymous, but *placidus* was less appropriate in prose than *tranquillus*.

5.1 *di praebuerunt:* a substitute, perhaps unparalleled, for the normal and very frequent *di dederunt* (*dant*, etc.),\(^3\) which occurs once in the *Dialogus* (10.5) and twice in direct speeches in the *Annals* (4.36.3, 6.8.4).

Tacitus, like *Livy* and a few other writers of artificial prose,
often introduces praebere in expressions in which dare is usual. Thus, e.g., the standard operam dare is replaced by operam praebere at 16.21.1: *Juvenalium ludico orum spectabiles operam praebuerat.* If, as is suggested by the immediate context (see Furneaux ad loc.), the sense of the passage is that the subject (Thrasea) had given an unsatisfactory stage performance at the *Juvenalia* (cf. ib. *enim offensio alius penetrabat, qua idea Thraseae fatui, unde eurus erat. ludia octastis a Tropiano Antenor institutis habita tragedio recinerat*), a closely comparable example of *operam dare* (denoting the performance on stage of actors) is to be found at *Vitr.* 5.6.2 *omen artifices in scenae dant operam.* Livy also has *operam praebere* once: 5.4.5 *moleste nives ferebat miles se suo amitu operam redhibere praebere.*

*Operam dare* is found in *Tacitus* only at *Dial.* 51.5; elsewhere *operam offere* and *operam navare* are preferred.

*Effusum praebere* (15.63.1) is used by no other writer before *Tacitus.* *Effusum dare* occurs in the *B. Alex.* (15.1), Livy (23.1.3), and elsewhere in *Tacitus* himself (1.43.1, 2.17.5).

*Aditum praebere* (13.4.2) is a non-classical variant, found occasionally in Livy (24.34.15, 25.36.6, 38.20.7, 43.18.3), the Younger Seneca (*bene*. 1.9.2), and Columella (5.5.13, 8.11.4), for the common *aditum dare,* which *Tacitus* does not have.

*Material praebere* occurs 5 times in the historical works (IV.4.1, 3.11.2, 4.59.1, 6.28.1, 13.49.1), *material dare* only at *Dial.* 5.2.
The latter alone is used by both Cicero (div. 2.12, de orat. 2.222) and Quintilian (4.1.11, 4.1.23), but Livy (1.23.10, 3.31.4, 3.46.3, 8.12.12, 31.26.11, 37.53.12) and Seneca (benef. 6.35.1, dial. 1.4.5, 7.27.2) prefer materia praebere.

At 4.41.1 Tacitus has facultatem praebere for the regular facultatem dare, which he himself uses 4 times in the historical works (once in the present chapter, 2; cf. 1.84.1, Iv.65.1, 6.5.1). Cicero uses only facultatem dare (26 times), as do Nepos (Resc. 4.2), Livy (3.56.10, 29.27.4, 32.26.18, 38.58.9), Seneca (benef. 4.6.1, 7.8.3, dial. 1.4.2, nat. 1.17.4, exist. 90.1), et al; Caesar and the ps. Caesarian writers have facultatem dare 26 times, facultatem praebere twice (Tell. 8 pr. 5, div. 1.49.2). Similar to facultatem praebere are casum (= exceptionem) praebere (12.28.1) and copiam praebere (6.50.2).

Tacitus is the only writer down to at least the time of Suetonius to use exceptionem praebere: Agric. 16.3 interventus civilium aequorum praebuit instantem quam excusationem; cf. Cic. Verr. 4.126 Sarmho ... dat tibi instantem exceptionem. Elsewhere exceptionem dare is found, e.g., at Cic. fam. 6.7.6, fem. benef. 3.36.2, dial. 4.34.5.

Finally, note the use at 37.1 below of terna praebere, an expression found previously only at Curt. 4.14.4 (see Fletcher, Annotations, 4.5), for the more common terna dare and terna vertere.
5.1 *cum dato signo more tectum loci*: when Tacitus uses the historic infinitive in a subordinate clause, there is usually, as here, inversion of subject and verb (cf. *III.* 10.3, *III.* 31.1, *III.* 31.3, 32.2, 11.32.2, 11.37.2, 12.51.2). If the subject precedes the verb (2.31.1, 2.4.0.1, 6.44.2, 13.57.3), it is generally accompanied by a long attribute.7

Inversion of subject and historic infinitive in subordinate clauses does not seem to have been the rule in the other historians.6

5.1 *pressusque Crepereius et statim ex his pagas est*: when two perfect (future perfect, pluperfect) passives with the same subject are linked by a copulative or disjunctive particle, Tacitus either omits the verbal substantive (usually *est* or *sunt*) with both or, as here, expresses it with one or the other (but never with both). The absence of the verbal substantive with both verbs is more frequent in the first 6 books of the *Annals* than in the later:5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal subst. omitted with both verbs</th>
<th>ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 (4:1)</td>
<td>8 (1:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal subst. expressed with one verb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whereas est is expressed with examinitus here, in a very similar passage in the first book of double ellipsis occurs: 3.51.1 ductusque in carcerem Frison ac statim examinitus.

5.1 parietibus... validioribus: validus, which is common in the poets and in writers of artificial prose, particularly historians (see Skard, 56), does not seem to have been in ordinary use in either the late Republic or early Empire. Its substitutes in the lower genres were firmus, and, to a lesser extent, valens (a less common word, with a more restricted range of employment).

In Cicero, for instance, firmus is found very frequently, but validus only 3 times: at rep. 2.4, in a passage dealing with Numa: oppressisse Longam Albanam, validam urben et potenti; on another occasion, patres, used in the Republic under the influence of the remote subject matter, see above, 1.2 n; validus urbe is a stock expression in history: cf. Jell. hist. frg. 1.113, Liv. 1.15.4, Tac. 11.8.3, 15.4.2; cf. Skard, 1.4; at fam. 16.1.3, in an expression of concern addressed to the sick Tiro: omnia vicaria, si, ut spero, te validum videro (the same sentiment is constantly expressed in fam. 16 — all the letters of which are to Tiro — with numerous changes of wording; clearly Cicero sought to avoid the appearance of insincerity which a single repeated formula of solicitude might have given: cf.,
e.g. 16.4.1 satis te nature videro, si plane confirmatum videro; 16.2 volupstati fore, si te firman cum primum videro; 16.10.1 ibi te ut firman offendam, mi Tiro, effici; 16.13 omnis a te data mihi mutabo, si te valentem videro; 16.3.2 cures curientes, ero in prirna, cum primum te videre sed, mi Tiro, valentem); and at sig. 133.

Similarly Caesar, the authors of the Caesarian corpus and ps. Quintilian (decl. min.) all avoid validus completely, but use firmus with varying frequency (Caes. 15 times, ps. Caes. 10, ps. Quint. 6), and Vitruvius has validus only twice, in adjacent passages and in almost the same expression (8.3.2 validos ... spiritus; 8.3.3 validam inflationem), but firmus 25 times. Quintilian, finally, uses firmus 40 times, but validus only 7 times late in his work: 5 times in a cluster in the tenth chapter of book 12, in which firmus does not occur (12.10.5, 37, 41, 63, 66), and twice in another cluster in the first chapter of book 10 (10.1.60, 62).

There are 13 instances of firmus in Tacitus (Livy. Tac. 470a), of which 5 are in the minor works and 6 in the Historiae. Note that, whereas validus is used with partes in the present passage, at Dial. 27.3 firmus is preferred with the same word (cf. Plin. nat. 32.162). In the Annals firmus is found at 3.18.1 and 4.52.1.

Varro is used 5 times in the minor works and twice in the early Histories (I-II), but is then dropped (Livy. Tac. 1734b). In the
minor works it occurs 3 times in phrases in which validissimus is later found: Germ. 40.1 valentissima nationibus; cf. IV.17.6
validissimorum ... nationum; Otric. 24.1 valentissimum in terris partem; cf. III. 53.2 valentissima terrae partem; Germ. 43.2 valentissimae
(civitatis); cf. II.82.1 validae civitates.

5.3 utique subveniretur patria principia clamat: the placing of ut before its verb in indirect commands, as here, is rare in the later half of the Annals (6 times, including the present instance), but is a frequent mannerism of the first half (25 times).
Notes

On the last passage, see Norden, Ant. Römcr., 319.

2. Cato Ann. 112.1, Plaut. Dist. 14, Poen. 507, Varro ling. 7.88, Cic. Qunct. 135, rep. 1.11, Sen. contr. 7.1.7, Sen. deor. 6.5.5, 9.2.1, nat. 5.1.1, 5.1.3, ps. Quint. deor. min. 435.19. The Younger Seneca has tranquillum m. in prose, placidum m. in the tragedies.

3. For dare operam + adjective, see Plaut. Amph. 278.

4. The words parum spectabilis operum praebuerat, if the reference is to acting, can hardly be taken (with Furneaux) to mean that Thersa had not appeared on stage at all; rather, the performance which he gave was parum spectabilis (or parum spectabilis, if the alternative suggestion for the Latin parum et spectabilis is accepted; spectabilis, however, is particularly apt in application to a stage performance).

5. Sec. e.g., Cic. deor. 1.3, att. 15.14.3, de orat. 3.7, B. Alex. 17.4, Nep. Paus. 3.3, Liv. 4.5.5, 22.4.3, 33.12.15, 42.12.6, Val. Max. 2.2.1, 2.6.7, 6.2.7, 7.2. ext. 1, 8.11.1, Sen.benef. 5.21.1, Plin. nat. 6.75.

6. Tertio vertere was probably the normal military term, tertio dare
an elaborate or unusual equivalent. Caesar and the Caesarian
corpus have only the former, but Virgil only the latter. See
TLL VI.1.1668. 211. For numerous examples of term came from the
poets, Livy, and a few other prose authors.
7. For a complete list of examples of the historic infinitive in the
historical works and the Agricola, see F. Perrochet, Rev. 14 (1936),
48.
8. See the examples from Sallust and Livy given by O. Rieman, Études
sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live (Paris, 1875), 219.
9. Other evidence has been found to suggest that the ellipses of esse
is less common in the later than in the early books of the annales:
see G. Stahl, Quibus conditionibus facitum ellipsam verbi admiserit
et quia ratione excoluerit (Vürzburg, 1900). The statistics given
by G. Wetzel, De usu verbi substantivi Tacitii (Diss. Leipzig,
Cassellis, 1876), 25, 32 are unconvincing.
10. 1.61.2, 2.3.2, 2.4.1, 2.6.2, 2.24.3, 2.83.1, 3.27.2, 3.48.3, 3.58.2,
3.51.1, 3.71.2, 4.32.2, 4.72.3, 6.18.1, 6.43.2, 13.29.2, 14.4.4,
14.2.1, 14.32.1, 14.32.3, 15.35.3, 15.7.1, 16.38.1.
11. 2.62.4, 4.21.2, 4.43.3, 4.63.1, 11.1.3, 12.38.1, 13.35.3, 13.61.2,
15.41.3, 14.5.1, 14.24.2, 14.32.3, 14.35.2, 15.69.3.
12. Both firmus and validus can denote good health (cf. e.g. Cic. Fam.
16.4.3, 16.2, 16.10.1, quoted below), strength of various kinds -
physical and natural (TLL VI.1.613.26ff., lb. 615. 11ff.; cf. Lex. Tac.
1735a), military/numerical (ILL VI.1.814.6ff.; cf. Lex.Tac. 1735a),
that conferred by fortifications (ILL VI.1.815.66ff.; cf. Lex. Tac.
1735a), mental, etc. - and power (ILL VI.1.816.14ff.; cf. Lex. Tac.
1736a). The derived sense 'fidelis', however, which Virgil sometimes
has (ILL VI.1.818.18ff.), may be alien to validus.
13. Valens (3½ times Cicero) is almost always used of persons; with
collectives it is rare (see har. resp. 60). It can denote either
good health (e.g. Fam. 16.1.3, 16.3.2), or strength of various kinds
(see l.s. for examples).
14. 1.6.2, 1.6.3, 1.15.1, 4.40.3, 4.48.2, 4.58.2, 1.69.1, 1.78.1, 2.9.1,
2.9.2, 2.32.2, 2.40.3, 2.50.3, 2.76.2, 3.10.1, 3.29.1, 3.48.1,
4.6.4, 4.6.3, 4.15.1, 4.20.1, 4.21.3, 5.3.2, 6.8.1, 6.15.2, 12.45.2,
13.0.1, 13.15.3, 13.44.1, 16.26.3.
6.1  *reputans:* this word, which is often approximately synonymous with *corito* (note, however, the literal usage at II.50.2) is used in prose mainly by historians and archaizers. It occurs 16 times in Tacitus (only in the historical works), 9 times in Sallust, 11 times in Livy, and 12 times in Pliny the Elder, but is avoided by, e.g., Caesar, Petronius and Quintilian. Cicero has it only 3 times in the speeches, 3 times in the philosophical and twice in the letters.

Tacitus uses *corito* mainly in speeches (see Syme, 726). The only example of the word in Sallust is also in a speech (Cat. 44.5).

6.2  *Fallacibus litteris accitus:* in the first century A.D. *epistula* was the word in regular use; the archaism *litterae*, which had been by far the more popular term under the Republic, is preferred only by the historians Livy, Curtius, and Tacitus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>epistula</th>
<th>litterae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca the Elder</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velleius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Maximus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca the Younger</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtius</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flint the Elder  19  
Quintilian  22  1
ps. Quintilian (palam.)  2  

On the progressive decline of *epistula* in the *Annales* (in the last 6 books it is found only twice, in a technical expression) see above p. 40.

The phrase *litterae secundae* isLiv. (10.18.7, 22.31.7; see 21.1 n.).

6.1 honoré praecipuis habit: *praecipuus* has full superlative rather than intensive (= 'special') force here: Agrippina was the guest of honour at Nero's dinner. Cf. III.38.1 *sicacitati causam apud Cæsarem* «cum equa militia, praecipuum honoré Junium Blaesus narrantur.

However, *praecipuus* is not always superlative (= *maximus*) in Tacitus, as maintained by Whiffin (Philol. 26 (1867), 161). Note the following examples (all from the last book of the *Annales*):

13.30.2 et I. *Numerius cornelia fama concessit, cui tres et nonaginta anni spatium vivendi praecipuaebus opes bona artibus, inoffensa tot imperatorum amicitia fuit; 14.57.3 *Sullam inopem, unde praecipuam audaciæ; 16.14.1 nemus praeclav habebat Antium caritate Agricinæ"
invisum Herodi onescus eius praecipue ad sexieridan cupidinum.

Tacitus merely uses the hackneyed maximum in the historical works other than in expressions in which it is unavoidable (circus maximum, pontifex maximum, with nullus, and after aux). In the Annals it is found 6 times in the first 6 books (2.56.1, 3.15.2, 3.40.2, 4.5.2, 4.10.1, 6.39.3), but never in the later books.

6.1 litus iuxta: the postponing of a preposition is not unusual in prose after pronouns and relative adjectives (particularly if the preposition is disyllabic), but is very rare after unqualified substantives. There are perhaps more instances of anastrophe of this latter type in the Annals than in any other prose work.

In many cases Tacitus seems to have adopted the usage to highlight (e.g. in antitheses) by anteposition the word governed by the preposition: 4.48.1 dum consilium lucrum intra siliquastrum nocte mansum in carcinis tuitam et vigilam capessentur; (lucrum and nocte are contrasted); 6.41.2 centumlibus pacifico ut Arthabam Scythas inter educatum ob saevitiam exsecrern cense Tidetis ing-niam Romanas per axiales sperabat (Scythas and Romanas are contrasted); 3.75.2 1111, quod praeterea intra sestit, comendatio ex iudicia, iuici, quod consulatum adoptus est; odium ex invide iubetur (antithesis: of consulatum adoptus est); 19.37.2 volucres et terras diversae e terris
et animalia maris Occano absumque petiverunt (antithesis: or, diversis a terris); 6.39.2 haec Tiberius non maris, ut alia, divisus neque 
per longinuam nauticae receptavit, sed urbem luxta (Tiberius was near the city rather than on Capri); 11.20.3 quaeruque in aetro gravia, 
humae infra moliti (in aero and humae infra are antitactical); 
15.47.2 et in aero Placentina via propter natum vitulam, cui carit 
in omne essest; securitas armamentis interpretatur, parari rem 
humanorum alibi recepti, sed non fure validum neque occultum, quia in 
uterum nascens ac iter luxta editum sit (according to the 
interpretation of the hanumpiece it was of significance that the calf 
was born near the road: note neque occultum); 12.22 intimidates ... 
ferocius quae pro fortuna dissensione aequalitate Caesarem fereratur ... multo 
quaque interruto non malis, cum nostra luxta custodiae circumdant: 
visui populi praebatur (the danecare of intimidates before Caesar 
in private (aequalitate Caesarem) is compared with that in public before the 
Roman people); 5.9.2 tradunt temporis eisca euctores, quia tribunvirali 
sumplicio adfecta virgines inauditem habebatur, a carnisifice lagem in luxta 
compressam (the cruelty of the act is increased by the place of its 
occurrence: alongside the gallows at which the execution is to take 
place); 13.47.1 quem natum Grapthus ex libertis Caesaris, usui et 
sementa Tiberio absumque dominis principis adiectis, ielli mendacio interdit 
(Grapthus had seen four reigns); 13.5.1 ipsum quippe apriori hisa 
Ticiumque progressum noque abcedentem a concors simul urbem
intravisae (the attentiveness of Augustus in accompanying the body of Drusus as far as Ticinum is contrasted with Tiberius' refusal to return Germanicus publicly); 2.30.1 consultaverit ibi, non habuit ursi forst open Graecia vnum. Brundisium usque recunia nonost (Brundisium lay at the end of the Appian way); cf. 16.19.1 et forte illis diemus Capenum petivérat Caesar, et Graecia usque progressus Petronius illic attinébat.

In the present passage Tacitus perhaps intended to emphasise the fact that the wreck occurred not on the open sea but near the coast (even though the ship struck no rocks).

In 13 other places the postponed preposition is caen (see Lex. Tac. 227a), a word which Tacitus hardly ever places before its substantive in the Annals, whether or not the substantive is emphatic (a poetic mannerism: see T. IV.9.2.1ff.).

There remain 12 examples of the device which convey no particular emphasis. In 5 cases the substantive is a river name, either by accident or in reflection of a formalic - perhaps official - usage (1.60.3, 2.4.1.1, 2.65.6, 4.5.1, 15.17.3).

6.1 observans etiam Aeceronimo necem, simil numm vilnum adjacentia: the usual construction would have been simply observans ... et ... adjacentia or perhaps simul observans ... et ... adjacentia (or simul ...
In ordinary prose *simil* can link (1) two sentences: e.g. Cass. Gall. 6.23.26. *hoc prorsum virtutis existimant, expulso aerei finitimae cadere nunc quantum prae uideare consism*: e.g. *simil hoc se fore tutores arbitrum, rapentiae incursiones timore sublato*; (2) two parallel, or nearly parallel, subordinate clauses: e.g. Cic. Verr. 5.44. *cum inas (navis) manœuvre esset ex praede, simil cum inas deciderat*; Cass. Gall. 6.54.8 ut ... simil ut; Quint. 1.1.12 *quia ... simil quia*; cf. Cic. Verr. 1.124 *ne ... simil ut*; or (3) (only very rarely) two long phrases between which a copulative particle would be awkward: Cic. Verr. s. pr. 12 *quia pro victura urbana sedium aequitatem fuit publicanius operum depopulationem, simil in more dicando omnem possessoriam contra eodem institutum accidit et condonatio*;

Pla. 76 *vestrae freudeae, vestrum acuas, vestrae criminationes insidiam searum, illius urbis anomorum narrat*; simul *cornic* et *familia* et *licentia urbis Amandae non omnium domiciarum in suribus eius impulsus vestro equidem*, *vestrae baud renderent provinciam effecerant ut ...* (cf. B. Alex. 74.3). But it is not used to join either single words or small groups of words.

The latter construction is a mannerism of the historical works, and above all of the later books of the *Annales* (on its increasing frequency, see *Introduction*, p. 43); cf., e.g. 1.70.2 *imperau aquilonis, simil sidera accuinocii ... rami ariume agmen*; 3.24.3 *sicl
allorum exitus, simil estera illius actatia memorab: 11.21.2

lamentione amicorum, simil scrii ingeio quaesturam ... adsequitur; 12.8.2 veniam exilii ... simil praeturas immetrat; 12.29.1 adic accolarum, simil domesticis discorinis circumventus (see loc. Tac. 1503a-b).

It is found first in a prayer in Plautus (Stich. 405 Neptune gratis habeo et Tempestitibus; simil Hercule), then in Cicero's verse (arzt. 36 Electa Steropeae, simil sanctissimae Maxe; cf. ib. 101) and occasionally in Sallust (see below), Livy (33.3.12 muta iam saepe memorata de maiorum virtutibus, simil de militari laude Macedonum cum discernisset), and Pliny the Elder (nat. 7.91 sanctorum aut legens, simil picture et audire). Tacitus uses it considerably more often than any earlier writer of either prose or verse.

Kroll (Glattha 15 (1927), 285) counted 22 instances of simil = of in Sallust. Almost all, however, are unremarkable, for they belong either to classes (1) or (2) above. Of the remaining 4, only one links two examples of the same part of speech or two short expressions of parallel construction: Jug. 76.2 ubi oppidanos proelioc intentes, simil oppidum et oneribus et loco maritum videt. The rest (Cat. 56.5 fretus ... simil ... existimas; cf. ib. 17.7, Jug. 46.1) stand between members different in kind. Tacitus too (probably in imitation of Sallust) sometimes employs the word in conjunction with variatio (e.g. 1.70.1, 1.70.3, 2.42.3), but he also makes frequent use of it to
join balanced phrases (as in the present passage and in those quoted above).

6.2 *benignitate deum.* Tacitus has *benignitas deum* 4 times (IV.85.2, 11.15.2, 12.4.2), but *benignitas deorum* never. Similarly Livy, in whom both forms of the genitive plural of *deus* are very frequent (*-orum* 88 times, *-um* 96), invariably writes *benignitas deum* (15 times).\(^6\) Since *benignitas* is one of only two words with which Cicero allows *deum*,\(^9\) it would seem that the expression *benignitas deum* was formulaic. However, it may have been falling out of use under the late Republic, for Cicero also has *benignitas deorum* (Cat. 4.19, fam. 15.4.1), and the author of the *B. Alex.* (75.3), Cicero’s correspondent Cato (fam. 15.5.2) and, later, Valerius Maximus (5.1.1a, 9.12, ext.7) all use the modernised expression only.

Even in early Latin *deum* was restricted mainly to certain apparently fixed phrases. Of the 14 examples of the form in Plautus, the expression *virtute deum* provides 7 (Aul. 166, Capt. 324, Mil. 676, 679, Enea. 390, Trin. 346, 355), *pro deum atque hominum fiden* and variants 3 (Cura. 694, Epid. 580, Men. 1053), *mutus deum* one (Amph. 84.1) and *pax deum* another (Poem. 25%).\(^10\) Terence has *deum* only in the formula *pro deum atque hominum fiden* (7 times: see McClynn, 1,123).

By the late Republic and early Empire the old form had dropped almost
completely out of use in all collocations. Cicero uses deorum over 100 times in the speeches, and even more frequently in the philosophica -- often dependent on words with which, it may be inferred, deum had once formed a special phrase -- but deum in a mere handful of passages, and then only in expressions in which he also admits deorum (see above). Deum is avoided completely by Caesar and the ps. Cesarian writers (deorum 9 times), Vitruvius (deorum 22 times), Seneca the Elder (deorum 14 times), Calclus (deorum twice), and ps. Quintilian (deorum 13 times), and found only once in Seneca the Younger (esp. 91.6; deorum 48 times), once in Petronius (at 117.3, in the sacred phrase mater deum; deorum 7 times), 3 times in Quintilian (1.6.10, 2.4.34, 7.2.3; deorum 11 times) and once in Pliny the Younger (esp. 84.7; deorum 20 times).

Tacitus, in contrast to the above writers and even to the historians and archaizers (deorum predominates by 52:4 in Valerius Maximus, 47:13 in Pliny the Elder, 7:1 in Sallust, and 11:6 in Curtius; on Livy, see above) has deum more frequently than deorum in the historical works (58:9; see Lex. Tac. 264a). It has been argued that as he advanced he turned progressively from deorum to deum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>minor works</th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deorum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the statistics are misleading, for there is a clear distinction in usage between the two forms. Of the 9 instances of *decemnum* in the historical works, 6 are in speeches, and the others in a final clause (III.82.1) which represents someone's thoughts. Note, for instance, that in speeches at 1.10.6 and 14.14.1 honor is linked with *decemnum*, but that in the narrative at 15.74.3 and 16.21.2 it occurs with *deum*. *Deum* is not confined to the narrative, but when used in speeches it is often, as in the present passage, in set expressions in which Tacitus does not admit *decemnum*: e.g. IV.85.2 (*benignitas*), 1.39.6 (*ira*), 3.58.3 (*verum*), 4.14.3 (*aurem*).

The change from minor to historical works is probably real enough: cf., e.g. *decemnum nominibus* (Germ. 9.2), *deum vocabulum* (14.15.5).
Notes

1. It could be added to the list of artificial words cited by Trankle (Jien Stud. 81 (1966), 116ff.) which are either absent from or rare in the early books, but more common later. It is found only once in the first decade (1.41.3), but 10 times in books 21-30. Of these latter instances 6 are in a cluster in chapters 12-36 of book 30 (12.19, 14.8, 30.11, 30.16, 31.6, 36.10).

2. The eclipse of litterae was probably facilitated by its inability to express plurality.

The assertion of Krebs-Schemz, s. i. 'eristula' that litterae could be used of both private and public correspondence, but eristula only of the former, is not borne out by the evidence, at least from the imperial period. The title of one of the imperial secretaries was ab eristula.

3. For the loc. plurimis maximisque fidibus auctoribus, litter, followed e.g., by Koestermann, reads maximisque fidibus. Maximum fidis (Beraldius) is less plausible, for Tacitus has fidissimus 9 times, but maximus fidus nowhere else.


5. 1.60.3, 1.65.3, 2.41.1, 2.63.6, 3.1.1, 4.5.1, 4.48.1, 4.55.2, 12.13.3, 13.47.2, 15.17.3, 16.35.1.
6. Similique is a common Flavian usage which could have been substituted

7. Examples are assembled in Dietsch's index, s.v. 'simul', fin.

8. 2.20.3, 7.13.3, 8.4.6, 8.5.3, 8.5.11, 8.4.2, 8.4.16, 8.4.14,
25.11.10, 29.15.1, 31.31.20, 37.54.10, 32.9.4, 41.24.8, 45.23.1.

9. M. Rosc. 33; cf. Flaccus op. fin. 10.8.6, 10.23.3. Deum also occurs
in the expression pro deum atque hominum fides (C. Rosc. 23, 39,
Div. Gen. 7, Terr. 1.25, 1.137, 1.7), in which the analogists advocated
the substitution of deorum: Cic. orat. 155 atque aitiam a cultusdem
zcre ian emendator antiquitates, non hominum, deorum atque hominum
fides deorum stult. Ita credo hoc ille nesciens:

10. Similarly Livy has per deum 12 times (3.5.14, 3.7.7, 3.8.1, 4.30.10,
6.1.12, 6.12.7, 7.2.2, 10.7.12, 21.11.1, 27.23.4, 38.46.12, 42.2.3).
per deorum only once (6.41.2; cf. 39.10.5).

11. Note, e.g., (1) ira deorum (Liv. Rep. 39, Mil. 86, nat. 1.45, loc. 2.22,
off. 3.194): Tacitus has only deum with ira (Lae. Tac. 264c fin.),
Livy deum 11 times (3.6.5, 4.9.3, 4.25.3, 5.14.4, 8.6.3, 8.6.11,
9.29.11, 10.39.16, 22.9.7, 25.6.8, 40.37.2), deorum only twice (8.9.10,
8.35.7); Quintilian also provides an instance of ira deum (7.2.3);
(2) actus deorum (Pent. 30, fin. 2.21): cf. Flaut. Amphi. 241 (see above);
(3) domum deorum (Arch. 18, Tusc. 1.68, rep. 3.4): Livy has only
dom with domum (1.54.3, 5.22.2, 44.33.3); (4) beneficium deorum
(e.g. Phil. 4.7, 5.23, 12.9, 14.25, nat. 3.71): Livy has only
beneficium deum (25.35.8, 40.23.2).

12. Deum is found at quaest. 6.2, in a quotation from Pollio.

13. The only example of deum in the minor works of Tacitus is in the same
expression (Gem. 45.2). Cf. Liv. 29.11.7, 37.9.9, Val. Max. 1.1.1,
2.4.3, 6.18.3, Phil. nat. 2.37, 5.147, 7.120, 11.261, 14.34, 18.16.
35.106. None of the latter three authors ever has mater deorum
(which occurs perhaps only at Sen. misc. 2.16.5). Valerius Maximus
has only one other example of deum (1.6.3) and Pliny only 6.

14. In a discussion of the phrase Editum deum (see above).

15. Seitz, K. Studien zur Stilentwicklung und Satzstruktur innerhalb
der Annalen des Tacitus (Marburg, 1958), 21.
7.2 **pauro exanimi:** in this metaphorical sense *exanimis* is found in Virgil, Horace, Livy, certain imperial poets, and once in Quintilian (*Mil. V. 2. 177f. 35ff.*); it belongs rather to poetry than prose.

Tacitus uses other striking phrases in the opening chapters of this book to describe Nero's state of mind: cf. *nunc silentium defixus* (10.1), *mentis impia* (ib.)

Nero's murder of Agrippina was inevitably compared both in popular verses circulated in the city (see *Suet. Ner. 39.2*) and in later literature (e.g. *Juv. 3.21ff.*; see *Bayo ad loc.*) with the slaying by Creusa of her mother. Suetonius accordingly includes a description of Nero hounded by the Furies after the event (*Ner. 34.4*). Tacitus omits any mythological reference, but makes use of certain suitably poetic phrases to describe the guilty feelings of the emperor.

7.2 **sive servitum anseret:** *servitum* (= *servi*) is found mainly in archaising prose under the early Empire. It is avoided by Seneca the Elder, Seneca the Younger, and Quintilian, all of whom have *servi* frequently, and used only once by ps. Quintilian (*frag. min. 178.2*). Livy, however, has it 21 times, and Pliny the Elder 11 times.
Tacitus uses only *servi* in the minor works (10 times), but has both *servi* and *servilia* frequently in the historical works.

The two words overlap in usage to some extent in Tacitus, but there is nevertheless a distinction observable. Under the following circumstances *servi* is almost invariably chosen:

1. In opposition to or juxtaposition with *liberti* (Agric. 19.2, Carn. 25.2, 1.7.3, 1.22.1, II.49.3, IV.58.1, 5.26.1, 6.21.1, 11.12.3, 15.2.2, 15.21.4, 15.54.4, 15.64.1, 15.72.2). The only comparable example of *servilia* is at 4.6.4.

2. In legalistic contexts of various kinds: (a) 10 times in reference to the interrogation of slaves under torture: (I.3.1, 1.23.2, 2.23.3 bis, 3.22.3, 3.25.2, 3.37.3, 4.29.1, 4.29.3, 4.47.3); (b) 3 times in the description of senatorial proceedings (12.53.1, 13.32.1 bis); (c) 3 times in the speech of the lawyer C. Cassius on slaves and their punishment (14.4.3, 44.2, 44.3); (d) twice in reference to grants of emancipation (15.54.2, 15.55.2).

*Servilia* is never used in any of these latter ways.

Apparently *servi* placed stronger emphasis on legal status than *servilia*.

7.2 *sive ad senatum et populum pervaderet*: the formula *senatus populusque Romanus* is rarely varied in classical prose, whether by the
reversal of the word order, the use of another copulative particle
for -que, or the dropping of Romanus. Cicero uses it about 50
times in the speeches, but its variants only 15 times, and then usually
for a special purpose. Of the 6 instances with inverted order, 3 are
in the expression in Ianuam populi et (ae) senatus (Verr. 2.14, 3.19,
Kid. 46; cf. Off. 3.109), one is in a formula (populi senatusque
indicio) found also in Caesar (leg. agr. 1.12; cf. Caesar, civ. 3.10.10),
and another has clearly been adopted because of the special weight
given to populus in the context: Verr. 2.121 quis anima legis sociis
amicisque dat in cuius imperium a populo Romano, auctoritatem
legum dandum ab senatu, et ab eis et populi Romani et senatus
existere (the remaining example is at Verr. 2.50). In 3 of the 8
places where et replaces -que, the allusion is to the senate and
people of a foreign state (Verr. 3.108, 4.138, Cat. 3.10), and in
another the substitution has been necessitated by a preceding -que
(Verr. 2.90; there remain Verr. 3.173, Mur. 24, 34, prov. cons. 7).
Finally, at Verr. 4.138 Romanus is omitted in a reference to the
Syracusan senate and people.

Tacitus, however, has senatus populusque Romanus (I.55.4, I.57.1,
III.60.3) significantly less often than the variants (16 times). His
unwillingness to use it was probably due partly to a feeling that it
was an emotive Republican phrase no longer meaningful under the imperial
system of government (note I.55.4 ac ne reverentiam imperii excere
viderentur, senatus populique Romani obliterata iam nomina sacramento
advocabant; I.57.1 et superior exercitus speciosis senatus
populique Romani nominibus relictis tertium nonas Ianuarias Vitellio
accessit), and partly to his habitual tendency to vary formulas (note
the use of senatus ac populus Romanus in speeches at I.56.2 and
III.84.2, and in a quotation from a letter at I.12.1: in such
contexts senatus populusque Romanus would hardly have been offensive;
its replacement can only have been motivated by a desire to avoid the
standard official connective.)

The Tacitean variants are, besides senatus ac populus, senatus
et populus (II.32.2, II.89.1, II.90.2, 11.11.1), senatus populusque
(II.90.1, I.2.2, 4.12.1), populus ac senatus (I.90.2, 4.67.4) and,
in the Annals only, patres et populus and its reverse (see 1.2 n.).
Notes

1. 14.10.1-2 and Suet. Ner. 34.4 are similar passages, and may well derive from a common source (see above, 3 n.). Since Suetonius' anecdote concerning Nero and the Furies purports to be a quotation of an admission by Nero himself, it is probable that it comes from the source rather than from Suetonius' imagination. If so, Tacitus has rationalised what he found in his authority.

2. Both are used of the slaves of individuals, of large bodies of slaves, and of slaves as a class.

3. On -que as the stock connective in the official language, see, e.g., Küt. - St. II, 10f.
In depicting the crowd scene Tacitus makes use of one of the longest successions of historic infinitives in the historical works. There are longer only at III.73.1 (on the panic of the Flavian forces besieged on the Capitol) and 4.51.1 (in the highly elaborate account of Poppaeus Sabinus’ Thracian campaign: see below).

Note too, in the sentence describing the clamour of the crowd (questibus ... compleri), the asyndetic tricolon (questibus votis clamores), the alliteration of the littera canina, \( r \) (rogitantium ... respondentium)\(^2\) and the homoeoptoton with accompanying isocolon (diverna rogitantium aut incerta respondentium). For a similar passage containing a combination of asyndeton and homoeoptoton, see 1.64.1 lacessunt circumgradiuntur occurrent: miscetur operantium bellantiumque clamor.\(^3\)

\( \text{questibus votis clamores: the conjunction of questus and vota in asyndeton may have been quasi-formulaic: cf. 1.11.5 questus} \) lacrimas vota.\(^4\)

Tacitus frequently uses asyndeton of the type comprising juxtaposed unqualified words\(^4\) in passages of rapid description or of some emotional content.\(^5\) In the later books of the \textit{Annales} most instances of the device, like that here, stand alone. But in the early books there is often a succession of examples in the same passage. Note, e.g.,
in the 6 chapters in book 4 devoted to the Thracian campaign of
Poppaeus Sabinus: 46.3 impeditum ardum cruentum; 48.1 vates
urere, trahe praedes; 48.2 clamore telis; 49.2 saxa hastae imere;
49.3 ballatorum imbellium; ib. equi armamenta; ib. sani ore
contactu; 50.4 cirium ire hortari; 51.1 presmare detrhere (cf., e.g.,
1.21.2, 1.35.1, 1.70.2-3, 2.19.1, 6.19.2-3, 6.35.1-2, 12.34).

Sallust too often has asyndeton in vivid descriptive passages
(see Wölfelin, All. 11 (1898), 34). Moreover he was probably Tacitus'
model for accumulations of the above kind (cf., e.g. Jug. 51.1, 99.3,
101.11 et saep.).

8.1 adfluere ingens multitudo: stock historiographical phraseology.
Down to the early second century A.D. ingens is used in prose as an
epithet of multitudo only by Sallust (Jug. 107.4), Livy (2.39.9,
4.33.2), Valerius Maximus (3.2.23), Curtius (3.8.16, 3.11.17, 4.7.2,
4.16.16), Frontinus (strat. 1.8.11), Pliny the Elder (nat. 9.33), and
Tacitus (5 times). The adjectives preferred in ordinary prose are
numa (20 times Caesarian corpus; Vitr. 10.4.1, 10.13.6), maxima
(Cicero, pa. Quint. decl. min. 295.29), infinita (Cicero, Caesar,
Varro ling. 9.85), and innumerabilis (Cicero, B. Alex. 2.1, Her. 3.33).
Tacitus has maxima multitudo only once (13.14.1) and infinita multitudo
once in a statement in the first person (see 1.2 n.): 3.25.2 ea res
admonet, ut de principinis iuris et quibus modis ad hanc multitudinem infinitam ac varietatem legam pervenat sit, altius dixissem. 7

For multitudo innumerabilis he uses m. innumera at 12.56.3 (cf. Flin. nat. 6.59). 8

Adfluo (of crowds) occurs first in Virgil and is then used mainly by historians and archaizers (TII 1.1242. 51 ff.). Cf. Liv. 35.3.1 adfluentem ... multitudo; Val. Max. 3.2.23 insenti multitudo ...
adfluentem. The Ciceronian and Caesarian expression most nearly equivalent to multitudo adfluit is m. concurrere: e.g. concurrere ad me maxima multitudo (Cic. Verri. 4.146; cf. Caes. Gall. 7.24.5). Caesar also has m. advolat once (Gall. 7.72.2).

8.2 terrore ... exterritis: figura etymologica is more common in Tacitus than has usually been supposed: 9 cf. 1.19.1 pervicacia victi; 15.4.2 annis ... ambit (cf. Virg. Aen. 6.550; Varro ling. 5.28 annia id flumen quod circuit aliquod. nam ab ambitu annis); 1.70.2 arisque annum (cf. Virg. Aen. 5.832f., 7.707, 804, 8.683, 11.433, 12.457; Isid. 9.3.84); ib. discerni ... incerta (perhaps accidental; see E.-H. s.v. 'cerno', 'certus'); III.25.1 auxilia auxuti (cf. 4.23.1, 6.34.1; Varro ling. 5.90 auxillum appellatum ab auxi); 3.72.4 divus adcor (see E.-H. s.v. 'decet'); 1.21.2 casu accidit; 1.13.6 casu ... prociderat; Agric. 3.2 casibus ... interciderunt;
Lucr. 56.3 currus ... incursabant; 2.9.1 flumen ... interflusbat (cf. III.5.2); 15.30.2 tantum itineris editurus (cf. 15.36.3); 15.61.3 itinere raditum; 12.16.2 moenibus ... muniment; 4.8.2 sede ... sedentis; 5.1.1 race ... pacta; 10 11.14.3 tres litteras adiicit, quae in usu imperitante eo, post obliteratae, adspiciuntur etiam nunc; III.38.1 concuere ... luminibus; I.16.4 dominorum domus; I.5.1 dari donativum; III.13.3 donum darentur (cf. 13.50.1); II.10.1 accusatorum causae (cf. 12.65.2; perhaps accidental: see E.-M., a.v. 'causa'); 2.63.1 canamina caneretur.

Figura etymologica is above all characteristic of high rhetorical prose. Compared with Cicero and Livy, Tacitus uses it only sparingly. He has avoided most of the common formalic instances (race pacta is an exception) (see Landgraf, o.c., pass.).

The prepositional prefix of exterritus has full local force here (= 'frighten away'). In extant pre-Tacitean literature exterreo is used in this way only by Virgil and Ovid (see TII V.2.2025.65ff.). But note Enn. ann. 36 exterrita somno; Cio. div. 2.129 exterriti somno (a reminiscence of Ennius?), where ex- has transferred force.

Exterreo is a favourite word of Virgil (21 times). The only other early imperial writers, of prose or poetry, who use it with any frequency are Livy (13 times), Silius Italicus (13 times) and, above
all, Tacitus (37 times). It must, at the time of Tacitus, have had an artificial flavour.

Throughout the Republic and early Empire the word is used in prose mainly in the passive, and particularly, as here, in the past participial form. The first prose author to admit the active was Livy (5 times). Thereafter active forms are found in Valerius Maximus (1), Seneca the Younger (4), Pliny the Younger (1), Suetonius (1) and, most frequently, Tacitus (12 times).

Tacitus uses *exterreo* only once in the minor works, in a Sallustian imitation: *Agric.* 36.3 *exterriti sine rectoribus equi*; cf. *Sall. hist.* frg. 1.139 *equi sine rectoribus exterriti*. In the *Histories* he has it 6 times (less often than *terreo* (16), with which it is usually roughly synonymous), but in the *Annales* 31 times (*terreo* 12).

8.5 *percussores*: a milder term than *sicarius*, according to Cicero: *S. Rosc.* 93 *erat tum multitudo sicariorum, id quod commemoravit* Bruciatus, *et homines impune occidebantur. quid? ea multitudo quae erat? ... sin eos (rutas) cuos qui leviora nomine appellant *percussores vocant, quaera ...* (see Landgraf ad loc.). It denotes a person who stabs or strikes someone with a weapon (= 'is qui percutit') without necessarily inflicting death. Note dom. 13:
qui sunt homines a Q. Metello, fratre tuo, consule in senatu palam nominati, a quibus ille se lapidibus adpetitum, etiam percussum esse dicit? L. Serrium et M. Lollium nominavit ... quis est Serrius? armiger Catilinae, stipator tui corporis, signifer seditionis, concitator tabernariorum, damnatus iniuriarum, percussor, lapidator, fori depopulator, obsessor curiae. Percussor looks back to percussum, as lapidator to lapidibus adpetitum. Metellus was not killed, but merely attacked.

Sicarius, which had been common in Ciceronian prose, is restricted almost without exception to the legal language under the early Empire. From the beginning of the first century A.D. down to the time of Hadrian it occurs, in all, once in Seneca (apoc. 14.1), once in Asconius (in tog. cand., p.99), once in Tacitus (13.44.5) (in all three in legal formulas), 3 times in Quintilian (at 7.1.9 in a legal formula, at 8.4.2 in a quotation of Cicero, and at 10.1.12 in a semantic discussion), and twice in Suetonius (at Jul. 72 in a quotation of Caesar, and at Jul. 11 in a legal expression). It may have fallen out of use because of its close association with the law courts.15

Its function is taken over in both ordinary and archaising prose by percussor and interfector.16

The connection of the former with percutio continues to be felt, as can be seen from Sen. contr. 7.5.4 percussor latebat post adulteram
... aspice corpus matris: quam gravis plagae, quam alta adactus est gading! sic ego novercor percussisset; cf. pa. Qunih. decl. maior. 1.4. However it is usually (as here) employed of those who inflict wounds for the purpose of causing death (cf., e.g., Sen. contr. 10.1.4, cen. dial. 1.2.7, 5.20.5, Quin. 6.2.31, pa. quint. decl. min. 66.4), and hence in practice is indistinguishable from cicatriz.

In Republican prose interfector is a neutral term which implies no disapproval on the part of the user. Cicero usually applied it to tyrannicides and to those who have committed justifiable homicide: e.g. Brut. 126 non invidiosa lege C. Cafum samuextrota et quatuor consularis L. Estianis, C. Catonis, Sp. Albanum cevente praestantissima L. Opimian, Gracchi interfectorum, a populo absolutum, cum is contra populi studium stetisset, Graccheni indices sustulissent; Mil. 72 quorum interfectorum implerunt orbem terrarum nomen sae- gloria; ib. 75 haec erro interfector si est, in confiteedo ab sinea noman timaret exsa liberaviisset?; Phil. 1.35 destra est neco qui in lege vivit ut non modo iurem, ed etiam cum summa interfectoris gloria interfici possit; exist. ed Brut. 1.16.3 Cassarum interfectorum. 17 Under the Empire it can still be used neutrally (e.g. Liv. 24.22.16, 31.23.2, 25.25.3, Val. Max. 3.1.11, Sen. benef. 5.16.6, exist. 7.4), but it also commonly refers to murderers and assassins (e.g. at Val. Max. 3.2 ext.9, 4.4.15, and usually in Tacitus).
Notes


2. Admitted only sparingly by Tacitus: see above on lilio infestam ferre (1.2); cf. W. Bens, Alliterationen bei Tacitus (Aschaffenbourg, 1905), 22.

3. Occasionally elsewhere Tacitus has striking examples of homoeoepoton in significant contexts: e.g. 1.70.3 sternuntur fluctibus, hauriuntur surstitibus (storn description).

4. In the present note only asymetron of this kind will be dealt with.

5. Cf., e.g. 1.23.2, 1.35.1, 1.41.3, 1.49.1, 1.70.2-3, 2.17.4, 2.18.1, 2.23.4, 3.1.4, 4.25.2, 4.46 ff. (see below), 4.63.1, 4.59.3, 4.70.2, 6.19.2-3, 6.35.1-2, 12.34, 12.51.3, 13.44.3, 16.13.1.

6. The influence of Servius has been found on 4.46-51: see Hornes, Att 14 (1906), 273f.; Syrbe, 729.

7. Elsewhere Tacitus has infinitus 4 times in the minor works and in a direct speech at 3.53.4. The table at TLL VII 1.450 indicates a definite stylistic distinction between infinitus (a word at home in ordinary prose) and ingens and immensus (both somewhat artificial).

8. Immensus is found mainly in poetry and archaising prose (see TLL, s.v.); Tacitus uses it only in the second half of the Annals. He never has immensusbilla.
9. See Landgraf, 'De figuris etymologiciis linguae latinae', Act. Soc. Phil. Erlang. 2 (1881), 4, where it is maintained that Tacitus very rarely uses the device. Similarly Seder (on *Testo tezi*, Ital. 22.4) found only 2 instances in the minor and historical works together (cf. *Tacitana Sacra*, 14.1.4), and Sorbon (65 n.1) could add only the present example.

10. Common elsewhere: see Landgraf, o.c., 16; G.F.W. Müller,

11. 10 times in the first decade (1.56.5, 2.50.7, 3.5.14, 4.23.4, 4.33.2, 5.28.13, 5.35.4, 5.37.5, 7.39.15, 8.41.14), and 3 times in the fourth (37.24.3, 39.13.8, 40.12.5). For other archaic or poetic words and usages found at the beginning of the work, then dropped until the later books, see Trinkle, _Wien. Stud. 81_ (1968), 116ff.

12. There are also 9 instances in Seneca the Younger, 4 in Valerius Flaccus, and 5 in Statius. Iacub, who shuns numerous traditional epic terms (see J. Obermeier, _Der Sprachgebrauch des N. Annaeus\nLucanus_ (Munich, 1886), 79), does not use it.

13. Cicero (3 times), Caesar (5 times), Seneca the Elder (once), Curtius (once), Columella (once), and Asconius (once) have only passive forms. Of the poets, Lucretius and Virgil allow only the passive, but Horace (once), Ovid (5), Val. Flacc. (2), Silius (7), and Statius (once) use the active as well.
Sicarius, however, means 'murderer'. Quint. 10.1.12 non per abusorem sicarius otiam omen vocamus, qui caelestia tale monstrum commiserunt.

Words which have a particularly strong connection with a technical (e.g. legal, medical, religious) vocabulary may become too stylized for ordinary use: cf. 'sin' in mod. Eng. Among legalisms avoided by both archaising and everyday prose may be numbered condemn (see 41 n.) and caedo (43.4 n.). The former is common enough in Ciceroan prose but is dropped from use in the first century A.D.

Percussor: Livy 2, Seneca the Elder 11, Seneca the Younger 6, Curtius 2, Pliny the Elder 2, Quintilian 1, ps. Quintilian 5, Petronius 2; Intersecto: Livy 10, Seneca the Elder 6, Valerius 3, Valerius Maximus 6, Seneca the Younger 3, Curtius 7, Pliny the Elder 5, Quintilian 3, ps. Quintilian 1. Tacitus has percussor 17 times, intersecto 15.

There remain jud. san. 4, fam. 12.23.2.
9.3 **hunc sui finem multos ante annos crediderat Aquinna:** the use of _finis_ for _mora_ is mainly poetic (see VIII VI.1.792. lff.). The fuller expression _finis vitae_ is classical, if rare (VIII VI.1.791 6ff.). Tacitus uses both, the former more often proportionately in the _Annals_, and particularly in the later books:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>minor works</th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann.1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>finis vitae</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>finis</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Sometimes he uses _finis_ of deaths presented as the end not only of someone's _life_, but of a _reign_ as well: 1.16.2 _fine Augusti et initia Flabii audion_; 1.11.4 _litter multitudo fine Augusti vanusque multitude ..._ _imperare_ _extorquere_ _rudes_ _animal_; 2.9.1 _Fontuni Aquinna servis ... communis line Augusti servare in insula Ilissinia_. But usually the word is interchangeable with _mora_.

9.3 **consulti super hierone:** in prose from the _Augustan_ age down to at least the late second century _A.D_. _super_ abl. (= dē) occurs only in archaising writers, and then predominantly in a _formalistic_ usage (governing _res_, whether singular or plural). Moreover often the contexts in which it appears have an _official_ or _formal_ tone.
In the first century of the period it is found only in Livy (13 times), always with res as object and usually in official contexts. Later Tacitus uses it 23 times (only in the historical works), more than any earlier writer. He often has it with res, but shows an increasing tendency to admit it with other objects as he advances in the annals (see Introduction, p. 42). His contemporary the Younger Pliny uses it twice (epist. 2.11.11, 2.16.4), both times in the expression super tanta res (note the context at epist. 2.11.11: super tanta res in illo costa praemanente Caesar dicendum est). After Tacitus, there are 3 instances in Suetonius, of which 2 have res as object (Jul. 5. 28. 13. 2) and the other is in an official context: Jul. 20. 1 in cunctum reporte, sed super et licentiam referre aut censere diuini ordonat (the reference is to a proposal in the senate); and no less than 107 (twice as many - 28 - in the first 2 books as in any other 2 books) in the archaiser Gallius, 52 of which govern res. It is probably an indication of the formality of the word that Gallius uses it 42 times in chapter headings.

For much of the Republic also super was obsolete. In prose of the last century B.C. it is found only 3 times in Cicero's letters twice - Att. 10.8.10, ib. 16.6.1 - in the phrase hoc super res, and once - ib. 14.22.2 - in official phraseology), twice in Sallust (Jul. 71.5, hist. frg. 3.86), and once in Nepos (at Faur. 4. 1, in a quasi-official passage).
Earlier it is used 11 times by Plautus, almost always in apparently set phrases: twice governing res (Amph. 58, Most. 727), and 8 times with words denoting women (summa: Bacch. 177, 367, 562, 607; cur au. 683, Cist. 680; succilla: Cas. 234; victrix: Nath. 1212). Even if had some currency at the time, it does not seem to have been in unrestricted use.

Elsewhere in early Latin there are examples in the Twelve Tables (5.3 uti legesitat super pecunia cives, sua rei, ut in ius iato; see Cir. inv. 2.143, Her. 1.23), Cato (at orat. frag. 109, in the phrase super talis res; the passage apparently refers to the censor's custom of consulting a consulium: see Balcovali ad loc.), Pacuvius (237 sua super rei), and Afranius (343).

The word probably fell out of use soon after Plautus and survived only in official use.

Like numerous other archaisms (see Axelson, Unpost. Wort., 25 ff.), particularly those associated with the legal and official languages, it is found only sporadically in the poets. Note that all 3 instances in Horace (carm. 3.8.17, 4.2.4.2, carm. m. nec. 18) are in official passages.

9.3 respondereunt Chaldeci voces ut imperaret maternus occidentae:

atque illa 'occidet' inquit, 'dum imperet': when intransitive, impero
is usually, as here, found in speeches in the Annals (7, times in 6 examples). The rare frequentative imperito (see von Knaak, Hor. 1, n. 5) is the preferred word in narrative. But as a transitive verb impero is common in narrative, for the transitive use of imperito is almost completely avoided (used only at 12.5%, 1, governing ends).

Note also the use of the commonplace occido here for intercicio in a speech (see Lefèvre, Persaminio, 256f.).
Notes

1. F.C. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge, 1961), 263, error in regarding the word as colloquial.

2. Unlike Livy, Tacitus does not restrict the word to official passages.

3. For a full collection of examples, see C. Goetze, *De corniculum
sermonum Galliati proprietatis observationes* (Halis, 1603) 32f.

4. In both places Cicero is referring to matters about which he is writing or is going to write to Atticus. He may have fallen into the stock phrase-type used in official correspondence between the senate and its representatives (cf. Liv. 26.35.3).

5. Twice in a speech at 1.6.3; in narrative at 1.7.1, 11.22.4.

6. The predominance of intransitive *imperat* begins in the second half of the *Historiae*. In books I – II *imperat* is found 7 times, *imperat* never; but in III – V *imperat* is used 6 times, *imperat* twice in speeches (III.38.4, IV.66.2).
10.1 per silentium defini: cf. Liv. 8.7.21 silentia defini. 1

See above, 2.1 n. on Tacitus' use of per for the modal and instrumental ablative.

In this sense defines occurs mainly in poetry and artificial prose (Tull. V. 3.1.62ff.).

10.1 mentis inoma: a poeticism (Ovid. Ars 1.465, 3.664, Sen. Ann. 721, 331.5.651, Stat. Theb. 10.876; cf. inoma animi: Virg. Aen. 4.300, 8.11.12.66, Stat. Theb. 11.152) employed only here by Tacitus. The words which he uses most frequently in the historical works to express madness or temporary senselessness (inspired by fear, guilt, etc.) are the rare and perhaps archaic vacca and vacovin (on which, see Deger, 17). He also has rabies (6 times), 2 alienatic mentis, sima (6 times), 3 purpura nigra and turrites niger, 4 among, seneca, deseae, insanus and insania are all avoided, and devastatio occurs only once (6.25.2). The only commonplace term used freely is seuor (11 times).

10.1 lucea opericbatur: opericium was archaic by the late Republic.

It is found frequently in Plautus (32 times) and Terence (14 times), but is avoided by Caesar, the ps. Caesarian corpus, the Rhet. Hor.,
Cicero in his speeches, philosophia, and rhetorica and, later, by Seneca the Elder, Petronius, Quintilian, and ps. Quintilian. The examples in Cicero's letters (Att. 3.10.1, 10.3, Fam. 6.20.1), all of which resemble closely the majority of those in Plautus and Terence (see below), suggest that the word survived longer in the colloquial language than in more formal prose.

In contrast to less artificial writers, Livy (37 times), and Tacitus (49 times) both use omeoror freely. There are also sporadic instances in Valerius Maximus (1), Seneca the Younger (9), Curtius (8), Columella (4), Pliny the Elder (4), and Pliny the Younger (2).

The word is rarely used as it is here (with impersonal object) by Republican writers. It is usually local in emphasis (always in Cicero and Terence, and at least 20 times in Plautus) and is almost invariably employed either absolutely or with a personal object: Plautus, Terence and Cicero together provide only 2 examples with an accus. rei (Plaut. Most. 730, Trin. 744). But in Tacitus (25 times), and also in Seneca (ben. 2.25.3, 7.14.4, sod. 6.6.3, ent. 10.12, 50.32, 54.42), Curtius (3.12.9, 6.2.32, 8.12.5), and Columella (2.4.8, 2.20.5, 3.20.3) the accus. rei construction is considerably more frequent proportionately. Numerous verbs show a similar widening of function in the artificial prose of the Empire (see on audire, 25.1 n., and ore, 33.1 n.).

The classical/non-artificial word which corresponds to omeoror...
is expecto. Tacitus and Livy often have *opponeri* in expressions in which Caesar, Cicero and others use *exspecto* in the same sense: e.g. *adventum opponerit* (Liv. 30.10.8, Curt. 8.12.5) / *n. expecto* (Cic. Qunt. 27, Cass. Gall. 1.27.2 and often: see Henguet 46k); *classis opponerit* (Liv. 31.26.3) / *n. expecto* (Cass. Gall. 3.11.1); *naves opponerit* (Liv. 36.44.2) / *n. expecto* (Cass. civ. 1.29.2); *templa opponit* (Liv. 1.56.8) / *n. expecto* (Cic. Ver. 1.61, inv. 2.174, Cass. civ. 1.32.2); *diem opponit* (IV.81.1) / *n. expecto* (Cic. Phil. 3.2); *eventum opponerit* (Liv. 35.49.10) / *n. expecto* (Cass. civ. 1.53.2, 1.94.6); *noctem opponerit* (4.50.4) / *n. expecto* (Cic. Mil. 52, hor. 4.43); *codias opponerit* (3.36.2) / *n. expecto* (Cass. civ. 1.16.4, 2.37.6); *exstilatuas opponerit* (1.30.4) / *litterns expecto* (Cic. Fam. 14.4.5); *mortem opponerit* (14.59.1) / *n. expecto* (Cic. Mil. 16).

Tacitus rarely uses *exspecto* with the same sense as *opponerit* (see Lex. Tac. 1.31b R for *exspecto* in the subjective sense), except when a passive or a tense of the perfect stem is required. In the active and in the present tenses he has it as an apparent synonym of *opponerit* 3 times in the minor works (Dial. 19.5, 26.6, Germ. 14.3; *opponerit* is found only at Agric. 16.2), twice in the first 2 books of the *Histories* (1.55.1, II.30.1), and once early in the first book of the *Annals* (1.7.6)."
10.2 centurionum tribunorumque: -que (the standard connective in the official language: see on senator et patronum, 7.2 n.) seems to have been the most usual particle linking centuriones and tribuni. Caesar has tribuni centurionesque 14 times, but tribuni et centuriones only 3 times.

In the Historiae Tacitus joins the two words only by -que (17 times) when they are both unqualified and in the plural.10 In the Annals, however, he uses the other copulative particles 8 times, but -que only 4 times.11 There appears to be no particular principle behind his choice between -que and the variants.

The natural order, with the higher rank expressed first, is rather tribuni centurionesque (Caesar has tribuni centurionesque 15 times, but centuriones tribuniques only 3 times). Tacitus, who often reverses the order of such expressions, places centuriones first 15 times in the historical works.12

10.2 morti parentis inascribimus: when employed in the singular for either patre or mater, parens is often enotive, denoting a father or mother not merely in the physical sense, but as the object of the care and pietas (genuine, or, as here, affected) of his or her children, or as the source of their protection and instruction.13

Note the following Tacitean examples: 16.30.3 acciderat sane
Pietate Serviliani... cumus caritate erga parentem, simul imprudentia actatis, non tamen simul consultavorat quam de insoluitate domus; 1.9.3 pietate erga parentem; 1.10.1 pietatem erga parentem;
1.7.4 de honoriam parentis consulturae; III.25.3 simul attolleret corpus, aequire humum, suaesse erga parentem officio fuge; 15
4.8.4 fratris consociati, hosti incitatum parente tradidi, unius
imorum necatusque sum, quoniam eas aut illi propria subhos, ne ascus
cum sum sensuitnum faveret attolleret; III.57.1 obhabeatur animae
miseratione caraque, ne pertinacibus amnis minus placabilis victores
relinqueret coniuri se liberis. crat illi et fecerat parentem;
Agio. 45.4 sed mihi filiisaeus eius auctor caritatis: parentis
adapto sum miserationem, quod assidere valudini, faverre
deficientem, assidui valde complexaque non contingat.

Parallelae eae canem multiplicatae eae praedilectis scriberae: cf.,
e.g. Cio. Case. 4 num quod de pietate dixisti, est ista quidem moenia
exigitum speciis inducius certa reantis: Uman. 29 non vivi cum saeis,
oximum cum parente nun nec inducius pietas. Fundamentum est animo
virtutum quem veretur ut dem-inque eae multum sequ et pars
liberis. Phil. 13.47 Caesar; adulescens sumus pietate et memoria
parentis sui; Liv. 7.5.1-2 quin contra se quaeque parenti causae
invidiae atque crimen esse aere passus, ut omnes di hominesque
secent se parenti aequa lactum quem iniurias eae salis, capit
consilium... pietate laudabile: 8.22.3 per speciem hominumae
parentis: 26.49.13 sum pro parente colebant; 44.1.10 orsua a
narricidio Persaei perpetrato in fratres, cognato in parentem
(violation of pietas); Vall. 2.100.3 filia eius Julia, nec consi-
tenti parentis ac viri immoer (neglect of the duties of pietas);
Val. lax. 5.4.1 inimicus parentis expoliatus, atque amicus
pace mutavit (in the section de pietate cum parentem et frater et
patrion; cf. 5.4. ext.6); Sen. benef. 4.19.3 luce via vocati color
non sitter manus parentem crato, ut acinar, acino; dial. 6.1.2 mortem
A. Cremoni Cordi, parentia tui (in a passage on the pietas of Marcin);
Quint. 11.1.63 facere taceo no men parentis non filio invicissimus, sed
insi, in cun dicabitur (in a discussion of the difficulties faced
by an orator when he must speak against the mother of his client;
the reference is to Cicero's conduct of the case for Quintius). 15

10.3 narravisse: the syncopated forms of the perfect infinitive
active and the pluperfect subjunctive active of first and fourth
conjugation verbs, and of certain analogues second and third
conjugation verbs (e.g. comiter, cujus, coramisse, reti, quero)
were in regular imperial use, while the full forms, such as that
here, were archaic. See Quint. 1.6.20 ff. sed abolita atque
abrogata retineres inscientias cuirum est et frivolis in parvis
inexactiae, multum enim litteratum, qui sine aspirations et
producta secunda syllaba salutarit ('avère' est enim), et
'calefacere' dixerit potius quam quad dicimus et 'conservaviisse',
his adiciat 'lace' et 'dice' et similis, recte est haec via; 
qui negat? sed adiciat et sullor et magis trinx; cf. ib. 17
inherent tamen et quidem soliciissima diligenter perseveritate,
ut 'audaciter' potius dixisset quam 'audacter', dixit quin
oratores alios sequantur, et 'mitavit', non 'mituit', et 'conivis',
non 'coire', his permittamus et 'audivisse' et 'soviisse' et
'tribunale' et 'faciliter' dicere.

The full forms are avoided completely by Tacitus in the minor
works and are rarely used in the *Histories*; in the *Annales*, however,
they predominate (see Introduction, p. 50). Sallust also prefers
the contracted forms (particularly in the *Jugurthia*), but Livy seems
to have syncopation throughout.

May was especially more frequently in the latter books (especially
the *Annales* and *Ab Urbe Condita*) than earlier.

3. May, however, and it made & canz: 1.33.2, 5.3.2, 7.3.4, 30.2.40.
7.5.8, 7.6.7.

6. Sallust, however, sometimes a collective (of 'conseque') as well as
a subjunctive sense: 
31, 7.2.1895, 8.7.

8. Opposite to hardly ever noted in leisure or the perfect step (never
by Tacitus): see *Ancient History*, 1.1, 38, 57.
Notes

1. Cf. 1.56.2 ob suo adeo. Tacitus seems to have been the only author to have varied the standard construction (abl. of cause or manner) found with definitum in this sense: see VII v. 341. 2 ff.

2. Habia is used only twice by Cicero, both times in the philosophical (Tusc. 3.63, 4.53). In the former passage it is applied to the madness of a dog.

3. On furans, see VII vi.1.1626.7 ff. Cicero prefers furiose in his speeches (25:14) and letters (6:1), but furana in the philosophical works (13:7). Tacitus avoids furiosa. All 3 examples of furans in the Annals (1.35.5, 1.40.2, 1.42.1) are used in reference to mutinous legions.

4. For the use of turbare and its derivatives to express mental disturbance, see VII VIII. 718. 7 ff.

5. Livy uses氮or more frequently in the later books (especially the fourth and fifth decades) than earlier.

6. Livy, however, has it only 6 times: 1.56.6, 5.6.2, 7.36.6, 30.10.8, 35.48.10, 44.26.7.

7. Expecto, however, possesses a subjective (= 'expect') as well as an objective sense: VII v. 2.1895. 2 ff.

8. Opporior is hardly ever used in tenses of the perfect stem (never by Tacitus): see Neum-Köglhner, III, 53, 579.
9. There is an accumulation of uncharacteristic words in the early chapters of *Annales* I: see on *impero*, 9.3 n. and on *hercule*, in the note on *saltem*, 1.2.

10. But *as* is used at I.33.1, where both are singular.

11. *-que*: 3.2.2, 12.41.2, 14.15.4; *et*: 1.66.2, 2.12.3, 13.18.2, 14.27.3, 15.53.2; *et*: 4.2.2. *-que* is also replaced at 1.61.3 (centuriones is qualified), 2.67.1 (after *-num*), and 11.37.2 (tribuno, sing.).


13. Not all instances of *pares* (sing.) fall into these categories. Sometimes it is general, expressing a parent of either sex (e.g. 4.31.2, 6.1.2, 13.26.3); or it may be used for variation in the vicinity of *pater, mater, paternus, or maternus* (see below, n.14).

14. Landgraf, *R. Rom.*, 1187 suggests that Tacitus used *pares* here in order to distinguish Julius Caesar, the adoptive father of Augustus (*pares*) from Octavius, his real father (*pater*, 18.1). It is undoubtedly true that Tacitus has deliberately varied his terminology, but it is incorrect to suppose that *pares* is more appropriately used of an adoptive father than is *pater*. In Tacitus at least *pater* is more frequent than *pares* in this sense (Lex. Tac. 105a B, 1056a B). Octavius is designated *pater* and Caesar *pares* because the reference
to Octavius is purely factual, while that to Caesar emphasizes the
notion of pietas. Similarly (against Landgraf, ib.) parentia loco
is the standard expression rather than materiis loco, because it
refers to the father in his role as protector, etc.

15. From the story of the son who unwittingly kills his father in battle;
for the use of parentes in passages dealing with the death or burial
of a parent, cf. the example in the present passage; Liv. 2.7.4;
and some of the following instances from Tacitus.

Verr. 1.66, 1.76, 3.63, 4.41, Liv. 12, 59, 69, Sull. 89, Glicent. 200,
Caes. 5, 25, 39, red. Sen. 37, Liv. 30, Phil. 13.25, Liv. 7.5.7,
8.35.6, 29.23.10, Vell. 2.126.1, Sen. epist. 90.38, Curt. 4.7.27,
4.10.20, 4.11.3, 8.3.14, 8.7.2.
cuncta eius dominationis floricus: on the comparative frequency
of the adjectival and substantival uses of cunctus in the prose of the
Empire, see 1.5 n.

Of the 32 adjectival examples of the word in Tacitus, 31 are
plural (the exception is at 1.31.1); of these, 21 are, like that
here, neuter. The neuter plural use is also disproportionately
frequent in Sallust, Valerius Maximus, and the Elder Pliny; clearly
it was a stock mannerism of artificial prose.

In the Annals there is a sharp distinction in usage between
adjectival cuncta and omnia. Of the 10 examples of the latter, all
but 2 are in speeches or equivalent contexts. Conversely, of the
21 examples of cuncta, all but 2 (11.24.6; 15.14.3) are in
narrative. Sallust observes a similar distinction: 7 of 9
instances of cuncta are in narrative (exceptions at 61.19; 61.20;
omn. l.26), but a majority of examples of omnia are in speeches.

In the Historiae cuncta is used only in narrative, but omnia is
not restricted to speeches (13 of 16 examples are in narrative). The
distribution of the pair in narrative throughout the historical
works is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>omnia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuncta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an obvious change of practice after the Historiae.
nannus at naufragium narrat: nannus is usually found before vowels in the few places where it is admitted in this section of the Annales. It occurs before consonants 10 times in the Historiae, but only 3 times in Annales 1-6 and once in 11-16. The pre-vocalic use also declines after the Historiae, though it remains constant in the two halves of the Annales (17:6:6).

Nannus belongs to elevated style, especially when used before consonants (cf. above). In ordinary prose of both the late Republic and early Empire it is found only rarely, and then usually before vowels. However, the poets (particularly Virgil) and certain archaisers use it freely, before consonants as well as vowels.

Cicero and Caesar use the word only sporadically, Caesar exclusively and Cicero predominantly before vowels. Seneca the Elder avoids it completely (although it is found at s. 6, 24 in a quotation or Aemilius Pollio), Seneca the Younger has it only twice in his philosophical works (7 times in the tragedies). Asconius and Celsus avoid it (both have nann frequently), Petronius uses it only in verse, and p. Quintilian (decl. min.) has it only 4 times (5 times before vowels).

In Sallust, however, it is found 22 times, in Livy 56, in Valerius Maximus 64, in Curtius 42, and in Fliny the Elder 182. Livy has the pre-consonantal use 39 times, Valerius Maximus 48, Curtius 20, and Fliny the Elder 73.
It is of particular note that Vitruvius is the only prose writer down to at least the end of the first century A.D. who uses namque significantly more often than nam (73:20). There can be no better evidence of his stylistic affection.

A reason for the unexpected diminution of namque after the Historiae may tentatively be suggested. It is of note that, like Tacitus, almost all of the archimicts listed above employ the word (or its pre-consonantal use) markedly more often in some parts of their work than others. Sallust has it frequently in his first monograph, the Catiline, and also in his final work, the Historiae, but rarely admits it in the Jugurthina. Livy uses it predominantly in the first decade:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 53 examples in the first decade of Pliny the Elder's Natural History and 71 in the second, but only 18 in the third. Finally, in Curtius there are only 3 instances of the pre-consonantal use in books 3-5, but 26 in 6-10.

Perhaps the word was so mannered that most authors felt self-conscious in using it. If so, they might be prone to change
their views about its propriety. With the exception of Curtius, all the above (and also Tacitus) use the word with greater freedom at the outset of their work than later (although Sallust takes it up again in the Histories). Tacitus may well have come to regard it as excessively affected, particularly when used before consonants.

narrabat: this word is seldom adequately translated by 'narrate', 'relate', 'describe' (et sim.). In structure it is either a denominative of narrare, with expressive doubling of the n (cf. narram, varro), or a syncopated form of an old verb *narrare.* Its original force 'make known', 'acquaint (someone) with something hitherto unknown (to him)' (with an emphatic notion of revelation), is probably most clearly seen in Plautus, but is still strong by the time of Tacitus.

The sense 'relate', 'narrate' (referring to historical narrative), in which the idea of revelation is secondary. The manner of its emergence can be conjectured. At an early date narrare entered the technical vocabulary of rhetoric, as the term designating the exposition of the facts of a case (the statement of the facts in a legal case inevitably involves a measure of revelation). Since the terminology of rhetoric was habitually used to describe features of other literary genres, it was natural that
the word expressing oratorical exposition should be applied to
historical narrative as well (the purpose of which, however, was
less to reveal than to describe). Nevertheless, narre is not coined
in this sense (cf. memoria; see 14.1 n.). In cases where it appears
to mean 'relate', the sense 'reveal', 'divulge' is often present in
varying degrees. 15

In Plautus the word is usually in effect the factitive of accipere.
It is used, for instance, of those who tell secrets (e.g. *Pers. 495,
Line 947), bring news (e.g. *Amph. 744, *Stich. 300), inform on others
(e.g. *Hec. 630, 735, *Truc. 313), impart confidences (e.g. *Pers. 1339);
explain the true facts of a situation (e.g. *Mol. 1404), etc. Note
the following passages in which its proximity to accipere well illustrates
its sense: *Amph. 744, quid est hinc nisi, Nars, nisi ille ut quid
accipere? / *Mol. quod id tu accipis? / *Hec. 630 quidnam hic nars
hibi? / quid id est? quid facis? quid id accipere? / quod accipe tu
nuncias. / ... *Mol. ut hanc non repere se accipere. 16. e homines salute!
ut discebas! non notas calceas: nunc novit orce: *Mol. 369 quid esse
dictum dicere: nunc, nunc. / *Pers. accipit unum cum accipit hoc
acceperam nonum / ut nunc ut narrabo tua libelium nunc facias. / ... iun
acceperam intasse tum libelium.
Cicero uses *narrum* 15 times in the speeches, 30 times in the philosophical works, and 56 times in the letters. Its disproportionate frequency in the letters, where it is constantly applied to news sent and received by Cicero, is a testimony to the survival, and predominance, of the original meaning. See, e.g. *Att. 5.5.1*

*Ludon nihil est quod sorbere: nunc nec quod sannum habeo (nihil enim
amateramus est) nec quod narras (nec enim nihil est): fam. 7.2.2*

*quid tibi caro alia narraret? nesci enim reliquam ludon; 9.6.6 arc tibi
en narror, quae tu minas aequam quam ipse, et narror.*

In the present passage the word approximates in sense to 'reveal'. Some other examples in Tacitus which clearly contain a notion of revealing or divulging, are: *III.56.1 prohibiti per civitatem
sermones, sermone, in lucem, ina narratum, cernetum, inaudiam velaverant; 2.24.4 ut quin ex longam reversione,
miracula narrabant; 4.69.2 interea Latiares reportum in publico
Sabiniu, velas neque cognitas narraturum, domum et in cubiculum
trahit.*
Notes

1. All but 1 (3.76) of the remaining 10 examples qualify things rather than persons.

2. In Gall. 9 out of 20 adjectival examples are neuter plural. In Val. 5 out of 11, and in Prin. the Elder about 37 out of 58.

3. In the rest of this note only neuter plural adjectival instances of the two words are discussed. For convenience I refer throughout simply to cura and cura.

4. Speeches: 1.42.4, 4.87.3, 5.82.1, 11.16.3, 14.12.1, 14.43.1, 15.54.1, 16.4.1; narrative: 4.11.2, 15.51.3.

5. Note that the exception of 11.24.6 is in the speech of the emperor Claudius.


7. The only instance of the word before a consonant in 11.16 is at 15.43.3, in the preface to the account of the Pisonian conspiracy. In the same chapter there is an example of the correlative cum... tam, an expression found elsewhere only in the Dialogus, and also of deinde before a consonant, a usage characteristic of the style of the Historiae rather than of the Annals (see Wolf, "Philol. 25 (1867),..."
105f.). Such an accumulation of early usages in a short space prompts speculation on the composition of the chapter. Since it begins a new section dealing with a subject which Tacitus obviously took trouble to investigate (note the unusual frequency with which he refers to sources in the subsequent chapters: 53.3, 54.5, 74.5; (see Syme, 300f.)), it may have been written after a time lapse. In making a fresh start Tacitus perhaps inadvertently reverted to some earlier mannerisms.

8. The diminution of the word in the Annals was noted by Wolfflin, Philol. 25 (1867), 111.


10. Quintilian uses nānq̣e considerably more often (52 times, 50 times before vowels) than the other non-archaising writers listed here. However, it must be noted that he has nānq̣e over 1,000 times. Proportionately, therefore, the frequency of nānq̣e is insignificant. In contrast the archaisers Valerius Maximus, Curtius, and Pliny the Elder use nānq̣e almost as often as nām. In most cases Quintilian was probably moved to adopt nānq̣e by phonetic considerations. Cf. the frequency with which he uses nām before consonants, on rhythmical grounds (see 38.2 n.).

11. Valerius Maximus uses nām 155 times, Curtius 55, and Pliny the Elder 257.


14. See the fragment of the orator C. Titus (a contemporary of Lucilius) ap. Isaeor. 3.16.16.

15. As, for instance, when it is used to introduce anecdotes.
et alia in concubiti mariti Albine examinita: in accounts of
portents examinative is the standard word describing death caused by
lightning: e.g. Liv. 22.36.3, 33.36.7, 42.30.3, Suet. Aug. 25.3.

12.3 et ... suadet testatorem summa testificiaturus: testificitor is a
synonym of testator (scarcely = 'protest', as it is taken by Furneaux,
at 12.7.1; here it obviously means 'bear witness', 'show', with no
notion of protestation), used by Tacitus only in the later books of
the Annals (7 times). It makes its first appearance in Licinius
Crassus (ap. Cic. de mort. 2.22). is common in the Ciceronian period
(in Cicero it is usually technical (= 'testify') rather than general,
as here and elsewhere in Tacitus), but thereafter falls into disuse:
the only post-classical examples in prose before Tacitus are at
Liv. 33.12.12 and Col. 1.4.2. Clearly Tacitus adopted the word as
an archaism.

The verbal formation -ficere is not prolific until the Christian
era. It produces only 10 words in old Latin, 6 in the Ciceronian period,
and 7 in the period from the death of Augustus to the death of Trajan.
Moreover a number of these, like testificior, are short-lived (an
indication of the uneasiness which the Romans felt about compound
words): causificior (used by Plautus, then not again until Apuleius;
the usual substitute is causor): cerifico (only in the Elder Pliny);
fructifico (at Gulp. cdi. 4.91 and in Columella); laurifico (only at enni. ep. 934); Luciferio (only in Laborius); mitifico (first in Cicero, then occasionally in archaisers; the regular term is mitico); modifico (first in Cicero, then in the archaisers Gallius and Fronto); notifico (in Pomponius Secundus and occasionally elsewhere in poetry); orbifico (only in Accius); pacifico (in Plautus, and thereafter only in artificial genres); purifico (in Pliny the Elder and archaisers); purificatus (at Gic. off. 3.105 only); versifico (used first by Quintilian, then not again until Ammianus).

12.3 Valerius Capito in: et Licinius Sabulum sedibus patriis reddidit:

sedes patria(e) is a highly active expression for domus, as can be seen from its only two occurrences in Cicero: Var. 3.46 diffusserunt
omnia per urbem, id modo passim, nec salus armentosae sed etiam secura
suae retributionisiamuriae evitati relinquaverunt; Phil. 12.14
excessusum ac cx Italia cicit, dicis nepatis et seibus patriis
relicturnum, ai - mod et cermi averturint! - rem publicam oppressisset.

Antonius (in the first passage Cicero treats it as an outrage that
men have been forced to leave the homes which belonged to their
ancestors; in the second the extent of the feeling against Antony is
illustrated by a reference to Tasso's intention of leaving his ancestral
home in order to be away from Antony's tyranny; note the juxtaposition of the equally emotive deo nematis).

The poets took the phrase up for its expressiveness, using it even in passages of no particular emotional import. Tacitus has followed their lead: neither here nor at 25.2 below is there any real emotive justification for its use (on the poetic influence at 25.2, see the note ad loc.).

Outside Cicero series patriae(s) is found in pre-Tacitean prose only at Sall. hist. 1.55.12 (emotive) and Curt. 3.7.11.

12.4 semulchammmie extrai permitt: the compound extrai (with literal sense) becomes increasingly common in the second half of the Annals for struc, which is preferred in the first (see Introduction, p. 14).

The two words were interchangeable when literal. Compare the following pairs of passages:

1.75.1 templum ut in colonia Terracemnensi strueretur
(cf. 2.49.1, 6.45.1)
15.74.1 templum Saluti exstrueretur eo loci (cf. Dial.
20.7, Agric. 21.1, IV.84.3).
6.45.1 ne publica quidem nisi duo opera struxit,
templum Augusto et scenam Pompeiani theatris.
IV.22.1 subversae longae pacis opera, haud proxim
atrix in modum municipii exstructa.

II.67.2 tertia deciesam struere amphitheatra iussi.
13.31.1 moles amphitheatri ... exstruxerat.

15.30.1 structam ante auguralis arm.
II.25.1 exstruxit in campo latici arm.

The compound seems to have been the word in every day use. It
predominates in the Cassararian corpus (17:4), Cicero (11:1),
Quintilian (4:0), Senece the Elder (3:0), and also in inscriptions
(49:7). For inscriptionsal examples from the late first century A.D.,
see Bruns, p.255 (Antiquae Tuscaniae ad Sabuncum, A.D. 76); id.,
p.265 (Lex urbis urbano, A.D. 84-96). Vitruvius, however,
overwhelmingly prefers the simple verb (36:10), whether because it
had survived in the technical language of architecture (for a word
which, though not in general use, continued to live on in a technical
vocabulary, see on astra, 14.1 n.), or because it was stylistically
more pretentious (see on nactus, 11.2 n. for Vitruvius' stylistic
pretensions).
With *permittō* the infinitive or, as here, the acc. c. infin. is regularly used by Tacitus (15 times) for *ut* + subj. The latter construction occurs only at 3.63.1, where the infinitive would have been awkward: *consulibus remissere ut perempto hinc et sic om. infinitius involveretur, nam inter rem circum ad rematum referrent.* (the separation of *remissere* from its dependent clause is facilitated by the use of *ut* before the ablative absolute).

In classical Latin *ut* + subj. is the usual construction with *permittō* (found 24 times, e.g. in the speeches of Cicero, where the infinitive occurs only once), but in the early Empire it is replaced by the infinitive (in Seneca the Elder the infinitive predominates by 11:1, in Seneca the Younger by 46:9, and in Quintilian by 17:1). The change probably took place on the analogy of *sine*.

On Tacitus' use of the final infinitive with *remissere*, see *Introduction*, p. 44. Clearly his liking for the construction was independent of its stylistic quality: he often prefers it to *ut* + subj. not only after verbs with which it was artificial, but also after those (such as *permittō*) with which *ut* had become archaic. Cf. his liking for -tus (rather than -tio) substantives (27.3 n.) and (in the later books of the *Annales*) for compound verbs (*Introduction*, p. 55).
12.4. Londinuque ab exilio Terentium recessae: in the sense 'return'.

(= redeo) recessus is an historiographical term which was not in ordinary use at any time during the Republic or under the early Empire. Plautus has it only twice for special effect (redeo almost 150 times) and Terence avoids it completely (redeo 89 times). Cicero, Vitravius, and Seneca the Younger use it only in opposition to recessus, and Caesar has it only as a military term in the sense 'so recipere'.

There are no examples in Petronius (redeo 21 times), Seneca the Elder (redeo 49 times), or Pos. Quintilian (redeo 57 times), and only one in Quintilian (redeo 35 times).

From histories to annals the more commonplace words reversus, reverto, and redeo both decrease slightly in frequency (reversus 0.4/4; redeo 16:7:7), but recessus increases (7:14:12).

Earlier Tacitus has reversus in the same expression as that in which he here uses recessus: I.77.3 recens ab exilio reversus, II.92.3 reversus ab exilio. He substitutes reversus for recessus in the present passage, in keeping with its normalizing tendency.

On literal instances of redeo with a personal subject are included in the figures given here: recessus is not used either metaphorically or with non-personal subjects by Tacitus. Examples of recessus as a reflexive have also been omitted.
Notes

1. For a full collection of verbs of this type, see X. Eignot, Les verbes dénombratifs latins (Paris, 1899), 392ff.


3. See Krebs-Schmals, s.v. for examples from the historians.

4. At Capt. 1023 it occurs in the expression in memoriam neglect which follows immediately on the usual phrase in memoriam recind (see Lindsay ad loc.); at Adv. 46, where it appears in a threat uttered against a slave, the language may be deliberately high-flown or militarian.

5. On Cicero, see Krebs-Schmals, l.c.; cf. Vitr. 3.1.12, dem. exist. 316 ff.


7. Reversio can mean 'turn back', but in Tacitus it is usually more general (= rediug).

8. On literal instances of rediug with a personal subject are included in the figures given here: reversio is not used either metaphorically or with non-personal subjects by Tacitus. Examples of recovery = seo recipere have also been omitted.
9. Obviously the 3 words are not fully interchangeable, for 2 are
deponents. But if comparable forms alone are considered, the rise
of regredior in the Annals remains apparent. Thus, e.g., the
participles reversus and regredens are both found 4 times in the
Historiae, but in the Annals regredens predominates by 12:1.
13.1 **quonam modo urbem inradatur:** Tacitus invariably uses
*quonam modo* for the normal *quo modo* in the historical works (Livy, Tac. 896). Livy is the only other extant author down to at least the time of Gallius who prefers the fuller expression (10:9), which is elsewhere extremely rare (used occasionally by Cicero, Sallust, Pliny the Elder, and Gallius). Tacitus may have taken it from Livy; or perhaps it had some currency in lost imperial historiography.

13.1 **praegredi exoscunt**: *posco* and its compounds are scarcely ever found with a verbal construction (*ut* or the infinitive) under the Republic, and are so used only rarely by archaizers and poets in the early Empire. *Posco* first occurs with *ut* in Tacitus; *exposco* has *ut* once in Ennius (ann. 177), but is not used again with a verbal construction until the archaizers and poets of the early Empire (e.g. Virgil, Livy, epic: DL, V.2.1773, 177). And *aposco* has the acc. c. infin. first in Livy, the infinitive first in Tacitus (TLL, V.1.590.42ff.).

Tacitus has chosen the infinitive here (rather than *ut*) in accordance with his taste for the construction in this section of the *Annales* (Introduction, p.44). Earlier, in the *Historiae*, he twice uses *ut* + subj. with *posco* (II.39.2, IV.5.1).
13.2

publici servitii victor: from at least the late Republic onwards servitus in its abstract sense (= servitus) was not in use.²

It is avoided by Cicero, Caesar, Nepos, Quintilian, vs. Quintillian, and Petronius, and employed only once by the Elder Seneca in an obviously elevated passage (2.1.11) which contains a number of archaisms.³ Outside the historians Sallust (13 times), Livy (11 times), and Curtius (once, 6.3.3), it is found elsewhere in pre-
Tacitean prose only once in a letter of Brutus, in a highly rhetorical passage (epist. ad Brut. 24.9), twice in Seneca (dial. 9.10.4, 9.17.5),⁴ trace in the Elder Pliny (nat. 7.200, 10.47) and occasionally in Columella.

There is a clear distinction in usage between servitus and the everyday word servitus in Tacitus. Of the 17 instances of the latter in the historical works, 16 are in speeches and the other in the rhetorical proemium of the Histories (1.1.2). Servitus is the standard word in narrative (30 times). It is also used 11 times in direct speeches, but occurs only once in a direct speech (17.54.2).⁵

Sallust also largely restricts servitus to speeches.⁵

The expression publican servitus is Livian (1.25.3). There is some evidence to suggest that Livy’s use of the word influenced Tacitus. Cf. Liv. 26.49.8 publicas servitio / Tac. 1.59.1 subiectus servitio; Liv. 28.39.18 servitio exequiarum / Tac. 12.27.3 servitio exequiarum.
In the minor works Tacitus has servitus 10 times, servitium only once (Append. 29.3).
Notes

1. Krebs-Schmids, s.v.

2. In early Latin Plautus avoids servitum but uses servitus frequently: Terence has servitum once (Andr. 675), but in a passage which may be high-flown.

3. Note furor (10), the old perfects in -are (agese 10, extruxerere 11), memo (12) for Seneca's usual tempus, and anni (13).

4. In both places it is metaphorical.

5. Narrative: Cat. 48.1; speeches: Cat. 51.31, Jug. 31.11, 31.20.
14.1 *vetus illi cupidō erat curriculo quadrigaram insistere:* the
infinitive is used with *cupidō* first by Ennius (see *Ennius* 222), and
then by Virgil, Silius, Statius, and Curtius, who is the only prose
author to have the construction before Tacitus (*Tull. IV.1423.1ff.*).
Elsewhere Tacitus uses only the more common genitive of the gerund
or gerundive.

In *extant* literature there is only one instance of *cupiditas*
(the usual prose equivalent of *cupidō*) with the infinitive (in
Ambrose: see *Tull. a.v.*).

14.1 *curru certare et equa regiam et antiquis ducibus factitum*
memorabat: a typically Tacitan use of *memoro* (introducing a
statement about ancient history) and one which well illustrates the
tone of the work at this period.

*Memoro* was in regular use in early Latin, for it occurs almost
90 times in Plautus (*comemoro* 15 times). But by the late Republic
it was obsolete. Caesar avoids it, and Cicero allows it only once
in his speeches (at *c.an. 4.107*, in an elaborate mythologising
description mentioned by Quintilian *as an example of digressio*
(*ἐκφράσεις*); an *ἐκφράσεις* was traditionally composed in high
style: Quint. 10.1.33 licet tamen nobis in dignissimum uti vel historico nonnumquam nitorum; cf. 4.2.19 licet interim narrativ introduci solet ...: interim per digressionen decoriam pratia, quilia rurum in Verrem de Fronsenvins); trice in the philosophica
(at Thm. 39, in a mythological passage: ut Oceanum Salacium un
Caeli satu terraque concertu generate estitosus memores sum, ex in
Saturnum et Ocean, deincens Ioves atque Iunones; and at leg. 2.62, in
a reference to the landatory orations pronounced at the death of
distinguished men: honoratissum virorum laudes in contione
memorantur); and once in the letters (at Att. 6.7.2: quod enim tu
mae laudes et memorandum diceas, maie quod dixerim mecum Romae
tinci quam cum latine vincent: the tone is similar to that at leg.
2.62).

Similarly in ordinary prose under the early Empire it is either
avoided (as by Seneca the Elder and ps. Quintilium) or used only in
special contexts. Petronius has it once, in an account of a
discussion about the legendary Thracian soothsayer Morsus: 55.4 ub
hoc exorante cossit rectors; eae morte diceat summa omnini
renes Morsum Thracen memorata est; Quintilian once, in reference to
events narrated by famous historians: 1.8.18 his accedat narratio
historiarum, dilesens quidem ulla, non tamen usque ad supervacuum
laborum occupata; non receptas aut certa claris sectoribus memoratas
exequias satia est; Vitruvius 11 times, almost always in passages
dealing with fairly remote history (especially Greek) or legend; and Seneca the Younger twice (in prose; in the tragedies it is found 11 times), once introducing a Virgilian description of the Golden Age (cixit. 20.37), and once referring to a long eulogy (mat. 4 præt. 18; cf. the example at Cic. leg. 2.62 quoted above).

Certain archaisers, however, use the word more freely. Sallust, for instance, has it 21 times, Livy 52 times, and Pliny the Elder 42 times; none of the three restricts it to contexts of any particular type (but note that Livy has it more often in the first than in either the third or fourth decades: 28.15:5).

Tacitus uses 

menor 

in two ways: (1) when referring forward or back to his own work (e.g. in the expressions 

ut autem memoratus

; at memoribimis); and (2) when, as here, quoting the utterances or writings of others. Most examples which fall into the latter class (including that here) are used to introduce historical examples, statements about remote antiquity, legend or myth, or high-flown pronouncements of various kinds (boastful, eulogistic, boastful, etc.). Cf., e.g.: Germ. 3.1 

reliqua et aegresce memorant; 

39.1 

vestigissimos us nobilissimis oculis semines memorant; 

43.3 

doec interpretatione in﹢

Castorum tolleremus memorunt; 

IV.83.1 

Aegyptiorum antiquties sic memorant. Ptolemeo radi ... 

oblatum per quiesten decore eoxico et maiore superhumana specie iuvenem 

(the Egyptian priests on the origin of the god Serapis); V.2.1 

Indaco.
Creta insula profuosa novissima Libyae insedisse memorant; 3.61.1
Ephesii adiere, memorantes non, ut vulgarius crederent, Dionysii
Apolinensis Deo renitos (the Ephesians on their mythological origins);
4.13.4 et Sogdiani eodem Veneria montem amis; Tyronium, vetustate
dilucidi, restitutum recte legere, nota memorantes de origine eius;
4.55.1 necus multum distantia inter se memorabant de vetustate
veneris (various Asian cities on their antiquity); 4.55.4 simul
litteras imperatorum et inter nobilissimam sodalem bello Macedoniam
uberritatem Clemens suorum, tamen eodem ac ditae circius termas
memorabant (the Sardians on their past history); 11.14.2 quidem
Severi, Athenienses vel Linus Thiborum et temporibus, Proculia
Palamedea Arxum memorat, sed legi litterarum formae ... expeririace
(traditions concerning the origins of the alphabet); 12.61.1
netalit dein de immunitate Cœlia tribusenda, multaque eorum antiquitate
sorum memoravit (cf. 3.25.1 above); 3.31.4 memorabantur exempla
exercitus (historical examples; cf. the following 5 passages); 3.71.3
memorabatur usque L. Metelli certificia maximi exempla; 11.23.2 quin
aduis memorari exempla, eae priscis notibus ed viribus et clarion
Romana indolem prodiderit; 13.6.1 exempla comissendi aedere imperii
memoravit; 3.62.3 et memorabantur Herenniae, Isaurici multaque alia
imperatorum nominis; 15.11.2 Iulius Lucilius, sospicis et si qua
Caesares obtingendae Dominaeve Armeniæ exercit ... memorat.
In similar contexts diœc is used only 3 times (1.1.3, 1.1.2, 12.61.2), and then for variation after both refero and memoro; and refero 5 times, 3 times for variation near memory (3.63.2, 4.55.2, 12.61.1), and twice independently (2.60.2, 11.6.1).

For the difference in tone between memoro and diœc, cf. the following:

5.10.3 interrogatue, quisnam forset, dixisse M. Silano genitum (on the origin of a man).

3.61.1 Ephesti adiere, memorantes non, ut vulgus crederet, Diannam atque Apollinis Deo genitos (on the origin of two gods).

15.69.2 ingreasti malites yogeri sum a tribuno dixere (actual).

11.17.1 (Italicus ce) secitum memorabat quando nobilitas ceteros antextet (boastful).

14.2 nec iam siiæ poterat: in the sense 'stop' (transitive) siiæ is frequent as a medical technical term (denoting in particular the staunching of blood, as at 15.56.5), but is otherwise found only in poetry and poetizing prose, often in stock phrases: e.g. fugam siiæ (Liv. 1.12.6, 10.79.1, 30.12.1, Sen. epist. 69.1, Curt. 4.16.2,
8.3.2, 8.14.37, Val. Flacc. 3.144, Tac. 12.39.1); grandum aiterna
(Virg. Aen. 6.465, Prop. 4.10.36, Liv. 9.2.10, Sen. Ner. Fri. 772,
epist. 4.0.7, Curt. 4.6.14, Sili. 10.367); inuentum aiterna (Liv. 4.38.3,
Sen. Agam. 203, benef. 5.34.5, Plin. nat. 28.112); balduna aiterna
(Ovid met. 14.605, Tac. Hist. 3.3.2), fictum (et sim.) aiterna (Ovid met.

The expression which Tacitus has in the present passage (neq
sinti aiternae) is also formulaic. It is first found in Plautus (Tim.
720), where it is impersonal and virtually has the sense 'it is
unendurable' (see Briix ad loc.), and is then taken up by Livy (who
employs it impersonally at, e.g. 2.29.8, but with a subject at, e.g.
3.16.3), Curtius (1.16.2, 5.5.11), and Pliny the Younger (epist.
10.55.9). It is found 5 times in Tacitus (cf. Hist. 11.2, Hist. 7.5,
V.23.1, 15.39.1), always with a subject (here Ner.).

14.2 ut est vultur curium venustatim: with curium the genitive is
frequent in old Latin (Ennius, Plautus, Terence: see Thr. IV.1450.15ff.),
but from the late Republic onwards is admitted only by orators
(Sallust, Tacitus, Gallius, Fronto, et al.: Thr. IV.1450.15ff.; M.35.15ff.)

Curium is used by Tacitus only in the Annals (7 times: 6 times
with the genitive). The more common cupidus (cupien is Ciceroian,
but comparatively infrequent, see Till. 1.e., and also at 24.29.85ff.;
11.3. *nulla* uterque non sinteitate, ut hancutus, sed incitamentum attulit: the compound *nullo* is found in Livy and Tacitus but nowhere else in extant Latin (VIII. 2. 1802. 3f.). Tacitus has it once in the *Historiae* and 3 times in *Annales* (XI. 13-15). On the frequency of emphatic compounds in the later books of the *Annales*, see *Introduction*, p. 55.

The nominative use of the *ab urbe condita* construction (*hulicinus* *nullor*), in which the participle is not predicative but has the role of a verbal substantive, occurs in books 13-15 of the *Annales* only here and at 13.9.3: *hulicinus* *ludens* *officius* *saepe* *aeris* *ab urbe condita*. However, it is a striking specimen of the early books. The following examples are found in I-3: 1.4.6 *aedecus dictator* *Caesar* *sulcis* *passim*; *sulcis* *velox* *criminalium* *saepe* *aeris* *ab urbe condita*. I.15.1 *mutatus* *princeps* *litigantur* *turbarum* ... *ostendebat*; I.19.5 *sulcis* *elutri* *orator* *publicae* *causes* *saepe* *aeris* *ab urbe condita* ... (on Tacitus' variations of the standard type with past participle, see *Nippo. *Andr. 5.9); 1.28.1 *hulicinus* ... *Tiberius* *perpulcrum*; 1.33.3 *nunc* *dulcis* *nulla* *officines* ... *suma* *Arripinae* *nulla* *commotion.*
1.36.2 augebat metum quam Romae seditionis ... hostis; 1.42.1
nove occisus Augusti prouos, interfacta Tiberii nurus necantiorerς
vos faciā: 1.58.1 mutata e Tiberium laetitia quanque adfacerē;
1.59.1 amnium ... mārti urae, subiectus servitio uxoris uteris
recordem aschant; 1.63.2 nova acie turvatus aqua, missaeque
subsidiariae cohortes et Judicium aequo impulser eos exerent
consternationem; 1.72.4 hostibus asperrum servus camina incerti
autoribus valēra: 2.2.3 accendebat dedicantes et ille dīvērum a
mārius institutia; 2.47.2 asperrissi in sanctam lucem plurimam in
eosdem misericordiae traxit; 2.57.1 cataca socialia paurere
compōsita non idem lactue hermanicum habeant ob superbiām Fisnico;
2.82.2 hos ulla sermones audīta nora ... incendit; 2.84.2 auctum
liberis Drusus domus Germanici maris urveret; 3.5.1 cuncta e
maiōribus reperēt; ... eaudēs; 3.9.5 inquit inter immitāntia invidiae
domum foro immunes festa ornantes conviviaque et evulāe: et
celeritātes loci nihil occultum; 3.22.1 quinvinque post dictum
rovium adhec intensus quāris infāri aec nōcēti misericordia
addideret; 3.24.1 adversā ... solēcio addēcit D. Silianus Turiae
fēminiæ reddītus; 3.28.4 essus in pueritia lacis nēcis nodicum in
praecens levamentus suæ ... 3.31.2 parva res magnum ad certaum
progressa prōruit inventi ...; 3.56.4 incensa super villā ossis
creavit; 3.50.3 neque servatus in periculum rei publicae necne
interfactus in exemplum ibis; 3.52.1 nēmitus adiēnda semonibus
The construction is slightly more usual under the Empire than it had been in the Republic but is by no means common.

14.3 majoribus eorum tribuedum dux: dux is rare in the Annals, where the archaism reor is preferred. The distribution of the two words in the historical works is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dux</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table suggests that reor increases in favour in the Annals (see Syme, 712, 716, 721). But the change is illusory. Tacitus admits only 4 forms of reor - ratus, reor, rebatur, and rebentur (see Lex. Tac. 1330 b). Of the 15 instances of dux, all but 2 are found in forms in which reor is not allowed. Both exceptions are of note. In the present passage dux has clearly been used for variation after rebentur and ratus in the preceding sentence; and at II.4.7.1 it is in
a direct speech.

Similarly *existimis* is used in the historical works only to complement the deficiencies of *reor* (4 times); and of the 5 examples of *arbitror*, 3 occur in forms for which *reor* supplies no substitutes, and the other 2 are found early in the *Histories* (where Tacitus was less selective than in the later books).

14.3 *non et eis Placitium est, qui pecuniam ob delicta potius dedit, quanx ne delinquerent.* Tacitus constantly varies the construction in the two halves of antitheses. For another instance of a final clause balanced by the final use of *ob*, see 1.53.3 *neque ob pecuniam, sed ut me perfidia exuvit.*

Antitheses with parallelism of construction are common only in direct speeches (e.g. 3.16.3, 3.50.3, 3.54.3, 11.4.2, 13.21.2, 13.56.1, 14.54.1, 14.56.2).

14.4 *notus quonque equites Romanos opera aeren, promittere superit donis incentibus.* Plautus frequently has *subito* with a final construction (usually *ut* + subj.; but the infinitive is also Plautine) in a sense indistinguishable from that of *cogit* (see Degg., 33).

Thereafter, however, the usage is restricted largely to the historians;
it is avoided even by Terence, who uses 

This passage shows that for Tacitus the word was not exactly 
synonymous with 

The clause nisi quod merces ab eo, sed libera 

notest, via necessitas usus fort would be pointless if subject carried 
a strong notion of compulsion. Note also that Tacitus prefers 
to suino in antithesis with words expressing freedom of will (Lib., 

sponte: 11.36.2, 14.61.4). In Plautus, however, suino undoubtedly 
meant 'compel' rather than 'induce', see in particular Pseud. If 
necessitas/usus subinit ut te rogates.

The original force of words no longer in use is often 
misunderstood.
Notes

1. 4.2.19: cf. 3.7.27, 9.4.127.

2. 2.6.2, 2.6.3, 3.proef.1, 4.1.19, 7.proef.3, 7.proef.12, 7.proef.17, 8.3.16, 9.5.3, 10.13.1, 10.16.2.

3. Note, e.g., 2.6.2 memoriatur antiquitus crevisiae audaces et abundantes sur Vesuvio monte; 2.6.3 loca ab antiquis memoratur; 7.proef.3 nec tamen hae nec non vindicare curiosum ab antiquis memoratur.

4. Refero is only a little less common in analogous expressions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memoriatur</th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>refero</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refero</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Historiae dico is so used as often as refero; but in the
Annals it declines (6.2.1).

5. A third class could be added, consisting of a few examples which
bear an unusual sense (= 'memoriu revocare in memoriam': see lex.
Tac. 8.26). There seems to be only one possible parallel in the
early imperial period (Curt. 3.10.7), but in late Latin the usage
is common (III, VIII, 651, 611f.).

Certain imperal poets occasionally use memor in other ways
which indicate that its etymological connection with memoria was
felt. In the sense 'memoriter narrare' the word is found in both
Statius (Theb. 12.815) and Virgil (Aen. 7.645), and Statius also has it with the meaning 'remember' (Theb. 11.579), which is frequent in late Latin (VIII 691.32).

6. Cf. I.1.1 (preface of the Histories), II.59.2 (a portent), IV.81.3 (eyewitnesses on the miracles of Vespasian), I.1.2 (preface of the Annales), 1.52.2 (multa de virtute eius memoravit, magis in species verbis alomata quam ut...), 4.32.1 (on the dramatic subject matter available to earlier Roman historians), 4.34.2 (quorum res gestas... nemo sine honorum memoravit), 11.17.1 (a boastful statement by Italicus on his nobilitas and virtus), 12.44.4 (King Pharammus on Iberian history).


8. Clearly the technical language of medicine has preserved a word which had fallen out of ordinary use. Cf. Eng. 'staunch'.

9. Other examples are found at 3.9.7, 3.20.6, 26.6.16 (corrupt), 29.10.1, 30.12.1, 45.13.13.


11. Reor is classified by Quintilian (3.3.26) as archaic but tolerable. His statement is presumably intended to apply not merely to the form quoted (reor) but to the verb in general. Cicero, however, (de orai.
3.153) refers only to the form rebar as on archiain. On Cicero's use of the verb, see Leaurand, "Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron" (Paris, 1936-38), 56f.

12. For some other kinds of variation in antitheses, cf., e.g., I.15.4, I.22.1, I.30.3, I.35.2, I.49.3, I.49.19, I.33.3, 24.18.3.
15.2 exstructaque apud nornas ... conventicula et cauponae: Norden\(^1\) mentions cauponae as one of the few examples of a cordium vocabulum used by Tacitus. But though cauponae were frequented only by the lower classes,\(^2\) there is no reason to suppose that the word itself was intrinsically vulgar. Tacitus does not use vulgarisms, even for effect (galliaus and spiritus at 6.1.2 may be exceptions, but note the context: the words themselves are being discussed).

The strictness of Tacitus' sense of propriety is easily exaggerated. Scholars have tended to pay one-sided attention to his omissions. When necessary, he is not reluctant to allude in explicit, if restrained terms to matters which the Romans regarded as cordium or as a possible source of embarrassment. Observe, for instance, the following direct references to the body and its functions:\(^3\) 11.60.3 cautum esse miliaria Octavius responcit omn. ca. simil.; 13.15.4 transitique exsultat alio marvo validum (venem); 12.7.1 soluta alicus; 14.8.5 constituenti ... ut tendens uterum 'ventrem faci exclamavit; 11.13.2 uterum exsulter. latae (milii) responcit; 1.40.3 uterum alicus ... corporum: V.6.3 responde, suo tendens per menses exsolvatur; 16.4.3 ut nulla oris aut narium excrementa viscerum; IV.20.1 respervera oris excremento; 4.572 ulcerosa facies in polumque medicamenibus interstitiae.

Again, though at II.21.1 he states that he is ashamed to describe the origin of a certain Curtius Rufus, he can, when it suits him,
mention lower-class occupations. Note his description of Vatinius as *suiciniae tabernae alumni* (15.31.2). *Suiciniae taberna* (with adjective rather than genitive) was no doubt a stock phrase of *taberna libyrica* (Cic. Phil. 2.21); *argentaria taberna* (Liv. 26.11.7).

Similarly, *luminaria* and *sporia* are occasionally introduced (Iuc. Sall. a.v.).

He is prepared to use both the Sallustian expression *patrem bellum*, even though, because of its double meaning, it caused amusement to its hearers at the time (Quint. 8.3.44), and *lithi*, which had obscene connotations (Cic. Fam. 9.22.3).

Finally, despite the general relief that the words *nec semper accipitrum humum aut exciditum caesum* (1.65.7) are a paraphrase springing from his reluctance to call a spade a spade, he includes a detailed reference to agricultural implements: *et III.27.2 proximis agrarum locis dolabrae et aliis falsae scutendo convexit.*

Clearly relevance must have played an important part in determining Tacitus' omissions and selections. The nomenclature is admitted (in suitably non-vulgar terms) when required.

15.2 *posita veno inritamenta lixi*: high-flown phraseology juxtaposed with *canonae* (cf. *suiciniae tabernae* alongside *alumni*). On *inritamentum* (Livy, Sallust, poets, al.), see ILL a.v.; or *venum*, see IV.11.1. *suiciniae* ob long (cf. IV.15.8).
L.S., and Nipp.-Andr. on A.1.

Luxus is a rare and elevated variant for luxuria. It is not attested until Terence (who uses it only once), but must have been much older, for Plautus has an example of its derivative luxor (a verb whose existence is confirmed at Fest. 107d). Presumably luxuria was built on the older luxus, which was driven out of use before the historical period as the less emphatic form.

Luxus is avoided by Cicero,\(^7\) Caesar, Petronius, and possibly Quintilian, and is used only 3 or 4 times by Livy (twice in the same expression within a few chapters in book 7: 7.33.5 fluantes luxus; 7.32.7 luxu fluentes),\(^6\) twice by the Elder Seneca (at contr. 1 pr. 7 for variation in the same sentence as luxuria, and in an elaborate passage at 2.5.7 in an expression - luxi flucite - perhaps reminiscent of Livy's fluentes luxus), 3 times by Sallust, once by Quintilian (3.3.28), 7 times by Seneca the Younger (once in a Virgilian and twice in Livian expressions),\(^9\) 3 times by Curtius, and 9 times by Pliny the Elder. Tacitus has it over 70 times in the historical works, but luxuria only 10 times. There are few more striking examples of his liking for the unusual.

For the synonymity of luxus and luxuria in Tacitus, compare the following passages:

Agric. 15.4 avaritias et luxuriam (cf. II.62.1).
IV.14.1 avaritia et luxu (cf. IV.74.2).
13.30.1 luxuria saevitiaeque
11.10.4 saevitas nec luxus

1.71.1 dilatae voluptates, dissimulata luxuria.
12.5.3 non luxum sed voluptatem absolvatibus.

16.3.1 gliscat interim luxuriam apud insan. consumabanturque
veteres opes.
13.4.1 per luxum avitas opes dissipasset.

It is not until after *Historiae II* that *luxus* establishes
predominance over *luxuria*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>S.</th>
<th>H. I</th>
<th>H. II</th>
<th>H. III</th>
<th>H. IV</th>
<th>H. V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>luxuria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luxus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the *Annales* *luxus* occurs over 50 times, *luxuria* only twice
(third hexad).

15.5 *vocemque deae vocabulis appellant*: *vocabulum* is usually
employed of common nouns, but Hipp.-Andr. (12.56), followed by
Eriksson (13), are wrong in asserting that in the classical period it cannot denote proper names. Cicero uses it in the latter way a number of times, almost always in reference to the names of gods: 1.40 idemque disputat aethera esse eum quem homines Iovem
nominabant... similique ratione persequitur vocabula reliquorum
deorum: 1.63 age et his vocabulis esse deos facimus quibus a nobis
nominantur? (variation before nominantium?); 2.61 quo ex genere
Cardininis et Voluptatis et Lubentiae Veneris vocabula consecrata sunt: 10
Tim. 36 qui (viri) se proenium deorum esse dicunt, itaque corum
vocabula nobis prodiderunt. Cf. div. 1.2 Chaldaei non ex artis, sed
ex gentis vocabulo nominati. 11

Vocabulum is used of proper names 16 times by Tacitus, always in the annals. 12 With the example here, cf. Germ. 9.2 deorum nominibus
(note the ordinary genitive plural form as well as the more usual nomen).
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In order to express adequately the burdens faced by the soldiers, Tacitus needs (at 1.61.7) to describe in relative clauses the tasks to be carried out without implements. The antecedents are simply omitted as superfluous.

7. See Peterson's apparatus (CCT) at Varr. 3.62.

8. cf. 1 pr. 12. At 1.57.9 the more likely reading is _lunum_ (Ggilvie ad loc.).

9. _dial._ 3.11.4, 10.1.3, _nat._ 1.17.5 (in libidinem luxuose; _cf._ Liv. 1. praeF.12), 4.13.5, _exst._ 71.15, 76.23 (luni fluantibus; _see above_), 83.25 (luxuque regales; _cf._ Virg. _Aen._ 1.637).

10. In this passage the word is intermediate in sense between 'common noun' and 'proper name'.

11. Nipp.-Andr. believe that _vocabulum_ is chosen here under the influence of _artis_. But it is clearly used for variation immediately before _nominati._

12. 1.6.3, 1.23.3, 1.61.2, 2.6.4, 2.55.3, 4.55.3, 4.59.1, 4.65, 6.41.2, 12.27.1, 14.62, 12.65.2, 13.14.1, 14.15.1, 16.12.2. In many places it has apparently been adopted only as a variant in the vicinity of _comomentum, nominate, or nomen._ But it is sometimes used independently. Eriksson (l.c.) sought to show that the usage declines in the later _Annals_, but the list of examples, taken from Nipp.-Andr., is incomplete.
16.1 Hi consuli considerer: the reading of n is nescium insignis

etatis nati considerer. For the variety of emendations, none of

them certain, which have been proposed, see Furneaux ad loc.

Hi consuli (Helmy), which has been adopted by Kocsternann and Fishur,

must remain doubtful on stylistic grounds, although it gives an

excellent sense. With only two exceptions, both of which are special

cases, Tacitus prefers erutilae and erulo throughout the historical

works to the less dignified cem and cen. ¹ Ceno is found nowhere

close either in the minor or historical works (erulor 13 times). ²

Of the 2 instances of cens one is in a hackneyed expression

(receuntam a cens) ³ in the early chapters of Historiae I (26.1),

in which there are numerous stylistic peculiarities; and the other

is in a quoted saying in the Annals: 6.5.1 cum die natali Augustae

inter sacerdotes sculatur, novendialmen cens cenam dixisse. ⁴

16.2 tensum imperticat: the phrase tensum impertio occurs a number

of times in other writers (VII.5.1.592.6lf.). This is the first

example of impertio in Tacitus. The only other is a few chapters

later at 21.3, in an expression (aures impertio) in which praebeo is used

elsewhere (1.16.2, 12.4.2, 12.4.2.3). Unconscious association probably

led to the repetition of the word soon after its appearance in a stock

phrase. Writers often unconsciously repeat words previously alien to
their vocabulary (see, e.g. on luxus in Livy, 15.2 n. above).

16.2 utique contraria adaeverantium discordia fruorutum: adsevero is usually employed by Tacitus (as here) to denote a serious assertion made against actual or potential opposition: cf., e.g. 4.28.3 et contra reus nihil infraicto animo obversum in calum quater vincula, vocare ultorem deos ... adseverabatque innocentem Cornelium et falso exterrimus (Vitius Serenus' replies to charges made by his son). 5

Adsevero appears to become more frequent in the Annals as adfino declines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adfino</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adsevero</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But the figures give a false impression, for each word has its own distinctive sense in Tacitus. Most instances of adfino support the observation of Bannier (TLL 1.1222.67ff.) that the word designates in particular the assertion of a 'rea incertam, falsam, addubitatem': 1.22.1 uventibus etiam malignaticis, duum novos notus et clarum Gthoni annus observatione siderum adfimant, genus hominum potestibus infidum, sperantibus sallex; 1.32.2 reg, ut in magnis mendacii, interfuisse se cuidam et vidisse adfimabant; 1.35.1 nono oire et nonas adfimare; 1.45.2 in simulatione uxae vinciri iussum et saevores noenas datum.
adilus praeferit exitio subtraxit (the last three words imply the insincerity of the statement introduced by adilus); I.56.2 inde atrox ruror, adilus praeferit minostique interfecit ...: II.54.1 recente Coenus libertus Neronom atroci mendacio universos permutit, adilus ...; 11.33 ergo Narcissus adremis quibus idem mutus non ulla esse incolavitatis Caesaris adilus, quam si ibi militum uno illo die in aliquo libertatis transferret.
Notes

1. Axelsson, Unrest, p. 106f., shows that cena is unpoetic.

2. Cicero has cena 58 times, cuilibor only 11 times.

3. cf. Plaut. M. ost. 485, Ver. 4. 126; Gic. 3. 406; Or. 10, 97, 98, 126;
   Caes. 20, Cat. mai. 14, Val. Max. 3. 6. 4; Phaedr. 2. 6. 20, Petron.
   6. 1; Suet. Neron 26. 1, Flor. epis. 2. 2. 10, Gell. 15. 20. 9, Vulp. dig. 23. 2. 6.

4. Alternatively cena may be a variant introduced after cuilibor; or, cena
   novendialis cena may be a fixed expression.

5. cf. II. 96. 2, 2. 28. 5, 3. 49. 2, 4. 53. 2, 6. 20. 3, 11. 23. 2, 12. 53. 3,
   14. 51. 1, 15. 65. 1, 16. 24. 1.
17-19. In the annalistic manner Tacitus usually appends some brief miscellaneous material (e.g. obituary notices, descriptions of portents) to the narrative of each year's events. The break with the ordinary narrative is marked by a temporal phrase such as sub idea tempus (Lex. Tac. 545 b.), edem anno (Lex. Tac. 1 a.), fine anni, idem consulibus (mainly in the later books), etc., or by a succession of such phrases (see below 47.2 n.), each introducing a new item.

The annalistic chapters in the third hexad, unlike those earlier, are often very short, and in a simple, even apparently careless style (perhaps in imitation of the old annalistic manner: see 47.2 n.). Here chapters 17-18 have a few unmistakably Tacitean touches (see notes), but are stylistically undistinguished. Note, in 17, the use of two relative clauses in the same sentence (1), the repetition of e(3) (for repetitions in annalistic chapters, see 47.2 n.), and the use of multi e for multi with the genitive (1).

17.1 levis contentione orta atrox caedae: levis is occasionally used by Tacitus for the colourless parvus, which is all but eliminated from the historical works by modestus. With this passage, cf. 1.80.1 parvo interim initio unde nihil timebatur, orta seditio.

See also 9.1 above: max domesticorum cura leves tumulos accedit.
III.9.1 Levi proelio (cf. III.69.2 medicum ibi proelium); 2.59.3 Levi praesidio (cf. 2.25.1 medicum praesidio).

17.1 *quod ... quam*; sentences with more than one relative clause are rare in the historical works, in which long periods of the Ciceronian and Livian kind are largely avoided, but common in the *Dialogae* (a good illustration of the effect of genre on sentence structure).

In the present book there are examples at 1.1 (speech of Poppaea), 19 (annalistic chapter, like that here), 22.2, 28.1 (imperial decree), 43.2 (speech of C. Cassius Longinus), 54.3 (speech of Seneca), 55.2 (speech of Nero), 61.2 (speech of Poppaea).

The *Dialogae*, which is similar in length to *Annales*, contains more than 40 examples.

17.1 *muti e Lucernia*; the classical *muti ex*, which is used twice in the *Historiae* (1.86.1, III.13.2), is found only here in the *Annales* for *muti + part. gen.* (2.11.5, 3.6.1, 3.30.2, 4.73.3, 5.10.3, 5.11.2). 5

17.2 *seditionem concivere*; the expression *seditionem concivere* is
Livian (4.48.12). The equivalent in less artificial prose is
seditionem concitare (Cic. Sat. 77, Eur. 83, B. Hisp. 37.2, Frontin. strat. 3.6.7).

Concito was archaic from at least as early as the last century of the
Republic. It is found 7 times in Plautus and twice in Terence, neither
of whom has concito, but is thereafter extremely rare in the prose of
all but Livy and Tacitus. Livy uses it 23 times (with declining
frequency after the first and third decades), Tacitus 19 times. The
frequentative concito also occurs in Livy (108 times); but in Tacitus
it is restricted to the minor works.

In the Historiae concito is used 4 times as a past participle (by
far the most common form in which it occurs), and 3 times in other
forms. In the annexed the other forms predominate by 9:3. Livy
similarly shows no tendency to confine himself to concitum (other
forms 16 times).

Observe the following expressions in which Tacitus has concito,
but others concito:

I. 3. 2 finis Neronis ... varias motus animorum ... conciverat.
Cic. part. 67 disputandi genus ad eodem illos animi motus ...
vel gignandos vel concitandos (cf. de orat. 1.220, off. 1.73,
Sen. orat. 85.11).
1.23.1 tantum consternationis invidiaeque concivit.
Gic. Verr. 5.21 nullam in te invidia ne ex illis
quidem robis concitabo (cf. Phil. 2.33).

16.32.2 et quantum misericordiae saevitiae accusationis
permoveat, tantum irae P. Ignatius testis concivit.
Quint. 6.1.14 concitare quoque invidia, odio, iram
liberius in peroratione contingit (cf. 3.8.12, Liv. 2.31.15;
see too Sen. dial. 4.31.1).
Notes

2. First at 4.28.1; \textit{Lex. Tuc.}, l.c.
3. Note 13.10 (9 lines), 13.24 (6 lines), 13.58 (4 lines), 15.22.2 (5 lines), 15.32 (7 lines). Perhaps the shortest annalistic section in the first hexad is 4.61 (7 lines). Cf., e.g., in contrast 1.53ff., 2.39ff., 3.30, 3.75ff., 4.14ff., 4.44ff.
5. See \textit{TLL} VIII.1610.68ff. on the construction (first Cat. 66.9); cf. Nipp.-Andr. on 3.39; Ko.-Sc., 54.
6. There are sporadic examples in Sisenna, Vell. Pline the Elder, the Younger Seneca and Quintilian (11.1.65 \textit{concit}e; see below on the past participial form).
7. It is found 11 times in the first decade, 8 times in the third, but only 4 times thereafter.
8. \textit{TLL} IV.36.
orandi causas: The expression *causam ordo* was not in use in the classical period. It occurs only once in the speeches of Cicero (in the early pro Quinctio), in which *causam dicere* is used over 70 times. But in the technical language of the imperial rhetoricians *ordo* was revived in the sense 'speak' (a simple revival, since the old meaning was always manifestly present in *orator*), although at the same time it was falling into disuse in its other sense (25.2 n.). Bonnell quotes over 30 examples from Quintilian: cf. Dial. 6.5 orantibus = oratoribus; 7.1 causam ... orare.

In Tacitus there is a clear distinction between *causam dicere* and *causam orare*. The subject of *causam dicere* is always the defendant; of *causam orare*, the advocate (*orator*). Clearly *ordo* had been resurrected in the schools to express the function of the *orator*, rather than to provide a needless synonym for *dicere*. 
Notes

1. 43. See Lendgraf, R. Rom., 69, for a list of all examples of *oro* in the sense 'speak' from the late Republic.
per accitum lasciviam: it has long been recognised that the
language of Tacitus is highly metaphorical. But it needs pointing
out that most of his metaphors are commonplace. The only instances
in book 14 which cannot be paralleled from earlier literature are:
2.2 ad libitum palliatis provoluta (vice often attracts metaphorical
language in Tacitus); and 3.3 venti et fluctus deliquariunt. 3

However, the metaphorical use of accito is, if not without
parallel, extremely rare. From pre-Tacitean literature only Vell.
2.36.6 can be cited: rexis mortis, quae ille conscientia assolverat
(Velleius may have sought a variant for the usual conscientia because
of the preceding conscientia, with its identical beginning). Tacitus
has it 5 times, at first with concrete objects (III.52.1, IV.83.1)
and then, in the Annals, with abstracts (cf. 3.27.1 accitus quae
usquam erravit). 4

Other rare metaphors in this book are 1.1 coalita audacia (a
transferred use of the word in the sense 'take root': see OLD s.v.,
(5) for parallels, mostly from the historians; elsewhere in the Annals
it is found only at 13.26.2: coalitin liberitate imprudentiam co
pronocisse - a rare example of a metaphor continued in a second word
(pronoices); not surprisingly it occurs in a speech: see below); 43.2 (senatus consultum) supplicium ... minitatur (mainly poetic:
see III VIII.1025.40ff.); 52.2 principem supergregatetur (an imperial
metaphor, used also by Quintilian); 56.3 velare odium (earlier perhaps
only in Seneca's tragedies; in Tacitus it is frequent - in the 
Annals mainly in the later books - for the usual *tempore*, which is 
mainly confined to the first hexad of the Annals).

Note that in the present passage (an indirect speech) *accipiam*
laeciviam adjoins some further metaphorical language: *abolites*
noni iam patriae norum famulis everti*. Tacitus' speeches, and in 
this book especially that ascribed to Seneca (53-4), are remarkable 
for accumulations of metaphors: cf. e.g., in the speech of Boudicca:
55.1 *provesta ... cupidines*, ib. *virginitatem impollutam*; in the 
speech of C. Cassius Longinus: 43.2 *auque quid hoc in nobis auctoritatis*
*cat*, *... destruendum existimabam ut nonaret integrum*; ib. *concusso*
*senatus consulto*, *auque auxilium ... minitabatur*; and in the speech 
of Seneca: 53.2 *tanta honorum ... in me cumulasti*; 53.3 *laboribus*
*institutus*; ib. *studia, ut sic dixerim, in usura educata, et quibus*
*almeinde venit*; 53.5 *gratiam ... circumedisti*; ib. *intra me volvam;
ib. *navitas mea emitit*; 54.2 *itineris vitae*; ib. *open ... sustinere*
54.3 *me in nesceretia ... detrueam*; ib. *traditis quorum silentore*
*praestingeri*; ib. *quod temporis ... sepositur* (the expression *iter*
*vitae* is taken from Seneca himself: 5 it occurs 4 times in his extant 
writings - *bene*. 3.31.5, *dial. 10.9.5, *avint. 44.7, 77.4* - but nowhere 
else in Tacitus).
corrumpi et corrumpere: the natural order in polyptoton* of this kind is active followed by passive. So at Germ. 19.1 Tacitus writes corrumpere et corrumpi. Cf., e.g., ib. 30.2 ament amenturve; Dial. 13.4 quod timent, an quod timentur; 35.5.2 color et coli; 6.35.1 pellerent pellerentur; Plaut. Poen. 337 spectare ... et spectari; Catull. 46.20 amant amantur; Cic. Cat. 2.23 amare et amari (cf. Lael. 27); Lael. 91 et monere et moneri; ib. 102 diligam sus ... diligamur; Tac. 2.5 refellere ... et refellir; Ov. met. 2.781 currit curritur; Liv. 4.46.2 contemnere ... et contemni.

The order is also reversed at 5.6.2: misericius sit ob amicitiam accusari an amicum accusare: cf. 3.51.1 corruptus simul et corrumpit; Sen. nat. 4.11.2 vincuntur et vincunt. On Tacitus' tendency to reverse the order of set expressions, see 10.2 n.

Polyptoton, in its various forms, is favoured above all by writers of rhetorical prose (e.g., Cicero, Livy) and by the poets.7 It also occurs in proverbs, in which word play of all kinds is common: note, e.g., Cic. nat. 3.7 nerae, vetera proverbio, cum nartibus; fam. 7.5.3 de manu, ut aiunt, in manum. Tacitus has it frequently in the Dialogus (about 23 times),6 but comparatively rarely in the Annals (about 57 times).9 Moreover, most instances in the latter work are, like that here, in speeches. The most usual type is that consisting of pronouns or adjectives in anaphora (e.g. 1.31.5 sun ... suna ...
sum). But there are occasional more striking examples: note, e.g. 1.28.6 *legionem a legione dissociat* (substantival polyptoton of this and other kinds has a slightly affected character, as can be seen from its rarity in Cicero's letters; the only parallel instance in the *Annals* is *diam ex dieg* (6.42.4)); 1.35.1 *dicta ulterius est* (the only example of its kind in the *Annals*, from the speech of the poet Cremutius Cordus; cf. *Dial.* 40.3 *omnia, ut sic dixerim, omnes nesciant*); 1.62.1 *errandi egressaque* (in prose this type of polyptoton occurs a number of times in the early annalists, in Caesar, who preserves some annalistic archaisms in his *commentarii* (4.2 n.), in the *B. Hisp.*, and in Livy; Cicero occasionally admits it, but also resorts to *negatvtio* of the kind *inculasti, occidum* (3.30.32); Tacitus has it nowhere else).

20.4. *quoc*: from early Latin onwards *quoc* usually follows a negative. Tacitus for the most part has it after *nihil, nunc, unde* and *ne*. It largely avoids it, preferring *necum* to *non quoc*. After *non* he frequently uses it, preferring *necum* to *non quoc*. *Necum* and *quoc* thus complement each other. It is of note that *necum* and *quoc* thus complement each other. It is of note that Sallust observes the same distinction between the two words. Plautus, Terence, and Cicero, however, use *non quoc* frequently.

The only other affirmative instance of *quoc* in Tacitus is at 3.59.5.
_Quco_ and _nequco_ had once been in regular use, but by the time of Tacitus they were obsolete. Of the 34 examples of the two words in Tacitus, only 1 is in the minor works, and that is in a special context (at _Agrius_ 38.2, in the high-flown account of the aftermath of the battle of Mons Graupius: see Ogilvie and Richmond on 36, pass.).

Neither _quae_ nor _nequae_ is used freely in all parts by Tacitus or his predecessors. Some forms are very rare or completely avoided, others disproportionately common. Within the restrictions imposed by the availability of forms, Tacitus uses _quae_ whenever possible for _possam_ in both _Histories_ and _Annals_. The only 3 instances of _possam_ after _neque_, _nihil_, or _ne... quidem_ for which _quae_ could have been substituted are in direct speeches (I.16.1, I.16.4, IV.64.2).

20.5 _noctes quaque dederi adiecias, ne quae tennes pudori relinquatur_, _sed... audent_: Koestermann needlessly adds (from l.) _ut_ after _sed_. For the construction _ne... sed_ + subjunctive, with _ut_ understood, see _Lex. Tac_. 1457a (9 times).
Notes

1. Draeger, 111ff.

2. I have examined all the metaphors in book 14. Most are common even in Cicero. Those which are original to Tacitus or rare are collected below.

3. I omit 47.1 praebentare imperatoris facie. Præbentare is a Tacitean coinage; the simple verb ubbro is frequently metaphorical.

4. I omit II.5.1: scientiam artemque harmoniam is obviously a paraphrase for harmoniae, which is formalic with accio (see 21.1...).

5. Syne, 335.

6. The repetition of a word in a different font: see Quint. 9.3.37;
   Ho. - Sz., 70f; Landgraf, 'Substantiatische Parataxen', All. 5 (1889), 161-191.

7. Ho. - Sz., l.c.

8. 6.4, 8.3, 9.5, 10.4, 12.2, 13.4, 23.6, 26.8, 27.2, 27.3, 30.3, 32.2, 35.5,
     33.5, 34.2, 35.3, 35.5, 37.1, 39.1, 40.3, 40.3, 40.4.

9. Narrative: 1.28.6, 1.39.4, 2.41.2, 3.55.2, 4.1.1, 4.32.1, 4.33.1,
     4.43.1, 4.46.2, 6.35.1, 6.42.4, 12.39.2, 12.49.1, 13.16.4, 14.17.2,
     15.67.3, 16.4.4, 16.18.2; Speeches: 1.12.3, 1.17.1, 1.31.5, 1.41.1,
     1.42.2, 1.43.3, 1.48.3, 1.68.3, 1.68.3, 1.73.4, 3.12.5, 3.12.6, 3.17.4,
     3.54.2, 4.16.2, 4.36.2, 4.35.1, 4.36.2, 5.4.4, 5.6.2, 6.8.1, 6.8.3,
     6.8.4, 6.46.4, 11.24.7, 12.34, 13.4.1, 13.8.1, 13.14.3, 13.42.4, 13.43.4,

11. See further Landgraf, o.c., 165; cf. Dial. 35.3.

12. For a full discussion of the usage, see Landgraf, S. Rosa, 80ff.

13. See Krebs-Schmalz, s.v. 'quire'.

14. The only instance of non quo is at 1.69.4.

15. Sallust has non quo only at Jug. 14.11.

16. Plautus has quo over 60 times, and necque almost as often; Terence has quo 25 times, necque 18 times.

17. On the forms in use, see Neue-Wagner, III, 3 623ff.
a Tuscis accitos histriones: in a passage deriving ultimately from the Annales Maximi Cellius (4.5.2) has the phrase aruspices ex Etruria acciti. The only example of accio in the speeches of Cicero is identical: har. resu. 25 si examen arumus ludit in secessum caveram venisset, aruspices accipientes ex Etruria nutares. Cr. Liv. 27.37.6 id vero aruspices ex Etruria acciti foddum ac tunc praetorio dioce.
The whole expression undoubtedly owes its origin to the official/religious language.

Accia ex Etruria seems also to have been familiar with objects other than aruspices.¹ Note the following: Liv. 1.35.9 acui purileisque ex Etruria maxime acciti; 1.35.6 vates ... ex Etruria accipientes;¹ 1.56.1 fabris unique ex Etruria accitis; 2.49.10 accito ex Etruria exercitu; 7.2.4 ludiones ex Etruria accitij; 29.34.2 ex Etruria ... acciri placuit; Tac. II.24.2 Etruria Lucaniacae at omni Italia in senatum accitos.

Thus in the present passage Tacitus has slightly varied (by the substitution of a Tuscis for ex Etruria) a stock phrase. Observe that at Liv. 1.35.9 and 7.2.4 above the reference is, as here, to the importation of stage performers.

Accio may have survived in officialiaese in various other expressions. Varro has it once (ling. 6.69) in reference to a summons issued by a praeco; and again (ap. Bell. 13.12.6) in a discussion of the right of summons possessed by various magistrates (in an expression -
accipier iubeo - used often by both Livy and Tacitus). 3

But in ordinary usage the word had little or no currency. 4 It
is used most frequently by Livy (over 30 times) 5 and Tacitus. Tacitus
has it in various Livian expressions, some of which no doubt belonged to
the stock of historiographical phraseology: III.45.2 (cf. IV.13.2)
accipier auxiliis (cf. Liv. 2.53.1, 10.10.1; perhaps in use in the
military language: cf. B. Afr. 26.3 coriis auxilius accipier);
III.51.1 placuit ... accipier (cf. Liv. 3.46.5, 5.8.12, 5.46.7, 23.22.10,
23.25.10, 29.49.7; perhaps officialise: note the contexts in which it
is used by Livy); 12.14.4 accipierus in renum (cf. Liv. 1.35.3);
14.6.1 litteris accipier (for parallels, see above, 6.1 n.); 11.36.3
accipier ullo (cf. Liv. 10.19.1); 15.38.4 accipier ... ex castris (cf.
Liv. 3.46.5, 5.8.12).

21.1 honos loco ortus: in the minor works Tacitus prefers natus
to ortus (12:3), but in the historical works ortus predominates (24:8).
Ortus (in this sense) was a literary or slightly artificial word, used
only sparingly by writers of ordinary prose. Caesar and the ps.
Casaerian writers, for instance, have natus 16 times, but ortus only
3 times, Cicero natus over 100 times in the speeches, ortus 13 times,
Quintilian natus 36 times, ortus 3 times, ps. Quintilian (decl. min.)
natus 18 times, ortus never, and Petronius natus 8 times, ortus never.
Often *ortus* is adopted by Tacitus when, as here, the emphasis is on the social status of the subject at birth: of Agric. 6.1 *splendidiae natibus ortam*; 3.30.2 *aquestri ortum loco*; 4.52.2 *cælestis sanguine ortum*; 12.37.1 *claria maioribus ortum*; 12.57.2 *resibus argentiae ortus*; 14.55.1 *tantis maioribus ortam*; 14.55.5 *aquestri et provinciali loco ortus*; 15.72.2 *natae libertina ortus*.

All 3 examples of the word in Caesar are used in the same way, as are most of the 17 in Livy and about half of the 13 in Cicero's speeches. There are only one or two similar instances of *natus* in Tacitus.

The word most commonly used by Tacitus in the historical works with the sense 'natus' is *genitus* (40 times), a term of higher stylistic level than either *ortus* or *natus*. It is avoided by Caesar, Seneca the Elder, ps. Quintilian, and Petronius, and found only once in Cicero (philosophical works). Livy, however, has it 19 times (only 4 times in the first decade), Velleius Paterculus 10 times, and Valerius Maximus 9 times. In the minor works of Tacitus there is only one example, and that in a special phrase: Dial. 12.4 *aemine ac uulilllos dis genitos sacrosae reges, inter duos neminem causidicam, sed Orpheus et Linus no, ni intrusnicere altius velis, inueni Apollo nomen accidens* (from the speech of Katerinus which Secundus — 14.2 — compares in style with poetry). Five of the six instances in Quintilian are very similar: in each case the notion of divine agency is present:

1.10.9 *mitium alicis, Orpheus et Linus: quorum utrumque dis genitus;*
3.7.5 *ut genitum (Romulum) praeside bellorum deo incredibile non esset;* 3.7.8-9 *addunt etiam diis honores parentes, ut si quis sit filius Iovis, addit antiquitas, ut iis, qui sunt ex Chao, progenies quorum, ut Apollo et Diana Letonae laudandum in quibusdam, quod geniti immortales ...;* 3.2.1 *nam cui dubium est, quin semen ab ipsa perum natura geniti primitus homines acceperint;* 10.1.109 *dono quodam providentiae genitus.*

Tacitus also uses *genitus* when the reference is to the social status of someone at birth, but proportionately less often than *ortus.* Livy uses it thus only twice (25.2.11, 40.9.2).

21.2 *parentum sedes theatro locata sit:* Tacitus has been careful to vary the expression *mensuram theatris sedem posisset* (20.2), though some 30 lines have elapsed since its occurrence.

21.3 The three short sentences *ortorum ... quaerit* (observe that they form part of an indirect speech) contain a number of examples of alliteration: *vatum victorias incitamentum in genis* (juxtaposed alliterative pairs; see 30.3 n.); *laetitiae maria quam lasciviae* (an alliterative antithesis, with accompanying homoeoptoton). For a
comparable accumulation of alliterative expressions in a speech, see 1.2 and notes.

21.4 dnonestamento: a Gallustian word (Hist. frag. 1.86, 1.55.22) for dedecus. In the Annals it occurs only in the later books.

21.4 Gracchi amictus, qui per consilia plenique incassarent, tum exolerant: most modern editors (e.g. Nipperdey, Fisher, Maha, Furneaux, Fuchs, Drexler, Koesterwain), following Heinsius, change exolerant (M) to exolerunt. However, the use of the pluperfect for the perfect, though largely avoided by Caesar and Cicero (outside the letters) is frequent enough in Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. Moreover the usage tends to occur in statements which are incidental to the writer's main subject. So here Tacitus has added a parenthetical remark to his account of the games. Cf. II.75 tum ipse exercitusque, ut nullo salmo, saevitia libidine raptu in externas mores proriperunt (note the preceding tum, as above; the passage is a virtual digression); III.51.1 distulerant (digression).
Notes

1. With certain objects other than haruspices, the phrase may also have been in use in official capacity; or it may have been a literary generalisation of the original haruspices ex Etruria acciti.

2. cf. Lucan 1.585 placuit Tuscas ... acciri vates.

3. e.g. Liv. 3.38.13, 7.39.13, 10.38.7, 10.42.3, 23.22.10, Tac. 1.71.1, 1.80.1, 15.55.1.

4. Cicero has it at rep. 2.25 (in a passage on ancient Roman history), de orat. 3.141 (on Greek history), Att. 13.40.1, and in the passage quoted above.

5. See tll. 9 (1694), 582f.

6. The other example of genitus in Quintilian is at 2.4.19: aut de serpente, quod Scipio traditum genitus (also denoting a supernatural birth).

7. M. 22. 321; Weismull. on Liv. 2.18.9; Draeger, II.

22.1 *inter quaes* while *interea* (-i) often indicates a complete change of scene, *inter quaes* is usually used by Tacitus to preface an event which occurs among the proceedings which he is narrating. In a number of places, for instance, it introduces one among various transactions of a senatorial sitting. Here, however, it could have been replaced by *interea*.

*Inter quaes* occurs first in Livy and is then found mainly in history and artificial prose (Ogilvie VII.1.2132/ff.). *Inter haec*, which Livy prefers to *inter quaes*, replaces *inter quaes* in Tacitus when there is a preceding word in its clause (Dial. 39.3, 11.35.1).

22.1 *adensis*: the past participle of the simple verb *adenuor* is never used by Tacitus (and is elsewhere confined to early Latin). All examples of *adensis* should be disregarded in a comparison of the distributions of *adenuor* and *adensis*. The compound all but replaces the simple verb in the later books.

22.2 *hunc illum minime dux destinari credebat*: the highly unusual construction *hunc illum (= hunc esse illum qui)* is found twice in Virgil in contexts similar to that here (dealing with the divine summons of Aeneas to power): Aen. 7.255 *hunc illum fatis extrema ab*
sede profectus/portandi genera paribusque in regna vocari/suscilis;
7.272 hunc illum posceres fata. Tacitus probably had Virgil in mind. He ironically implies that in popular rumour Plautus was a dux fatalis like Aeneas.

Significantly the poeticism dapes occurs in the same sentence, though found nowhere else in Tacitus: the divine will is revealed by the lightning which struck Nero's request.

22.3 nemotus his: an idiom much liked by Tacitus in this section of the Annals: see Heubner on Hist. II.2.1.

22.3 commone t ad Plautum litteras, consuleret quieti urbis: the omission of finit ut is, from the classical period onwards, mainly historiographical. It also occurs in official style: cf. Sall. Cat. 29.2 senatus decrevit, darent operam consules; Caes. cfr. 1.7.5 ut decreatum darent operam negotiatorum. Tacitus has the construction only in the historical works, and there largely in the Annals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subordinate verb is usually, as here, placed at the beginning of its clause, probably to establish the construction at the outset for
the purposes of clarity. When there are two subordinate clauses, the order is often chiastic, with the verb of the first in the initial position, and that of the second enclosing the whole construction:

e.g. 12.35.1 stimulásat Claudiam, consuleret ræi publicae. Britanniæ

muritian robors circumdiaret (cf. 1.68.1, 2.72.1, 17.27.3, 15.11.3, 15.17.3, 16.10.4).

At 12.49.2 - cum rediret in Syria inbetur - Heestermann without justification changes rediret to redire. No reader would have been tempted to take cum with rediret. For it is obvious from the context that the construction is cum inverese.
Notes

1. e.g. 2.34.1, 3.33.1, 3.58.1, 6.6.2, 12.53.1. Eriksen (45ff.) makes no allowance for the difference between inter quae and interea.

2. TLL VI.2-3, 2742.82.

3. Bo.~Sz, 529f., 532f.

4. See Bo.~Sz, 533 and Weiss.4ULL. on Liv. 27.10.2. It is unnecessary to add ut at Liv. 3.4.3 (see Ogilvie ad loc.): neque iam daretur videret ne quid res publica detrimenti caperet.

5. The formula velen + plun. subj. (Dial. 14.2) may be disregarded.

6. II.45.1, III.10.4, III.64.1, IV.20.2; 1.35.2, 1.35.5, 1.41.3, 1.44.1, 1.68.1, 2.17.2, 2.21.2, 2.26.2, 2.40.2, 2.65.2, 2.72.1, 2.79.1, 3.10.1, 3.16.4, 4.73.3, 4.74.2, 5.11.2, 6.17.1, 6.36.2, 6.37.4, 11.15.3, 11.25.3, 11.31.1, 11.31.2, 11.36.1, 11.37.2, 12.25.1, 12.49.2, 12.63.1, 12.65.3, 13.5.2, (Koest. alters occurreret to occurreo), 13.9.1, 13.15.2, 13.27.3, 14.30.3, 15.3.1, 15.11.3, 15.17.3, 15.63.1, 15.64.3, 15.66.1, 16.10.4.

Note that the usage tends to occur in clusters in the Annals.
23.1 *quibus excisis metum hostium intenderet:* in Tacitean usage the
archaism *quia* would hardly have been possible here.¹ *quia* is almost
invariably preferred when (1) there is a word in agreement in the same
clause (especially, as here, in ablative absolutes) (16 times);² or
(2) there is no expressed antecedent (27 times).³

*metum intenderet:* for *intendere* in this sense (almost = *auxeo*),
see III. VII. 1. 2115. 1 ff. (first in Sallust, then in imperial — mainly
artificial — prose). *Auxere metum* (*timorem*, etc.) is the usual
frag. 6. 7. 4, Cass. *giv.* 2. 29. 1, 3. 64. 2).

23.1 *illo poenit, non inponere excediunt:* it has been shown by
Wolfflin⁴ and others⁵ that the monosyllabic forms of *ire* (and certain
other forms such as *iux*) are avoided in late popular Latin for the
corresponding forms of *vade* and *ambule*. In the Vulgate, for instance,
the singular imperative *i* is not used, but *vade* occurs 101 times; the
plural *ite*, however, is found 66 times, but *vadite* never. Hoffmann
sought to trace the beginnings of the disappearance of *i* and *it* back
to Vitruvius, from the letters of Cicerono.⁶

In certain respects the view of Wolfflin and his followers, now
generally accepted, requires modification. The avoidance if \( i \) and \( it \) is not a characteristic of colloquial/vulgar Latin alone, nor is it mainly late; rather, it is a feature of literary prose (of a variety of genres) in both the late Republic and early Empire.

Thus Cicero has almost 260 examples of \( i \)re, but only 2 monosyllabic forms, of which one (Ep. carj. 13) is in a formula (i.e., \textit{actor}) from the official language (see below), and the other is linked with a supine in a fixed expression: \textit{nat.} 3.74, \textit{essem} \textit{it}

\textit{actor}. Similarly, of over 450 instances of \( i \)re in Livy, only 6 are monosyllabic (1.25.7, 1.26.11 bis, 3.46.3, 8.7.19, 9.11.13), and all of these are in the same official phrase as that used by Cicero.

Sallust, Caesar, Valerius Maximus, Velleius, Pliny the Younger, Pliny the Elder, and Suetonius all use \( i \)re more or less frequently but avoid the monosyllables completely.\(^7\) There is one example of \textit{it} in Petronius, but it is in what was undoubtedly a popular formula: 47.6

\textit{anathemiassis in cerebrum it}.\(^6\) Finally, both monosyllabic examples in Quintilian (6.5.73, 9.2.8), who uses \( i \)re 47 times, are in quotations.

Tacitus has \( i \)re well over 100 times, but avoids the monosyllabic forms as well as \textit{it}.\(^9\)

One of the words employed as a partial substitute for the avoided forms of \( i \)re is \textit{urpe}.\(^10\)
Thus, of the 5 examples of *pergo* expressing motion in the speeches of Cicero, 4 are in forms in which *ire* is not used (imperative singular, first person singular perfect): 

1. *ex. agr. 2.58* 
   *perse in Sicilian; cat. 1.10 pergo suo coepisti; ib. 23 recta perna in exilio*; 
   *Flcn. 98 in Macedoniam ad Flaccimnagis perresi.* 

Note that, while Cicero has *ire* 6 times in polysyllabic forms with the phrase *in exilium* in the speeches against Catiline (1.20, 1.22, 1.23, 2.12, 2.15, 2.16), at *cat. 1.23* (above) he replaces it by *pergo* in the same expression when an imperative is required.

Livy uses *nemit* and *perse* very frequently. That *nemit* in particular was a deliberate substitute for the corresponding form of *ire* can be seen from its frequent occurrence in phrases or phrase-types in which *ire* is used in non-monosyllabic forms:

- *9.41.10* ad urbe ... magnis itineribus pergit. 
- *28.17.11* quo ... itineribus magnis ierat (cf. 8.30.12, 26.25.17).

1. *23.4* infesto exercitu in agrum Albanum pergit. 

- *4.39.9* ad urbe ... pergit (cf. 37.13.10). 
- *7.39.17* iam antque confestia ad urben (3.50.13, 3.51.4).
It is of note that after the first decade Livy largely replaces *pergit* by *ire* (in keeping with his liking for abundance of expression, *lactea ubertas*). In books 1-10 *pergit* occurs 17 times (as a verb of motion), but in books 21-45 only 6 times. *Ire* *pergit* appears first at 21.57.9, and is thereafter used 15 times. Observe in particular the following: 27.15.4 *ire* *obsuna hosti pergit* (for the usual *obsuna ire*; cf. 2.6.3, 9.23.4); 12 23.22.11 (cf. 21.57.9) *pergit* *ire* ... *ad urbem* ... *conspiciendam* (cf. 26.44.6 above); 26.17.3 (cf. 30.8.2, 30.11.5) *pergit* *ad hostes ire* (cf. 28.1.9, 37.37.5 above); 33.1.2 *pergit* *ire* *ad urbem* (cf. 4.39.9, 7.39.17 above); 25.15.10
cum peditum omne infestis signis ire ad urbem permitt (cf. 1.23.4 above).

Sallust has permitt 8 times, Tacitus 14. The following passages show that for Tacitus permitt and ire were interchangeable in sense:

II.59.2 exercitus itinera terrestri perrgare iubet.

II.66.3 legiones ... eo flexu itinaris ire iubet, quo ...

6.44.1 nec ultra moratus ... permitt properus.

II.43.1 irret propere nee remanendo ... (cf. 13.19.4, 14.7.5).

15.59.1 fuere qui ... hortarentur Pisonem perrgare in castra (cf. 1.18.1).

II.31.1 ceteri circumstrepunt, irret in castra (cf. 1.17.2, 13.14.3).

With the present passage, cf. Liv. 1.23.4 infesto exercitu in agrum Albanum permitt. As an epithet of exercitus Livy has infestus 10 times, infensus never. Infensus exercitus is found previously only in Sallust (hist. frg. 2.92). Infensus is an elevated equivalent of infestus, employed only by Virgil, Livy, and Tacitus with any frequency (see the table at TH VIII.1.1465.30 ff.). Tacitus is unique among extant authors in using it more often than infestus (68:27). The latter predominates in the minor works (6:1).
ad occasionem: the accus. c. infin. is used 10 times with amarus by Tacitus (only in the historical works), but is rare in earlier Latin. It is found first in Sallust, who has it once (Hist. IV. 5.88), then twice in Livy (23.28.5, 33.5.4), and occasionally in imperial poetry and artificial prose (ILL VI.2-5, 2123, 2487).

Amarus is not particularly common in Republican or early imperial prose, but is a favourite word of Tacitus. Here, as elsewhere, he uses it in a context in which acio, in a subordinate clause (e.g. after acem) would have been expected in less affected prose. Most instances of acio in Tacitus either occur in the minor works or in speeches in the historical works, or perform functions for which amarus would have been impossible. None is found after cum, quod, quin, sin. Amarus frequently follows a verb, as here, and expresses a reason for the action described by the verb: cf., e.g. II.20.2 consilia curaque in omninatione placentiae marno terrors vertit, amarus, ut initia bellii provenientic, hum in cetera fore; 4.69.3 ut non in cura quaque semina futuri exiti meditaetur, amarus praeter omen et insidias maria oportunum.

23.2 adversus ... adversus: for variation of this type, cf. 1.9.5 amud ... amut; 4.13.1 amut ... amud.
atque illius rincis quos praecredientem incursaverat Marci:

praecredior here = praetercredor. The use of *praes* = *praeter* in verbal compounds occurs first in Augustan poetry (Propertius, Horace) and is then found in writers of artificial prose under the Empire.\(^1\)

Note the high-flown context of the only instance of the usage in Petronius: 99.3 incultis asperisque racionibus altissimae nives haerent, ant ubi aratro demalecta tallus situl. dum locumia levia pruna
dilabitur. similiter [in pectoribus] in [considerat] formam videm
mentes obsidet, eruditis praelabitur.

It has been argued\(^1\) that the equivalence of *praes* to *praeter* in such compounds is apparent rather than real: in an example such as Tac. 5.10.3 Torquatum Thermescus sine praelatione (a Tacitean
coinage), *praes* has the sense 'forward' and the accusative is that of distance covered.\(^1\) But this view fails to explain the metaphorical case quoted above from Petronius; moreover even if it were correct, there is no doubt that praelatione + acc. in effect has a sense indistinguishable from that which could be given by *praeterlatione.*

There is only one instance of a compound in *praeter* with literal
sense in Tacitus, and that is found early in the Histories: III.71.1
cito omnes formae at inseminatia foro tenda praelaterecti (praeceberat
is used 3 times elsewhere with the same sense). Tacitus prefers the
more abstruse pra-* formation (10 times).\(^1\)
23.3 *hostilissimus audaciam exterius constuius*: Cicero uses *hostilia* a number of times in a qualitative sense ('befitting an enemy') or with a meaning approaching that of *infestus* (\textit{VII. VI.2-3.3052.28ff.}), but rarely as an equivalent of *hostium*. In the latter sense the word belongs to high, though not necessarily oratorical style (see \textit{VII. VI.2-3.3051.7ff.} for examples). It occurs, for instance, in the example given by the \textit{Rhet. Her.} of the grand style (4.12).\textsuperscript{18}

Tacitus uses *hostilia* for *hostium* 19 times (\textit{Lex. Tac.} 556b). Observe that here two successive adjectives perform the function of genitives; often however Tacitus alternates adjective with genitive.\textsuperscript{19}
Notes

1. On the distribution of *quis* and *quibus* in Tacitus, see now R. H. Martin, 'Quibus and Quis in Tacitus', GC 82 (1960), 144-5. Martin's general conclusions remain unaffected by the slight differences in usage which exist between the two forms.

2. I. 30.1, II. 12.1, II. 12.3, III. 52.3, 2.23.4, 2.45.1, 4.8.4, 6.1.1, 11.2.2, 12.26.2, 12.57.4, 13.49.2, 14.57.1, 15.14.3, 16.17.3. There are 3 similar instances of *quis* (IV. 75.2, IV. 76.2, 11. 31.1), none of which is an ablative absolute with a past participle.


4. ALL 4 (1927), 251.


7. Sallust 42 times, Caesar 62, Valerius Maximus 25, Velleius 4, Pliny the Younger 18, Suetonius 15. On Pliny the Elder, who allows no monosyllabic forms, see A. Monnerford, Eliniana, 49 ff.

9. In poetry both i and it are common.

10. When used as a verb of motion peregrino is usually accompanied by an expressed goal of motion (but see II.59.2, 6.44.1). Since it is often absolute, the two words are not completely interchangeable.

11. The first instance of peregrino, in any form, is found at 9.2.8. For peregrin see 22.19.4, 22.33.9, 23.27.3, 23.28.11, 25.43.5, 25.15.10, 26.11.8, 26.17.3, 29.32.12, 30.6.2, 30.11.5, 33.1.2, 34.25.9, 35.4.3, 35.22.7.


13. Caesar avoids it, and Cicero has it only a few times in the *rhetorica*. Livy uses it 10 times, Sallust 4 times.


15. By *Blase*, l.c.

16. On which see XII.34.1222ff.

17. See *Lex. Tac.* s.v. 'praefero', 'praegredior', 'praefestiio', 'praefluvi', 'praevhor', 'praegnao'.

18. The only other instance of the word in the *Phat. Her.* is in a passage illustrating the figure descriptio (4.51), which is defined thus:

descriptio nominatur sume rerum consequentium continet perspicuum et
dilucidiōn cum gravitate expositionem.

19. See J. Molger, 'Un procédé de style propre à Tacite',

tolerantium: a more stylish word than *fero* and *perfero*

(which Tacitus uses mainly in speeches: see 1.2 n.), as can be seen from its rarity (except in the form *tolerandus*, or with the technical sense 'sustain', 'nourish') in ordinary prose. Cicero, for example, has 8 instances in the speeches and philosophica, of which 6 are in the form *tolerandus*. I closely follow *perfero* (Cat. 2.25), and another is immediately paraphrased by *fero* and *patio*: *Verr. 3.201 quod si hoc minere et hoc recte jut arato tolerane, hoc est Sicilia ferro ac sati potest ... Most of the few examples in Caesar have the technical sense. Petronius avoids the word, Seneca the Elder has it once (*contr. 1.6.6*), ps. Quintilian once (*de or. min. 6.25*), and Quintilian 4 times (*1.10.16, 1.12.8, 6.2.23, 6.3.112*) (twice in the form *tolerandus*).

The historians, in contrast, use it frequently (*Sallust 16 times, Livy 27, Curtius 14, Tacitus 69*). Sallust, like Tacitus, prefers it to *fero* and *perfero*, which he allows once in narrative (*Jul. 52.3*) and twice in speeches (*Jul. 31.11, 55.10*).

445. On *Perox,* see below, 3.2 n.

25.1 *proelium ... adi grant:* In ordinary prose the only objects used with *audere* are neuter adjectives and pronouns. The first writer of prose to allow substantival objects with the verb seems to have been Livy. At 27.9.10 he has the expression *nefas audere,* which is also used by Virgil (ap. 6.62.), at 23.14.3 *capitale fraude ausi,* and in a number of places *facinus audere* (5.24.9, 8.35.6, 23.2.3, 28.27.16), a phrase found previously in both Plautus (*En paeu. 542*) and Terence (*Enni. 959*), and used later by Curtius (4.6.15), Valerius Maximus (5.4. ext. 3), Suetonius (Cat. 49.2), and also by Tacitus (* Agric. 26.1, 1.23, 21.85.2, III.23.2, IV.54.2*).

Since Livy has over 200 examples of *audere,* he has obviously made only a restricted use of the substantival construction.

Tacitus, however, had *audere* with substantives more than 20 times in the historical works. With the present instance, cf. *Stat. Theb. 9.651* *ausum ... incursa* (cf. *III.73.2 incursa ausi; 13.36.1*): *ib. 10.430 balla audere.*

Sometimes it is particularly clear that a verb (infinitive) would have been used either with the substantive or instead of it in ordinary prose: *2.40.3 nec Tibertius poenam alius palam ausus (= ausa punire).*
12.55.1 *vim cultoribus et opidanis ac plerumque in mercatores et
navicularion audebant (= *vim inferre); II.65.1 (cf. 2.12.1) non
ausia ducibus eadem die obnunciosem castrorum (= *obnuncio castra);
2.62.2 *plus ultiones ausus (= *cum ulciscis).

The free use of objects with verbs previously mainly intransitive
is a characteristic of the artificial writers of the Empire, and
particularly of Tacitus (see further on *oro, below).

25.2 *saeclorum oratum: by the time of Tacitus *oro in this sense was
archaic (although in the sense 'speak' it had been revived by
rhetorical writers: see above, 19 n.). Tacitus uses it thus 60
times, always in the historical works. *Rogo, the current term, is
largely avoided, except in the minor works (5 times *Dialogus) and in
technical expressions (*rogo sententiam, *rogo legem) in the historical
works. It is also admitted at 1.13.5, for variation (cf. *exorat,
1.13.6), at 2.31.1, in an indirect speech, at 3.16.1, in a direct
speech (and soon after *oro and *exoror), and at 15.63.1 in the expression
*orat oratum. Only at IV.44.1 is it employed for no apparent reason
in ordinary narrative.

The use of *oro with a substantival object represents a
development first seen in Livy; previously only names or nouns had
been allowed as object of the thing asked for.
Tacitus goes slightly further than Livy in the freedom with which he uses the substantival construction. Of the 26 instances of objects of the thing asked for which he has with *pro*, only 1 (12.7.1 *enim*) is non-substantival; in Livy 6 of 20 are pronominal.5

25.2 attineri a se Velonesian pro minore amicitiae ostentantibus, something of the literal sense of transitive attinere can still be seen at Plaut. *Men.* 759: *sedes* (*pellam*) ante oculos attinere and at *Cont.* 266: *senex est in testudine, nunc ian cultros attinere* (= 'hold near', 'hold at').6 Moreover in two other places in Plautus the prefix seems to retain a certain figurative force: *Bacch.* 131: *ita me vadatum amores vincitaneque attinere* ('you hold me bound (to you)'); *Mil.* 1527: *si foro iudicis, morae, virtus attinere animam iuuenem* ('hold your heart bound (to him)'). At *Truc.* 537: *solutus causae dictat, testis vincitane attinere* / Ch. *solvi* *iatus* ('hold (in custody)') and *Per.* 539: *ita me attinuit, ita definit* ('detain', almost 'delay').7 The word is used more loosely, but in each case the new sense is easily explicable from the old: 'hold to (oneself)' > 'hold (in one's custody)'. But contrast, e.g., *Tac.* 3.36.4: *convictaneque attinere publica custodia insitit*; 6.19.2: *qui carcere attinebantur*; 6.23.2 *in Palatio attinebatur*; 15.57.1: *Volusii Proculi judicio Epicharion attineri*, where *ad-* has no semblance of force: no mention is made of
the subject, in whose possession (ad) the object is held. See 14.4 n. (subico) on the modifications of sense which resuscitated words are prone to undergo.

After Plautus attingere (trans.) fell into disuse. It makes its next appearance in Sallust\(^7\) (Iuc. 108.3, hist. frg. 1.77.16), and is not used again until Tacitus, who no doubt took it from his predecessor (note its absence from other historians, including Livy, and even from the poets).

Tacitus has the word only once in the Historiae,\(^9\) but 26 times in the Annals, usually with the meaning 'aliquo loco retineo'. In this sense retineo is common in the Historiae, but rare in the later books of the Annals in particular (Lex. Tac. 14003).

25.2 patrinia in sedes remansae: in epic remansae is found a number of times in expressions similar to that here: Virg. Aen. 2.95 patriae

vacuum remansae victor ad arma; 11.793 patrinia remansae in urbes;

Cv. nat. 15.430 in patriae remansae; Sil. 14.152 patriae

remansae ad arma; Luc. 1.650 patriae sedes remansae in urbis.

Tacitus seems to have recalled this almost formulaic use of the word.\(^10\)

Remansae belongs above all to post-Augustan epic and tragedy (only twice in Virgil and 3 times in Ovid, but 11 times in Lucan, 11 times in Valerius Flaccus, 27 times in Silius Italicus, 12 times in Statius.
and 16 times in Seneca's tragedies). In prose it is used often enough by Tacitus (15 times) and Pliny the Elder (23 times), but is elsewhere very rare. The only instance in Cicero is technical: nat. 2.116 *cum uoce consumpto necessitas nulla proest nec remanset aer*; for the disproportionate frequency of the simple verb *eo* in reference to such incorporalia, see *Dei VIII. 785. 52ff.*. All 3 examples of *remeo* in Seneca's prose (contrast the frequency of the word in the tragedies, above) are also used of incorporalia: *dial. 1.6.9* *give* *necessus inimica remansit inter secidit*; *en. 35.11* *observat orem curum in se remanunt*; *ib. 86.15* *agit illa continuus ordo fatorum et inevitabilis cursum per states viciss remansit et effectus rerum curium aut provent aut notant*. *Gr. ps. Quint decl. mai. p.10,16* *nec remanser* *viventes a cinerea semen*. 11

Livy has *remeo* only 3 times (9.3.7, 9.16.3, 21.3.5) and Sallust avoids it. Clearly Tacitus' liking for the word is to be ascribed to his poetizing tendency rather than to the influence of the historiographical tradition.
Notes

1. See Til. II.125.18ff. Quint. 5.6.45 vem aceleratissimum (cf. Liv. 2.10.11, 25.23.15) may be disregarded.

2. Twice in 5 chapters in book 12 Tacitus has the striking variant acies audere (20.1, 32.1).

3. See the full discussion by F. Heerden, Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Semantologie III (Erlangen, 1881), 8ff.; esp. 72ff. (on the decline of the word in ordinary imperial prose).

4. o.c., 527.

5. l.c.

6. See Lindsay ad loc.

7. There is an example in an unassigned dramatic fragment quoted by Cicero, orat. 157.

8. At Cic. inv. 2.169 - potentia est ad sua conservanda et alterius aeternandi idoneorun rerum facultas - aeterni (P) is possible, for the early De inventione contains words which were archaic by the later period of Cicero's career (see P. Thielmann, De semina proprietatis cune lectorum eud Cornificiun at in primis Ciceronis libris (Strassburg, 1679), 4), but aeterni (Skl) gives a far better antithesis.

9. II.11.3 delectans arma conios forant, ni victorem exercitum aitius acie obscures noctis, obtenti audientibus. Note the Virgilian phrase obscures noctis (Georg. 1.478).
10. Note that the Virgilian phrase resero victorem (in the first passage quoted above) also became formulaic in later poetry: Val. Flacc. 4.589 remaeque victorem ab oris; 6.344 Hesychius pronius remaeavit ab hospite victorem; Luc. 2.383 Smythiel. Cæsari victorem remaeavit ab oris; 3.75 31 remaeavit in urbem victorem; Sen. Agam. 412 remaeque victorem similis, exiisse iungens/lageramus victorem classe de tanta rebus.

11. Varro uses remae twice (mast. 3.5.7, 3.7.1) (of the flight of birds: for remae in this sense, see III. VII. 795.4ff.), Columella 4 times, and Lel. 5 times. Caesar, Nepos, Vitruvius, Seneca the Elder, Petronius, Quintilian, and ps. Quintilian (decl. min) et al. avoid it.
cadibus et incendiis nemorumatus: nemorumor, used only here by Tacitus (nemoror 13 times), is found elsewhere only in Livy (8 times). That Tacitus took the word directly from Livy is highly likely, for at 3.36.10 - am mc urca et inca coloniae nemorae et Romines can cadibus et incendiis nemorumatus esse - Livy has it with the same expression (cadibus et incendiis) as that with which it is used here.

cadibus et incendiis: a stock alliterative phrase used 20 times by Cicero, once by Hirtius, 4 times by Tacitus, 9 times by Livy (2.17.2, 2.54.3, 5.39.11, 22.3.6, 22.14.4, 25.25.6, 31.56.10, 36.43.5, 43.5.4), and once by Sallust (Cat. 43.2). All 4 Tacitean instances are in slightly different forms: at 2.52.2 the usual order is reversed (incendia et caeda), at III.81.2 both words are singular (caede et incendio), and at V.25.1 one is singular, the other plural (caede et incendiis). Note that the form adopted here is identical to that found in the Titiarian passage quoted above.

Cicero usually has caedes in the singular, incendium in the plural; Livy however prefers the plural of both words.

The Tacitean variant igne et caedibus (2.8.4), a conflation of caedes + incendia and ferro et igne, appears to be unique (no parallel quoted by Titi). Cf. D.35.2 capitis patibula, ignem crucem, where
qusilae goes naturally with jama, and matihula with omma (see note ad loc.).

26.2 superbia Parthenium nemisi: neronia is a race and mainly poetic word which is found first in Virgil but is undoubtedly older. The present example looks like a reminiscence of Liv. 1.39.4: superbia violatianum neronia remis (all 3 instances in Livy are in the third book). It so, Tacitus has twice recalled Livy in the same chapter.
Notes

1. For a full collection of examples from these three authors, see Wöflin, Auswahlte Schriften (Leipzig, 1933), 255.

2. Ciceron has causae before incendia 15 times, the reverse order 5 times (Wöflin, l.c.); in Livy causae always precede. It is natural in Latin to arrange words linked by copulatives in order of ascending length.

3. Caesar is plural at Cat. 3.21; incendium is singular at Cat. 4.4, Phil. 1.39.

4. Caesar is singular at 2.17.2, 5.39.11; incendium is singular at 2.17.2.

5. See Norden, Anm. VI, 216.
necus consistitis suscipiens necae aleoria libera sunt.

continuus is standard in poetry for the normal matrimonium (which is impossible in dactylic verse), but is very rare in prose. It is avoided by Caesar, Callistus, Cicero in his speeches, Livy, Velleius, Senecha the Elder, Seneca the Younger (in prose; in the tragedies it is found 19 times), Petronius, Quintilian, and Pliny the Younger, et al. The single instances in Nepos (Gim. 1.3) and ps. Quintilian (def. min. 161.22) both follow closely upon matrimonium (variation).

The word is occasionally employed in prose to impart vagueness, when the writer wishes to imply a distinction between the union which he is describing and the regular Roman matrimonium. Thus it is applied more than once (nat. 10.104., 11.34) by the elder Pliny (and also by certain late authors: TII. IV.325.72F.) to the unions of animals; and Cicero has it at nat. 2.70 in reference to the ties undertaken by the gods.

Again, it is sometimes used to denote marriage as one of the bonds which underlie the societas vitae. In such cases its connection with nuptae (continua) is uppermost in the author's mind. The remaining 4 examples in Cicero's philosophical works (cf. 1.54, Tusc. 5.5, Fin. 4.17, 5.65) fall into this category, as does the one instance in Columella (12.pr.1).

When applied to normal Roman matrimonium continuus may have had a certain active content (cf. 'union', the English word to which it
most nearly corresponds. Unlike *matrimonium*, it is particularly common in grave inscriptions (see *TL* IV.325.5), the language of which is often affective. Again, the only instance in the letters of Cicero (Att. 8.6.1) refers to a marriage of emotional significance for Cicero: that of his daughter. Finally, note the pathetic tone of Suet. *Aug.* 99.1: *omnia debeo dimissis, dum adventissent ab urbe de Drusi filia aegra interrogat, repente in osculis Liviae et in hac voce, deficit: 'Livia, nostri coniugii minor vive, et vale' (perhaps a reminiscence of inscriptive language).

Tacitus uses *coniugium* more often (12 times, only in the *Annals*) than any writer of prose down to his time.

Here, as at 3.25.1 and 11.34.1 it is juxtaposed with *liberi*, probably on the analogy of the set phrase *coniux et liberi* (see below, 34.2 n.). *Coniugium suscipere* is virtually equivalent to *coniugem ducere*.

At 4.40.3, 12.6.3, 13.19.3, and 14.1.2 it is simply a variant following *matrimonium*.

At 2.86.2 - *mater eis in eodem coniurio manebat* - Tacitus may have had in mind the sepulchral formula *uno coniurio vixerunt* (e.g. *CIL* VI.35469; cf. *TL* IV.325.5).

No special reason can be seen for the use of the word in the remaining places in which it occurs.
27.3 *non enim, ut olim:* _enim_, unlike _nam_, is unusual in the narrative of the _Historiae_ and _Annales_, except in the expression _neque enim_ and _exceptam_ (on which see below, n.3). Its use here, however, was almost unavoidable, without a recasting of the sentence. _Nam_ sometimes follows _nam_ in Tacitus, but only when it can be placed alongside the verb (see _Lex._ _Tac._ 966afr.). Here the presence of _ut olim_ causes the negative to be separated from the verb.

In the historical works there are 26 examples of _enim_, apart from special cases.3 Of these, 20 are found in speeches.4 Clearly the word had a strong oratorical ring, for it is largely confined to speeches by Sallust also.5 The more rhetorical _Livy_, however, uses it frequently in the narrative as well as in speeches.

Of the 6 examples which occur in the narrative in Tacitus, 1 is found only in the _Historiae_ (1.51.3), and 2 follow verbs (3.36.1, 3.60.1).6 There remain 3.38.1, 5.3.1, and 6.38.1.

27.3 _affectus affectus materiae:* _affectio_ rather than _affectus_ was the standard word in Republican prose (see _PL._ I 1.1173.25ff. for _affectio_ in the sense - 'propensa voluntas' - borne here by _affectus_; Cicero has the latter only at _Tusc._ 5.47. But in the first century A.D. _affectum_ almost completely displaces _affectio_, in all genres:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>affectus</th>
<th>affectio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seneca (rhet.)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca (phil.)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Maximus</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celsus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny the Elder</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintilian</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa. Quintilian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacitus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the formation -tus was moribund in the early Empire (see below) as a source of new verbal abstracts, there are some parallel instances of an increase in the popularity of an already existing substantive in -tus at the expense of its previously preferred synonym in -tio. Contemptio, for example, is used 29 times in late Republican prose (Cicero, Caesar, Rhet. Her.); but contemptus only once (Caez. Cal. 2.30.4), and then in the fixed phrase contemptui est; in the early imperial period, however, the form in -tus drives that in -tio out of use (see the table at Th. IV.658). Again, actio is rare in certain senses before Seneca the Elder and Valerius Maximus, but thereafter it encroaches noticeably on actio (as indicated by Klotz, ThL I.499.47ff.). We owe to Quintilian the information that excessio (= 'digression') was at his time of writing being replaced by excessus: 3.9.4 excessio vero vel,
Abitus and ambitio are for the most part distinctive in sense (see OLD, s.v., for a good differentiation), but ambitus acquires at least one meaning in the first century which had previously belonged only to ambitio ('desire for advancement', 'ambition'). Finally, the rhetorical term praetorius overtakes praetorius in Quintilian (see Bornell, s.v.), though at the end of the Republic the latter had been preferred.

It is of note that Tacitus inclines strongly to the current auctus, even though he could have used an old-fashioned word, auctio. It is a feature of his historical style that when given a choice between a substantive in -tus and one in -tio, he usually prefers that in -tus (his preference for dominio in the striking exception: see above, 2.2 n.; cf. actio, actus, Lex. Hag., s.v.). Thus auditus, continuius, excessio, posterior, relatus, and vestitus are all generally used instead of their synonyms in -tio. Also, status is preferred to statio, contractus to contractio, and vanitus to vanitia.

It will be useful to discuss each of these words separately:

auditus: Tacitus had auditus 6 times, auditio only once (the two terms are largely interchangeable in sense, although auditio has one meaning not possessed by auditus: 'recitatio', 'oratio': see TLL II.1292.52ff.). Seneca the Elder and Quintilian prefer auditio (6:-), Flavius the Elder auditus (17:1).
contemptus: Tacitus uses contemptus 9 times, contemptio only twice (11.20.1, 15.1.2). Moreover both instances of the latter were adopted for a special purpose: to furnish a word with passive sense. All 9 examples of contemptus are active (this distinction between the two words in Tacitean, not general). Obviously Åkerblom (17) was mistaken in regarding the appearance of contemptio in the later books as evidence for the movement of Tacitus' style towards 'normality' (note, moreover, that by Tacitus' time contemptus was the more 'normal' term: see above).

accessus: unlike accessus, accessio is not found until late Latin with literal force. But both words, according to Quintilian (4.5.12) were employed as rhetorical technical terms to translate παρέξεσθαι ('digression'): hanc partem παρέξεσθαι vocatur Graeci, latini accessum vel accessionem. Quintilian himself uses only accessio (see Bonnell, a.v.), while Tacitus prefers accessus at 4.32.1.

positus: mainly poetic. Positio, however, is found 3 times, for instance, in the elder Seneca, 12 times in the younger Seneca, and 20 times in Quintilian. Tacitus uses positio in the minor works, positus in the Annals. Cf. Dial. 15.7 edem positio enzil siderum; ann. 6.21.2 positus siderum non stutia dimensus.
relatus: Tacitus twice employs relatus of narration. Relatio, the usual first century word in this sense (see Bonnell, s.v.), he allows only as a senatorial technical term.

venatus: it is not possible to determine the stylistic levels of venatus and venatio in the first century A.D.: neither is common in ordinary prose. At the end of the Republic, however, venatio had been the usual term. Pliny the Elder prefers venatus (19:4). Tacitus has venatus 5 times, venatio once.

astus: Tacitus is the only extant writer who uses astus in any case other than the ablative singular (3 times, in the Annals). Astutia, the normal word, he has only once, in a speech (13.36.2).

contactus: found first in Sallust's Histories, then in poetry and artificial prose. It was never accepted into ordinary usage. Tacitus uses it 6 times, always in the ablative singular, but avoids contacitio.

raptus: Tacitus is apparently the first prose author to use raptus in the same sense as rapina (11 times). For the sense, cf. Liv. 26.40.17 per latrocinia ac rapinar tolerantes vitae; Tac. Germ. 35.2 nullis raptibus aut latrociniiis populantur.
The proportion of substantives in -tio to those in -tus is about 3:1 in the language as a whole, at all periods. In Tacitus, however, it is 1:1. These figures will illustrate Tacitus' unusual liking for words in -tus. The comparative incidence of the two formations in his contemporary Quintilian is about the same as in the language as a whole.

As well as using existing words in -tus when possible, Tacitus coined a number of others; he does not, however, admit neologisms in -tio. I have found the following in -tus: adductus, aditus, advertere, sinecitus, distinctius, succensus, presentus, subvertere. But almost all other writers of the period are markedly more willing to introduce words in -tio than in -tus. The following table shows coinages in the two formations in a selection of first century authors: 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-tio</th>
<th>-tus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca the Elder</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca the Younger</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny the Elder</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celsus</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribonius Largus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintilian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearly -tus was relatively infertile: it provides a proportionately large number of new words only in the highly affected stylist Pliney the Elder. The formation -tio, on the other hand, obviously had considerable vitality in the rhetorical schools, medicine, architecture, and philosophy. Moreover, unlike -tus, it is the source of some neologisms in the non-technical Petronius. 10

In the light of these statistics, Tacitus’ avoidance of coinages in -tio, and his marked general liking for -tus words, become partially explicable. Words in -tio, particularly neologisms, probably evoked associations with the language of rhetoric, philosophy, and other technical subjects, which a historian would wish to avoid. For an archaicist the almost dead -tus formation would have held greater dignity.
Notes

1. *Matrimonium* designates the state of marriage, nuptiae usually the ceremony by which one enters *matrimonium*: of. *pa. Quat. Accl. min.*
   11.4. "uxor est, una ver nuptias a parentibus in matrimonium tradit in societate multis annis lucat."

2. Columella may have taken the word from Cicero's translation of Xenophon's *Aeschylos*, to which he is referring.

3. I cite instances of (a) *animum* and *nemus animum*, to neither of which there is a corresponding use of *nunn*; (b) parenthetical *animum*, which for the most part is employed differently from parenthetical *unnia*; the former (Lex. Tac. 3.7a) follows *ipn* 4 times, *as (id, etc.) 5 times, hioc twice, and *utrumque, irasc., and int. once*; *unnia*, however, with very few exceptions, as found before substantives, adjectives, and, occasionally, verbs (Lex. Tac. 891a); and (c) *animum* in direct questions (Lex. Tac. 745a-b): almost without exception, the few examples of *unnia* in questions are separated from the interrogative word of the sentence (Lex. Tac. 895a); *unnia*, however, frequently comes immediately after the interrogative.

4. 1.30.1, 2.4.2.2, 1.59.3, 1.69.3, 2.38.2, 2.38.2, 2.55.1, 3.6.1, 3.55.2, 3.70.2, 4.20.3, 4.35.4, 4.40.4, 6.8.3, 11.17.1, 13.4.2, 14.55.3, 15.1.4, 15.55.3, 16.2.2.

5. See *PfI* V.2.570.611f.; Buns, *Sallustianum* (Leipzig, 1897), 46.
   Axel, *Unpoet. Text.* 122f. has shown that *unnia* was unpoetic.
6. When a finite verb is placed at the beginning of its clause, it is far more likely to precede *erim* than to follow *per*. Livy, e.g., has verbs almost 70 times before *erim*, but never after *per*; the practice of Caesar is similar (Nerguet, 311 b 4). In Tacitus finite verbs follow *per* at 2.33.1 and 4.37.3 (at 3.7.2 and 12.52.1 the verb is the only word of its clause); for the frequent use of *erim* after verbs, see Lex. Tac. 3.6 b 4.


8. All of these are prepositional compounds formed on an already existing -tus base. Compounding, according to Quintilian (8.3.36), was one of the acceptable methods of coinage. Tacitus would no doubt have been aware of the criticism which Sallust had met because of the excessive boldness of his neologisms (Bell. 4.16.1). *Auggalactus* (13.45.3 *per in urbe auggalactus aequat, provinciae Lucitantiae praefectur*), which would be alien in kind to the above words were it a Tacitean creation for auggalactus, as it has almost universally been regarded (e.g. by the THL, OLP, Lex. Tac.; and by C. Fuchs, *Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Satzgeschichte*, II (Berlin, 1934), 9; of the editors only Walther and Heister interpret the word as a participle), I take as a participle. Perfect participles, particularly of deponent verbs, are not uncommon with present force (see E. Laughton, *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford, 1964), 13f.; cf. Drueger, 84): e.g. 11.5.1 *momento Claudio in rerum...*
necevit, filius Pharamus opibus. Moreover, *ego*, accompanied by an
adverb, adjective, or participle frequently has the sense 'as generis' in Tacitus (Lex. loc. 61): e.g. 14.15.5 quasi per virtutes clarix
honoris ageare. Finally, if *senarius* is a substantive, why is it
plural? There is only one rivalry which Nero hopes to prevent (the from
prosecuting by sending him to Lucania: that with Nero himself.
Furneaux's objection to the participial interpretation, that *senior*
does not appear to be used absolutely by Tacitus elsewhere, carries
little weight: see MIL I.975.4ff. For the absolute use of the word
(both in the Republic and the first century A.D.).

At MIL I.1401.71 (e.g. 'age') *senarius* is taken as a perfect
passive participle (sc. a Nero). But this interpretation destroys
the sense of the passage. Otho is sent to prevent his rivalling Nero,
not to save him from being rivalled by Nero.

9. The figures are taken from Paucker, e.g., 9ff.

10. I have omitted Petronius' *seviratus* and *bonatus*, for both are
denominatives rather than verbal abstractions. Denominatives in -itus
belong mainly to the legal language (*seviratus*; or *consulatus*, etc.);
otherwise they are vulgar (*bonatus* is put into the mouth of Titanius;
cf. Iasius' *licentius*, and Ocelius' *parcicidius*, which is branded
by Quintilian (16.42) as *viro tolerabile*. Messala's coinage *rexix*
(Qunt. 8.3.4) now once vetere moneunt, fuorem olim novum, ut
Messala primus 'rectum, saecularum' Augustus primus dixerunt) was
apparently acceptable as a legalism.
29.1 subjectorum ei provinciarum suae, ut bicunio proculo virissist:

this type of hyperbaton (the verbal substantive is separated from its verb) is frequent, for instance, in Cicero (particularly in the later speeches)\(^1\) and Livy,\(^2\) but comparatively rare, like most types of hyperbaton, in Sallust\(^3\) and Tacitus (cf. 3.2 n.). There are only 22 instances in the whole of the Annales, and of these 13 are, like that here, in speeches or similar contexts.\(^4\) Accompanying inversion, which is common in rhetorical prose (see n.1), is found only twice: once in a speech - 2.26.4 salut adsceticam, si fort eorum Ballardum, relinquet; materiam Drusae Tractis oris et, - and once in a statement made by Tacitus in the first person (4.7.3: see Introduction, p.15).

In 8 places, including this,\(^5\) of which 6 are in speeches (see n.4), the usage occurs in the protasis or apodosis of conditional sentences (traditional: Div. 3.22.9 destatque exercitus hostiam verum; verum; siles tegeissent; cf., e.g. 2.15.10, 2.32.1, 2.32.2, 2.36.15). Similar conditions without hyperbaton are common in the narrative.\(^6\)

29.2 rumores omnii, qui nescire sine aemulo sinit: in the historical works Tacitus uses sine 3 times with a plain accusative (= 'allow': e.g. 2.55.5 desiderium in estra, licentiam in urbem, vasum ac lasciviasen per aemum militem aemulat) and 6 times, as here, with an accusative and accompanying predicate (= 'leave').\(^7\) Both constructions
are found occasionally in poetry (see L.-S. for examples), and that with a predicate is common enough in old Latin (e.g. Cato agr. 113.1, 113.2, Plaut. Hec. 351, Host. 306), but after Cato neither occurs in ordinary prose down to at least the time of Hadrian, and even in the more elevated genres both are rare.

With a plain accusative the word is used before Tacitus only 3 times by Livy (4.2.8, 28.26.11, 34.24.2) and once by the Elder Pliny (6.45). All 3 Livian examples are in the same prayer formula, with either an appositional accusative and infinitive or an explanatory ut clause attached: 4.2.8 ne id Jupiter optimus maximus sine re in mediatione immerium so resideret; 28.26.11 ne inste Jupiter optimus maximus sinit, ut etc.; 34.24.2 'ne inste' incuit 'Jupiter optimus maximus sinit Ianuoric regina ... ut ...'

The predicative construction occurs twice in Livy (2.9.2, 36.26.3) and once in Curtius (4.16.9). There are also 2 examples in Columella (12.54.1 sald ... aspera trideo sinito; 12.57.1 Decubus horiae in aquis sinito), which should be compared with Cato agr. 113.1: sinito dies XV aperta (in all 3 cases the verb is imperative and the predicate is a temporal expression). Obviously, Columella's precepts, if not themselves traditional, were composed in a form traditional in the agricultural language.

Tacitus has the two constructions more often than any earlier writer, in keeping with his taste for the transitive use of verbs.
mainly intransitive (see 25.1 n.).

29.2 Corbulonis concertator: concertator is a Tacitean neologism, coined as a variant for the preceding agculus.

About half of Tacitus' 88 coinages⁹ are prepositional compounds of existing words (on compounding as an acceptable means of coinage, see Quint. 8.3.36 and on affectus, 27.3 n., above), and another 20 are of the commonplace -or formation which Tacitus has used here.¹⁰ Of the remainder some are technical, and were no doubt already in use, though not attested in literature. Clearly Tacitus was conservative in introducing new words. He no doubt wished to avoid criticism of the type to which Sallust had been subjected as an over-bold inventor (see 231.4.15.1).

29.2 Paulinus suetonius ... Corbulonis concertator, receptaque

Armeniae dacs acque domitis parvallibus omnius: parvallius is an archaism, used only here by Tacitus: cf. Varro ling. 5.3 multituba verba claudi non continent, claudi ante significabant, ut hostis: nam tunc co verba dicoquent peregrinum qui sui lexibus literatur, non dicunt cum aenea tunc dicant peregrinam (cf. 7.49, Cic. off. 1.37).

It occurs 6 times in Plautus, but was probably already obsolete.
for it is usually found in mock-official, elevated, or bombastic passages.

From the beginning of the Empire down to the time of Tacitus the word is found only in Livy (5 times) and Pliny the Elder (once). Livy has it only in special contexts: at 25.12.10, in a _causa_; at 29.27.3, in a _prayer_; at 38.30.3, in official style; at 52.30.4, in a reply by the _haruspices_; and at 45.16.7, in a senatorial decree. The Plinian example is in a passage which reads like officialless:

7.166 C. Fabius Lusanus consul, cum Flumen Isarae profito, consiliis adversariis, Allerquinum _venerabili gentis_ a.d. VI Augustus, XCVII perduellium causa, Fabri quartae liberatus est in acie (perhaps in the style of a report to the senate).

With the example here, cf. Liv. 38.50.3, from which it may be inferred that _perduellia_ (in an ablative absolute) occurred in the official phraseology describing the award of a triumph after victory:

seniorum ... _victorum_ exsultum _proditum_ _memoriae_ esse, ut imperator, qui devoti perduellibus, conscripsisset provincia exercitum reportasset, sine _opus_ at laures _privatos_ in _honos_ _suis_ urbanis _inipit_; cf. 29.27.3

_divorus incolisse_ victis perduellibus _victores_ _sulla_ _decorato_ _praeclarae_ _tumulti_ _necum_ _dono_ _vixit_ _istatis_ (a general's prayer that he may return from a campaign in triumph).

Tacitus implies by his use of the formula here that the glory sought by Suetonius was that of a triumph. Hartman's _consulitis reΚellibus_ is unnecessary.
Notes

1. See Norden, *Ant. Kunst*., 203 n. In the early pro. S. Rome, Cicero restricts himself largely to examples of the kind *facta non est* (5), with the negative interposed to avoid the unacceptable *non facta est* (in the best Latin only the collocations *non est factum* and *factum non est* are found: see H. Schneider, *De verbi in lingua Latina, collectione* (Hunster, 1912), 27). Later, however, he allows the device more frequently in positive sentences, often with inversion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total no. of examples</th>
<th>No. with negative interposed</th>
<th>No. with inversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Freig.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hil. (1-70)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil. 2-3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. See Hunster, 315.

3. For a collection of Sallustian examples, see H. Funkhanel, *Vorb und Satz in der lateinischen Prosai bis Sallust* (Leipzig, 1938), 167ff. The usage occurs only twice in the Catiline (add 31.1 to R's instances), is slightly more frequent in the Jugurtha, and may have been common in the Histories.

5. 2.26.1, 2.70.1, 3.16.1, 6.3.4, 12.16.2, 14.7.3, 15.35.3.
6. e.g. 2.39.1, 3.14.6, 8.13.3, 11.19.1, 12.36.3, 12.42.3.
7. It is necessary to distinguish examples of the word which have one or other of these constructions from those with which an infinitive is understood. See NKP. Znte. 1355a for the instances referred to here.
8. Sine is still found occasionally in old Latin in its original sense ('1st go': Hesiod, pararminia, 190), with which it takes the accusative (Plaut. Am. 425). I am not concerned with examples of this type here.
9. See Brauer, 116f., for a list.
10. On which see Paucker, Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte II (Berlin, 1894), 11ff.
11. Apul. 250, 542, Sirt. 203, 211, 222, Paus. 583, 589.
12. See E. Räckel, Hebräisches in Kleuthe (Berlin, 1922), 236.
The account of Suetonius Paulinus' attack on the Druids is composed in a heightened style marked by numerous poetizations, of which some are explicit Virgilianisms.

Tacitus' battle descriptions, unlike those of Livy,¹ do not usually contain accumulations of epic phraseology, though they are sometimes highly rhetorical (2.19, 4.46-51). In this case it was probably the strange character of Suetonius' opponents, with their similarity to the Furies (in modum Furiarum, 1), which fired Tacitus' imagination.

30. 1. aiea, dense amis virisque: in combination with the ablative (almost = 'implatus', 'cooperitus'), dense is almost exclusively poetic (CIL V.1.546.68ff.). It is particularly common in descriptions of foliage, forests, groves, etc.: e.g. Digen 27 opitum silvarum, formosia dense viris; C.G. mar. 3.155 vallia ... ploesia et acuta dense superceau; 14.350 densem tristibus (Fast. 6.9 arboribus) densem.

For an example more similar to that here, cf. Virg. Aen. 10.173 mille rect denseae acies atque horrendibus hastis.

aiea virisque: the formula aiea equi viri (with and without copulative participles), and in particular the derivatives aiea equi,
ama viri and equi viri are found frequently in prose and poetry of all genres and at all periods: e.g. in Plautus (Bacch. 927, Merc. 152), Sisenna ( pry. 113), Cicero (Cacc. 35, Phil. 3.21, 12.9, Off. 3.116, Fam. 9.7.1), Sallust (Cat. 32.20, Jug. 51.1, 57.1, 92.7, hist. Pry. 4.69.16), ps. Sallust (rep. 2.10.7), Caesar (Bull. 7.12.3), Népos (Ham. 4.1), Virgil, 2 Ovid (met. 8.22), Livy (over 70 times: see Rügner, 1515), Seneca the Elder (contr. 2.1.10), Valerius Maximus (5.1.6.5, 7.3.3 bis), Seneca the Younger (Hial 2.4.23, opist. 82.15, Agam. 221), Curtius (3.2.13, 3.3.9, 4.13.1, 4.14.12, 5.10.3, 8.14.1, 8.14.27), Silius Italicus (17.162), Statius (Theb. 7.796, Ach. 2.93), ps. Quintilian (dec. min. 115.22), Suetonius (Aug. 63), and Tacitus (almost 70 times). Since they express the three essential resources of ancient military effort (as can be seen most clearly in Livy), it is probable that they derive ultimately from the old Roman official/military language. Note, e.g., Liv. 44.1.6 audiō sucessorīs adventi cum arma viros equos cum cura inspisset, ornato exercitu obiunctum

ventīdi consuli processit (a description of an official inspection of the three components of an exercitus). The frequency with which the three words, in various combinations, are found in asyndeton (including asyndeton bimembra) bears witness to the antiquity and fossilised nature of their connection. 5

At least one combination, vīri equī, had become so familiar that it could be used proverbially: Cic. off. 3.116 cum his vīris equīsumque,
ut dictur, ... decertandum est (see Otto, Sprichwörter, 126).

Clearly therefore it is unsafe to suppose that any writer, in using one of the formulas, is directly following another writer. Even assuming, with Norden (Aen. VI, 348 n.2), that Ennius had the expression arma viiri, Virgil's arma virunque cano would undoubtedly have been striking to a Roman ear chiefly as an adaptation (note that Virgil has used neither word to denote military resources: arma = 'warfare', and virum refers to an individual) of a military formula so commonplace that it is admitted even by Cicero in his speeches (Cae. 33, Phil. 12.9).

Similarly, it is unlikely that Tacitus intended to recall Virgil in each of the 7 places in which he has arma viiri (cf. Germ. 44.2, 1.67.1, 11.22.1, IV.12.3, IV.59.3, 15.1.4). The expression is inevitable in military narrative and hence is common in the historians. Livy, for instance, employs it no fewer than 23 times, in a variety of contexts (see Fügner, l.c.).
mulierum et fanum aemem: a typically Tacitean expression, for which fanum mulierum aemem could have been substituted. Cf. 1.40.4 mulierum et miserae aemem. Livy always writes mulierum aemem (2.40.3, 5.17.16, 3.2.8).

stermente obvius: as a masculine substantive obvius makes its first appearance in extant literature (prose and verse) in Livy (17 times). Thereafter in the early Empire it is found in Velleius (2.120.2), Valerius Maximus (2.2.9, 7.1.9), Seneca (Dialog. 9.12.4, oris. 3.3, 3.4., 29.1), Curtius (4.16.21, 5.6.5), Oros (1.47, 2.126), Pliny the Elder (11.110), Quintilian (10.3.29), ps. Quintilian (decl. min. 236.23, decl. mai. 153.11), and Tacitus (9 times: Hist. Tac. 100f. ab).

Livy's use of the word exercised some influence, whether direct or indirect, on subsequent historians. Note the following expressions found first in Livy, then taken up later: Liv. 28.3.10 obvii passim cadentur: cf. Curt. 5.6.6 passimque obvii cadentur (clearly a direct reminiscence of Livy); Liv. 39.49.9 summoventes obvios; cf. Val. Max. 7.3.9 obvii sumnavit; Liv. 22.7.7 obvius parco contentur (cf. 22.55.4); cf. Tac. Ann. 62.2 parco contentur obvius.

With the present example, cf. Liv. 7.33.10 obvius sternit. Note Seneca's similar strenuus obvius (Dialog. 3.11.2) (in a passage recounting historical example).
30.2 *igni suo involunt* apparently from Virgil: cf. *recurr. 2.308
totum involvit pennis nemus.

30.3 The remarkable alliteration, unparalleled elsewhere in the Annales (and perhaps in the whole of Cic. if this is nemus), in the two sentences praesidium ...

... *jubebant* can hardly have been accidental. It was probably introduced to enhance the poetic colour of the description.

30.3 *praesidium posthec imposuit* ... *saevia superstitionibus sacri:*
the Romans were undoubtedly sensitive to triple alliteration of this

kind. Donatus noted an example in Terence (*En. 700 solus senio

servat*), and Servius remarked (on *Res. 3.193 quaeus Cassandra canebat*)

that it was considered *vitiosa* in his own time, though favoured by

earlier ages: *haec compositio iam vitiosa est: quae maioribus placuit,

ut (4.32) 'Anchises aenovit erican' et (7.366) 'sala sara sensibuit'*. That the poets were aware of its effect can be seen from its frequency -

too marked to have been due to chance - from Virgil onwards in the

second half of hexameters.²

The device is particularly common in the religious and official

languages: e.g. *Cæs. nat. 14.1 sive circumas sive circumferenda

censeas; Cæs. div. 1.102 quod bonum faustum felix fortunatunque esse*
(cf. Plaut. Trin. 41); Varro. 4.67 dare donare dicere conserare Iovi Optimo Maximo; Cluent. 157 (Law) CONSERT ... CONVENIT ... CONSENTIT; Liv. 1.16.3 precibus exercunt, uti volens propitius suam semper societat progeniem; 1.32.13 consuet consensit conscivit; 3.13.6 (tribuni) si sita rum pecuniamque ni sitatur nonul promitti placere promuntiant. In prose it varies in frequency from writer to writer. Quintilian, for instance, has it so rarely⁸ that he must have been at pains to avoid accidental occurrences. Cicero, however, and in particular Livy admit it often, the latter as well in speeches and narrative as in sacral and official style.⁹ Both writers, moreover, commonly have series of more than three alliterative words.¹⁰

In the Annales there is an average of about 9 instances of triple and multiple alliteration in each of the longer books (1–4, 6, 12–15). In a section of Livy (1.1–28) which is comparable in length to a book of Tacitus, the number of examples is considerably higher (about 50). The present passage, with two examples close to each other in the same sentence, is without parallel in the Annales (cf. Cic. Orat. 51).

me voli commemorari quoniam hanc sceleris, quam cam munita
potuerit perdidisse.

30.3 saevia superstitionibus: in prose of all genres saevus is the
vox propria describing wildness of the sea, wind or weather.¹¹ In other
connections (as here), however, it is an artificial substitute, rarely used by writers of less elaborate types of prose, for crudelis. Caesar, for instance, avoids it completely; Cicero has it only twice (in the philosophia: Leg. 3.23, rep. proc. 9),¹² Seneca the Elder (crudelis about 40 times) once, Quintilian (crudelis 8 times) twice (once for variation alongside crudelitas in what is perhaps a quotation, and once in a special context),¹³ Petronius (crudelis 7 times) once (at 107.4, for variation near crudelitas), and pu. Quintilian (crudelis 17 times) twice (at 210.6 and 294.9, in both cases supported by juxtaposed crudelitas). Livy, however (16 times), Sallust (7 times), Seneca the Younger (28 times), Mela (11 times), Pliny the Elder (20 times), and Tacitus, among others, use it freely. Of the poets, Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Silius, Statius, and Valerius Flaccus all have seeing more often than crudelis.

That the two words (and their derivatives) were roughly interchangeable in sense can be seen from the following passages:

Liv. 4.29.6 argamis est quod imperia Mondiana, non Postumiana annelligata sunt, cui cui prius auctor tam saevi exempli faret, occumtura insi nova titulm crudelitas iurecit; Sex. dia. 4.5.3 orico huius mali ab ira est, cune ob frequenti exercitatione et satietate in obliviones clementiae venit et same tudes humanae: excipit animo, novissimn in crudelitatem transit: rident itaque gaudentque et voluptate multa perfruantur pluribusque ab iratores...
voluit absunt, per otium saevi; exist. 83.20 ubi possedit anima nimia
via vini, quaecumque mali latentbat. emersit. non facit abstrusae vitiae,
sed protrahit ... crescit insolentia subregion, crudelitas saevi,
malitiae vividae; Suet. Tib. 61.1 max in omne genus crudelitatis
cravit ...; post eum interitum vel saevissimae exiliiit; ib. 61.2
singulis enim crudeliter facto adus exacti longum esse: genera, velut
exemplaria saevitiae, murmure sat enir.

Tacitus uses crudelitas only once, and then for variation. Livy, in
contrast, has it 19 times, and Sallust 12 times. Tacitus often goes
further than his predecessors in eliminating a commonplace word. Of
all writers of prose, only Pliny the Elder has such a marked
preference for saevus (20:1).

30.3 cruors captivo, adulescens arma: the juxtaposition of alliterative
pairs was common in the religious language: e.g. Gaeo ap. 141.2
vino, invicemque viduaret et restitutumque; ib. 2 fruges frumento,
vinati virgiantique; ib. 3 pastores nescuerque norm pavantia; Liv.
10.39.16 cum secundum sollemnis praeditioe discessit breve ac mora
necessariam rebus odiam calamens ac cruorem. It may also have been
characteristic of Saturnian verse: Naev. Poen. 5 eorum sectam acientur
multi mortales; ib. 57 manac natura tumultus vectora posuidit.
Examples are found in the poets and in rhetorical prose, but are
by no means frequent: e.g. Virg. Aen. 6.693 Jake e fortunamque virum
moresque parvasque (cf. Naev. 57 above, and see Norden at loc.); Cic.
Naev. 56 aedem acerit a ferretur infestus; Verg. 5.32 cupiditatem,
cruelitatem, superbiae, seclus; 5.89 vitae viriumque famae tesserat;
Sall. 16 fratrum titlis, sororibus stupris: ill. 77 lexem
libertas maior relictur; Sall. Jus. 41.4 multas mortalis ferro aut
Rupr. Liv. praet. 12 per luxum atque libitinem persamendi.

Tacitus uses the devise only sparingly in the Annals. Note, e.g.
1.56.1 uides et pellibus, invalida at hincemia (speech); 1.59.1
subjectus servitio usuris utemur; 3.69.3 necque reser principem suam
sciencia cumto completi (speech); 4.69.3 congressus conlocuia,
notas corporae suarum; 6.23.2 nimirum ac socii consiliaretur Caesar;
14.21.3 vetum victorias incitamentum iuvenis (speech). The present
example is remarkable in that it immediately follows two triple
alliterative sequences.

cumore captivi: captivi. Here is the equivalent of the genitive
captivorum. The phrase is modelled on Virg. Aen. 10.320 captivique
roti perfundat sanguine flamen (see J. Kolager, Orpheus 11 (1984),
25), where the context is similar to that here (in both cases the
reference is to the sacrifice of captives).
Tacitus' substitution of cruent for Virgil's sanguis is of note. He thereby both created an alliteration and introduced a noble term into the passage.

At all periods cruent is a specialized word, denoting only blood which has been shed. Sanguis was originally used, conversely, only of blood within the body; but by the historical period it had also acquired the sense of cruent. The convenience of having a single word which could express blood of both kinds is obvious: hence it is not surprising that sanguis tended to supplant cruent in ordinary usage.

From the late Republic onwards the latter is avoided completely by various writers of prose (e.g. Caesar, Nepos, Vitruvius), and used only rarely by others. Only in poetry is it admitted with any frequency. The proportion of instances of cruent to those of sanguis (for statistics, see III, s.v. 'cruent') is, e.g., in Cicero 1 to 12, in Ocelus 1 to 40, in Seneca's prose 1 to 15, in Tacitus 1 to 9, and in Livy 1 to 6; but in Horace 1 to 2, in Silius 1 to 1.6, in Lucan 1 to 3, in Ovid 1 to 2.5, and in Lucretius 1 to 4. Note in particular that in Seneca's tragedies, in marked contrast to his philosophical works, there are 55 instances of cruent to 72 of sanguis. Valerius Maximus, whose prose is highly coloured, has cruent 21 times, sanguis 69.

In Tacitean usage sanguis would undoubtedly have been possible here: cf. II.3.2 sanguinem arae obfundare vetibus: precibus at iae purae altaria adolventur.
Note that Tacitus also has *crurum* (in an alliterative series) at 1.65.7, in another chapter marked by an accumulation of poetisms (see the commentators ad loc.): *infectos caeno aut crurum cibos.*

For the use elsewhere of *sanguis* in similar collocations, cf. II.55.1 *cruem locum Calba noriens sanguine infecert*; V.6.3 *vestamque infectum sanguine; 1.42.4 infecta sanguine contra flumina.*
Notes

1. On which see Ogilvie, Livy, 21. The battle account at Plaut. Amph. 188f, also appears to have been influenced by similar descriptions in epic: see Fraenkel, Plautinisches im Plautus (Berlin, 1922), 341 n.1. on boat, 232 (probably from Ennius).


3. See, e.g. Gic. Phil. 8.21, 12.2, Fam. 9.7.1, Liv. 10.16.6, 22.39.11, 23.24.9, 28.57.8, 35.35.7, 35.44.5, 44.1.6, Tac. 13.57.2. See further S. Freuus, De bincurria dissonant et scriptores Romanos usus sollemni (Darmstadt, 1861), 70, 74, 91f.

4. 3.54.10, 7.11.10, 7.33.10, 9.24.10, 21.46.2, 22.7.7, 22.7.11, 22.55.4, 23.36.3, 25.9.3, 28.5.10, 28.7.10, 28.3.14, 28.26.7, 29.33.6, 32.25.11, 32.29.2, 39.49.9.

5. In poetry, however, it is extremely rare.

6. 


8. There about 5 examples in 40 pages (Taubner) of book 2.

9. For some examples from Cicero, see, e.g. J. Strube, De tropis et figurae quaie inveniuntur in orationibus Deseathanas et Ciceronis (Würzburg, 1883), 131ff. on Livy, see A. Lambert, Die Indirekte Rede als künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livius (Zurich, 1935), 25ff.
10. See Straub, l.c.; on Livy, see F. Petzke, Dionidi remi: Tacitinius quaternus differat a Liviano (Regimont, 1888), 76.

11. Note, e.g., the recurring expressions saeua tempestas (Cic. Bsat. 60, Liv. 24.8.12, 30.33.2, 31.45.14, 40.21.5, Val. Lax. 9.1.1, 9.8.2, Sen. Dial. 10.7.10; cf. Flin. nat. 2.125 saevitiam tempestatum); saevus ventus (Cic. Att. 5.12.1, Liv. 28.18.12, Gell. 2.22.20; cf. Cato, Sall. 3.13.7 cum saevire ventus coepisset); saevus maris (Sen. contr. 7.1.10, Sall. Jug. 17.5; cf. Sen. dial. 4.7.2, Veil. 1.2.3 saevitia maris); saeva hiems (Sen. benef. 7.15.1, Col. 2.20.5, 11.3.4, Sall. 3.26, Flin. nat. 18.209, 18.269; cf. Sen. epist. 90.41, Col. 7.1.14, 8.17.11, 8.17.15 saevitia hiemis). It is obviously unlikely that Velleius' saevitia maris (1.2.3) is in any way derived from Sallust, as suggested by A.J. Woodman, 'Sallustian Influence on Velleius Paterculus', Hommages à Marcel Berard, 1, Collection Latomus, vol. 101, 793.

12. The following statistics do not include the technical instances of the word discussed above.

13. 9.3.48 consenuntur et diversae: 'mulier, tyranni saeva crudelitas, matris meae, ingrata, verae, temperantia dementia'; 2.10.5 saeviores tranquilia novareog.

14. At 6.4.4, Saeviissimae follows in the next sentence. Syme (725) noted the rarity of crudelis among odd phenomena of word selection in Tacitus. Tacitus' avoidance of tranquillus and ridella, mentioned by Syme in the
same connection, can be explained in the same way as that of

Ornelis: the more elevated equivalents placidus (5.1 n.) and

fidus are preferred.

15. Cicero in particular provides some striking instances of the usage, but they are sporadic. The above collection was made from a considerable portion of his oratorical prose.

31.1 remuque et domus: polysyndetic -que et is an archaism found in poetry and the historians.¹ Tacitus has 16 examples of the construction (Lex. Tac. 395b, 1276b), of which only this has as its first member a word other than se or in se. However, cf. sequae et domus (1.4.1) and sequae remuque (2.3.2). The present example is a conflation of the two and is thus only a minor variation of the standard type.²

31.1 quod contra vertit: in this sense (= evenet) verto is normally found only in the formula of benediction quod bene vertat (and variants, including quod male vertat), which was current at the time of Plautus and Terence,³ but may have faded out of use later. In Livy and Curtius it usually prefaces official proclamations.⁴ Plautus has two different forms of the expression: di bene vortant, in which the verb is transitive, though its object is usually unexpressed (see Lodge II.84.8b); and (quam) res bene vortat, in which the verb is intransitive (Lodge II.84.9a). The former was probably the older; when the explicit reference to the gods was dropped, the need would have been felt for another subject, the introduction of which presumably produced the intransitive use of the verb, with its slightly different sense. For the loss of di as subject, cf. the emergence of the impersonals tonat, fulsat, etc. from Jupiter tonat, fulsat (the
personal expressions were still retained in the augural language at
the end of the Republic). The secondary *cum res bene vortat* is
already predominant in Plautus.

Tacitus' *quod contra veritit* is easily recognisable as a
derivative of the formula: *contra* is scarcely different in sense
from *male*, and *quod* is retained. But a fresh turn of phrase has been
created.

31.1 *filiae stupro violata sunt*: the euphemism *violae* is approved
by Cicero (in reference to a passage from tragedy) in his discussion
of obscenity (Fam. 9.22.1).

31.1 *quasi quaeas resiciam salerni accedissent*: on the change of
subject, which prompted Kitter to add *Romani* before the verb and
Nipperday to delete the whole clause, see Carbon, 141. Abrupt
changes of subject have an archaic flavour and are frequent, for
instance, in Sallust.

But the carelessness of the sentence is undeniable. Had Tacitus
followed his usual practice of employing *quisque* with a singular
superlative (*praestini quisque* is the only instance of its kind in the
historical works: cf. *accid. 36.2 proxiimo quisque*) the sense would
be clearer. Attention would be drawn to the different subjects of the subordinate and main clauses by the presence of a plural verb in the one and a singular in the other (precipitosa quisque Icenorum, quasi sanctam regionem ... accipisset, avitias bonis excitatur).

31.2 remiunt amar: this phrase (= armam raptim cane, sumere) is used a number of times by Virgil (Aen. 7.340, 8.220), from whom Tacitus probably borrowed it \(^7\) (it had not found its way into earlier historiographical or archaising prose).

Arma cane or sumere would have been sufficient here, for the action described is not particularly impulsive. The more vivid phrase has been preferred regardless of niceties of sense. The needless use of expressive terms (of which Tacitus is often guilty) causes them to suffer a weakening of force (see on saepe patris, 12.3 m.). Tacitus uses arma rumpere more often (5 times) in the historical works than both arma cane and arma sumere together (the former is found twice in the Historiae, the latter twice in the Germania: Lex. Tac. 90a fin).

31.2 convertis ad rebelliones Trinovantibus: rebellatio (only here in Tacitus) is used earlier only by Valerius Maximus (twice, in the same expression - crebris rebellitionibus - and in passages close to
each other: 7.3.ext.9, 7.4.1). Rebellio, the usual word, is a peculiar feminine abstract in -o, -onis (most words of this formation are personal: e.g. centurio), a parallel to which is perdueillo (of the same root). Rebellatio, a normal -tio substantive, would have had a stronger verbal notion, and hence is especially apt here: commotis ad rebellantium = commotis ad rebellandum.

1.3 recens deduci: adverbial recens is employed by Tacitus only with past participles or, occasionally in the Annals, with equivalent words. It is found in early Latin, but from the late Republic onwards is restricted to archaising writers (Sallust, Livy, Gallia, al.).

Nuper often has a sense indistinguishable from that of recens (Lex. Tac. 987α). But there is usually a slight difference in usage between the two words, even when nuper is found with past participles (it has a wider range of employment than recens). Recens is almost always placed before its past participle (15 times out of 17), but nuper is preferred when it is convenient either to postpone the adverb, or to separate it from the participle by a word or group of words. Of the 26 examples of nuper with past participles in the historical works, only 8 directly precede the participle.

Recens had apparently not attained such strong adverbial force
that it could be freely detached from its verb.

31.4  nec ardum videatur: as a metaphor ardum is almost debased by

Tertius. Other writers use it only rarely, and then usually for effect,

but Tertius has it constantly (17 times) for difficilè. There are

only 6 examples of the latter in the historical works, of which 5 are

in the first two books of the Historiae. Moreover 3 are in either

the comparative or superlative, some in which ardum is not used.

There remain 2 instances early in Historiae I, and one at 17.3 below,

in a perfunctorily written military chapter.

Ardum (met.) is found only twice in the speeches of Cicero

(in which difficilè is used more than 70 times), both times in

passages in which the metaphor is maintained at some length: Ver.

1.36 cum sibi omis edictum allegationem difficilè, omnis aditus

ardum aut notius interclaseas videreat; Sest. 100 haec ego vixam ...

si aut apparat utque ar dum aut p ingen esse particulorum ... 19.12,

mentier. In the philosophical it is used 3 times (difficilè over 90

times), in the rhetorica 5 times, and in the letters not at all.

Caesar has it once (difficilè 20 times).

Under the Empire Seneca the Elder has difficilè about 20 times,

but ardum never, Quintilian difficilè 66 times, ardum 4 times:

(1.1.10, 11.1.75, 12.3.6, 12.11.25), and pa. Quintilian (adloc. min.)
difficilis over 20 times, but arduus never.

The historians Sallust and Livy have the usage no more frequently than the less elevated writers.

The expression found here, however (ardum videri), which Tacitus uses 3 times in the Annals (cf. 12.3.2, 14.3.2) is historiographical; earlier it occurs only in Sallust (Cat. 3.2), Livy (21.30.10), and Curtius (9.2.9).

Tacitus' choice of words is often inflexible compared with that of Livy. By eliminating the more commonplace of two synonyms, he weakens the effectiveness of the rarer word (see above 31.2 n., on rapiunt arma).
Notes

1. Ho.-Sz., 515.
2. Brink, JRS 41 (1951), 48 n. 96.
3. For examples and brief discussion, see J. Köhn, Altlateinische Forschungen (Leipzig, 1905), 34ff.
4. See the examples referred to by L.-S. s.v., IIIB.
5. Ho.-Sz., 415.
6. Ho.-Sz., 733; on Sallust, Kroll, G15.15 (1927), 205f.
7. See H. Schmaus, Tacitus ein Nachahmer Vergils (Erlangen, 1887), 1ff.
8. See the examples (from the Empire) given by C. Paucker, Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte II (Berlin, 1884), 16.
9. F. Bader, La formation des composés nominaux du latin (Paris, 1962), 166, suggests that rebellio may have been formed on the model of perduellio.
10. See Cooper, Word Formation, 3, on the various verbal functions performed by substantives in -tio.
11. Wolfflin, Philol. 27 (1868), 140.
12. See Heubner on I.77.3; Wolfflin, Rh. M. 37 (1882), 111ff.
13. It can, however, occasionally refer to a fairly remote time (Lex. Tac. 983ab). Compare the following: IV.68.4 recens conscriptis/III.22.4 numen ... conscripta; 4.69.2 recens comita (cf. 6.2.1)/13.15.1 super comitam; 11.25.3 recens repertam/4.19.2 super reperta (cf.16.15.1).
14. Exceptions at 1.77.3, 15.6.3.

15. II.53.1, II.56.2, 1.39.1, 2.20.1, 4.19.2, 13.15.1, 15.24.2, 15.28.2.

14.3. **Addendum:** The present passage contains also with 

which it is very natural in earlier Aristotelian, particularly with

the preceding sections (the 20.2 sections must therefore it was 

because it presupposes also near arguments), in the manner of

sections of arguments in the Aristotelian order, especially in 

the later books of the *opinio*, see Introduction, p. 35.

14.3. **Addendum:** The present passage (particularly of 

oral personal cases) is present at all periods after 20.2, but only
32.1 externosque frenditus: externos here is not equivalent to the genitive externorum ('of foreigners'), but has the sense 'in a foreign language': TII V.2.2023.7ff.

32.3 templum, in quo se miles consobravit: Tacitus has the metaphorical use of consobro (historiographical: TII IV.283.56ff.), 6 times in the later *Annales*, but only once in 1-6 and once in the *Historiae* (where the opportunities of using it would have been ample, since it is mainly military). In this book there is another example: only 2 chapters below (34), and a third in 45.

32.3 *nullit* lexano: Tacitus never combines *fundsc* with *euncan*, with which it is very common in earlier historians, particularly Livy. He probably avoided the full expression not because it was hackneyed, but because it comprises two near synonyms. On the rareness of combinations of synonyms in the historical works, and especially in the later books of the *Annales*, see introduction, p.35.

32.3 *mod peditum intersecit*: the partitive genitive (particularly of plural personal names) is common at all periods after *mod*, but only
if the verb in the relative clause is expressed (quod peditem est would have been more natural here). With accompanying ellipses of the verb, it may well be original to Tacitus. Non-elliptical examples occur 5 times in the Historiae, and 6 times in the Annals; elliptical, only twice in the later books of the Historiae, but 7 times in the Annals (Ixx. Tac. 12956).
Notes

1. Examples collected by "Wolfflin, Ausgewählte Schriften, 261f.

2. Many commonplace alliterative pairs used by Tacitus as well as earlier historians are to be found in Wolfflin's list, o.c., 253ff: e.g. animus, incendia, fortuna, fames facinus, ferrum, flamma, facinus, al.


4. The type is not discussed by any of the standard books. I have found no examples in Plautus, Terence, Cicero (speeches, philosophica), Caesar, Sallust, or Livy.
mira constantia: mirus is an epithet much used by Tacitus (though not by earlier historians), particularly, as here, to denote a notable manifestation of an abstract quality: cf., e.g. Dial. 9.5 m..liberalitatem; Agric. 6.1 m. concordia; IV.25.4 m. constantia; 1.33.2 m. comitas.

In the prose of Cicero mirus and its synonym admirabilis vary in frequency from genre to genre. In the philosophical works admirabilis predominates by 33:5; in the letters mirus is no less strikingly preferred (26:9); and in the speeches both words occur a similar number of times (10:11). The popularity of mirus in the letters, and of admirabilis in the philosophical works suggests that mirus was the more expressive term (and hence the more suited to the intimate and emotive style of epistolography), admirabilis the more academic. In the speeches and philosophical works mirus is particularly common with a qualifying guidam or in exclamations (about 10 times), a further indication of its emotive quality.

Tacitus uses admirabilis only once, in the Dialogus (30.5).

The range of complimentary or quantitative epithets found in Tacitus with abstracts designating virtues, qualities, or attributes is extremely limited. With auctoritas, benevolentia, benigntas, clementia, constantia, dignitas, gloria, orvitas, industriia, and misericordia, for instance, only magus, multus, notabilis, conspicuus, priscia, and mirus are used in the historical works. With the same words Cicero in the speeches has summus, divinus, inauditus, clarissa.
cravis, magnus, immortalis, illustres, incredibilis, singularis, insignis, praestans, admirabilis, inusitatus, maximus, eximius, excellens, admirandus, pristinus, amplissimus, verus, sempiternus, aeternus, iustus, and probatus. Tacitus' restrictiveness is no doubt due partly to a desire to avoid hackneyed terms of approval (which had suffered a loss of force from overuse: cf. his avoidance in the narrative of the Histories and Annals of the emphatic superlative: 49.2 n.), and partly to the pessimistic tone of the historical works.

Of the 6 Tacitean epithets listed above, notabilis and conspicuus are rare, and mirus had by no means succumbed to overuse. Multus is often used by Tacitus where other writers would have preferred magnus.

33.1 ambiguum an: with a verbal construction (here and elsewhere an indirect question; at 4.65, acc. c. infin.) ambiguum is not uncommon in Tacitus (Lex. Tac. 705), but is otherwise rare in both prose and verse (TLL I.1844.11ff.). In all pre-Tacitean instances of the usage ambiguum is impersonal, but in Tacitus it is usually personal.

For a comparable example of the use of an adjective for a verb, see on amarus, 23.1 n. Tacitus often makes one part of speech perform the functions of another: cf. on audae, 25.1 n. (substantive for infinitive).
33.1 *illeam sedem belli deliberat*: by the first century A.D. delico, which had been common at the end of the Republic, had dropped out of ordinary use. It is avoided by Vitruvius, Petronius, and Seneca the Elder, and used only once by both Seneca the Younger (dial. 1.3.14) and ps. Quintilian (de ci. min. 143.25). All of these writers (particularly Seneca the Elder and ps. Quintilian) have elago more or less frequently.

*Sedem belli, belli* is a stock phrase in the archaizing historians (for *locus b.*): cf., e.g. Liv. 4.31.6, Vol. 2.74.3.

33.1 *esse atque*: a phrase (here = *senectus*) found 6 times in Tacitus (Læx. Tac. 466b, fin.), but never previously.

33.2 *quod uberrimum revelant* is the substantival present participle, which is common at all periods in cases other than the nominative singular, is for the most part used to fill gaps in the language by providing a word with substantival force when no appositive noun exists. Here, however, Tacitus has chosen defendantibus despite the existence of the *tor* substantive *defensor*, which he elsewhere has 6 times (twice in military contexts: III.30.1, 15.6.2). Cf. also 2.5.3 *longum impedimentorum armen opportunius ad*
insidius, defensoribus iniquum. Sometimes a substantival participle is preferred to a substantive of the same root in order to distinguish a person who happens in particular circumstances to perform a certain function from one who habitually performs the function. Thus at Liv. 1.25.4 - ut primo statim concursu increpaverat armis aequitasse falsae gladii, horror ingenii spectantes secastringit - the participle spectantes denotes men who happened to be onlookers; spectatorae, however, is used predominantly of formal spectators (particularly in the theatre). So here the participle may be intended to imply that Suetonius looked for objects of plunder which were only casually defended (= 'unsafe for those who happened to defend them'); it is explicitly stated that he avoided regularly garrisoned places: consilia castellia praesthesia. The use of defensoribus would perhaps have suggested an organised defensive force.  

Defensoribus would have been possible at 2.5.3, but by substituting defensoribus Tacitus is able to show that attacks on the baggage train were frequent.

Most of the numerous substantival present participles in Tacitus to which there exists a corresponding substantive carry no particular nuance; the substantive in each case could equally well have been used. I have noted the following: III.30.1 obstructus (in antithesis to defensoribus: clearly the participle does not differ in function from a substantive in -tor; Tacitus has deliberately avoided
The text on the page is not legible.
'supporters', cf., e.g. 4.60.2); III.33.1 munientium (for munitor in the same sense, cf. 1.58.2); 3.43.2 venantibus; 3.40.3 praeecessarium (= 'provincial governors'; cf. praeses at 12.46.4); Dial. 30.1 discensium (discens is used in the preceding sentence (29.4) with no difference in sense); Dial. 41.3 rectentis; ib. rectentis; V.6.1 munientium; 11.6.2 rectentibus; I.1.1 dominantes; I.1.1 dominatibus; IV.74.2 dominantium; 3.75.2 dominatibus; 4.11.2 dominantium; 14.52.3 dominante (for the political use of dominus, with a sense often equivalent to tyrannus, see III. V.1.1920.82); II.60.2 origantibus; IV.52.1 origantium; 4.41.1 origantibus.

Although the superfluous substantive participle is found under the Republic (in certain genres in particular), it becomes more common in the post-Augustan period. In using it with such frequency Tacitus is in accord with the practice of his age.

The following examples occur in Cicero: audientia (orat. 55, 132), audientiam (off. 1.137, 2.66, Brut. 99, 279, Tusc. 2.5), conscientiam (Tusc. 3.75), consolantia (Tusc. 3.75, Att. 11.17a.1), consolatibus (Lect. 1.10, orat. 143), discensium (orat. 143), discensium (off. 1.152, ad orat. 1.16), suberrantibus (liv. 2.123), exsistentium (Brut. 92), decenti (off. 1.13), decenti (rep. 1.70), praecipianti (off. 1.13), praecipiantia (rep. 1.70).

Almost all are in the philosophical and rhetorical works, where Cicero is likely to have been especially influenced by the Greek
participle. He has avoided the usage in the speeches.

In the first 3 books of Livy (almost 300 pages, C.C.T.), I have
found only these examples: lecentum (1 v. pref. 4), scribentia (ib. 3),
commemantum (2. 65. 7), commiscantum (3. 29. 5).

Quintilian, however, has the device almost 40 times in the first
two books alone. Note, for instance, that while auditor predominates
over audient by about 26:5 in Cicero's rhetorical works and by 34:0 in
the Rhet. Her. (I include only those instances of auditor for which
audient could have been substituted; the participle is avoided in
the nominative singular, nor is it found with an attribute), in books
1, 2, and 12 Quintilian prefers the participle by 12:0. In none
of the three writers does audient have any nuance which could not have
been expressed by auditor (in Cicero, e.g., both words are found a
number of times in similar contexts in the genitive dependent on
audient; see above for examples of animus auditoris). Similarly, in
books 1, 2 and 12 Quintilian prefers doceo to doctor by 8:1. Cicero,
however, in all genres uses doctor almost exclusively in both
singular and plural; his only 2 instances of doceo (see above) were
probably adopted for concinnity.

Other substantival participles used frequently by Quintilian
but rarely by Cicero are discend and praecipiens.

The prose of the Rhet. Her. and of Cicero's rhetorical works
is closely comparable with that of Quintilian's Institutio. Clearly
in at least one genre the substantival participle had gained significantly in favour between the late Republic and the end of the first century A.D.

Similarly in history not only Tacitus but also Curtius has the usage considerably more often than Livy: e.g. 3.3.11 albae vestes recentes equo adormabant (recentes is the object of adormabant and nomes of recentes; Curtius could have written rectores accora); 3.5.14 inaudientium; 3.13.4 custodiendium; 3.13.11 precandentibus; ib. praedentium; 4.2.23 minusmittibus; 4.5.15 pronummarias (cf. 25 pronunmarias); 4.7.15 ducentium iterum monstrantium ritu (the text is uncertain); 5.4.18 solivantes; 6.5.17 venantium; 7.1.24 militantium; 7.4.14 audientium; 7.4.28 navicantium; 7.8.16 vivantibus (= incolla); 7.9.6 navissentis (cf. ib. nauticum); 8.1.12 venantibus; 6.2.22 pronummarium; 8.3.21 assimantantium; 8.10.19 incollauntium (cf. ib. incollas); 8.14.25 vixentibus eam (drivers of elephants; for rector in this sense, see L. 1.3., a.v.); 8.14.27 recentibus; 8.14.40 explicantes; 9.10.27 comissantes; 10.10.11 incollantium.

33.2 casidas patibula, irmae omnes: asyndetic pairs are often combined in Latin. Here the first word goes naturally with the third (cf. 2.5.4 irmae et casidibus), the second with the fourth. For a similar
arrangement, see Ball. Cat. 30.8 pericula repulsae, indicia cestatem. 15

33.2 casius ... festinabant: festino is another verb of which the
transitive use is found mainly in poetry and archaising prose (first
in prose in Sallust: TLL VI.1.610.36ff.). Cf. 25.1 n., 25.2 n.,
25.3 n.
Notes

1. *limis* is perhaps most common in the neuter singular in expressions such as *non mirum, mirum videtur*; in the present note I am concerned only with examples which qualify nouns.

2. Sometimes *admirabilis* is used in the form *admirabilia*, or as a neuter plural substantive, but there remain over 20 instances which qualify nouns.

3. cf. the difference in English between 'admirable' and 'wonderful'.


5. Laughton, o. e., 74.

6. The text is uncertain. M has *militariam*, for which Hadvig, followed by Koestermann (whose text is quoted here) read *militarium horrea*.

7. *defensoris* usually means almost 'defensive garrison': *TII V.151.42ff.*

8. I am grateful to Prof. E. Laughton for supplying the following list.

9. 1.1.17 bis, 1.1.25, 1.1.36, 1.2.11, 1.2.25, 1.2.27 bis, 1.2.29, 1.2.31 bis, 1.3.6, 1.3.12, 1.3.14, 1.5.7, 1.7.31, 1.10.25, 1.11.9, 1.12.11, 1.12.13, 2.2.2, 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.11, 2.4.5, 2.4.29, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.13, 2.5.14, 2.6.1, 2.6.6, 2.8.2, 2.9.1, 2.10.3 bis, 2.10.10, 2.16.13, 2.17.29.

10. 1.2.27, 1.2.29, 1.10.45, 2.2.11, 2.4.29, 2.5.13, 2.10.10, 2.17.29, 12.2.11, 12.6.4, 12.9.10, 12.10.17.

11. *decess*: 1.1.17, 1.1.36, 1.2.25, 2.2.2, 2.3.5, 2.9.1, 2.10.3, 2.16.13; *doctor*: 12.2.2.
12. 3 times Cicero (see above); cf. Quint. 1.1.17, 1.2.11, 1.2.27, 1.3.6, 1.3.14, 1.11.19, 1.12.13, 2.2.2, 2.3.7, 2.4.5, 2.5.1, 2.5.14, 2.8.8, 11.1.5, 12.2.12.

That *discipulus* and *discusa* were to Quintilian interchangeable can be seen from 2.5.1 and 2.5.13-14.

13. Both Ciceronian examples (above) are probably required for concinnity; cf. e.g. Quint. 1.1.25, 1.3.12, 2.3.5, 2.6.1, 2.6.6.


15. Wölflin, o.c. 32.
34.2 *anime adeo feroci: Ferox is very frequent in history (e.g. over 100 times Livy, 16 times Sallust, 30 times historical works of Tacitus) and poetry (Virgil 11 times, Lucan 17, Statius 12, Seneca's tragedies 51, Silius 47, Ovid 58, Horace 12), but rare in ordinary prose.*

*Animus ferox* is a stock historiographical/epic phrase (perhaps from Ennius) found in Sallust (Cat. 5.7, 38.1, Jug. 11.2, 106.3), Virgil (Aen. 10.610), Livy (e.g. 3.68.2, 8.1.8, 10.9.7), Silius (16.535), and also once in the Younger Seneca (in reference to Alexander the Great, Clem. 1.25.1). In the present passage it reads *adeo feroci*; clearly the emendation of Doederlein is certain.

Tacitus use *ferox* in various other traditional expressions:
- *provinciarum feroci* (Agric. 6.1; cf. Liv. 40.35.13); *praem ferox* (1.39.1, 3.47.8; cf. Liv. 21.60.4, 36.17.9); *miles ferox* (III.69.4; cf. Liv. 29.9.5); *Persicet locum* (IV.57.3; cf. Liv. 2.28.8, 26.15.5); *Ferocius eximius* (A.16.1; cf. Sall. Cat. 23.3); *Juvatus feroci* (14.25.1; cf. Sec. Phon. 44.5, Lec. 3.534, Vell. 2.134.1).

Sometimes he varies slightly a phrase found in one or more his predecessors: e.g. 4.12.2 *ferox acclama* (cf. Sall. Jug. 14.21

*acclamatus ... feroci*; 1.35.1 *lingue ferox* (cf. Liv. 7.32.11, 23.47.6, Curt. 7.4.3 *verbis ferox*). In a few places he seems to have had particular passages of Livy in mind: 1.1.4 *reborc corporis stellide ferocam* (cf. Liv. 7.5.6 *stellide ferocam viribus suis); 2. 11.10.3
34.2 coniuges quaeque tates victorius necum trahent: in prose coniux is rarely used independently, as it is here, but is largely confined to certain phrases which express collectively the various objects of a man's family, and occasionally patriotic, loyalties. The most frequent is coniux et liberi.\(^3\) Cf., e.g., parenti, coniuges

\(\text{coniuges olim conibus (Cic. fin. 6.22.2)}; \text{coniuges } \ldots \text{dona } \ldots \text{patriss (Att. 1.14.3)}; \text{coniugis } \ldots \text{filiae } \ldots \text{filique (red. Quir. 8)}; \text{parentibus. liberiis. coniugibus. fratribus (Phil. 14.36); filii } \ldots \text{coniugis (Phil. 9.5), al.}\)

As an independent term coniux is a poeticism (in high poetry it is the standard word; Virgil, for instance, has \textit{uxor} only once, in the \\textit{Aenid}, but coniux very frequently). Before Tacitus it is found in prose 3 times in Cicero (twice for variation after \textit{uxor} - Phil. 3.16, \textit{off.} 2.25 - and once ironically: \textit{Phil. 2.113 stetim. inter \textit{coniugem} cum ego sine contumelia describo}), \(^4\) 5 times in Livy (1.11.2, 1.21.3, 24.25.6, 34.7.1, 34.36.5), once in Seneca the Elder, in a passage of elevated tone (\textit{contr.} 10.3.2 \textit{ageo tibi vetere exempla excederunt bonarum coniugum}), \(^5\) once in \textit{Velleius} (2.75.3), 4 times in \textit{valerius maximus} (2.1.7, 2.6.14, 4.3.3, 4.6.pr.), 3 times.
in Seneca the Younger (*Lenux*, 1.9.3 *nec*, *nat.* 1.17.7), and 3 times in *ps.* Quintilian (*decl.* *min.* 47.4, 329.20, 368.16).\(^6\)

Tacitus does not use **coniux** on its own before book 12 of the *Annales*, but in 12-14 he has it 3 times (about as often as **uxor**); he then drops it in 15-16. His motive for so suddenly taking up, then discarding the usage is inexplicable. The other 7 examples are:

12.51.1 *seque et coniuxae abstulit*; 12.51.2 *coniux prava vita prius ut rimae fugam ... toleravit*; 12.61.2 *fatale sibi ut coniugem Tacitia ferret*; 12.65.1 *coniuxae principis devotionibus retinuisset*;

13.32.2 *provinccia corna de capite fenacae coniuris cognovit*; 14.59.3 *Octaviamque coniurun sociari*; 14.60.5 *coniuran revocavit Octavius*. Note the clusters at 12.51, 12.61-5, and 14.59-60.
Notes

1. See E. Skard, Emn. v. Tulliustung (Oslo, 1931), 321. It is found 8 times in Cicero, not at all in Caesar, once in Seneca the Elder (musc. 5.2, in a passage on Xerxes), once in Quintilian (2.2.3), and 2 times in the prose of the Younger Seneca (cf. the tragedies).

2. Musc. 733.

3. See Add. IV. 342. 65.

4. For a similar ironical use of an elevated term in a Ciceroonian speech, cf. *juvenis* at *Caec. 67* (cf. *juvenis* as a stylistically higher word than *adolescens* in the late Republic, see B. Axelsson, *Die Synonyme adolescens undjuvenis*, *Hermes* Herouzeau (Paris, 1944), 7-17).

5. Seneca habitually falls into high-flown language when giving *exemp* from the past. cf. *Caecin. 1. 6. 6*, 2. 1. 8.

6. In the last passage for variation.

(2) (a) in justification of sentiment with *sib* and (b) when argument is placed at the head of the motion in question.
mulier scarcely ever overlap in usage in Tacitus. Here, however, as at 37.1 below, mulier performs a function which Tacitus usually reserves for femina.

Femina is used by Tacitus almost exclusively in the following two ways:

1. to denote, in the old Republican manner, a woman of distinguished position or exemplary character: e.g. Agrig. 45.1 nobilissinarum feminarum; 1.57.4 feminae nobiles; 2.75.1 femina nobilitate principis; 14.42.1 conspicuas feminas; 14.41.1 feminae industrias (cf. 1.72.1, 3.49.1, 11.13.1, 12.22.3, 13.12.2, 14.12.3, 14.15.1, 15.32, 15.37.3); see further Lex. Tac. 655a. So at 12.53.1 - si locum ad matres de poena feminarum, quae servis coniunguntur - the reference is not to women in general but to freeborn women who marry below their status (cf. 18. statalturnae, ut ignaro domino ad id prolentae in servitute, sin consensu est, pro libertis habentur). For this sense see Liv. 39.8.7 stipula promiscua ingenuorum feminarumque. 3

2. (a) in juxtaposition or antithesis with vir; and (b) when emphasis is placed on the sex of the woman in question.
For *vir/femina*, see *Lex. Inc.* 454 b (17 times, in minor and historical works).

For the emphatic use, see, e.g., *III.59.3* subierunt obsidium *etiam feminae*; *1.69.4* nihil relictum imperatoribus, *ubi femina manipulor intervisit, sinea adent*; *2.55.6* nec ... se intra decoras feminas teneret; *3.53.5* praeciditae nunc feminam exercitio cohortium; *12.7.3* versus ex co civitas, et cuncta feminae obsoebant; *12.37.4* novum sanc et moribus veterum Irsidium, *feminae signis Romanis praesidere*; *14.35.1* solitum audem Brittanias feminarum ductu bellare testabatur.

Tacitus is in accord with the literary usage of his time in giving the latter two functions to *femina* rather than *mulier*. Under the Republic, however, the situation had been different. In pre-Augustan prose there are only 4 examples of *femina* alongside *vir*, all of which have a special point: 5 *Varro Ling.* 8.78 *pom virum dicitum sapientissimum et diligentissimum, feminam sapientissimam et diligentissimam* (variation: cf. ib. *uno vocabulo dicitus virum et mulierem sapientem et diligentem*); *Cic. inv.* 1.52 *necas vir melior necas feminas lection* (here and in the following two passages *femina* indicates a woman of distinction); *Cael.* 34 *cur te fratrem vitae potius quam bona paterna et avita et usque a nobis cum in viria tum etiam in feminis repetita moverunt?* (in reference to the distinguished
ancestors of Clodia); Tusc. 1.27 in claris viris et feminis.

Vir/muller, however, is found 11 times in Plautus, once in Cato (agr. 156.6), 17 times in Varro, about 12 times in the speeches of Cicero, twice in the philosophica (Tusc. 2.55, lez. 2.69), and twice in Sallust (Cat. 17.3, Jug. 85.40). Note also S.C. de Bacchusnibus 10 (Brune, Post., 165) necue vir necue mulier; ib. 19 viril etae mulieres (cf. 20).

Similarly, in the whole of the Republic the independent emphatic use of femina occurs only twice outside verse: Cic. Cluent. 199

culn utultitutia est ut cern homo hominem, et vis ut nemo feminam, et crudelitas ut nemo matrem appellare possat (perhaps = 'female'); Tusc. 2.35 illi, qui Gracchae femina rerum publicarum dederunt, corpora inueniit fidei laboris voluerunt; um et Spartiatis etiam in feminas transfuderunt, quae ceteris in urbis mollissimae cultu 'parietum umbis occultantur' (an elaborate passage, in which the word may have been admitted as a poetically). The corresponding use of mulier, however, is commonplace in prose: e.g. Cato agr. 83

mulier ad eam reni divinam ne adsit; C. Gracchus orat. frg. 58
en. quoque auctoritates sequuntur, quae propter mulierem

exceditationem ut mulier est ornatus; Tusc. 2.46 exclamationis ut
mulier, non constantem et sedata feret; off. 1.113 cum (Ulixes) et
muliernibus ... inservire; al.

A change first begins to appear in Livy. Not only does he use
femina with emphasis (both in contrasts with vir and independently),
but he shows an increasing tendency to do so the further he advances.
Thus in the first and third decades vir/mulier is found 7 times, vir/
femina 6 times; but in the fourth and fifth decades vir/femina
predominates by 13:5. Similarly mulier/pueri alone is used in the
first decade (4 times); but in the later books femina/pueri is
preferred by 8:3 (see Packard for all these pairs). The
distribution of all emphatic instances of the two words is as
follows:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mulier</th>
<th>femina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>books 1-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that femina takes over the emphatic function
progressively: the proportion of examples of femina to those of
mulier is 1:2 in books 1-5, 1:5:1 in 6-29, and finally 2:1 in 30-45.

Soon after this femina gains an even greater ascendancy as the
emphatic word, in academic as well as in artificial prose (in the
popular language, however, the emphatic use of mulier seems to have
lived on). In Seneca the Elder it outnumbers mulier by 8:0;
(there and the following figures include only emphatic instances of the two words), in Seneca the Younger by 25:2, in Velleius by 3:0, in Mela by 5:0, in ps. Quintilian (decl. min.) by 21:4, in Pliny the Younger by 3:0, and in Suetonius by 15:2 (in whom both instances of mulier are in quotations from an earlier period).

Quintilian, while preferring vir/femina to vir/mulier\textsuperscript{15} (at 9.4.23 he comments on vir/femina in terms which imply that it had become a fixed phrase: *et aliis naturalis ordo, at 'virum ac feminam, dicam ac noctem, ortum et occasum' dicas potius, omnium et retrorsum\textsuperscript{16}, continues to use mulier emphatically as often as femina\textsuperscript{17}. It is possible that in ordinary educated usage mulier retained a limited currency as the emphatic term throughout the first century A.D.; but it seems more likely that Quintilian's taste for the word was idiosyncratic, for the concurrence between Seneca the Elder and ps. Quintilian suggests that both were adhering to contemporary upper-class/academic practice. Quintilian is so steeped in the prose of Cicero that he sometimes anachronistically follows a Cicernian rule of style (see 36.1 n., 38.2 n.).

\textit{Mulier} complements femina in Tacitus. It is almost always employed either neutrally\textsuperscript{18} or with a slightly pejorative tone: \textit{v.22.3 ob stuprum Claudiae Sacratiae mulieris Ubiae} (neutral); \textit{12.51.4 id nomen mulieris} (neutral); \textit{13.13.3 insidias mulieris semper atrocia, tum et}
false: 13.44.1 Pontiae mulieris nuptae amores vacaora ... sed ubi
mulier vacua fuit (neutral); 14.11.2 muliere naufraga (neutral);
14.12.2 anguea aiixa mulier (neutral); 12.66.2 Locusta, super
veneficii nemeta et diu inter instrumenta regni habita, eius
mulieris ingenio paratum virus (in this and the following passages
the word takes on a pejorative sense); 13.45.2 huius mulieris cuncta
alia deinde praeter honestum animam; 14.3.2 mulieris usu accleram
adversus insidias intentae; 15.51.2 is mulieri olim cornitus (cf. 1
necus ili (mulieri) ante uina verum honestaru cura fuerat); 15.57.2
libertiae mulier (see above for the use of femina in reference to
freeborn women); 15.59.5 nomen mulieris Tatiae Galla (cf. ib. quin
degenerent et sola corporis forma commendata mulier matrimonio
abstulerat). 19

Occasionally also it is used for variation (1.69.4, 3.35.2,
3.35.4).

In the present passage mulier is uncharacteristically placed in
antithesis to viri. Tacitus' intention may be conjectured: Boudica,
in her bitter statement of a feminist sentiment, has probably used the
word with ironical self-contempt (the pejorative use) with the same
sense ('mere women') as that borne at 3.50.3 by muliercula in a
similar antithesis with viri (also a speech): nec quicquam grave ac
serium ex eo metua, cui suorum ipse Placitisorurn prodictor non
virorum anima, sed mulierum et adscit.

Tacitus has *mulier* with *vir* only twice elsewhere, in both places
for a special purpose: *Agric.* 33.1 *mixto virorum mulierumque ploratu*
(a reminiscence of Livy’s account of the attack on Veii: 5.21.11
*mixto mulierum ac virorum ploratu*); 15.57.2 *libertine mulier ...*
*ingenui et viri* (the epithet *libertine* necessitates the use of *mulier*
rather than *femina*; see above).

At 37.1 below *mulier* is used independently with emphasis:
*et miles ne mulierum euidem neci temporabat*. Perhaps Tacitus was
influenced by unconscious association with the example here; or
perhaps he momentarily allowed his fastidiousness to relax (there is
at least one other stylistic peculiarity in the same chapter: see on
difficili, 31.4 n. ).

The only other independent emphatic instance of the word in
Tacitus (1.65.4) is required for variation.
Notes

1. The increased frequency of *mulier* in *Annals* 11-16 (once *Hist.*, 3 times *Ann.* 1-6, 14 times *Ann.* 11-16; see Axelson, *Unpoet. Wort.*, 55) is therefore to be ascribed not to a shift of preference but to the demand of subject matter.

2. From Terence onwards throughout the Republic *femina* is severely restricted in use: it either has the technical sense ‘female’ (on which see below) or denotes a woman of excellence: see F.B. Linderbauer, *Studien zur lateinischen Synonymik* (1903-4), 20; Axelson, *Unpoet. Wort.*, 55ff. In Plautus it has a wider range of employment, but its later restriction is to some extent explicable. Of the 8 non-technical examples which Plautus provides, 2 are used with abusive (*Perr.* 208, *Truc.* 131) and 3 with laudatory epithets (*Aul.* 135, *Mil.* 258, 1003: cf. *Cist.* 705), and the remaining 3 are all found in emotional statements (*Amph.* 509, 1060, *Rud.* 281). It would appear that in early Latin the word had an emotive content which made it suitable in passages of blame as well as of praise (note that while 3 of the 8 instances - *Aul.* 135, *Perr.* 208, *Truc.* 131 - are in abusive or laudatory adjectives, only 2 of 297 examples of *mulier* - *Asin.* 521, *Host.* 176 - are similarly used). Its specialisation as a term of praise is not remarkable in a society preoccupied with the idea of female virtue. On the use of laudatory adjectives with *femina* in
archaic grave inscriptions, see J. Köhn, *Altitalinische Forschungen* (Leipzig, 1905), 91.

3. At Suet. *Tib.* 35.2 and *Dom.* 8.3 the word denotes upper-class women, although it is accompanied by uncomplimentary epithets (*famosae, probrosis*).

4. It is convenient here to distinguish examples in explicit (a), from those in implied contrasts with *vir* (b). Both types, however, are emphatic.


9. Note the poetic quotation (see the whole context) and the use of the artificial word *juvenis* for *adolescens* (on which pair, see Axelson, 'Die Synonyme *adolescens* und *juvenis*, F. Lelong, *Arcade* (Paris, 1948), 7-17).

11. In conjunction with *pueri*, *femina* and *mulier* may be taken as emphatic: women, as the weaker sex, are linked with children in implied contrast to the stronger (military) sex.

**mulier:** 1.2.1, 1.29.5, 1.58.7, 2.40.2, 2.40.11, 3.5.14, 3.68.8, 1.59.13, 5.21.11, 5.42.4, 6.3.4, 6.25.9, 7.6.5, 22.7.11, 27.45.7, 29.17.16, 29.28.3, 34.1.7, 34.2.7, 34.4.6, 36.4.10, 38.22.8, 39.3.5, 39.15.2, 39.19.12, 39.17.6, 39.18.5, 43.3.2; *femina:* 1.9.5, 1.46.7, 2.13.6, 2.13.11, 7.23.6, 9.19.10, 10.23.2, 10.28.4, 22.7.12, 22.60.2, 25.36.9, 26.49.11, 27.51.8, 29.19.13, 28.20.6, 28.23.2, 32.40.10, 34.2.1, 34.2.7, 34.2.11, 34.3.1, 34.5.12, 34.7.3, 34.7.9, 36.24.11, 37.5.1, 37.20.1k, 38.21.14, 39.13.8, 39.13.10 bis, 39.13.14, 39.14.7, 39.17.5, 39.49.3, 40.33.6, 41.11.5, 45.2.7, 45.28.11.

12. *Femina is never used emphatically either by Vitruvius or by the freedmen in Petronius’ *Cena Trimalchionis.* But note the following instances of *mulier:* Vitr. 2.8.13: *vitrum post mortem quamvis Artamisia uxor eius revocata Rhoudi indigentes mulieres imperata civitatibus Cariae totius, uraeas classis praefecti sunt*; 6.7.4 in his viri sine interpolationibus mulieres vanitatem; 6.7.5 Graeci enim *mulieres sex* amplexi occur, vol convivia virilia solent esse, quod eo mulierem non accipiant; Petron. 39.10 in virgine mulieres (nascentur); 42.7 sed mulier quae mulier milium genus; 67.10 mulieres si non essent, semia pro luto haberamus; 74.13 codex, non mulier.

13. Seneca the Elder: *contr.* 1 pr. 8, 1.2.18, 2.1.6, 2.5.4, 2.5.16, 2.7.9,
10.3.2, unus, 2.2 (femina); Seneca the Younger: benef. 1.11.6,
dial. 3.12.1, 5.2.3, 5.21.2, 5.24.3, 6.7.3, 6.7.4, 6.16.1, 6.16.2,
6.24.3, 12.14.2, 12.15.1, 12.16.5, nat. 1.16.2, 1.16.7, 4 pr. 19,
7.32.3, epist. 63,13, 84.9, 94.9, 95.20 bis, 95.21 bis, 122.7 (femina);
dial. 2.16.1, 4.30.1 (mulier); Velleius: 2.88.2, 2.100.3, 2.111.1
(femina); Mela: 1.45, 1.57, 1.114, 2.19, 3.34 (femina); ps. Quintilian:
10.14, 61.13, 79.15, 80.19, 80.23, 80.24, 81.2, 81.4, 81.10, 81.13,
81.15, 114.9, 114.13, 115.26, 116.29, 203.22, 208.23, 320.5, 329.6,
332.9, 337.26 (femina); 76.5, 79.28, 336.23, 424.9 (mulier); Pliny:
epist. 3.16.1, 6.20.14, 6.33.4 (femina); Suetonius: Jul. 22.2, Aug.
21.2, 29.2, 44.2, Tit. 2.3, 50.3, 61.4, Cal. 17.2, Claud. 15.4, 19,
35.2, Nepo. 29, Vesp. 19.1, Dom. 4.1, 6.3 (femina); Jul. 52.3, Aug.
42.3 (mulier).

15. 5.10.25, 5.11.10, 7.4.21, 7.4.23, 11.1.3 (vir/ferina).

16. Note that at I.31.1 - femina virisque - Tacitus reverses the order,
in keeping with his practice of varying set expressions.

17. 4.1.13, 6.pr.5, 8.3.47, 12.10.5 (femina); 1.7.28, 2.17.20, 7.2.52, 7.7.5,
11.3.19, 11.3.91, 11.3.138 (mulier).

18. Without either emphasis or a laudatory tone.

19. Femina is probably never found in Tacitus with either a neutral sense or
with a pejorative epithet or tone, although occasionally it is employed
in reference to the failings of the sex (the emphatic use): e.g.,
6.49.2 imbecillum tali super casu feminarum animum. I have taken the
examples of II.13.2 and 12.2.3 to be complimentary; and those at
II.31.2, 12.42, 14.32.1, and 15.44.1 to be emphatic. At 13.45.2
the word is used for variation.

In calculation III.20 and 21.20, the word is used only once in
context. (See to an introductory remark from III 20.1 It is of
the sort when a student might be encouraged to read on
further.) In 20.7 there is no indication that the student should
read on or not. At 20.20, the word is used for instruction,
more effectively, in 20.20.5 the student might explore further
as a stimulus, if not.

...外...
36.1 *silebat:* used 20 times by Tacitus (19 times in the historical works). Its synonym *taceo*\(^1\) occurs, outside the minor works, only once in the *Histories*, in a poetic phrase: III.54.4 *taceat solitudo et tacentes loci* (the metaphorical use of *taceo* is confined almost exclusively to poetry: with this example cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.265 *locu ... tacentia*; Tacitus seems to have enhanced the bare detail which he found in his source: *cf.* Suet. *Vit.* 16 *cum deserta conia remperisset*);\(^2\) and once in the *annals*, probably for variation (before *silentium*): 4.60.2 *seu loquor et taceat inventis, crumen ex silentio, ex voce.*

In early Latin *sileo* had no currency. It is used only twice in Plautus (once in an introductory formula: *Poen.* 5 *sileteque et taceat tuo animo advertite*; and once in what may have been a technical sense: *Capi.* 460 *quasi muti silent*; *see n.1*; and once by Terence (*Phorm.* 778).

But in the late Republic it inexplicably gains ground. Cicero uses only *taceo* (12 times) in his first three works (*de inventione*, *pro Quinctio*, *pro S. Roscio*),\(^3\) but from 70 B.C. onwards turns progressively to *sileo* (without ever dropping *taceo*). *Taceo* predominates by 51:14 (about 4:1) in the speeches down to 60 B.C.; by 24:13 (2:1) in those after 60 B.C.; and by only 9:7 in those after 50 B.C. In the philosophical works, most of which were written after 50 B.C., both words are found 11 times.\(^4\)
Si\'le\'o enjoyed no lasting popularity. It is avoided by Seneca the Elder, Quintilian, and ps. Quintilian, all of whom employ \textit{taceo} frequently (Seneca 65 times, Quintilian 33, ps. Quintilian 41), and used only once by Petronius (\textit{taceo} 11 times), in an obviously high-flown phrase: 110.6 \textit{Exo\'loge\'e}, et \textit{per\'i\'l\'i\'tan\'i\'um \'a\'d\'v\'e\'c\'a\'t\'u\'s et pra\'e\'s\'e\'t\'i\'a \'con\'c\'o\'n\'di\'a \'a\'ce\'t\'o\'r, ne \'s\'i\'l\'a\'e\'t \'s\'i\'n\'e \'f\'a\'b\'u\'l\'i\'s \'h\'i\'a\'r\'i\'t\'a\'s, mult\'a in \'u\'l\'i\'e\'b\'r\'e\'m \'l\'e\'v\'i\'a\'t\'a\'m \'c\'o\'s\'p\'i\'t \'i\'a\'c\'t\'u\'r\'e}. The stylistic difference between \textit{si\'le\'o} and \textit{tace\'o} at this time can most clearly be seen from the works of Seneca the Younger. In the tragedies \textit{si\'le\'o} is found 24 times, \textit{tace\'o} 13; but in the philosophica \textit{tace\'o} 32 times, \textit{si\'le\'o} only once, in an extended personification: \textit{dial. 3.19.2 ratio ... \textit{si\'le\'o}.} \textit{S\'i\'le\'o} survived only in poetry and archaising prose.

Only Pliny the Elder has a liking for \textit{si\'le\'o} as marked as that of Tacitus (26.3). Livy prefers \textit{tace\'o}.

\textbf{36.1} \textit{u\'t sp\'e\'m\'e\'r\'e\'r\'e\'nt s\'o\'n\'e\'r\'e\'s b\'a\'r\'b\'a\'r\'e\'r\'u\'s}: \textit{s\'o\'n\'e\'r\'e} is a very rare poetic (Lucretius, Virgil, Valerius Flaccus) and Sallustian (\textit{Hist. 2.87.D}, 3.95.D) word (for \textit{a\'g\'u\'s, s\'o\'n\'i\'t\'u\'s}) found only 3 times in Tacitus. In each case it is used of the noise raised by barbarians in battle as a means of inspiring fear (such noise made a strong impression on the Romans and is often described in battle accounts: e.g. \textit{Liv. 5.37.8 i\'a\'n c\'a\'n\'i\'c contra c\'i\'r\'e\'a\'g\'u\'s h\'o\'s\'t\'i\'t\'u\'s p\'l\'a\'n\'a e\'r\'a\'n\'t\'a \'e\'t n\'a\'t\'a \i\'n v\'e\'n\'o}).
tumultus gens truci cantu clamoribusoque variis horrendo commotus compleverant sono; see Gilvie ad loc. for parallels: 1.65.1 nox per diversa inqules, cum barbari festicam aliquis laeto cantu aut truci sonore subiecta vallium ac resultantis saltus compleverat; 4.48.2 ut clamore telis suo quisque particulo intentus sonorae alterius proslit non acciperet. 6

One of the Sallustian examples of the word is applied to similarly exotic sounds: hist. 2.67.9 servilius ... de improviso moneta, ex quo in iuva oppidi telis connectus erat, occupavit sacrum katri maciae: et in eo oratio suarum eplari diebus certis die, culus erat de nomine, exaudiri sonorae ... The other is in a battle description.

Two other highly artificial terms which Tacitus employs exclusively in reference to barbarians are the poeticism ductor, and the archaism prolect. 8 Researché phraseology would have helped to suggest the strangeness of foreign tribes.

36.1 imbellis inermes: On the marked decline of asyndeton in the later books of the Annales, see Introduction, p.36.

Asyndeton binominal of this type (adjectival, with at least one compound in in-) was formalic. There are 9 pairs of adjectives in asyndeton in the Histories and Annales, and of these all but 3 (of which
2 are in the *Historiae* comprise at least one word in *in-*; cf.
1.17.4 *gravem, infructuosam*; 2.48.1 *locupletis intentatue*;
6.8.4 *illicitum, ances*; 12.48.2 *invisus infamis*; 16.26.3 *inteneratus, imollatus*. Cf. also 4.36.3 *levae imobiles* (substantival); 6.19.2 *inustres, imobiles* (part of a longer series). The exceptions are
IV.60.2 *levae abeuntas; V.5.1 sinistrum foedus; 4.37.3 ambitiosus, superbum.*

Half of the 27 instances of longer adjectival asyndeta in the
historical works also include a compound in *in-*: II.11.5 *horridus, innumerus, hamusque dissimilis*; II.46.3 *atrox iugum incertum*;
II.58.1 *indisciplinae tenuenta, serviciae ac huncenatius quam
discipliniae et gastris propios*; III.39.2 *sanctus interbus, nullius
repentini honoris*; IV.56.1 *turbo turbidos subsums subsums duem pollutas*;
V.16.2 *perdum impavum victum*; 1.51.1 *semiramos, incertos aut
palantia*; 1.53.2 *extorren, infamem et post interfectum postnum
Accipam semia epoi aenam*; 1.74.2 *agens ignota ignota*; 2.63.2
*incubitum ferro, aenexum hostibus*; 4.46.3 *imperium aridum cruentum*;
12.64.3 *incidit incidit infamia violata*; 13.1.1 *incomen, nobiles et ... e
Cesareus posteris.*

In Sallust's *Catilina* and *Jugurtha* 8 of the 15 examples of
adjectival asyndeta bimembe are of the same kind: *Cat. II.3
infinita insatiabilis; 15.4 *incurus, dis hominibusque infestus*;
*Jug. 2.3 incorruptus aeternus; 14.7 deformatus aeternus, incus.*
17.5 saevus; importuosus; 44.1 inermis inebellis (cf. the present Tacitean example); 66.3 palatia inermes (cf. Tac. 1.51.1 above); 91.7 mobile infidum. Cf. also the following longer series:

Cat. 19.4 inusta acerba crudelis; 48.2 crudelis inmoderatus ac ... calamitosum; Juc. 51.1 variis incerta, foeda atque miserabilis;
85.1 industrius auribus medicus; 85.3 invidos occurrantia tacitices.

In the ordinary prose of the late Republic asyndeton bimembris of all types, and especially that of adjectives, had been very rare.

In Cicero’s pro Sestio, for instance, there are 56 examples of asyndeton with more members than two, but only 2 of asyndeton bimembris (14.90). Similarly in the pro Milone I have noted only 3 examples of asyndeton bimembris (47, 67 bis), but 26 of longer asyndota. 10 In the whole of Caesar, 11 and in the pro Sestio, pro Milone, and the letters of Cicero 12 there are perhaps only 3 examples of adjectival asyndeton bimembris, of which 2 include a compound in in:- Att. 7.20.1 inanes, imperati; Fam. 2.13.3 avvens infindis; cf. Att. 9.15.3 crudelis iratus.

But a change is apparent by the first century A.D. In the Declamationes linores ascribed to Quintilian asyndeton bimembris occurs more often than longer asyndetic series; 13 and in Seneca the Elder it is only slightly outnumbered. 14 Moreover both writers admit adjectival examples freely, without any tendency to restrict themselves to the formulaic type. 15

Clearly Tacitus has disregarded contemporary developments in
educated usage and adhered to the Sallustian tradition.

Tacitus has here employed the more usual third declension form of *inermis*, thus gaining a mild homoeoptoton. He readily places two words with the same ending in asyndeton, but avoids triple jingles. In Sallust's *Catiline* and *Jugurtha* triple homoeoptoton in asyndeton is more than twice as numerous as in the whole of the *Annals*. Cicero's liking for the device is even more marked than that of Sallust.

In the *Annals* about 50 examples of asyndeton of the type which consists of juxtaposed unqualified words are, like that here, in speeches. Moreover in the early books there are sometimes accumulations of examples in the same speech (1.17.4, 3.33.3-4, 4.8.4-5), in imitation of the Sallustian manner (cf. e.g. *Cat.* 20.7, 20.8, 20.12, 20.14, 20.15, *Jug.* 14.7, 65.41, 110.4, 111.2). By the third hexad the construction is used more sporadically. On its propriety in speeches, see above, 1.2 n.

In Curtius 17 of the 23 instances of asyndeton in books 3-6 are in speeches; and in Livy 40-42, 11 of the 20.

36.3 *ad interquenda pila:* the first example of this secondary sense
(= conicare) of introqueo is metaphorical: Cic. Tusc. 4.77 alternae
... versus introqueitur inter fratres gravissimae centuriae.

The literal usage appears slightly later, in Augustan poetry (Virgil, Ovid). It remains chiefly poetic throughout the next century (Tit. VII.2.32.26ff.); the only pre-Tacitean instance in prose is at Sen. epist. 45.9, in a personification: quaeu fortuna, quae quod habuit telum nocentissimum vi maxima intermit, mutat, non vulnerat. Tacitus has introqueo only here.

The regular words (as seen from Caesar and the Caesarian corpus) for the discharging of weapons were conicio (26 times Caesar and Caesar corpus), iacio (5 times), and mitto (12 times). Tacitus has conicio once, iacio never, and mitto once. He uses instead a variety of unusual and sometimes poetic words: iaculor 4 times (mainly poetic with an object: Tit. VII.1.72.36ff.); libris twice; vibre twice; ingero 3 times (Sallust, Livy, Curtius, poetry, al: Tit. VII.1.35/9.73ff.); torqureo once (mainly poetic).
Notes

1. It is possible that originally the two words differed in sense (see E.-W., s.v. 'sileo'), but by the time of Cicero they overlap to a considerable extent. In Cicero, however, *taceo* seems to be the preferred term with the sense 'to say nothing' at a particular moment (hence expressions such as *audite taceant Quinct. 79, Cat. 1.8, Planc. 4.5*, and *cum tacuisti, Sull. 69*); *sileo* when a more abiding silence is meant (*div. Caec. 32, Verr. 5.57, 5.126, Mil. 11; cf. Plaut. Capt. 485*).

2. From the account of the last hours of Vitellius.

3. Similarly in the early treatise *ad Herennium* only *taceo* is found (5 times).

4. The resuscitation of *sileo* can hardly be ascribed to Cicero alone. The word had almost certainly found its way into contemporary educated usage, for it was also employed by Atticus (as may be inferred from *Att. 16.7.5*). Moreover Vitruvius, writing soon after, has *sileo* twice, but *taceo* not at all. There is also an example of *sileo* at *b.Hisp. 3.7*.

5. *Sileo* is used particularly often in application to things: E.-W., l.c.


9. Tacitus, like Sallust, commonly has a pair of words in *asynedeton* followed by a third word or phrase which is connected by *aut* or a copulative particle. I have not classified such examples as *asynedeton bimembre*. 
10. These proportions contrast strikingly with the corresponding figures for Sallust: in the Catiline and Jugurtha there are 32 examples of asyndeton bimembre, compared with 89 of asyndeton with more members than two (1:3). Asyndeton bimembre, if used with any frequency, must at the time have had an archaic flavour (note that it is common in the legal language: Ho.-Sz., 828). Ho.-Sz., 829 and S. Preuss, De bimembris dissoluti quæ scriptores Romanos usu sollemni (København, 1881), 11 exaggerate the frequency of the device in Cicero.

11. Preuss, o.c., 11f.

12. For collections of examples of asyndeton bimembre from Cicero's letters see C. A. Lehmann, Quaestiones Tullianae I (Leipzig, 1886), 23ff; H. Sjögren, Francs 16 (1916), 32ff.

13. In 225 Teubner pages asyndeton bimembre is found about 24 times, asyndeton with more members than two 14 times. For a full collection of examples of asyndeton bimembre, see S. Wahlén, Studia critica in declamationes minores cuae sub nomine Quintiliani feruntur (Uppsala, 1930), 75ff.

14. In books 1, 2, 7, and 9 I have found 22 examples of asyndeton bimembre, and 29 with more members than two.

15. See, e.g. Sen. contr. 1.8.13, 7. praef. 2, 7. praef. 6, 7.7.3, 9.1.11, 9.2.6 (none includes a compound in in-). For the numerous adjectival examples in ps. Quintilian (none with a compound in in-), see Wahlén, o.c., 77f.
16. Another writer of the period who makes considerable use of asyndeton bimembra of all types is Seneca the Younger; see K. Busche, Rh. M. 70 (1915), 568ff. He has 6 adjectival examples with, but 18 without an in- compound. Quintillian, probably in imitation of Cicero, continues to avoid asyndeton bimembra, though freely admitting longer asyndeta.


18. See, e.g. Best. 1, 12, 15, 51, 56, 57, 84, 95, 128, 131, 135, 137, 138, 144, 145.


20. On the frequency of asyndeton in speeches in Sallust, see Wöllflin, All 11 (1906), 34.


22. Speeches: 4.0.8.11, 4.0.8.19, 4.0.10.1, 4.0.11.7, 4.0.11.8, 4.0.12.6, 4.0.12.7, 4.0.13.3, 4.0.13.4, 4.1.23.10, 4.2.62.10. Of the remaining examples
5 are in official contexts of various kinds: 40.44.11, 40.52.5, 40.52.6, 41.9.11, 42.30.11; cf. 40.28.2, 40.46.6, 41.3.1, 42.30.9.

It is well known that Livy favoured asyndeton in official passages (Ro.-Sz., 829), but it has not been pointed out that he often has it in speeches.

2. For a comparable pattern of semantic change, see D.A. West, Ph. 15 (1965), 27ff., on _haurio_ (the derived sense 'drink' appears first metaphorically, then literally at a much later date).
velut cuncta erudit: the modification of metaphors and striking
expressions by velut is more characteristic of the Dialogue than of
the historical works, where boldness of expression is constantly
sought after. Velut is so used 15 times in the Dialogue, but only
17 times in the Annales, which are 4 times as long (Lex. Cap. 174 b).

tergo praebens: for tergo do or verno (see above, 5.1 n.).

difficilis effici: an unexpected use (without parallel in the
Annales) of difficilis for Tacitus' normal audax (31.4 n.).

demullerum quidem neci terrarebat: on this uncharacteristic
use of miller for femina, see 35.2 n.

There are thus two peculiarities of diction in the same sentence.
The battle, which is described very briefly, clearly did not interest
Tacitus, and his lack of interest is reflected in a diminished
attention to stylistic matters.
ad reliquâ belli perpetranda: before Tacitus _perpetra_ is found only in Flautus, Varro (ling. 7.110), Livy (24 times), and Curtius (3 times, twice in phrases taken from Livy).  

It seems to increase in the third hexam at the expense of _pater_, also an archaism. However, the change is not genuine, for in Tacitus the two words are not interchangeable: the compound never appears in any of the phrases (at least some of which were traditional in historiography) in which _pater_ is used.

It is of note that, while _pater_ occurs a number of times in Tacitus with _balbum_ as object (a stock phrase), _perpetra_ twice (at IV.51.2 as well as here) governs _reliquâ belli_. The prefix of the latter may (for Tacitus) have retained some force (= 'put the finishing touches to' rather than 'carry out').

_ismi atque farro_: _atque_ is usually found before vowels, but many writers employ it at least occasionally before consonants as well, chiefly under the influence of the rhythms of the clausula. No less than 92.9 per cent of pre-consonant examples in a representative selection of Cicero's works have been shown to occur in the clausula; and a considerable proportion of examples in Livy, Curtius, Seneca the Elder, Seneca the Younger, Sall., ps. Quintilian, Quintilian, and Pliny the Younger are similarly placed.
But there are other authors, including Tacitus (who pays little
attention to clauses)\(^6\) who admit pre-consonantal atque anywhere in
the clause rather than predominantly at the end. Some non-rhythmic
factors motivating its use are as follows:

(1) Of the 25 examples in Valerius Maximus, 18 precede \(2\), \(e\) or \(a\),
before which \(g\) was apparently regarded as cacophonous. On the use by
certain other writers of atque before gutturals, see U.II.108.73;
no one else, however, employs it thus as often (proportionately) as
Valerius.

At A.4.11 Ladvig's atque nocturna (the MSS. have simply omnia,
which requires supplement), which is accepted by Kempf, is unlikely,
if not impossible.

(2) It is almost certainly in imitation of Cato that Sallust
adopts the pre-consonantal use (at all points of the clause) with such
frequency (over 300 times).\(^7\) In Cato's speeches and Origines (but
not in the Legagriculura), as elsewhere in old Latin (see Introduction,
p.6) atque is extremely common before both vowels and consonants.
Sallust uses the word in certain phrases in which Cato had had it, a
sure indication of indebtedness: atque pulcher (Cato or., frg. 56,
orig. frg. 110, Sall. Cat. 20.3); a. strenuus (Cato orig. frg. 83,
Sall. Cat. 51.16, Jug. 22.3); a. superbia (Cato or. frg. 167, Sall.
Cat. 2.5, 23.6, Jug. 14.11, 41.3, 35.45); a. nauseia (Cato or. frg.
177, Sall. Jug. 27.2, 35.8).
(3) Of the 28 instances of atque before consonants in the historical works of Tacitus (I omit here the 17 special cases found in the expression haec atque talia), 9 11 link proper names. 9 About one-quarter of the 26 examples in Caesar are similarly used, 10 as are one-sixth of the 72 in Livy. 11 Although the proportion in the latter two authors is lower than in Tacitus, it is sufficient to show that the usage had a quasi-formulaic character.

(4) Atque seems to have been considered apt before certain words, as well outside the clausula as within. A particularly widespread expression, for instance, is vallum atque fossa, which is found (usually outside the clausula) in Caesar (Call. 5.21.3), Sallust (Jug. 23.1, 45.3), Valerius Maximus (9.1.ext. 6), and (probably) Livy (38.4.6). 12 Although its creation may have been inspired by considerations of euphony, it had probably been handed down (in the military language) as a set phrase, its sound and rhythm no longer important.

Some other formulae are: from atque formano (Sall. Jug. 55.7, Liv. 22.38.4); 13 atque inquam (Cic. Verr. 3.84, Quint. 1.4.3, 2.4.3, 2.5.21, 2.8.2, Pallad. 1.5.1, 5.4.2); a. flagitium (Cic. dix. Cacc. 6, Verr. 1.82, 2.2, 4.83, Tusq. 1.72, ps. Quint. decl. min. 122.20, ps. Quint. decl. major. 3.1, Tusc. 6.6.1); a. vehemens (Cic. imp. Posn. 23, Vell. 2.103.3, Quint. 4.1.64, ps. Quint. decl. min. 12.27); a. fortuna (Cic. Verr. 2.67, Sall. Cat. 33.1, 51.12, Liv. 1.25.2);
a. turris (Caes. civ. 2.2.5, Liv. 21.7.8); a. periculum (Sall. Cat. 4.1, 4.4., 30.5, 52.2, Liv. 1.28.4, Tac. 2.40.2); a. virtus (Cic. Cat. 4.21 bis, Sull. 93, Arch. 15, Liv. 6.11.3, 21.30.11, 25.38.10, Tac. 3.62.1); a. servus (Plaut. Men. 272, Trin. 435, Cic. Caec. 20, Liv. 3.19.10).

With the present example, cf. Cic. Rosc. 141 armis atque ferro; Cat. 3.1 flamma atque ferro, dom. 145 furori atque ferro; Phil. 9.14 caede atque ferro, leg. 2.45 aes atque ferrum.

Tacitus is not alone among imperial historians in using atque only sparingly before consonants (see above for figures). Curtius, usually a close imitator of Livy, has it perhaps only twice; and Velleius only 9 times. Even Livy's 72 instances do not represent a very great frequency.

Outside history, Quintilian, probably in imitation of Cicero, has the usage frequently (often in the clausula, before words with which Cicero also employs it in the clausula), but Seneca the Elder (4 times), Seneca the Younger (24), ps. Quintilian (22), Pliny the Younger (7), and Petronius (1) are more restrained. The technical/archaising writers Pliny the Elder and Columella (after book 3) admit it with greater freedom.

Since atque (both before vowels and consonants) was falling into disuse in the early Empire, it is not surprising that the pre-
consonantal use is comparatively rare in ordinary imperial prose (Quintilian is apt to preserve Ciceronianisms which were no longer used). But the reason for its decline in the historians (in whom the pre-vocalic use is frequent) is obscure. It is possible that Cato and Sallust had so effectively made it a personal mannerism that its excessive employment by later historians would have savoured of intolerable dependence. Note that Tacitus rarely has the usage in Sallustian expressions. 21

In the Histories Tacitus has atque only once before a consonant (V.12.2). He is more willing to use it thus in the first hexad of the Annals (23 times), but in the later books he reverts to his earlier restrictiveness (4 times). 22

38.2 *serendis frugibus incuriosos*: incuriosus is a peculiarly Tacitean term (18 times), found previously only once in the Histories of Sallust (4.36) and probably at Sen. epist. 95.50 (incuriosi is a conjecture by Madvig for the MS. curiosi). The frequency with which Tacitus employs it may be due to the influence of historical works now lost (including Sallust's Histories), rather than to originality; observe his indebtedness to the historiographical tradition in the use which he makes of the adverbial form incuriosus: cf. Sall. hist. frg. 2.42 incuriosae esse; Liv. 29.3.8 incuriosae agentibus; Tac. IV.13.3 incuriosae ... agent (cf. IV.28.2).
38.3 *gentesqua praefereces:* there are 12 emphatic adjectival compounds in *praec-* in Tacitus,\(^23\) giving a total of 40 examples,\(^24\) not one of which is in the minor works.\(^25\)

There is some evidence that in the early imperial period adjectives and adverbs in *praec-* were felt to be artificial, or at least literary. None occurs in Petronius, Vitruvius, Seneca the Elder, or ps. Quintilian (*decl. min.*) and Seneca the Younger has only one instance (*praerapidus*) in his prose.

Livy, however, has 13 such words\(^26\) (9 of which are used by Tacitus also, an indication that historiographical tradition was at work), Pliny the Elder 26 (117 examples), and Suetonius, whose prose has numerous historiographical features, 12 (16 examples). Moreover from the Augustan period onwards various poets of epic style show a particular liking for the formation. Virgil, Ovid, and Statius, for instance, all coin neologisms in *praec-* but not in *per.*\(^27\)

*Praeferox* is first used by Livy, and is later found also in Suetonius.

*Praecalidus* and *praegracilis* (both used only in the *Annals*) are Tacitean neologisms.
1. 4.13.16 sacrificio perpetrato (cf. Liv. 25.16.2, 44.22.16, 44.37.13); 7.2.29 perpetrata caedes (cf. Liv. 1.6.1, 4.5.5.5, 4.5.5.11).


3. See Tränkle, l.c.

4. By J. Wolff (Jahrb. 26 (1901), 637ff.).

5. On Curtius, Seneca the Younger (who almost without exception has the word in the clausula), and Pliny the Younger, see Axelson, Unpoet. Wort., 83 n. On the other writers I have consulted the Thesaurus material.


7. A full collection of examples is to be found in A. Kunze, Sallustiana (Leipzig, 1892), 4ff.

8. See Lex. Tac. 106a; Wöllflin, Philol. 25 (1867), 134.

9. 2.42.5, 2.51.1, 2.52.3, 2.64.1, 3.13.2, 3.19.1, 3.73.2, 3.76.2, 6.5.2, 6.8.5, 13.31.2.

10. Call. 3.8.2, civ. 1.7.6, 1.18.2, 3.4.3, 3.19.1, 3.30.1.

11. See Pügler, 179-80.

12. B has atque, M ac. The formulaic nature of vallum atque fossa supports the retention of atque, even though elsewhere Livy writes vallum ac fossa (see R. Novak, Wien. Stud. 15 (1893), 251ff.).

13. The Livian instance is in an oath, in the archaising phrase fugae atque formidinis ergo: perhaps from the official language.
14. Livy and Caesar share a number of expressions: *vallum atque fossa, atque turris, atque pecus* (Sall. 4.1.6, Liv. 3.30.3, 7.30.15). All may have been standard in the military/official language.

15. Most of the examples of *atque* in the above list occur outside the clausula.


17. e.g. 44 times in books 1-5.

18. In books 1-3 Columella has the usage only 4 times; in the next 3 books it is found 17 times, in 7-9 23 times, and in 11-12 18 times.

19. From the middle of the first century onwards *atque* (before both consonants and vowels) seems to have enjoyed a continuing currency in technical prose of various types, despite its gradual disappearance from ordinary use. It is frequent not only in Columella and Pliny, but also in Celsus, Scrib. Larg., Marcellus, and Palladius: see J. Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius u. zur lateinischen Fach- u. Volksprache* (Lund, 1935), 37.

20. Ho.-Sz. 477.

21. Apart from *atque crniculum*, above, note *ascuabilius atque constantius* (15.21.4; cf. Sall. Cat. 2.3).

22. I omit instances of *haec atque talia*.

23. *praecactus, -calidus, -divus, -furus, -ferox, -fervidus, -praecilis, -gravis, -longus, -notens, -pruemus, -validus*.

24. 16 Histories, 24 Annals.
25. On compounds in *per-* and *prae-* in general (with a complete list), see J. André, 'Les adjectifs et adverbes à valeur intensive en *per-* et *prae-*', REL 29 (1951), 121-154.

26. See André's list for examples from all the writers mentioned here.

27. See André, o.c. 146ff., 151.
mimabanturque, quod dux et exercitus tundi bellii confector
servitias oboedient: G. Williams (Hermes 96 (1958), 97 n.) has
shown that oboedio denotes originally obedience to a magistrate,
and, secondarily, obedience to the senate. Its use here of
obedience to a freedman is ironical (cf. auctoritate above, 1).
Cf. 11.35.1 omnia liberto oboediebant; 12.7.3 cuncta feminae
oboediebant. The other 2 examples of the word in Tacitus (1.17.1,
15.6.3) are technical.
longa senecta ... insidiis obnoxius: it was argued by Wölflin
that the poeticism senecta increases from Historiae to Annals at the
expense of the commonplace prose term senectus. But on closer
inspection it emerges that the relationship between the two words is
more complex.

In the first place, while almost 50 per cent of instances of
senectus (6/14) are in the nominative, senecta is avoided in that case.

Secondly, senecta is used 16 times (over 60 per cent of all
elements) in the ablative (never with a preposition), but senectus
only 3 times (twice with prepositions).

Thus the two words are comparable only in the accusative, genitive,
and dative cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hist.</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>senectus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senecta</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table does not establish convincingly a change between Historiae
and Annals.

The disproportionate frequency of senecta in the ablative, and
its absence in the nominative, can be paralleled in other prose authors.
BeforeTacitus the word is used in prose by Nepos (frg. 15 Peter),
Varro (ling. 5.5), Livy (6 times), Valerius Maximus (4.3 ext.3,
8.13 ext.1), Pliny the Elder (43 times), and ps. Quintilian (decl. mai.
4.16). The nominative occurs only 3 times (Liv. 2.40.6, Plin. nat.)
366.

8.116. 30.69),\(^5\) but the ablative once in Nepos, once in Varro, 4 times in Livy, and no less than 25 times in Pliny. Pliny has senectus 10 times in the nominative, but only 5 times in the ablative.\(^6\)

Senecta had originally been an adjective. In Plautus it is still found 7 times in the fossilised ablative expression senecta:actate, as well as 3 times on its own (always in the phrase in senecta).

Apparently, when detached from actate to form an independent substantive, it continued to be regarded as more acceptable in the ablative than in other cases.

Nepos and Varro, like Plautus and Terence, have senecta (subst.) only in the phrase in senecta,\(^7\) but Livy shows greater licence. One of his expressions, senecta invalidus (6.8.2), is taken up, perhaps directly,\(^8\) by Tacitus (7.2.1, III.65.1, 3.33.3, 13.6.3).
Notes

1. Philol. 25 (1867), 101.

2. See in general Krebs- Schmalz, s. v.


4. Thesaurus material.

5. Virgil does not use the nominative of senecta (see Austin on Aen. 4.30), but Ovid has it in pentameters. On the influence of metrical considerations in determining a poet's choice between senecta and senectus, see E. Bednara, ALL 14 (1904), 346.

6. Pliny occasionally uses both senecta and senectus with concrete sense, to denote the old skin annually shed by snakes and other animals: see L.-S. for examples.

7. Terence's one instance of the word is at Ad. 954.

8. Note the absence of senecta from other historians.
Juvenem questionem: it has been shown by B. Axelson that there is no evidence in the classical period for the traditional view that adolescentes denotes a younger man than juvenis; rather, the difference between the words is stylistic. Adolescentes is the regular prose term, while juvenis is an elevated word, used only twice, for instance, in Cicero's speeches, and then for special effect. But from the Augustan age onwards juvenis becomes more frequent in ordinary prose at the expense of adolescentes, without, however, completely displacing it.

More questionable is Axelson's assertion that under the Empire there is no apparent distinction between adolescentes and juvenis. In Tacitus, while juvenis is, as here, always a neutral term, expressing simply a man who is not yet senex, adolescentes can take on an emotive colouring. It may designate a youth who is too young and immature (nonum adolescentem) for a task which he is doing, or for an honour, office, etc. which he has received. Note, e.g., 1.46.1 trepida ululare incassare Tiberiun quod ... dissident interea miles natus duorum adolescentium nonum adulae suctoritate comprimit (a complaint that the commanders of the German legions, Germanicus and Brutus, are too immature to be able to check the mutiny; cf. 2.43.1 invitum haec ... (Tiberius) amicis retres dissensit, nee postea maturi Orientes nisi Germanici sapientia componi; non suam astutam versasse, Drusi nonum satis adolevisse); 4.17.2 Tiberius ... acquirei adolescentes
senectae suae impatienter indoluit; cf., ib. monuit ... ne quis mobiles adulescentium animos praematuris honoribus ad superbiam extollaret (Tiberius is indignant that the priests have offered vows on behalf of the safety of Nero and Drusus, for he considers that they are too young for such an honour; cf. 17.1 - Neronem cuoque et Drusum idem dis commendavere, non tam caritate iuvenum quam adulatione - where there is no hint that the brothers are excessively young; stress lies rather on the motives of the priests, and iuvenum is no more than a general characterisation); 1.10.1 ceterum cupidine dominandi ... paratem ab adulescente privato exercitus (Octavian was subject to the charges that he was (a) privatus, and (b) too young when he first raised an army); 1.4.5 servendum feminae duobusque insuper adulescentibus (indignation is expressed that the state is to be enslaved to a woman and two mere youths; earlier in the same chapter (3) it is explicitly stated that Agrippa is too immature to shoulder such a burden: non aetate necue rerum experientia tantae moli paren); 1.47.2 simul adulescentibus excusatum cujusdam ad patron reicere (mere adulescentes can be excused for referring questions to their father); 1.3.1 Claudium Marcellum ... admodum adulescentem pontificatu et curuli sedilitate ... exulit (the implication is that under normal circumstances Marcellus would have been too young for the offices; the chapter deals with Augustus' efforts to secure the succession by elevating certain persons to positions of honour).
A distinction between *adulescens* and *juvenis* is also observable in Petronius. All 7 instances of *adulescens* are in speeches, and 5 are in the vocative case (3.1, 20.6, 50.5, 129.6, 157.7). The tone adopted by the speaker is usually abusive, sympathetic, condescending, or affectionate: 50.5 'omnis inquit *adulescens* ...' (affectionate); 137.7 'ignoscce inquit *adulescens*, sollicita sua causa!' (sympathetic); 3.1 'adulescens' inquit 'quoniam sermones habes non publici saperis ...' (Agamemnon the rhetorician condescendingly praises the style of Encolpius); 81.4 *adulescens omni jibidine impurus* (in an abusive speech); 129.6 *narrabo tibi, adulescens*, paralysin cave (Procloenos adopts a didactic tone); 20.6 *ancilla risu meo probita complevit munia et apnovi quidem* *adulescens*, ...' (the *ancilla* of *cortilla* addresses her prisoner).

*Juvenis* is more common (19 times), and is usually factual in tone. Of the 15 instances which are in speeches, only 2 are in the vocative case (118.1, 127.1); both are found in formal and emotional addresses.

The difference between *juvenis* and *adulescens* is also stylistic. *Juvenis* is common in poetry and posticingising prose, but in ordinary prose of both the late Republic and early Empire is largely avoided for *adulescens*. It is of note that Livy, who has both words,
sometimes employs *adulescentia* with a tone similar to that of *adolescens* in Tacitus. It denotes the period of immaturity rather than simply of youth. Observe the following formalistic examples:

3.12.8 *veniam errori atque adulescentiae petendo*; 8.55.2 *ut veniam errori humano, veniam adulescentiae* C. Fabi daret; 40.15.10 (aortebat) re *adulescentiae, te errori veniam impetrare meo*; 31.11.13 *exuanentes errores adulescentiam*ne. *Livy* does not use *lunenta* in similar expressions.

41 *additur senatus consultum, cui tales operam antitutuset*

*validissimae, perinde quae tenesetur ac publico iudicio calamiss*

*condemnatis:* *we belong above all to the language of law.* In the *Lex aurelia* (111 B.C.), for example, it outnumbers aut by about 140:2, in the *Lex Acilia repuanderum* (128 or 124 B.C.) by 70:4 (cc. 1-71 Brusa), and in the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* by 16:—. In prose it occurs disproportionately often in legalistic contexts and in formulas which can be shown to derive from the legal language. 4

The present example is in a *senatus consultum*. Observe that it connects words of contrary meaning. *et* is frequently used thus in laws: e.g. *plus minus* (Lex XII tab. 3,6); *minora maiorum* (Lex *Silia de ponderibus publicis*, Brusa, 46); *summet reliquiae* (Lex *agraria* 2, Brusa, 74); *detur extimaturve* (Lex *agraria* 20, Brusa, 77);
supra infrave (Epict. imp. Caes. Aug. 10, Bruns, 250); publica
preivatave (Lex Antonia de Tabernaibus I, 1.12, Bruns, 93). For the
joining by -ve of emo and verde in a senatus consultum, see S.C. de
aedificiis non dimendis II.26 (Bruns, 201) eremet venedetve.
Tacitus has probably made little change in the wording of the
original decree.

From the legal language -ve passed into prose with the function
of linking contraries. \(^5\) Tacitus has the usage about 20 times
elsewhere in non-legal contexts (Lex Tac. 1739b IA - 174a3).

The following are the other common formalistic uses of -ve taken
over into prose from the law: \(^6\)

(1) linking two tenses of the same verb: e.g. Ter. Hec. 759,
de orat. 2.206, part. 57.64, Tusc. 1.9, Att. 7.10, 11.7.5, Liv. 1.10f.6,
Quint. 5.2.4; cf. oportuerit oportetive (Lex Latina tabulae Bantinae
2.8, Bruns, 54); oportet Freeman (Lex Lacilia 13, 16, 17, 22, Bruns, 51f.);
obvenit obvenitve (Lex agraria 23, Bruns, 78); eduit emexitve (Lex agr.,
1.10).

(2) linking a simple verb or adjective with a preposition
compound of the same root: e.g. Cic. inv. 1.107, Liv. 34.2.10,
38.40.14, Sen. dial. 6.18.3, Plin. eunst. 2.17.18, ran. 3.5, Tac.
13.49.2; cf. dari reddive (Lex agraria 12, Bruns, 75); rogando
subroamndeve (Lex Julia munificia 99, Bruns, 107).

(3) linking numerals or words expressing quantity: see No.-Sa., 503
for literary examples; cf. duo plus eave (Lex municipalis Malacitana col.2, 1.33, Bruns, 149; S.C. Cestorianum, Bruns, 195; Lex Julia et Papia Poppaea, Bruns, 115); alter ambove (S.C. de iudia saesularibus II.61, Bruns, 192; Cic. Phil. 5.53 bis, 7.11, 8.33, 9.16, Liv. 30.23.2).

(4) linking two words or groups of words of which the second is a modification (= 'or at least') or an intensification of the first: e.g. Cic. de orat. 3.118, top. 86, part. 28,101, leg. 2.67, 3.6, 3.10, 3.11, Sen. dial. 3.7.2, 3.7.4, Suet. Aug. 34.1; cf. deperissent dimensione fuisse (S.C. Iuvantianum, Bruns, 205); ea maceria parsae quae eis maceriae (Edict. imp. Caes. Aug. 18, Bruns, 250); homo mortuus esseve hominis mortui (Edicta praetorum XVI.1, Bruns, 220).

(5) attached to alius: e.g. Cic. part. 140, Liv. 1.20.7, 5.54.1, 23.19.17, 25.36.5, 29.21.7, 38.30.7, 42.50.8, Sen. dial. 4.31.8, Quint. 2.4.35, 2.7.2, 2.8.7, 2.17.25, 5.10.107, 5.13.6, Plin. epist. 8.20.2; cf. Lex Julia municipalis 73, 63, 122, 137, 144, Bruns, 106ff.; Lex Julia et Papia Poppaea, Bruns, 116; Lex Ursonensis Tab. I, col. 4., 1.22, Bruns, 124; id. Tab. IV, col. 1, 1.37, Bruns, 136.

(6) attached to qui: see Ho.-Sz., 503 for literary examples; cf. Lex Julia de vi publica et privata, Bruns, 111 (7 times); Lex Julia et Papia Poppaea, Bruns, 115 (4 times); Lex agraria 17, 23 bis, 30, 40, Bruns, 76ff.
condemnatus: very rare in all prose genres after the Augustan period. It is markedly outnumbered by damnō in Seneca the Elder (129:4), Seneca the Younger (70:3), Fliny the Elder (73:2), Petronius (9:1), Quintilian (55:-), pa. Quintilian (183:2), the Younger Fliny (28:1), and also Tacitus (53:3). Of the poets, Horace (4 times), Ovid (29), Virgil (7), Juvenal (13), Statius (17), Lucan (35), Valerius Flaccus (5), and Silius (37) have damnō alone. Only damnō goes into the Romance languages.

Condemnō seems to have been the more legalistic word. It predominates over damnō in laws and also in the lawyer Cnæus (37:15) and in the Cod. Just. (70:49). Moreover it was familiar enough in legal documents to be abbreviated simply as Q (see ILL. IV.123,72f.). Another legalism avoided by prose writers of all types under the Empire is siciarius (see on persecutio, 8.5 n.). Legal words were naturally felt to be unpoetic (see on suerit, 9.3 n.).

Condemnō was probably the word used in the senatorial decree which Tacitus is paraphrasing. For the expression judicio publico condemnare in laws, see ILL. IV.124.17ff. The other two Tacitean examples of condemnō (one of which is juxtaposed with siciarius) are in legalistic passages expressing verdicts of the senate (13.44.5, 14.46.2).

The only instance of condemnō in Fliny the Younger is also in a legal context (epist. 2.11.2).
Notes

2. o.c. 15.
3. Cicero, Cassar, Seneca the Elder, and Quintilian all avoid invena completely.
4. Ha-Sz., 503 list a number of formulas, but do not discuss their origin.
   Certain writers of ordinary prose (ps. Quintilian, Seneca the Elder, Petronius, and Vitruvius) all but avoid -ve, even in formulas.
5. e.g. Cic. Flacc. 12, dem. 73, de orat. 3.116, 3.203, orat. 122, part. 137, opt. gen. 15, inv. 139, 2.31, 2.68, Liv. 3.14.3, 3.34.2, 4.52.8, 6.23.5, 7.1.3, 8.21.1, 8.23.15, 8.39.10, 9.37.3, 21.55.2, 30.23.4, Sen. dial. 6.18.3, nat. 1.1.9 (cf. 7.23.2), 1.6.3, 2.1.2 (cf. epist. 22.8), 2.39.1 (cf. orat. 58.2), 3.26.8, 7.26.1, epist. 65.5, Quint. 3.4.15, 2.4.38 (cf. 3.6.42), 9.1.29, 11.1.27, 12.5.1, 12.6.15, Plin. epist. 2.17.18, 2.17.21, 5.27.4, 8.15.2, pan. 3.5, 42.8, Suet. Jul. 27.2, 42.1, Aug. 77, 84.2, Cal. 36.2, Claud. 14, 15.2.
6. Not all of which were pointed out by Ha-Sz., i.e.
7. The Thesaurus material gives about 35 inscriptive examples of condens, almost all from laws, but only about 10 of damno.
8. In the expression ob innocentes condendumus. On the legalism ob + gerundive, see G.P. Shipp, Glotta 31 (1952), 244ff.
45.1 *in hoc ordine interferit:* Tacitus uses *interim* with *in* instead of the dative (a usage which occurs 12 times: *Lex. Tac. 676a*) only here. No doubt he departed from his usual practice in order to put unaltered the conventional senatorial expression *in hoc ordine* (12 times Cicero’s speeches) into the mouth of Cassius.

45.1 *annibus nepotiis:* on Tacitus’ use of *omnia* (adjectival) in speeches for *quaestia,* see 11.2 n. At 3.18.4 in the narrative he writes *omnia in nepotiis.*

45.2 *quod hoc evit:* read rather *vexit* (M). Cf. 12.32.3 and see Jof, Coniectanea (Uppsala - Stockholm, 1950), 101.

45.3 *quaerit dignitas tua defendat:* *dignitas* and *dignatio* are distributed thus in Tacitus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minor Works</th>
<th>Histories</th>
<th>Ann. 1-6</th>
<th>11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>dignitas</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dignatio</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table gives the misleading impression that the less usual *dignatio* (see below) increases in the first hexad of the *Annales,* but
declines in the later books. In Tacitus the two words differ in usage:

(1) Only dignitas is used, as here, in direct speeches (IV.42.3).

(2) The set phrase ex dignitate occurs 4 times in the historical works (1.77.1, 2.35.2, 11.22.6, 13.31.1), but ex dignitate is avoided. For ex dignitate, see, e.g. Her. 2.20, Cic. orat. Brut. 1.2.2, Fam. 5.8.4, Inv. 5.23.11, Sen. dial. 4.6.2.

(3) Only dignitas is used with the adjectives senatoria and aedile (II.57.2, IV.39.1, 3.30.2, 16.17.1). Senatoria dignitas and aedile dignitas are common during the Empire (TLL V.1.1138.4ff.; ib. 17ff.).

(4) Dignitas is twice used in the expression dignitas foras (II.28.1, 12 51.4); there is no comparable instance of dignatio.

(5) Dignatio always stands alone, but dignitas is a number of times linked with other substantives. The combinations dignitas/aestas (II.48.1; cf. III.35.1), dignitas/fama (6.17.3), and dignitas/salus (IV.42.3), are elsewhere commonplace.

The primary sense of dignatio (dignatio is derived from dignor; dignitas from dignus) is 'actio dignandi' (TLL V.1.1132.14ff.). The sense which it has here ('dignitas') and elsewhere in the artificial prose of the Empire (TLL V.1.1133.9ff.) must be secondary. The first extant examples (Cic. Att. 10.9.2, Livy: see TLL V.1.1133.9ff.) have the derived meaning. The word must, therefore, have been in existence before Cicero.
43.3 quis ne in metu quidem pericula nostra advertit: at the time of
Donatus the elliptical advertit was regularly used for the full form
animadvertit: on Ter. Enni. pr. 44 nos ζλλεμπικώς dicimus
<advertite ut> attentis, veteres plane animum advertite. But in the
early Empire it is rare and largely restricted to writers of mannered
prose and to the poets (III.1.862.43ff.). In late Republican prose
it occurs only 3 times in the eccentric stylist Varro (ling. 5.166,
10.6, 10.46), and once in Cicero (fam. 1.1.3), in a passage reporting
proceedings of the Senate. Perhaps Cicero was seeking to catch the
formal tone of the acta senatus.

Tacitus has animadvertit only in the minor works and Historiae
(5 times), advertit with one exception (III.25.3), only in the Annales
(11 times).

In one of the senses ('sanic') possessed by animadvertit, Tacitus
is the only extant writer to use advertit (III.1.864.23ff.), by a simple
analogical extension.

Other archaic or artificial words which Tacitus assigns to Cassius
in this speech are super (43.1), venit (43.2), naturae (44.1),
nectis (44.1), and insceps (44.4). See Introduction, p.13.

43.4 pronuntiamus ultra dominum iure causam videri: iure causas is the
standard legalism expressing a verdict of justifiable homicide. It
occurs first in the Twelve Tables: 8.12, si non furtum facit, si im
occisit, iure causas est. Later it is found, for instance, in Livy's
version of an Athenian decree: 31.44.6 additum decreto ... si quis
centra imminimam prove honore eius dixisset pecissaeve, cui occidisset
cum iure eamem; in Seneca's account of the verdict given by
Augustus when a certain Hostius Quadra was killed by his slaves
(contrast the present example): nat. 1.16.1 Augustus indicamus
vindicata indicuit, cum a servis occisus esse, at tamen non
promittavit iure causam vidiri; in a reference to the judgment
passed by Antonius on the murderers of Caesar; Sen. bevit. 5.16.1
incitavit Antonius in dictatorem suum, quem iure causam promittavit,
interfectores eius in provincias et imperia dimissit; and in a rescript
of Gallicus: Cod. Iust. 9.16.3 dubium non est, cui inferendas
caesae voluntate processaserat, iure caesum vidiri. It is also
attributed by six sources to Scipio Africanus as a comment on the
killing of Tiberius Gracchus. There are 9 other examples of the usage
found in prose from the beginning of the historical period down to the
time of Suetonius.

A legal verdict was traditionally given in the form 'he seems to
have committed the deed' (pecissae videtur) rather than 'he committed
the deed'. e.g. Cic. Verr. 2.93 pronuntiat STATIUM LITTERAS PUBLICAS
CORDISSE VIDERI. The whole expression iure caesum videri thus belongs
9.16.3, and the examples, other than Vell. 2.4.4, given at n.9).\(^{12}\)

In the sense 'kill' caedo is an archaism (for the current occido). In the period from early Latin to the time of Hadrian it is used, with perhaps only two exceptions, only in the military,\(^{13}\) sacred,\(^{14}\) and legal languages,\(^{15}\) and in descriptions of the slaughter of animals.\(^{16}\)

The exceptions are: Cic. Phil. 9.5 qui a Veientium rege caesi sunt; Liv. 4.17.6 legatorum qui Fidenis caesi erant statuae publice in rostris positae sunt. Both passages refer to the same event (the murder of the Roman legati at Fidenae by Lars Tolusnius in the fifth century B.C.).

Cicero (l.c.) tells us that a statue-group set up to commemorate the ambassadors still survived in his day. Caedo may have been the word used in an accompanying inscription.\(^{17}\)

Occido is often substituted for caedo in juxtaposition with iure,\(^{18}\) a modernisation which indicates that caedo was no longer natural to Roman ears.
Notes

1. Tacitus uses the two constructions almost indiscriminately: Landgraf, S. Rosc., 96. Under the Empire the dative seems to have been favoured in all genres: TLL VII.1.2283.72ff.

2. Erikssoon, 17f.

3. See TLL V.1.1139.32ff.

4. The text at Att. 10.9.2 does not seem to have been questioned, though the change from dignatione to dignitatione would be an easy one. I can see nothing in the context which would have motivated the use of dignatio instead of the usual word.

5. I omit the few instances of animadvertō which are in the past participle, a form in which adverto is not used by Tacitus.

6. In the tragic tale of the son who unwittingly kills his father in battle.

7. Super had perhaps survived in the legal language (see 9.3 note). If so, its use by the lawyer Cassius would be apt. See below, on iure caesum videre (43.4).

8. Note the alternation of compound and simple verb (occidisse... caesurum), as in the law from the Twelve Tables.


12. A.E. Astin (l.c.) argues that Scipio's use of *videri* introduces a certain ambiguity into his remark on the killing of Gracchus: it 'prevents an absolute and irretrievable commitment to the statement that Gracchus was *iure caesum* (o.c. 136). Scipio, Astin holds, was anxious not to incur popular odium by declaring outright that the killing was justified. Clearly Astin has not grasped the legalistic character of the words. Scipio chose to speak as a *iudex* pronouncing Gracchus justifiably slain. In origin the use of *videri* in judgements was no doubt motivated mainly by the legal taste for precision: the judge must formally acknowledge his fallibility (see Daube, l.c.). But it is highly unlikely that in practice a verdict such as *pecisse videtur* would have struck a Roman as ambiguous. The insignificance of *videri* to non-lawyers is shown by the frequency with which it is omitted in our literary authorities (see Daube's remarks, o.c. 74, on the omission of *videri* in literary reports of augural opinions). Note moreover the wording of the passage from the *Cod. Iust.* quoted above: *dubium non est eum ... iure caesum videri*: if *videri* retained any force, it would be inconsistent with *dubium non est*.

13. Denoting killing in battles, etc. See *OLD*, s.v. for examples.


15. Only in the phrase *iure caesus*. 
16. Similarly in English 'slaughter' is no longer used of the killing of individuals (it is attested with this sense from the thirteenth century; cf. the legalism 'manslaughter'), but is regularly applied to the killing of animals. Like caedo, 'slaughter' can also designate carnage in battle (attested since the fourteenth century). See the Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology, s.v.

17. Another apparent exception is at Mil. 14: ille dies, quo Ti. Gracchus est caesus. But Cicero has in mind the formula iure caesus which he has just used in reference to Gracchus (8). At Sall. hist. frg. 2.47.12 - in animis habetote non me ob scelus aut avaritiam caesum - caesum means almost 'justifiably killed': the phrase ob scelus aut avaritiam plays the role of iure.

44.1 omnibus neascius: Tacitus uses nescius and ignarus interchangeably, as can be seen from the following pairs of passages:

4.50.4 Turesis sua cum manu noctem opperitur, haud nescio duce nostro.
13.40.1 repente agmen Romanum circumfundit, non ignaro duce nostro.

3.46.1 inconditique ac militiae nescii oppidani.
III.56.2 ignarus militiae, improvidus consilii (cf. I.88.2).

4.13.3 adultus inter extorres et liberalium artium nescios.
6.21.1 litterarum ignarus.

15.9.2 imminentium neascius.
I.29.2 ignarus futuri.

3.1.1 violenta luctu et nescia tolerandi (almost = 'incapable of').
2.43.2 ingenio violentum et obsequii ignarum.

6.32.4 eo de homine haud sum ignarus sinistram in urbe famam (cf. IV.84.4, 6.7.5, 11.27).
4.32.1 levia memoratur videri non nescius sum.
IV. 37.3 dispersos et nescios miles noster invaserat.

14.3.3 pars (navis) ipso in mari per artem soluta
effundebatur ignaram ('off her guard').

Both words occur in the passive as well as the active in the
historical works (Lec. Tac. 952a, 936b).

Nescius had fallen into disuse long before the time of Tacitus.
With one exception, it is restricted in late Republican prose to two
formulas: non sum nescius (Her. 1.10.3, Sull. 20, fin. 1.1, 5.5, 7.15.1, 7.16.1, 7.12.2, 15.7.1, Att. 16.15.2); and ne forte sis
neciscus (Font. 2, Att. 15.11.4). The exception is in Varro: rust.
5.15.7 necque tamen neciscus saepe imbecillitatis.

In imperial prose before Tacitus the word occurs only twice in
Livy (27.7.5 haud neciscus; 43.13.1 non sum nescius), twice in
Columella (1. prael. 12, 1.8.4), once in Quintilian (1.3.12), and once
in ps. Quintilian (decl. mai. 10.13).

Throughout the historical works, Tacitus' preference alternates
from one word to the other (Introduction, pp. 49ff.)

44.3 postea vero nationes in familia habebus: the only other
instance of vero in Annales 11-16 is, like that here, in a speech
(12.6.2). But all 4 examples in the first hexad are in the narrative,
as are 9 of the 10 in the Historiae (exception III.2.3). In the minor works the word is more numerous than in the Historiae and Annals together (21 times; 16 times Dialogue).

On Tacitus' avoidance of participles in the narrative, see 1.2 n.

at quidam insantes peribunt: neither song nor insong had any currency from at least as early as the late Republic onwards. They are avoided, for example, by the author of the ad Herennium, Caesar, Seneca the Elder, Petronius, Quintilian, and ps. Quintilian (all of whom use nocemus and innocemus), and used only 5 times by Cicero (at leg. 3.6 in a law, and at Phil. 2.18 in what may have been a set legal phrase). Seneca the Younger has song 7 times and insong 11 times in his tragedies, but neither in his philosophical works. Apart from the poets, the historians make most use of the two words (Livy 15 times, Curtius 11, Valerius Maximus 9, Tacitus 23).

The following groups of passages show that for Tacitus song/insong and nocemus/innocemus were interchangeable:

15.35.3 quavis scirem ... victurum tamen fuisse, si clementiam indicis exspectasset.

II.10.2 quavis invisum ac nocentem more tamen audiendum consubant.

2.31.3 iuravitque Tiberius petitorum se vitam quavis nocenti,
nisi voluntarism mortem properavisset.

6.29.2 quam et si nocens periculi tamen experta fuisse.

15.4.5 unde quanquam adversus gentem et novissime exempla meritos miseratio oricbatur . . .

3.22.1 Quirinius post dictum repudiam adhuc infensus quamvis infami ac nocenti miserationem addiderat.

With the present example cf. I.6.1 inaudita atque indefensi tamquam innocentes perierunt.

On Tacitus' increasing preference for non/insula in the later Annals, see Introduction, p.40. Note that the examples of non/insula above are from the third hexad, but those of nocens/inocens are all in the Histories or first hexad of the Annals.
Notes

1. With a few variations of number and gender. Notice also Delot. 8 non erunt nescii, which is of the same structure, but in the third person.

2. In Plautus insona is almost as frequent as inuoca (7.1). Cf. Capt. 476 (mon).

3. Comprehensio sentium; cf. Liv. 4.45.2 inilicium ciro siue comuneiens
sono voces dederunt. The remaining 3 examples are at Tac. 2.41,
off. 1.62, Fam. 4.15.3.
had a distinctive tone in prose from the late Republic to Tacitus' day. It is used particularly often to denote (1) noble or exemplary deaths; and (2) deaths of noble or exemplary men:

(1) The first sense is seen most clearly in the phrase obiur publicam mortem obire, which is found 3 times in Cicero (Phil. 9.4, 2.15, 2.16), once in Seneca the Younger (dial. 6.3.1), and 3 times in Tacitus (2.83.2, 3.6.1, 15.6.1). The first of the Tacitean examples is in an inscription dedicated to the dead Germanicus, the second in a paraphrase of an imperial edict. The whole expression probably had some currency in official uses. Cf. the tone of the following: Cic. Phil. 9.2 reti er omnis qui in lexatione mortem obierunt ad incertum vitae periculum sine ullo mortis metu profecti sunt: de orat. 3.116 sitne hominem doloriae causa mortem obire;2 Liv. 5.52.3 non minus hostium admirations quam vestra conspectum est, cum inter Gallias tela de resesse ex arco sollemne Fabiae gentis in colli Quirinalli obiit;3 Val. 1.9.3 tam fortiter in eo mortem obierat;4 Sen. c. 19.82.20 in acrie educturus exercitus pro coniugibus ac libertis mortem obitum.5

(2) In the present passage obire mortem refers to the death of a man of exemplary character who had won Tacitus' full approval.

Cf. 3.75.1 obire ... viri illustres; 4.44.1 obire ... viri nobiles; 4.44.3 obiit et L. Antonius, multa claritutum generic; 5.1.1 Iulia
Augusta mortem obit ... nobilitatim per Claudiam Familiam et adoptione Liviorum Iuliorumque clarissimae; 5.27.4 obit ... M. Lentius, de cuinis moderatione atque sapientia ... concordati. Similarly Cicero applies the expression to the death of Alexander the Great (Phil. 5.43), and Velleius to the deaths of Cato (1.13.1), Scipio Aemilianus (2.4.5), and Q. Catulus (2.22.4). In Nepos quondam dicau obitae is used in reference to the deaths of a number of the excellentes duces (see n.1).

The numerous examples of obire (rarely with mortem or diem) in familia epitaphs and grave inscriptions also fall into this second category. Roman obitaries are invariably eulogistic. Of particular interest is the formulaic sepulchral antithesis vixit/obit, for Petronius puts it into the mouth of one of his freedmen: 43.1 honeste vixit, honeste obit; cf. OII X.4629 beate vixit, beate obit.

The only pre-Tacitean prose writer who uses obire (usually independently) indiscriminately is Pliny the Elder.

47.2 *co amici:* the repetition of this expression (cf. 1) looks clumsy.

Syme (74.2) has argued that the sentence is a later insertion by Tacitus, prompted by the remark at 15.22.2 that the gymnasium hare referred to was struck by lightning: the death of Menenius Regulus would have made a more effective termination to the year. But annalistic chapters, both in Tacitus and Livy, frequently contain a series of unrelated
items each introduced by a phrase such as *eo anno* (see 17 n.). Livy, like Tacitus here, often repeats the same temporal expression within
a short space: e.g. 33.42.1 *eo anno*, 2 *eo anno*, 5 *codem anno*,
6 *eo anno*, 6 *eo anno*; 34.53.3 *eo anno*; 7 *eo anno*; 39.55.6 *codem anno*,
56.1 *codem anno*; 41.13.1 *eo anno*, 4 *eo anno*; 42.10.1 *eo anno*, 6 *eo
anno*. Tacitus may have been imitating the old anachronistic manner.
Notes

1. I am not concerned here with the variant obire (sum) diem, which occurs mainly in colloquial Latin: see W. Schulze, *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen, 1974), 140. Russe on Sen. *proc. 1.1*. In Cicero it is confined to the letters. Note however that at 1,55.1 Tacitus writes *supremum diem obit.* The addition of *supremum* seems to have made the expression acceptable in non-colloquial genres (cf. *Nep. Alc. 10.6, Dion. 2.5, Hil. 7.6, reg. 1.3, Timol. 5.4*). *Supremum diem* is a more accurate euphemistic variant of *more than the elliptical diem.*

2. Cf. *Sert. 83, Phil. 11.26.*

3. Cf. 26.22.8 (the only other Livian example).

4. Cf. 2.61.4.

5. In the sense *die* Seneca has *obire* elsewhere only at *exsibt. 95.4.*

6. The examples at 1,55.1, 4.71.4, and 16.6.1 refer to deaths of members of the imperial house. In each of the 4 remaining cases (12,14.4, 13,33.1, 14.62.4, 15.59.5) the source of the death is expressed in the ablative (*faeto, morte, abruptis ... yenia*), a change which may have altered the tone of the expression.

7. e.g. *CIL 3.9531, 5.31595, 6.851, 8.86541, 11.1421, 12.907, 12.5519, 13.8350.*


Tacitus seems to have been the first writer to use exim with markedly greater frequency than exin (24:12). Even if the reading in any one passage remains doubtful, the large number of cases of exim attested by Plautus at least makes it probable that Tacitus admitted the form freely.

In early Latin exin and exinde may have had some currency, but neither is common. Both words occur 3 times in Plautus (exinde: Curc. 363, Pacuf. 680, Triu. 52), the former twice in the same proverb. Exim is found in the prose of Ennius.

Apart from Tacitus, the only prose authors down to the time of Hadrian who use either exin or exinde are Cicero, Livy, Suetonius, and Varro.

Cicero has the two words 8 times in his translation of Aratus, but only a further 3 or 4 times in his prose, and there usually in significant contexts: at leg. 3.7, in a law; twice at div. 1.55, in a passage taken from the historian Coelius Antipater; and perhaps at nat. 2.101, in an elaborate piece of writing.

Livy has 7 instances of exinde, of which 5 are in two almost identical formulas (praetores exinde sortiti sunt; praetores exinde facti:) found in annalistic chapters; no doubt they were either fossils from the official language or traditional annalistic expressions. At 27.5.6 the MSS. are divided between exin, exim, and exinde: see Johnson and Conway (CCD) ad loc.
Suetonius and Varro both commonly use archaisms.

Tacitus avoids exim and cxim in the minor works, and has them only very rarely in the Histories (twice). But in the Annals they occur 34 times. 9

48.2 PRAETORIUM necandonque more maiorum: throughout the Republic and well into the Empire neco is probably most commonly used, as here, of execution, whether performed by the state or by a private citizen. All 8 instances in Tacitus have this sense.

For the use of the word in reference to state executions, see, e.g., Cic. inv. 2.144: et aliter lex: tyrannic occiso quinque eius proximos cognationes magistratus necat; rep. 2.53 (lex) ne quis magistratus cives Romanum adversus provocati necaret neve verberaret; Liv. 10.9.4: Porcia ... lex ... gravi pugna, si quis verberaret necasse civem Romanum sanit; Vell. 2.34.4: in suo consulis in carcere necati sunt; Val. Max. 5.4.7: praetor apud tribunum suum capitati crimine captum tribunum in carcere necandum tradidit; Ill. exist. 4.11.7: nisi statim pontificem qui defodiendum necandum curarent (cf. Liv. 22.57.2). 10

Private executions represent the exercise of the ius vitae necisque in one of its forms; they are regularly described by neco, as the verb corresponding to nec.
The *paterfamilias* had the right, for instance, to put deformed infants to death. For the use of *necor* in this connection see, e.g. Cic. *Leq.* 3.19 deinde cum esset cito necatus tumquam ex duodecim tabulis insignis ad deformatam mor. Curt. 9.1.25 si quos (liberos) insignes, aut aliquum partes metbrorum inutilis, notaverent, necare inuent; cf. Plaut. *Truc.* 399 si quod perissent id <non p> ostenae ac tollerem (in reference to the exposure of an unwanted, but not deformed infant); cf. *Cod* 15. 9.79 alitas forte tom fuerit si vendas partum-invitus mundo: pietas ignoscit - necetur.

It was also possible for the *paterfamilias* to inflict capital punishment on his offspring for some offence: e.g. Sall. *Sat.* 39.5 in 10 etrus Fulvius, senectis filius, aum metractum ex itinere parentis necare in>. Quint. 12.1.37 liberos necare nonuncum muliererrimum est.

A husband who found his wife in adultery could put her, along with her lover, to death: Cato ap. Sall. *Sat.* 10.23.5 in adulterio uxorem stat at si prehendisses, sine incipie inanu necares; Liv. 1.58.4 ut in sordido adulsorio necata dicatur; Plaut. *Bacch.* 360 nihil est lucri quad ne hodie faceres savalim; cum illam cubament cum illa opprimes, nako ut necem (the soldier speaks as if the *meretrix* (illa) is his legal wife).

A dominus possessed the *jus vitae necisque* over his slaves (Caius 1.52). Hence the point of *necor* at Plaut. *Truc.* 781 in a threat
addressed to two slaves: *Aicio primo nec duuplicis habentis lignum, ne eum bilincdix vos necem.*

Finally, the lanista had the right to dispose of his gladiators. Neco is the verb found in the oath which the latter were compelled to take acknowledging that their master might execute them: Hor. sat. 2.7.56 sed reftet, uni viridi ferro neceari/auctoratus, ear; Sen. epist. 37.1 eodem honestissimi habis et illius turpisissimi auctoramenta versa sunt. 'uri, vinciri ferro neceri'; Petron. 117.5 in verta Amalini luavimus; uri, vinciri, verbeari ferro neceri.

WÖflflN, 14 apparently following Festus (158.17; 160.7), sought to show that *neco* denotes killing without the use of a weapon. 15 This view, which was accepted by Lofstedt 16 and Axelsen, 17 must be rejected, at least as a description of the connotation of the word when it refers to execution rather than to murder. Note, for example, that in all 3 instances of the gladiatorial oath quoted above *necari* is found with *ferro*. Similarly a sword is the instrument of death envisaged at Liv. 1.58.4 (see above) for Lucratia: *cum fuerit baume incolumem servam modam posituram sit, ut ...* (cf. it. 2 Sex.Turn. 89; *ferrum in manu est; moriure, si causeris vocem*); as too for the adulteress at Liv. 10.516. Again, at 10.9.5 in his account of the Lex Valeria (300 B.C.) Livy uses *neco* of the ancient punishment of beheading by means of an axe: Valeria lex cur suum qui provocasset viriis caedi necurium neceri vetuisset ... Finally, cf. Liv. 9.6.2
et vulnerati quidem necisque

(note: the juxtaposition of vulnerati with necati and cf. Fest. 158.17, quoted at n.15).

Clearly necat was a generic term for execution, whatever its method of infliction. 18

Of the Tacitean instances of the word, 2 are used in application to private executions: V.5.3 necare quasquem ex armatis nequeat;
Sec. 19.2 quasquem ex armatis necare Tacitus. The sense in each case is that according to convention the patres familias among the peoples in question (the Jews and the Germans) did not possess the ius vitae necisque. The language is taken from Roman law: it was over his aedile's descendants that the Roman pater familias had patria potestas, 19 and hence the ius vitae necisque.

At 5.21.1 - muro ex tempore at e vetere memoria facinore
decernam quasquem ignominiosae cohortis sorte ductos fusi necat -
Tacitus may have adopted an ancient formula, for Sallust has the same phraseology in a description of the old Roman punishment of decimation: hist. frag. 4.22 sorte ductos fusi necat.

With the present passage cf. Sust. I.49.2 quaeris ut puniatur
more maiorum, interpres vitae qualem id genus esset noceat; ut cum
corporisset nudi hominis cervicem inserit turcæ, corpus viride ad
necem cadit ...

The only other example of interest is at 12.47.5: Bodanistas
quasi juris iurandi memori, non ferrum, non venenum in sororem et
natrum expromit, sed proiectos in humum et veste multa gravius
opertos nesci. Infact, following Schultze, tentatively ascribed
to the word here the sense 'choke', which he saw as intermediate in
the process of development by which neco acquires the meaning 'drown'
(which it possesses in the Romance languages). He thereby
unjustifiably gave the meaning of the whole context to an individual
word. Neco, as usual in Tacitus, designates execution; the method
of execution in this case is, for a special reason, smothering
(Tacianius is under oath not to use a more conventional means of
putting his sister and uncle to death).
Notes

1. Lex. Tac. 4.22 b; TII. v. 2.1506.63.

2. Epid. 4.9 uterque in alto ventust ... exim velum vortitur; 
   Pom. 75 ut quonam est ventus exim velum vortitur. See Otto, 
   Sprichworter, 363. The remaining examples are at loc. 227.


4. TII. v. 2.1506.66 ff. Both words occur in the texts.

5. I omit the 2 instances at cmt. 154: dein ..., ot exim: pro deinde et 
   pro exinde dicimus.

6. Sec TII. v. 2.1507.9 f.

7. 25.10.9, 31.5.2.

8. 31.4.4, 37.47.3, 42.3.5. The remaining 2 examples of the word are at 
   1.28.10 and 24.42.1.

9. Tacitus does not use exinde, an indication that, even if it had dropped 
   out of use, it was felt to be less artificial than the short forms.

10. cf. e.g. Cic. Iun. 8.10.7, 24.19.5, Val. Max. 9.8. ext. 2, 
    9.15.1. Curt. 6.11.20.

11. For the ins vita necisique inherent in patria potestas, see, e.g. 
    Cic. deC. 77, Just. 8.46.10.

12. cf. Sall. Cat. 52.30, Val. Max. 6.1.3.


14. All 7 (1890), 278.
15. Wölflin apparently meant that the word was not used of killing with a sharp weapon; as he allowed, it is often found of death caused by scourging or cudgelling. The distinction between the two forms of death seems over-subtle, for scourging no less than stabbing would produce a wound (see Fest. 158.17 neci datus proprius dicatur, qui sine vulneris interfectus est, ut veneno, aut fama).

16. Late Latin (Ostia, 1950), 191.

17. Uncl. Wort. 66.

18. Another sense possessed by neco from the earliest period is 'murder'. The relation between the two meanings is unclear, but it is possible that in origin the word designated execution and that the sense 'murder' was a secondary development: an unjustifiable execution could be viewed as murder. In many cases in extant literature the two senses merge into each other (e.g. Sall. Jug. 42.1).

In the Lex Cornelia de sicaeis et vanificis of 61 B.C., neco is used of murder with a weapon: e.g., qui cum belo abulaverit hominem necandi ... causa (Brusa, p.92). Moreover not infrequently in both the classical and early imperial periods, particularly in legalistic contexts, it conveys the general notion of murder with the means unspecified (an old generic use surviving in the legal language. Note that in this sense the word is especially common with parentem or hospitem as object: Enn. xii 7. 212 qua parentem aut hospitem necasset; Plut. Mor. 479 homo necavit hunc; Cic. S. Rosc. 70.
nullum supplicium constiississet in eum qui parentem necasset;
Cael. 51 ad hospites ..., necandum: inv. 2.48; Deiot. 15; Att. 2.9.2;
West. 174.27 [he where] causat elius obmurere, qui parentem necaviisset;
Her. 1.25 et lex: 'qui parentem necasset indicitus erit, ut is evoluitur
et obligatus corio devolatur in profuentem'. The last passage in
particular suggests that the phrase parentem necasset was a legalism.
For some other general examples, see Cic. Hil. 8.9.17 bis, Inv. 3.13.5;
Qunt. 5.14.21. But there can be no doubt that in ordinary non-
technical language the word was disproportionately common by the Late
Republic in reference to murder without the use of a weapon, and above
all to that by means of poison. Thus, for instance, while in the
pro S. Roscio, the pro Milone, and the Philippicus Cicero never uses
necass to describe the deaths of the elder Roscius, Gladius, or Caesar,
all of whom were killed with weapons (occido and interficere are very
common in all three speeches), in the pro Cluentio he employs it no
less than 13 times of the poisonings of Oppianicus. cf. e.g. Cael. 51,
eff. 3.86, Her. 2.8, 2.14, 3.33 bis, Sen. contr. 9.2.13, Val. Max.
6.3.8, 6.5.1, Curt. 10.10.14, Qunt. 7.8.2, Sus. Her. 43.1.
Wölflelin and Vestus erred in not distinguishing between the
senses 'execute' and 'murder', and between the legal language (in which
the generic use was retained) and everyday speech.

20. Late Latin, 192.
nulla iniuria provocatum Antistium gravissimas in principem
contumelias dixisse: in the minor works there are about as many
examples (60) of the intensive superlative as in the whole of the
Annals (in which a high proportion of examples are, like that here,
in speeches: Introduction, p. 37). In the histories the usage is
as infrequent as in the Annals (about 53 times), but is more common
in narrative (speeches account for about one-third of examples).

Most emphatic superlatives in the historical works refer, like
that here, to things. Those applied to persons are found mainly in
speeches, particularly in the Annals (5/3 Histories, 9/11 Annals).
Cicero constantly uses superfluous superlatives as personal epithets.
Obviously Tacitus regarded the device as excessively oratorical and
hence inappropriate in history. On his avoidance of oratorical
epithets, see Further 33.3 ii.

pro magnitudine delicti poenam statui par esse: according
to hominem, delictum (denoting an offence, whether public or private)
came into use in jurisprudence only at a late date (in the late jurists
it far outnumbered pecusus). But Tacitus provides valuable evidence
that it had already entered the legal language by the early Empire.
Almost all 19 examples in the minor and historical works are
legalistic rather than general, and a few are in tags which closely
resemble maxims found in the Digest. With the example here (in an imperial rescript) and that at Gem. 12.2 - et levioribus delictis pro modo poena - cf. Ulp. 111.12 pro modo delicti poenam irrogare; Paul. V. 25.13 convicti pro modo delicti aut relevantur aut capite puniuntur. Mod. 893.19 miles pro modo delicti castigatur; Mod. 316.39 presides secundum delictum admissum libertas poenas irrogant.

For the use of the word in reference to military offences, see 11.10.3, 13.35.4; cf. Vocab. Iurisprud. Rom. II.153c.
Note


   *Annals*: narrative: 2.58.2, 4.68.4; speeches: 1.22.1, 2.63.1, 2.70.1, 3.34.6, 4.3.5, 4.34.2, 6.22.2, 16.31.1, 16.31.2.

53.4 The speech of Seneca throws light on Tacitus' methods of composition, for we are able to compare it in style with the surviving works of Seneca himself. Its most striking feature is an accumulation of metaphors (20.4 n.), some of which can be paralleled from Seneca. But for the most part Tacitus has employed his own style. He has introduced a few usages more appropriate to speeches than to narrative, but these are not specifically Senecan.

53.2 quartus decimus annus est. Caesar, ex quo ...: a standard type of speech-opening in Tacitus: cf. agric. 33.2 septimus annus est, commilitionem, ex quo (Ogilvie and Richmond ed loc.); 1.29.6 sexius dies aitur, commilitionem, ex quo.

53.2 medio tempore: Seneca never uses medius as a substantive with a dependent genitive. For numerous Tacitean examples of the construction, see lex. Tac. 816a.

53.3 pro ingentibus meritis: some Ciceroian epitaphs of meritus are magnum, maximum, praecipuum, praestantissimum, suumum, singularum, eademum, amplissimum, and praedolorum. Seneca has ingena meritum once
(bene). 3.8.2), but Tacitus was probably acquainted with the
expression from earlier historiography (cf. Liv. 39.49.11, Curt.
8.3.14).

53.4 ut sic dixerim: Seneca always writes ut ita (sic) dicam,
Tacitus always ut sic dixerim. Metaphors are rarely modified in the
narrative of the Annales (see on velut, 37.1 n.). Elsewhere ut sic
dixerim is found only in the minor works (4 times: Lex. Tac. 286d-
287a). Obviously Tacitus has introduced it here as suitable in a
speech, without ascertaining Senecan practice (or, if he had a copy
of Seneca's speech before him, without using the actual words of the
original).

53.4 culbus claritudo venit: Seneca does not use the archaic
claritudo, but has claritas 19 times.

For the most part the only abstracts used by Tacitus as subjects
of venio are words relating to time (Lex. Tac. 1751a). Seneca, however,
often has words denoting qualities, emotions, etc. with the verb (e.g.
dial. 1.3.11, 3.19.5, 4.5.3, 5.12.1, 6.1.3, 7.7.2). But Tacitus has
not imitated Seneca. Cf., in the preceding chapter (52.3), postquam
Narcom, amm, esrum, venisset. The usage has been repeated unconsciously.
There are other repetitions in this section of book 14: e.g. 54.2 levissimia quoque curie immem; cf. 55.4 haudquaeque artibus tuis paria; 55.3 vernata est; cf. 56.2 versabitur (only once elsewhere in the Annals); 51.3 validior Tigellinus; cf. 57.1 validiorque ... Tigellinus; 55.3 juventa; cf. ib. iuventa; 57.3 finges; cf. 58.1 fingesbant; 59.3 praves; cf. 59.4 gravioribus; 57.4 interficitur; cf. 58.2 interfecerunt; 61.1 venerantur; cf. ib. venerantum.

53.5 *Innumerus pecuniam:* Tacitus largely avoids the usual epithets expressing magnitude which are found with pecunia (magna, ingens, \(^1\) infinita, \(^2\) grandis\(^3\)). Seneca, however, always writes *ingens pecunia* (benef. 1.15.6) or *magna pecunia* (benef. 2.21.5, 3.8.2, epist. 22.12, 45.9). *Innumerus* is a rare word used by Tacitus a few times in the later Annals (8.1 n.), but avoided by Seneca in prose.\(^4\) Tacitus usually employs *immensa* with *pecunia*, a collocation which does not occur earlier. *Immensa* is more frequent in Tacitus than in earlier historians, who prefer *ingens*.\(^5\)

53.5 *Intra me ipse volvo:* the phrase *intra me volvo* is found in prose before Tacitus only at Curt. 10.8.9. It may have been historiographical.
proceribus civitatis: proceres had been a word of high style since the time of Plautus. It is common in Tacitus, but is not typical of the style of Seneca (found only at dial. 7.3.2, sestr. 33.1). The expression proceres civitatis, a substitute for the usual principes civitatis, occurs before Tacitus only once in Columella, in a passage on ancient Roman history: I praef. 18 illis enim temporibus, ut ante iam diximus, proceres civitatis in agris morabuntur.

Tacitus normally employs primores civitatis for principes civitatis (Lex. Tac. 1181a). He almost certainly took the phrase from Livy, the only earlier writer who uses it. Livy has it 12 times in the first decade, but only twice thereafter; principes civitatis, conversely, occurs only twice in the first decade, but 9 times from book 25 onwards.7 Primores (with or without civitatis) had, like proceres, a recherché flavour. It is first found at Catull. 68.87, in a passage on the Trojan war (nam tum Helenae ruptu primores Argivorum cooperat ad esse Troia ciere viros), and is then used only by poets and archaisers.

No doubt Tacitus departed from his usual practice here for variety.

ubi est animus ille modicis contentus?: an appropriate sentiment
in the mouth of Seneca. The phraseology can be paralleled from Seneca's own works: _pat. I prol. Il murum ingentia spatia sunt_, in quorum possessionem animus admittitur, et ita, si secum minimum ex corpore tuli, si sordidus ossa deterrit et expeditus levitque ac contentus medico emicuit (note that animus is subject, as in the present passage). _Medico(-is) contentus_ may have been a common stoic catchcry.

Extended personifications of this kind (animus is subject of an expressed and an unexpressed verb) are extremely rare in the historical works. It is possible that Tacitus is deliberately imitating Seneca, who frequently personifies animus (_e.g._ _dial._ 3.7.4, 3.8.2, 5.5.7, 5.8.1, 5.36.2, 6.10.3, 7.6.1, 9.2.4).
Notes

1. TLL VII.1.1537.72ff.
2. TLL VII.1.1425.61.
3. TLL VI.2-3.2182.73ff. Tacitus has pecunia grandis once (16.17.5).
4. Dahlmann, Hermes 72 (1937), 305.
5. See the table at TLL VII.1.450.
7. See Packard for references. On the adjectival use of primor, see Madvig on fin. 3.52.
54.1 *et tu ... sodihere: antithesis with parallelism of construction,
in a speech (14.3 n.).

54.2 *ut omnia mortalia: omnia for omnes, in a speech (11.2 n.).

54.2 *quo modo ... ita*: there are 6 examples of the correlative *quo modo ... ita* in Tacitus, of which 5, like that here, are in speeches
(Iv.8.1, Iv.8.2, Iv.7.2, 15.21.1), and the other follows *final ut*:
16.16.2 detur hoc industrium virorum posteritati, ut, *quo modo*
exsequiis a promiscua seculatura separantur, *ita* ...
So 2 of the 4 instances of *quo modo ... sic* in the historical works are in speeches
(Iv.39.2, Iv.70.2), and another follows *ut* (11.6.2).

54.2 *in socio itineris vitae*: a metaphor undoubtedly taken from Seneca:
see Syme 335 and 20.4 n., above.

54.3 traditio quorum fulcros praestringit: also perhaps deliberately

Senecan: Syme, l.c.
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The Commentary deals only with stylistic and linguistic matters. Textual problems are sometimes discussed, but only when they can be illuminated by points of usage. Diverse subjects are treated, but certain themes predominate.

Many of the notes are concerned with the history and usage of certain words and stylistic devices down to the end of the first century A.D. Tacitus' originality and idiosyncrasies, and his indebtedness both to contemporary developments in educated usage and to the historiographical tradition, are pointed out. Archaisms, posticisms, and words of high style are differentiated from words current among the educated classes. Tacitus' vocabulary is compared in artificiality with that of previous historians and other archaising writers of the early Empire. The Controversiae and Suasoriae of the Elder Seneca, the Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian, and the Declamations ascribed to Quintilian have been taken as evidence for the ordinary educated usage of the period.

The style of Tacitus is perhaps most interesting because of the evolution which it undergoes. Wolfflin found much convincing evidence for stylistic development from Historiae to Annals. Lefèvre and
Eriksson attempted to show that after moving towards greater artificiality of expression in the first six books of the *Annales*, Tacitus partially reverted in the later books to a more 'normal' style. In the Introduction (II) and throughout the Commentary new evidence has been produced to show that the thesis of Löffstedeit and Eriksson cannot be maintained. As many mundane words and usages are eliminated in 11-16 as are taken up. Moreover two apparent synonyms may be distinguished from each other by subtleties of usage, stylistic nuances, or shades of sense. Often when one word seems to be replaced by another, the two words are in fact not interchangeable; each is used for a distinct purpose.

The historical style of Tacitus is not uniform, but depends to some extent on subject matter (see, in general, Introduction I). The speeches, for example, are markedly different from the narrative both in vocabulary and sentence structure. Care has been taken throughout to indicate the influence of context on Tacitus' choice of words.

In the first chapter of the Introduction Tacitus' style is placed in historical perspective. His indebtedness to earlier historians and his originality are discussed. In the third chapter it is argued that the striking accumulations of careless repetitions which are found in the later books of the *Annales* but not in the earlier are evidence that Tacitus spent less time on revision as he neared the end of his work.

Statistics indicating the incidence of words in writers for whom
there exists no concordance (e.g. Seneca the Elder, Seneca the Younger, ps. Quintilian, Quintilian – the lexicon of Bonnell is incomplete –, Pliny the Elder) were acquired at the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae in Munich in the summers of 1968 and 1969. It will be readily apparent when an item is derived from the Thesaurus material; for convenience I have not constantly acknowledged my source.