

A PHILOLOGICAL COMMENTARY ON

TACITUS, ANNALS 14, 1-54

Thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

by

J. N. Adams



Brasenose College,

Oxford

July, 1970.<sup>ms</sup>

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
I. The Style of Tacitus	1
II. Stylistic Change in <u>Annals</u> 11-16	29
III. Were the Later Books of the <u>Annals</u> Revised?	75
COMMENTARY	82
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	412
ABSTRACT	423

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank my supervisor, Dr. R. M. Ogilvie, for his constant help and encouragement. I am also grateful to Dr. W. Ehlers for allowing me to use the library and archives of the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae in Munich in the summers of 1968 and 1969.

## 2. THE STYLE OF LIVY

Livy and Sallust were regarded in the first century as the leading exponents of two essentially different styles of historiography. Quintilian, who considered the pair to be the greatest of Roman historians, emphasized more than any the diversity of their styles (2.5.19, 10.2.105-6).

Moreover he quotes the judgement of another historian, Servilius Sulpicius, that they were pariter ... sed aliis modis scribentes (10.1.106). Livy's hostility to the style of Sallust is attested by Seneca the Elder (controv. 9.1.137).

Sallust set out to transfer the style of Thucydides into Latin (Sen. controv. 9.1.13; Vell. 2.38.2, Quint. 10.2.105, Gell. 1.27).<sup>1</sup> He writes in a manner which is unperiodic, brief (Sen. controv. 9.1.13, Sen. epist. 114.17, Quint. 4.2.43, 9.3.13, Frontin. 1.1.1) and lacking in ornamentation.<sup>2</sup> Just as he goes back to old Latin for some of his vocabulary (Quint. 8.3.79, Post. quinqu. 13. Agg. 26.3), so in his avoidance of rhetorical effects (with the notable exception of chiasmus and antithesis)<sup>3</sup> he recalls the austere style of the early annalists (3.4 n., 35.1 n.). His sentences lack the careful interconnection which is a mark of the rhetorical prose of the time (1.2 n.). An acoustic roughness can also be seen in the abruptness with which he is apt to introduce changes of subject (31.1 n.),<sup>4</sup> in his lack of attention to rhythm,<sup>5</sup> and in his use, after the manner of the annalists, of old words of some (see below, p. 51).<sup>6</sup>

Livy's conception of historical style was more like that of Cicero (de orat. 2.36 fructus orationis laus et appetitus). His writing is periodic,<sup>7</sup> full (1.2 n., 27.1 n.), highly metaphorical (1.2 n., 28.2 n.), and free of archaic word-forms.<sup>8</sup>

I. THE STYLE OF TACITUS

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, emphasises more than once the diversity of their styles (2.5.19, 10.1.101-2). Moreover he quotes the judgement of another historian, Servilius Nonianus, that they were pares ... magis quam similes (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).<sup>1</sup> He writes in a manner which is unperiodic, brief (Sen. contr. 9.1.13, Sen. epist. 114.17, Quint. 4.2.45, 9.3.12, 10.2.17), and lacking in concinnitas.<sup>2</sup> Just as he goes back to old Latin for some of his vocabulary (Quint. 8.3.29, Suet. gramm. 15, Aug. 86.3), so in his avoidance of rhetorical effects (with the notable exception of chiasmus and antithesis)<sup>3</sup> 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.),<sup>4</sup> in his lack of attention to rhythm,<sup>5</sup> and in his use, after the manner of the annalists, of old word-forms (see below, p. 51).<sup>6</sup>

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,<sup>7</sup> full (1.2 n., 23.1 n.), highly rhetorical (3.2 n., 29.1 n.), and free of archaic word-forms.<sup>8</sup>

Sallust found an imitator in L. Arruntius,<sup>9</sup> who wrote a history of the Punic War: Sen. epist. 114.17 L. Arruntius, vir rarae frugalitatis, qui historias belli Punici scripsit, fuit Sallustianus et in illud genus nitens. But his style was often criticised (Sen. contr. 9.1.14, Sen. epist. 114.17, Quint. 4.2.45, 8.3.29, 10.2.17, Suet. gramm. 10.2, 15.2, Gell. 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. 34.6). 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, 4.34.3). Moreover at Agric. 10.3 Fabius and Livy are explicitly linked as eloquent historians.<sup>10</sup> We have no testimony concerning the historical style of Pliny the Elder, but if, as is likely, it resembled that of the τόπος in the Natural History,<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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).<sup>13</sup>

Like Sallust, Tacitus avoids periods of the Ciceronian and Livian kind, though there are occasional examples in speeches (17.1 n.) and military chapters.<sup>14</sup> He writes with Sallustian brevity,<sup>15</sup> inconcinnity,<sup>16</sup> 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,<sup>17</sup> 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 simulatam 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.).<sup>18</sup> 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 homoeoptoton 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 (14.3 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;<sup>19</sup> but this view has been refuted.<sup>20</sup> In imitation of Sallust chiasmus too is used frequently,<sup>21</sup> but double chiasmus of the kind seen, for instance, at 3.4.1 - miles cum armis, sine insignibus magistratus, populus per tribus<sup>22</sup> 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 quae basilicam infectant ... accusatur pater in ultimis annis, nepos in primis adoptatur, in mediis abdicatur filius.

In vocabulary Sallust and Livy have much in common.<sup>23</sup> 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 (49), as well as in later historians. Sallust (Jug. 2.4) and Tacitus (II.78.2) 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. Occipio occurs once in Calpurnius Piso (36) and twice in Sisenna (25,104), and then in Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. Apiscor, which is Plautus alternates with the compound adipiscor, is

used by both Fannius (8) 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 secus, a phrase first used by Plautus, had a long life in historiography. It occurs in Sempronius Asellio (7), Sisenna (80), Sallust, Livy, Tacitus, Suetonius, Frontinus, and Ammianus. Necessitudo, which in the sense 'necessity' is preferred to necessitas by both Sallust and Tacitus, earlier occurs in Sempronius Asellio (5), probably as an archaism. Plautus uses necessitas exclusively. Finally, it is worth noting that glisco, which is particularly common in Tacitus, is already found in Sempronius Asellio (4) in a Tacitean phrase (invidia Lepido glisceretur; cf. 15.64.1).<sup>24</sup> The vocabulary of history probably started to become fossilised at the end of the second century B.C., for it is then that an archaising tendency becomes apparent.<sup>25</sup> Sisenna and Claudius Quadrigarius seem to have taken over from Gato 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 (attineo 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 cueo and nequeo 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 cuacta (adjectival) and omnia (11.2 n.), servitium and servitius (13.3 n.),

tolero and fero (perfero) (1.2 n., 24.1 n.), and enim and nam (27.3 n.) is the same in Tacitus as in Sallust.<sup>26</sup> 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 curis, but uses the Sallustian anxius animo twice (2.1 n.).

Sallust was criticised for his borrowings from Cato (Quint. 8.3.29, Suet. Aug. 86.3, gramm. 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 Claudius Quadrigarius)<sup>27</sup> 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).<sup>28</sup> The frequentative ducto, which occurs in old Latin (Plautus, Ennius, Terence) and Sallust, is used by Tacitus only once in the Histories (II.100.2). It does not appear again until late Latin.<sup>29</sup> It was obviously a highly recherché term resurrected by Sallust. Similarly torpedo (= torpor), which was taken up by Sallust from Cato (see Gell. 11.2.6), occurs in Tacitus only once in the Histories, in a reminiscence of Sallust (III. 63,2, cf. Sall. hist. 1.77.19). Prosapia, a word described by Quintilian as insulsum (8.3.26) and excessively archaic (1.6.40), and mentioned by Cicero as an archaism (univ. 11), is used by Sallust (Jug. 85.10) in a phrase (veteris prosapiae)

which is probably from Cato (cf. orig. 29 veteres prosapia), but is avoided completely by Tacitus. Finally the old frequentative pollicitor (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 Histories of Sallust, a work which is likely to have left an even greater impression on Tacitus than the Catiline and Jucurtha. 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 praebeo = do 5.1 n., litteris accire 6.1 n., opperior 10.1 n., sisto 14.2 n., evulgo 14.3 n., concio 17.2 n., accio 21.1 n., verbal compounds in prae = praeter 23.3 n., audeo + substantival object 25.1 n., oro + substantival object 25.2 n., perpopulor 26.1 n., sino + object 29.2 n., obvius 30.2 n., perpetro 38.1 n., adjectival compounds in prae 38.3 n., senecta invalidus 40.1 n. Perpopulor was almost certainly taken directly from Livy.<sup>30</sup>

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

substantival present participle 33.2 n., femina 35.2 n.

The remaining influence on Tacitus' vocabulary was poetry. A poeticising tendency in Roman historiography can be traced back to the annalists.<sup>31</sup> Coelius Antipater, according to Fronto, was a diligent imitator of Ennius: p. 62N ... Ennius eunoue studiose aemulatur L. Coelius. 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 inops is used in reference to Nero's state of mind because the description of a parricide's guilty conscience was a conventional poetic (tragic) τόπος. In ἐκφράσεις 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 sedes patria 12.3 n., velo (metaphorical) 20.4 n., remeo 25.2 n., rapiunt arma 31.2 n. Virgil is the poet most often recalled,<sup>32</sup> but post-Virgilian poeticisms are also traceable (velo 20.4 n.).<sup>33</sup>

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. Arruntius made to Sallustian usage (epist. 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., deum (gen. plur.) 6.2 n., opperior 10.1 n., imperito 10.3 n., reor 14.3 n., luxus 15.2 n., concio 17.2 n., verbal compounds in prae = praeter 23.3 n., oro (= rogo) 25.2 n., saevus 30.3 n., arduus 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 (munera), glisto (= cresco), fidus (= fidelis), ob (= propter), modicus (= parvus),<sup>34</sup> iuvenis (= adulescens),<sup>35</sup> iuventa (= adulescentia), repente (= subito),<sup>36</sup> cupido (= cupiditas), grator (= gratulor), minitor (= minor).<sup>37</sup>

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.<sup>38</sup> 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 poeticisms but also of words and phrases which are mainly historiographical.<sup>39</sup> Pliny's letters, in contrast to those of Cicero, contain many poeticisms.<sup>40</sup> Columella's work on agriculture, unlike that of Varro, is composed in an affected style marked by archaisms and poeticisms. 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 se in acc. c. infin., below p. 39 , per 2.1 n., praebeo 5.1 n., simul 6.1 n., exterreo (active) 8.2 n., super 9.3 n.,

vocabulum 15.5 n., accio 20.4 n., audeo 25.1 n., oro 25.2 n., coniugium 27.2 n., sino 29.2 n., ambiguus 33.1 n., nescius 44.1 n., exim 48.1 n.

Also worth mentioning is his habit of giving an old phrase a new twist. See on naufragio intercepta sit 3.3 n., a Tuscis accitos histriones 21.1 n., igne et caedibus 26.1 n., quod contra vertit 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,<sup>41</sup> 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.).<sup>42</sup>

The components of Tacitus' Histories 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, Cell. 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.<sup>43</sup> The speeches in Sallust, though composed in a predominantly Sallustian style,<sup>44</sup> contain some words which are either avoided or rarely used in the narrative (see on quidem 1.2 n., cogito 6.1 n., omnia 11.2 n., servitus 13.3 n., fero and perfero 1.2 n., 24.1 n., enim 27.3 n.).<sup>45</sup> 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 ... vel<sup>46</sup> 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.<sup>47</sup> Polypoton (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).<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless Tacitus partially or completely replaces various recherché words with mundane terms which are rare or avoided in narrative. See on the use of fero and perfero for tolero 1.2 n., 24.1 n., cogito for reputo 6.1 n., deorum for deum 6.2 n., omnia (adjective) for cuncta 11.2 n. (cf. 1.3 n.), impero for imperito 9.3 n., puto at II. 47.1 for reor 14.3 n., servitus for servitium 13.2 n., possum for queo 20.4 n., rogo for oro 25.2 n., and enim for nam 27.3 n. Quibus is preferred to quis in direct speeches (13 : 2),<sup>49</sup> timeo to metuo (6 : 1),<sup>50</sup> and the substantival use of omnes (plural) to that of cuncti (11 : 3).<sup>51</sup> 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.<sup>52</sup> Moreover barbarians and members of the lower classes use much the same vocabulary as senators.<sup>53</sup> The common soldier Vibulenus, for instance, employs the favourite Tacitean archaism ob (1.22.2), and also interficio, a word of high style which is avoided by the freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis.<sup>54</sup>

At the other stylistic extreme are the ἐκφράσεις which Tacitus occasionally inserts in the narrative. These contain conglomerations 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 *ἐκφράσεις* in a colourful style.<sup>55</sup> For an *ἐκφρασις* in Cicero's speeches, see Verr. 4. 107 (see 14.1 n.). But it is not until the early imperial period that the device becomes common in ordinary prose.<sup>56</sup> Some standard topics which could be made into *ἐκφράσεις* were storm scenes,<sup>57</sup> battle accounts,<sup>58</sup> descriptions of natural scenery,<sup>59</sup> eulogies of people and places,<sup>60</sup> and mythological details.<sup>61</sup>

In Roman historiography elevated descriptions of various kinds had long been commonplace. Sisenna, for instance, included a storm scene in his history: frg. 104. subito mare persubhorrescere caecosque fluctus in se pervolvere leniter occipit.<sup>62</sup> In Livy a good example of an *ἐκφρασις* is the account of the second battle of Fidenae (4.33), which has a number of epic touches.<sup>63</sup> Cf. 1.7.3 ff. (Ogilvie ad loc.) and 21.58.3-11 (storm). In Curtius note the account of the storm at 4.3.16 and the description of the Ocean at 9.4.18.

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 *ἐκφράσεις* are at Agric. 38 (the aftermath of the battle of Mons Graupius),<sup>64</sup> 1.65 (incident during the retreat of Caecina), and 2.23 (storm).<sup>65</sup>

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 pleraque eorum quae rettuli quaeque referam parva forsitan et levia memoratu videri 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 magnus and the other is in the expression parvi liberi;<sup>66</sup> 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.<sup>67</sup> Finally note the polyptoton (rettuli ... referam), a device used predominantly in speeches by Tacitus (20.4 n.).<sup>68</sup> Lofstedt'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 fate (6.22.1) Tacitus uses haec ac talia for haec atque talia, which is exclusively preferred elsewhere in the Annals.<sup>68</sup> In the next sentence there is an instance of denique, 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 ingens, which are used with frequency only in the higher genres,<sup>69</sup> 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: ea res admonet, ut de principiis iuris et quibus modis ad hanc multitudinem infinitam ac varietatem legum perventum sit, altius disseram.

Hercule, which is usually found in speeches (1.2 n.), is used at 12.43.2 to introduce a comment by Tacitus on Rome's dependence on exports from Africa and Egypt: at hercule olim Italia legionibus longinquas in provincias conneatus portabat, nec nunc infecunditate laboratur, sed African potius et Aegyptum exercemus, navibusque et casibus vita populi Romani permissa 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 saltem 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.<sup>70</sup> These annalistic chapters probably reproduce the style of

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, 32.7.14, 33.25.3, 33.53.7). They are remarkable above all for their striking sequences of repetitions (e.g. 31.4.2 crearet, 4.3 creati, 4.4 creati, 4.7 creatus, 4.4 facti, 4.5 facti, 4.6 instauratum, 4.7 instaurati; 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 Gellius (4.5) which we know derives ultimately (probably via Verrius Flaccus) from the Annales (HRR I, p. 4 illam statuum ... eam statuum). 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).<sup>71</sup>

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 dedicata 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 Laelia, in cuius locum Cornelia ex familia Cossorum capta 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:<sup>72</sup> patrem ei censorium

fuisse memoravi; aetas ad octogesimum annum processit; decus triumphale in Thraecia 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 annus habuit pari magnificentia ac priora) is reminiscent of Livy's formulaic method of describing the production of games (e.g. 33.25.1 ludi Romani eo anno ... magnificentius quam alias facti; 33.42.9 ludi Romani et apparatus magnifice sunt et ter toti instaurati).

Battle descriptions were familiar to the Romans from official reports, epic, and rhetorical exercises<sup>73</sup> 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,<sup>74</sup> 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,<sup>75</sup> is about 10 times that in Cicero.<sup>76</sup> At the time of Plautus the construction is scarcely

ever found outside military and official contexts.<sup>77</sup> Note in particular Plaut. Pers. 753 ff. *hostibu' victis, civibu' salvis, re placida, pacibu' perfectis, / bello exstincto, re bene gesta, integro exercitu et praesidiis; id. Amph. 188 f. *victores victis hostibus legiones reveniunt domum, / duello exstincto maximo atque internecatis hostibus.** Cf. Cato orig. 99 *postridie signis conlatis aequo fronte peditatu, equitibus atque alis cum hostium legionibus pugnavimus.* From a later period an instructive passage is Cic. Att. 4.18.5a, where Cicero has obviously fallen into official style: *a Q. fratre et a Caesare accepi a.d. VIII Kal. Nov. litteras datas a litoribus Britanniae proxime a.d. VI Kal. Octobres. confecta Britannia, obsidibus acceptis, nulla praeda imperata tamen pecunia exercitum ex Britannia reportabant.*

The following table shows the distribution of the ablative absolute in Tacitus.<sup>78</sup>

	Examples per page overall	Examples per page in military contexts	Examples per page in non-military contexts
<u>Ann. 4</u>	3.5	7.3	2.9
12	4.6	6	2.8
13	4	5.6	3.3
15	4	5.7	3.3

Obviously the construction is unusually common in military chapters.<sup>79</sup>

The best example of a rhetorical battle description in the Annals is the account of Poppaeus Sabinus' Thracian campaign (4.46 ff.). The

passage is marked by asyndeton, parallel phrases and clauses, anaphora, antithesis, isocolon, and chiasmus. Note., e.g., at 49.3 the asyndeta bellatorum, imbellium, equi armamenta, and sanie odore contactu, and the anaphora quos vulnera, quos sitis; and at 51.1-2 the anaphora nunc ... nunc, the asyndeton prensare detrahere, the parallel clauses deturbare telis, pellere umbonibus, the chiasmus incerti iotus, vulnera improvisa, and the isocolon with accompanying antithesis aliis in audaciam, aliis ad formidinem.

For a striking instance of a battle described in epic style, see chapter 30 of this book and notes.

Notes

1. E. Norden, Ant. Kunstur., 202 ff.; R. Syme, Sallust (Cambridge, 1964), 245 ff., 260.
2. Norden, o.c., 204; Syme, o.c., 265.
3. On chiasmus, see K. Latte, Sallust (Leipzig, 1935), 4 f.; on antithesis, see Norden, o.c., 203. Sallust's antitheses, unlike those of contemporary rhetorical prose, are often marked by inconcinnity (Syme, o.c., 265).
4. W. Kroll, Glotta 15 (1927), 285 f.
5. Latte, o.c., 2 f.
6. H. Tränkle, Wien. Stud. 81 (1968), 133.
7. Norden, o.c., 236.
8. Tränkle, l.c.
9. P.-N. II, 1262.
10. Although Servilius, Aufidius, and Fabius seem to have followed Livy in sentence structure, they need not necessarily have been averse to taking over vocabulary from Sallust. Servilius was an admirer of Sallust (Quint. 10.1.102). The influence of Sallustian phrasology has been detected on various first century writers: Pompeius Trogus (Schanz-Hosius 2, 322), Velleius Paterculus (A.J. Woodman, 'Sallustian Influence on Velleius Paterculus', Hommages à Marcel Renard, I, Collection Latomus, vol. 101, 1968, 785-799), and Pomponius Mela (see the Preface, v-vii, of C. Frick's Teubner text, 1880).

11. On which see Norden, o.c., 316 f.
12. Syme, 353 ff.; Norden, o.c., 328 f.; see also R.H. Martin, 'Tacitus and his Predecessors', in Tacitus, ed. T.A. Dorey (London, 1969), 125 ff. For a collection of Tacitus' imitations of Sallust, see E. Wölfflin, Philol. 26 (1867), 122 ff.
13. Tacitus' imitations of Livy have been discussed by G. Andresen, 'Tacitus in Livius', Woch. f. kl. Phil. 33 (1916), 210-214, 401-406, 688-694, 758-766. But many of Andresen's parallels are unconvincing. Some can be attributed to accident, others to the existence of a stock of historiographical phraseology which was handed down throughout the first century. Most of the plausible imitations cited seem to be in the Agricola, Germania, and Histories. There are other respects in which the Annals are more Sallustian and less Livian than the Histories: see below, n.17. For further discussion of Livy and Tacitus, with some additional parallels, see Syme, 733 f.
14. Norden, o.c., 339 f.
15. Norden, o.c., 334, 338.
16. Sorbon, pass.
17. Syme, 734.
18. On the rarity of hyperbaton of the type abab in Tacitus, see Draeger, 92.
19. B. Voss, Der pointierte Stil des Tacitus (Münster, 1963).
20. H. Heubner, 'Sprache, Stil und Sache bei Tacitus', Gymnasium, Beiheft 4 (1964), 133-148.

21. W. Kroll, Glotta 15 (1927), 300 n.1.
22. Draeger, 102.
23. See on patres 1.2 n., various phrases containing cunctus 1.3 n., anxius 2.1 n., ingens multitudo 8.1 n., recedior 12.4 n., servitium 13.3 n., sparus with acc. c. infin. 23.1 n., tolero 24.1 n., sons / insons 44.4 n.
24. For the sense ('grow') cf. Tac. 4.27.2.
25. E. Fraenkel, JRS 41 (1951), 193.
26. However, Tacitus seems also to have recalled some Livian instances of servitium (13.3 n.).
27. W. Kroll, Glotta 22 (1934), 7 n. 6; E. Fraenkel, Eranos 49 (1951), 56.
28. Outside old Latin, Sallust, and Tacitus, atque is often used before consonants for rhythmical reasons (38.2 n.).
29. TLL V.1.2467.
30. F. Kuntz, Die Sprache des Tacitus und die Tradition der lateinischen Historikersprache (Heidelberg, 1962), 162, 168 has suggested that there is more Livian vocabulary in Tacitus than Sallustian. But so much more of Livy than of Sallust has survived that such a conclusion is extremely unsafe. Note too that Tacitean words which we can say with certainty were drawn directly from Livy are fewer than those which undoubtedly come directly from Sallust.
31. See Wölfflin's remarks on Claudius Quadrigarius, ALL 15 (1908), 10-22; cf. F. Kuntz, o.c., 10.

32. H. Schmaus, Tacitus ein Nachahmer Vergils (Erlangen, 1887);  
 H.F. Miller, Proc. Virg. Soc. 1 (1961), 25 ff.
33. Some poeticisms in Tacitus, and their provenance, have recently  
 been treated in detail by F. Kuntz, o.c. See Kuntz's remarks,  
 p. 64, on poeticisms used without special point.
34. Löffstedt, Periphrasis, 74.
35. On this pair, see B. Axelson, 'Die Synonyme adulescens und iuuenis',  
Mélanges Marrouseau (Paris, 1948), 7-17.
36. Löffstedt, o.c., 168 f.
37. See the table at ThL VIII, 1024, 50 ff.
38. E. Fraenkel, JRS 41 (1951), 198.
39. For the Livian influence on Seneca, see 5.1 n., 14.2 n., 15.2 n.,  
 30.2 n. He also uses dehonestamentum, a word found earlier only  
 in Sallust (21.4 n.).
40. A.N. Sherwin-White, The Letters of Pliny (Oxford, 1966), 5.
41. See the discussion of propriety at Orat. 11.1.
42. Most of these remarks will be illustrated in the discussion which  
 follows. On the style of the speeches in Livy, see Orilvie, Livy, 20.
43. K. Schenkl, Sitzungsber. d. Kais. Akad. Philos. Hist. Kl., 60, 568.
44. R. Syme, Sallust (Cambridge, 1964), 266.
45. See further H. Schmorr von Carolsfeld, Über die Reden und Briefe  
 bei Sallust (Leipzig, 1886), 15 ff.
46. Norden, Ant. Kunstst., 334 n.1.

47. A. Kohl, Der Satznachtrag bei Tacitus (Würzburg, 1960).
48. We hear of a poeticising tendency in imperial oratory (Tac. Dial. 20.5), but it may be inferred from the style of Seneca the Elder and of the two collections of declamations ascribed to Quintilian that many speakers avoided artificial words. According to Quintilian (11.1.6), archaisms were inappropriate in the exordium, statement of facts, and arguments of a speech; by implication they could be used in the more elevated peroration.
49. Quibus: I.30.1 bis, I.38.1, III.2.4, IV.32.2, IV.64.3, 3.12.5, 3.16.3, 6.8.2, 13.21.5, 14.44.3, 14.53.4, 16.35.1; quis: 3.53.4, 6.8.4.
50. Timeo: I.29.2, II.76.3 bis, IV.42.3, IV.42.6, 3.54.2; metuo: 3.50.3.
51. Omnes: I.30.1, II.76.1, 3.53.3, 11.4.3 bis, 11.24.7, 12.37.2 bis, 14.44.1, 14.55.5, 14.56.2; cuncti: I.83.3, 3.12.5, 6.8.3.
52. Wolfflin, Philol. 26 (1867), 140.
53. However in the remark of Sejanus' small daughter (5.9.1) moneri = puniri looks like a genuine children's usage.
54. Löfstedt, Peregrinatio, 256.
55. Quintilian's remark at 10.1.33 (see 14.1 n.) is addressed primarily to the orator. Cf. Quint. 2.4.3.
56. For some examples from Seneca the Elder, which are the more remarkable because Seneca is usually such a mundane writer, see contr. 1.6.4 f., 2.1.10 ff. (on which see below, 13.2 n.), 7.1.4,

- 7.1.10, 8.6.2 (on the Virgilian influence on contr. 7.1.4 and 8.6.2, see M.P.O. Morford, The Poet Lucan (Oxford, 1967), 33), Petron. 114.
57. Morford, o.c., 32 ff.
58. Ogilvie, Liv. 21.
59. See Plin. epist. 2.5.5 nam descriptiones locorum, quae in hoc libro frequentiores erunt, non historice tantum sed prope poetice prosecui fas est. Cf. Quint. 2.4.3. On the poetical character of such descriptions in Pliny's letters, see Sherwin-White, l.c. (see n. 40 above).
60. Quint. 4.3.12 sed haec sunt plures, ut dixi, quae per totam causam varios habent excursus, ut laus hominum locorumque, ut descriptio regionum, expositio quarundam rerum gestarum, licet etiam fabulosarum. See 14.1 n. for the use by both Cicero and Seneca the Younger of the archaism memoro in eulogistic passages.
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 poeticism caecus (TLL 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 Koest. ad loc. It is worth noting that the whole phrase placidum aequor (23.3) is Virgilian (Aen.8.96). On placidus as the high-flown equivalent of tranquillus, see 5.1 n.

66. Lofstedt, Peregrinatio, 71 f.
67. o.c., 47.
68. Wolfflin, Philol. 25 (1867), 134.
69. See the table at TEL, VII.1.450. 30 ff.
70. W. Soltau, Livius' Geschichtswerk (Leipzig, 1897), 85 ff.
71. See Packard for examples.
72. Syme, Ten Studies, 36.
73. Ogilvie, Livy, 21.
74. 'Eine Form römischer Friedensbulletins', Eranos 54 (1956), 189-194.
75. Fraenkel, o.c., pass.; J. D. Leeman, Orationis Ratio I (Amsterdam, 1963), 176.
76. Leeman, l.c.
77. Leeman, l.c., cf. E. Laughton, The Participle in Cicero (Oxford, 1964), 101 ff.
78. Examples per page have been calculated from the edition of Fuchs, which has no apparatus at the bottom of each page. The following chapters have been taken as military: 4.23-5, 21, 46-51, 56, 73; 12. 12-18, 27-40, 44-5, 49-50, 54-5; 13. 6-9, 35-41, 53-7; 15. 1-17, 24-31.
79. An attempt has been made by R. Enhofer, Der Ablativus Absolutus bei Tacitus (Würzburg, 1961) to show that the ablative absolute declines in frequency after the Historiae. His statistics are selective:

<u>Dial.</u>	<u>Germ.</u>	<u>Agric.</u>	<u>Hist. IV</u>	<u>Ann. 1</u>	13
20	32	88	240	163	121

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 ANNALS 11-16

It was argued by E. Löfstedt<sup>1</sup> and at greater length by N. Eriksson<sup>2</sup> that, although Tacitus progresses towards greater artificiality of diction in the first half of the Annals, he returns in the later books, and particularly after 12, to a more 'normal', 'classical' style. This view, hitherto widely accepted,<sup>3</sup> has recently been called into question by F.R.D. Goodyear.<sup>4</sup> 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',<sup>5</sup> but sees this movement as a feature not merely of the last hexad of the Annals, 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 Annals, 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.<sup>6</sup>

It has recently been observed that there are similarly conflicting patterns of stylistic development in Livy:<sup>7</sup> while various archaisms and poeticisms 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.<sup>8</sup> Archaisms and artificial words in particular could easily pall 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).<sup>9</sup>

(3) It is no longer possible to place Latin words in any but the most general stylistic classes (e.g. archaisms, vulgarisms, colloquialisms, poeticisms). The Romans themselves had some of our own categories (e.g. archaisms),<sup>10</sup> but they also classified words according to various qualities which are all but lost on the modern reader (e.g. euphony, 'meaningfulness').<sup>11</sup> An archaising historian such as Tacitus who discards an archaism or artificial word may be motivated not by an impulse to 'normalise' 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 maximise 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.

(1) Eriksson saw the normalisation 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.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> We are particularly fortunate in the survival of Seneca the Elder's Controversiae and Suasoriae and ps. Quintilian's Declamationes Minores, 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;<sup>14</sup> both avoid completely many words<sup>15</sup> 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;<sup>16</sup> 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,<sup>17</sup> but only in *ἐκφράσεις* which, according to rhetorical theory, could contain usages proper to history and poetry.<sup>18</sup>

Two other useful guides to first century educated usage are Quintilian (Inst. Orat.) and Petronius (excluding the speeches in the Cena Trimalchionis),<sup>19</sup> but both must be used in conjunction with the Elder Seneca and ps. Quintilian, for Quintilian occasionally adopts mild archaisms<sup>20</sup> and anachronistic Ciceronianisms,<sup>21</sup> and Petronius writes up some passages more elaborately than others.<sup>22</sup>

(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 Eriksson, 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.<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> 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,<sup>25</sup> and between dignitas and dignatio.<sup>26</sup>

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.<sup>27</sup> Examples of stylistic change which, broadly, is of the opposite kind to that noted by Eriksson 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 Eriksson's one-sided picture by providing some generally conflicting evidence.

The view of Goodyear and of R.H. Martin,<sup>28</sup> 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.

O. Mebs<sup>29</sup> noted a decrease in the incidence of anaphora in 11-16, after a surprising rise from Histories to Annals:

<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann. 1-6</u>	11-16
83	140	90

K. Jax<sup>30</sup> convincingly demonstrated that combinations of synonyms (or near synonyms)<sup>31</sup> 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:

<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	11	12	13	14	15	16
152		16	18	20	7	-	7	2	3	6	3	5	6 <sup>32</sup>

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<sup>33</sup> to decline in the later books. Each phenomenon seems to be most common in book 1.<sup>34</sup>

Two of the most striking kinds of antithesis<sup>35</sup> - 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 praesentia quam vetera et periculosa mallent); and (2) two or more antithetical pairs of words are juxtaposed (e.g. 1.70.3 nihil strenuus ab ignavo, sapiens ab imprudenti, consilia a casu differre)<sup>36</sup> - diminish in the narrative portions of the later Annals. In books 1-3 I have noted 45 instances of the two devices in narrative,<sup>37</sup> but in 13-15 (of comparable length) only 14.<sup>38</sup>

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:<sup>39</sup>

<u>Ann.</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	11	12	13	14	15	16
	40	30	12	31	1	13	13	18	10	6	8	6

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 bimembre of the type consisting of two substantives with qualifying or dependent words undergoes a similar decline:<sup>40</sup>

1-6	11-12	13-16
51	6	10

Parallelism of phrases and clauses<sup>41</sup> is particularly frequent in Annals 1, but thereafter decreases:<sup>42</sup>

<u>Ann.</u> 1	4	14
136	64	61

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.<sup>43</sup> Tacitus, however, probably following Sallust (who in turn appears to have been following the early annalists) uses it only sparingly.<sup>44</sup> 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 Annals as in the last 6 (but there is not a high incidence in either section).<sup>45</sup>

The intensive (as distinct from the relative) superlative, a usage employed to excess in much rhetorical prose (e.g. by Cicero and Velleius)<sup>46</sup> is found disproportionately often in speeches in the historical works. Of the 30 examples which occur in narrative in the Annals, about two-thirds are in the first 6 books.<sup>47</sup>

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

C. Wetzell<sup>48</sup> and in particular C. Stuhl<sup>49</sup> showed that ellipse of esse diminishes in 11-16. It has been possible to confirm their conclusion with some new evidence.<sup>50</sup>

The placing of prepositions in anastrophe drops sharply in 13-16, as Goodyear has demonstrated with convincing statistics:<sup>51</sup>

	1-6	11-12	13-16
	238	65	100
expected	218	56	129

A. Kohl<sup>52</sup> 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.<sup>53</sup>

#### Word Choice, Syntax

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

Wolfflin was the first to find signs of a continuation throughout the Annals 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 tanquam;<sup>54</sup> that the form vinculum is driven out after book 1 by the older vinclum;<sup>55</sup> that the use of quidam in combination with substantives - amplitude characteristic rather of the oratorical style<sup>56</sup> - diminishes from hexad to hexad;<sup>57</sup> that variants of the traditional pair adversus/secundus become increasingly common after the start of the Annals;<sup>58</sup> and that the archaising dehinc (= deinde) is twice as frequent in the last 6 as in the first 6 books.<sup>59</sup>

Similarly R.B. Steele noted an increase in the incidence of the archaic/poetic usage quo + subj. (without a following comparative) for final ut<sup>60</sup> in 11-16:<sup>61</sup>

<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann. 1-6</u>	11-16
4	9	24

E. Kucera found that Tacitus shows a greater tendency to admit inconcinnitas of expression in the later books.<sup>62</sup>

Finally, Eriksson himself conceded that the highly artificial use of commomentum for nomen increases in 11-16.<sup>63</sup>

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<sup>64</sup> and is common in historians other than Velleius.<sup>65</sup> 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:<sup>66</sup>

minor works	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann. 1-6</u>	11-16
5	42	83	82

Most authors omit se (but not eum, etc.) considerably more often with the future active than with other tenses of the infinitive.<sup>67</sup> In the Histories Tacitus rarely omits it with tenses other than the future; in the Annals, however, he becomes progressively less restrictive:

	<u>se omitted with future active infinitive</u> <sup>68</sup>	with other tenses <sup>69</sup>
<u>Hist.</u>	10 (77% of all instances)	3
<u>Ann. 1-6</u>	14 (67%)	7
11-16	19 (55%)	15

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:

	minor works	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann. 1-6</u>	11-16
<u>litterae</u>	1	18	38	17
<u>epistula</u>	5	38	11	2

Note that epistula still predominates in the Histories, 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, cuos ab epistulis et libellis et rationibus appellet; 16.8.1 praeficeretque rationibus et libellis et epistulis libertos.

sons, insons, nocens, innocens: on the archaisms sons and insons, see 4.4.4 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;

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann. 1-6</u>	11-16
<u>nocens, innocens</u>	12	12	4
<u>sons, insons</u>	2	6	15

ludicrum, ludi: ludicrum is used for ludi mainly by historians.<sup>70</sup>

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 ludicrum comes into favour.

	Ann. 1-12	13-16
<u>ludicrum</u>	4	10
<u>ludi</u>	11	9

deligo, lego: it is sometimes wrongly assumed that compound verbs are uniformly of lower stylistic level than their corresponding simple verbs. Deligo was an archaism at Tacitus' time of writing (although at the end of the Republic it had been commonplace). Eligo and to a lesser extent lego were the equivalents in ordinary educated use.<sup>71</sup> Wölfflin has shown that eligo is dropped by Tacitus after Annals 1.<sup>72</sup> It may be added that lego continues to be used (with diminishing frequency) until 12, after which it too is dropped:

	Hist.	Ann. 1-6	11-12	13-16
<u>lego</u>	22	12	4	-
<u>deligo</u>	21	48	8	29

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

In books 1-12 lego and deligo tend to occur in clusters, a phenomenon probably due to unconscious association. Deligo 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 (72, 73, 75) and twice in 5 chapters (52, 56) in 4: 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. Lego is found twice in 5 chapters (43, 47) in 1; twice in 5 chapters (48, 52)

in 2; 3 times in 6 chapters (30, 32, 35) in 3; and twice in the same chapter (16) in 4.<sup>73</sup>

exterreo, terreo: exterreo is another artificial compound.<sup>74</sup>

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

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann. 1-6</u>	11-16
<u>terreo</u>	16	7	5
<u>exterreo</u>	6	12	18

No allowance has been made here for those instances of exterreo which are not synonymous with terreo but have the sense 'frighten away';<sup>75</sup> 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 formulaic usage preserved in the official language and taken over from there by archaisers).<sup>76</sup> 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 oratio obliqua):

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann. 1-6</u>	11-16
<u>super</u> with words	1 (20% of	6 (45%)	11 (92%)
other than <u>res</u>	all instances)		

quando = quoniam: an artificial usage rarely found in the ordinary prose of either the Republic or early Empire.<sup>77</sup> It is infrequent at the start of the *Annals*, but outnumbers quoniam in the later books:

	<u>Ann.</u> 1-4	5-16
<u>quoniam</u>	11	5
<u>quando</u>	3	17

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 (17:9).<sup>78</sup>

neque ... neque: correlative neque ... neque becomes progressively less common after the first 3 books of the *Annals*:<sup>79</sup>

minor works	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-3	4-6	11-16
16	31	24	6	6

In the narrative it is distributed thus:

<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
21	13	5

The variants neque ... aut and nec ... aut, which are frequent in poetry,<sup>80</sup> are fairly evenly distributed throughout the historical works.<sup>81</sup>

The diminution of neque ... neque is therefore genuine.

Nec ... nec is about as common in the minor works (13 times) and in *Histories* I (7 times) as neque ... neque, but it is thereafter all but dropped. It occurs 3 times in the rest of the *Histories*, and only

3 times in the whole of the Annals. Necue was a word of higher style than nec.<sup>82</sup>

The use of the final infinitive with verbs for ut + subj: there are about 20 verbs which are used both with ut and the final infinitive in the historical works.<sup>83</sup> The distribution of the two constructions with these is as follows:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>ut</u>	20 (2:1)	24 (1:1)	10 (1:7.8)
infinitive	11	22	33

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:

	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6		11-16	
	<u>ut</u>	infin.	<u>ut</u>	infin.
<u>perpello</u>	4	2	-	3
<u>suadeo</u>	3	7	-	4
<u>hortor</u>	3	1	1	4

There are in all 2 instances of the final infinitive with verbs in the minor works, 22 in the Histories, 34 in Annals, 1-6 and 50 in 11-16.<sup>84</sup>

ammis, flumen: by the Ciceronian period at the latest, ammis, which had once been in regular use, was obsolete.<sup>85</sup> Tacitus prefers

flumen in the Histories and Annals 1-6, but amis thereafter:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>flumen</u>	26	27	6
<u>amis</u>	17	19	18

Finally, see the Commentary on coniur,<sup>86</sup> maximus/praecipuus,<sup>87</sup> testificor,<sup>88</sup> and flris (= mors).<sup>89</sup>

The most striking examples which have been noted of stylistic change of the opposite kind are the gradual diminution of neque,<sup>90</sup> of e before consonants,<sup>91</sup> and of the third declension accusative plural form -is,<sup>92</sup> and the sudden discarding of ni, foies,<sup>93</sup> and ouis<sup>94</sup> after 12. It has also been shown with some plausibility that rursum (= rursus), adversum (= adversus), obsidium (= obsidio), necessitudo (= necessitas), loci (= loca), postponed quippe, formido, apiscor (= adapiscor),<sup>95</sup> pollicor (= promitto),<sup>96</sup> and antire (= antire)<sup>97</sup> decline in the later books, and that correlative aut ... aut<sup>98</sup> and timere base.<sup>99</sup>

Some of this evidence requires further comment:

adversus, adversum: it is possible that the increase of adversum 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 M is strongly supported by the fact that 30 of the 64 instances of adversum 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.<sup>100</sup>

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

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

	<u>Ann.</u> 1-2	3-6	11-14	15-16
<u>adversum</u>	10	38	4	12
<u>adversus</u>	20	7	42	11

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

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

	<u>Ann.</u> 1	2-6	11-14	15-16
<u>adversum</u> before vowels	4	17	2	7
<u>adversus</u>	5	1	9	3
	<u>Ann.</u> 1-2	3-6	11-14	15-16
<u>adversum</u> before consonants	4	23	2	5
<u>adversus</u>	15	7	33	8

Adversum is an archaism. Sallust probably took it over from Cato's Origines, where it is attested,<sup>102</sup> and Tacitus from Sallust. Sallust has it only in the Jugurtha.<sup>103</sup>

e,ex: the decline in the frequency of e before consonants which M shows in 13-16 is certainly a genuine stylistic change, for e continues to predominate until the end of the work in certain apparently formulaic expressions (above all before proper names: cf. e numero, e provincia, e domo, e superiore, e convicio, e praesentibus). 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. 332: cf. ex diverso, maius ex parte, ex modo, ex dignitate, ex more).

quippe: it was maintained by Eriksson that examples of quippe occupying second position in their clause<sup>104</sup> are less common in the second half of the Annals than in the first. But more detailed examination of the evidence shows that Tacitus' changes of taste are more numerous than Eriksson allowed. Annals 1 reveals a closer affinity with the Histories 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 (13:10), 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).

formido: this word declines most strikingly after the first two books of the Annals rather than in the third hexad (as asserted by Eriksson).

The third declension accusative plural in -is: the observation of C.C. Tingdal that -is undergoes a continuous diminution in the Annals seems to have gone unnoticed. There are twice as many instances in 1 as in any other book:

<u>Ann.</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	11	12	13	14	15	16
	26	11	13	12	-	8	-	2	2	5	1	1

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.<sup>105</sup> 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.<sup>106</sup> Note also the idiom mentioned above in which present participles ending in -is are governed by adversum.

Some new evidence can be added to the above:

atque, ac: these and the other copulative particles are not completely interchangeable in sense and usage, but they overlap to a considerable extent.<sup>107</sup> A writer's choice is governed above all by

stylistic considerations.<sup>108</sup> Atque is a word of high style.<sup>109</sup> It has been shown, for instance, to be particularly characteristic of those speeches of Cicero which are composed in the grand style.<sup>110</sup> In the early and less elaborate speeches, and in the colloquial and technical works, it is far outnumbered by et; but in the imp. Pomp., e.g. it is more frequent than both et and -que. Tacitus uses it more often in the first half of the Annals than in the second:

<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
271	253	113

If the proportion of instances of atque used as a copulative to those of copulative et is tabled in the three sections of the Annals, it is seen that atque declines continuously:<sup>111</sup>

1-6	11-12	13-16
1/3.6	1/5.1	1/7.5

num, an: as a particle introducing simple indirect questions, num was obsolete by the first century A.D.<sup>112</sup> It is gradually dropped by Tacitus in favour of the current word an:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>num</u>	7	4	2
<u>an</u>	2	6	16

ignarus, nescius: Tacitus' use of this pair - of which the latter was already archaic by the late Republic<sup>113</sup> - 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, nescius comes into favour. Ignarus regains the ascendancy in 6-14, but in the final two books nescius again increases:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-2	3-5	6-14	15-16
<u>ignarus</u>	30	9	7	33	2
<u>nescius</u>	2	4	12	7	6

For the return of a more artificial word in books 15-16, see on adversum and postponed quibus above, and see Gerber and Greef, Lex. Tac. 911b on neque in 16.

-avisset: 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.<sup>114</sup> The full forms fall off slightly but perceptibly after the first few books of the Annals (in the Histories they are rarely used).<sup>115</sup> The proportion of contracted to uncontracted forms in various sections of the Annals is as follows:<sup>116</sup>

<u>Ann.</u> 1-3	4-12	13-16
1/5	1/3.3	1/2.5

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

quis, 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 Caesar.<sup>117</sup> Virgil and Livy both show greater hesitancy in admitting old forms than their predecessors Lucretius and Sallust.<sup>118</sup> Of the forms mentioned above, for instance, adversum, -aviset and quis are all frequent in Sallust's later writings,<sup>119</sup> but largely or completely avoided by Livy.<sup>120</sup> Tacitus seems to have moved slightly away from the Sallustian practice towards that of Livy (and probably that of other modern historians, such as Aufidius Bassus and Servilianus Nonianus). However, he undertook no systematic removal of old forms from his vocabulary; only quis is abruptly discarded.

The nominative use of the ab urbe condita construction: This unusual construction (see e.g., 1.42.1 neve occisus Augusti propeos, interfecta Tiberii manus nocentiores vos faciat), for which it is simpler to use a substantive (e.g. here caedes) with a dependent genitive, is strikingly frequent in the early books, but is all but excluded from the later.<sup>121</sup> It is possible that Tacitus dropped it because it had become an obtrusive mannerism of his style.

Ad + gerundive: with a selection of examples Wolfelin<sup>122</sup> showed that often when ad + gerundive appears in the Annals instead of the archaizing dative of purpose with the gerundive, Tacitus was compelled to

use it by the requirements of sense, euphony, or variation.<sup>123</sup>

The following table shows all examples in the Annals of those instances of ad + gerundive for which the dative of the gerundive could apparently have been substituted without difficulty:<sup>124</sup>

<u>Ann.</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	11	12	13	14	15	16
	10	-	-	-	-	4	1	2	1	5	4	7

The change in the later books is clear;<sup>125</sup> note too that Tacitus' practice in book 1 has not altered greatly from that in the Historiae (on which see Wolfflin, l.c.).

tutor, tueor: both Plautus and Terence always have tutor for tutor (in the sense 'guard'; Plautus occasionally has tueor = 'see'), but by the late Republic the frequentative was no longer in use, except in the past participle tutatus, which provided a substitute for the avoided past participle of tueor.<sup>126</sup> In Cicero's speeches there are almost 90 examples of tueor, but only 7 of tutor, of which 5 are in the form tutatus and another is needed in polyptoton: Phil. 4.2 qui rem publicam libertatemque vestram suo studio ... tutatus est et tutatur.<sup>127</sup> In the letters, where tueor is used more than 100 times, the sole example of tutor is a past participle. In the rhetorica tutor occurs twice, once as a past participle and once as a present infinitive. It is only in the philosophica that Cicero has tutor more than once in forms other than tutatus. Tueor, however, still predominates (118:8).<sup>128</sup>

Under the Empire Vitruvius, Seneca the Elder, Seneca the Younger,

Petronius, Quintilian, and ps. Quintilian (decl. min.) et al. avoid tutor completely.

Before Tacitus the only writers of prose who used tutor with any freedom are Sallust (8 times; tueor twice) and, in particular, Livy (over 100 times). In the first decade Livy employs it scarcely less often than tueor (20:23);<sup>129</sup> in the third, however, tueor 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 tutor is at its most frequent in the first hexad; it then declines to the position which it had had in the Historiae:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>tutor</u>	1	10	1
<u>tueor</u>	15	7	11

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 Annals 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:

<u>Dial.</u>	<u>Agric.</u>	<u>Germ.</u>	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
36	13	15	19	11	10

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.<sup>130</sup>

In 11-16 however, there are 6 examples in ordinary narrative.<sup>131</sup>

Similarly in the Histories 15 of the 19 instances are in narrative.<sup>132</sup>

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

Repeated (but not correlative) et ... et: this usage is rare in 4-12, but is no less frequent in 1-3 than in the last hexad:

<u>Hist.</u> I-III	IV-V	<u>Ann.</u> 1-3	4-12	13-16
38	11	33	6	31

Note that it decreases at the end of the Histories, but is taken up again at the start of the Annals.

struo, exstruo: the compound seems to have been the word in ordinary use in the early Empire.<sup>133</sup> In the Annals it gradually displaces struo:

	minor works	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>struo</u>	-	8	12	3
<u>exstruo</u>	5	9	5	12

Another artificial simple verb which is all but eliminated by a compound is apiscor (see above, p.45).

It is an indication of the complexity of stylistic change in the Annals that, while the commonplace compounds exstruo and adipiscor

drive out struo and abiscor in the later books, deligo and exterreo, 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:<sup>134</sup> (figures in brackets show number of occurrences)

expromo (4), emerco (4), expurgo (1), expio (1), evinco (3:6),  
perfunctor (1:4), perpopulo (1), everto (5), adhortor (1), enumero (2),  
exosco (2:4), exoptulo (3:7), adquiro (4), conitoi (5), contego (1:3),  
pernotesco (1:3), evulgo (3), pervulgo (2), revellesco (1), praeparo (2)  
decerto (1), demoror (2), denego (3), demereor (1), depello (de reuerentia:  
1:3), depopulo (2), inclaresco (1), dedico (1), evalesco (1), emitto (1)  
(de telis), extimesco (3), excreto (2:5), extello (sens. propr.: 1),  
exsolvo (de votis: 1), conseruo (1), comprobo (1), comato (2),  
comparo (1), concupisco (3), confido (1:2), confirmo (4), adfirmo (2),  
conflagro (1), consaluto (1:2), constituo + infin. (1), conqueror (2:4),  
contendo + infin. (1).

On perpetro and patro, see 38.1 n.

The number of compounds confined to or predominating in 1-6 is strikingly smaller: occido (4), permanio (2), percolo (1), perstimulo (1), pertempto (1), adpropinquo (1), conterreo (1), exsatio (2), inardesco (1), dego (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.<sup>155</sup>

1. JRS 26 (1907), 22-31.

2. ibid., 25.

3. For brief remarks on which, see ibid., 27; ibid., 28, 29.

4. See H. Tränkle, 'Anmerkungen und Vorschläge zur Kritik der lateinischen Sprache', Zeitschr. f. d. Phil. 81 (1904), 103-117.

5. See Quint. 10.2.27 and Ter. Phyl. 412 on magis being used in contrast to magis as a synonym of magis, see ibid., 2. ibid., 26 and references on magis in ibid., see ibid., Stylistica, 26, and references.

6. See P. Kappeler, De Ter. in epigrammatis metricis ratione (Zürich, 1866), 120 n.1.

7. See, e.g., Quint. 1.6.40, 8.7.11, 8.1.26, 8.3.27, ibid. 10.7.1.

8. See, e.g., Quint. 8.7.7, 8.3.16. The epithet significans as applied to words apparently means 'expressive', 'meaningful'.

9. See, e.g., on significans 8.5 n., ibid. 10.3 n., ibid. 11.2 n.,

## Notes

1. Synt. II, 283 ff.
2. Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus (1934).
3. For favourable reactions to the dissertation of Eriksson, with whose name the theory is most commonly associated, see Koestermann, Gnom. 11 (1935), 322 ff.; Hofmann DLZ 56 (1935), 1774 ff.; P. Aalto, Eranos 51 (1953), 54; Klingner, Hermes 83 (1955), 187 n.1; Syme, 739
4. JRS 58 (1968), 22-31.
5. o.c., 28.
6. For brief remarks on which, see Syme, 739; Goodyear, o.c., 26f.
7. See H. Tränkle, 'Beobachtungen und Erwägungen zum Wandel der livianischen Sprache', Wiener Stud. 81 (1968), 103-152.
8. See Quint. 10.2.18 and Tac. Dial. 23.1 on esse videtur in Cicero; on criticism of Cicero's overuse of comperio, see Landgraf, S. Rosc., 86 and references; on stque in Cato, see Marouzeau, Stylistique, 263, and reference.
9. See P. Spitta, De Tac. in componendis enuntiatis ratione (Götting., 1866), 120 n.1.
10. See, e.g., Quint. 1.6.40, 8.2.12, 8.3.26, 8.3.27ff., Gell. 11.7.1.
11. See, e.g., Quint. 8.2.9, 8.3.16. The epithet significans as applied to words apparently means 'expressive', 'meaningful'.
12. See, e.g., on sicarius 8.5 n., testificor 12.3 n., oro 25.2 n.,

- affectio 27.3 n., contemptio 27.3 n., sileo 36.1 n., condemno 41 n.
13. 1.6.45 ergo consuetudinem sermonis vocabo consensum eruditorum.  
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. reor, 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 pluperfect subjunctive of first and fourth conjugation verbs and of the perfect infinitive (Quint. 1.6.17, 1.6.21), deum (= deorum) (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. 2.1.10ff. Note, e.g. egere (2.1.10). Cf. 13.3 n.
18. See Quint. 10.1.33 licet tamen nobis in digressionibus uti vel historico nonnunquam nitore; see also on memoro, 14.1 n., and above, p. 14.
19. Löffstedt occasionally made use of Petronius as a representative of ordinary imperial usage: Peregrinatio, 168f., 256f.
20. e.g. reor (2.16.9, 11.3.31, 12.10.5), which he describes (see above, n. 14) as 'tolerabile'.
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 = cito 12.12.3, dehonestamentum = dedecus 12.14.3, 14.21.4, disserto = dissero 12.11.1, 13.38.3, dido 11.1.2 (see Lex. Tac. s.v. 'fama' for alternatives), diutinus = diuturnus 14.18.2, dignus + gen. 15.14.1, distermino = divido 11.10.2, funus = cadaver 13.17.3, 15.71.1 (see Norden, Aen. VI, 178), genero 15.23.1 (see Fraenkel, Horace, 293 n.3), illo = illuc 15.60.4, intorqueo 14.36.3 (see note ad loc.), inultus = impunitus 13.25.2, moenia = portae, urbs 14.24.4 (see Nipp. - Andr. ad loc.), obtego = protego 16.5.3, partio = partior 12.30.2, permeo = pervenio 14.58.4, popularis = populus 12.16.1, 14.24.4, praevalidus = validissimus 15.20.1, queritor 16.34.2, regno trans. 13.54.1, retego = 'reveal' 15.74.1, rebello = descisco 12.50.2, innumerus (see 8.1 n.), eo infitias = infitor 15.2.3, merso = mergo 15.69.2, subvecto = subveho 15.43.3; (2) eligo = deligo (see Philol. 25 (1867), 108), honestataque inhonesta (without variation : see Philol. 26 (1867), 151), firmus = validus (see 5.1 n.), apparatus = paratus 2.69.2, capillus 4.57.2 (see Tränkle, Wien. Stud. 81 (1968), 123), cadaver 1.22.2, 2.18.1 (see Norden, Aen. VI, 178), consimilis 3.13.2, satietas 1.49.2, firmitas 4.63.1, taceo = sileo 4.60.2 (see 36.1 n.), tacitus = silens 2.43.5, adpropinquo = propinquo 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 quis in Tacitus', CQ 82 (1968), 144-146.
29. 'Über den Gebrauch der Anaphora bei Tacitus' (Erlangen, 1918), 26, 33, 43.
30. 'In componendis synonymis quae ratio adhibita sit in Taciti Germania et Agricola', Studi in onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli (Varese, 1955), 431.
31. On combinations of synonyms as characteristic above all of Cicero's middle style, see P. Gotzes, De Ciceronis tribus generibus dicendi in orationibus pro A. Caecina, de Imperio Cn. Pompei, pro C. Rabirio perd. r. adhibitis (Rostock, 1914), 111. Cf. Gordon, Ant. Kunstler., 167 n.1.
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 im Lat. (Lund, 1931), 189, 195f., 204f.
34. Lindholm 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. II (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 21 examples of the two devices, and in 13-15, about 10 (see n.38).
38. Narrative: 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 1.7.1 bis, 1.16.2, 1.24.3, 1.28.2, 1.29.1, 1.31.4, 1.51.3, 1.53.5, 1.55.3, 1.61.2, 1.63.2, 1.70.2, 1.70.3, 1.72.2, 1.74.2 bis, 1.80.2, 1.81.2 bis, 2.4.2, 2.17.3, 2.19.1, 2.39.4 bis, 2.44.2, 2.45.1, 2.46.1, 2.64.1, 2.64.2, 2.72.2, 2.87, 2.88.3, 3.1.4, 3.13.1, 3.19.2, 3.21.1, 3.24.2, 3.25.1, 3.29.2, 3.29.4, 3.30.4, 3.66.4, 13.5.1, 13.16.3, 13.45.3, 13.46.3, 14.39.2, 14.45.2, 14.62.2, 14.63.2, 15.18.1, 15.27.3, 15.29.1, 15.31, 15.40.1, 15.57.2.
- Speeches: 1.18.3, 1.19.2, 1.26.3, 1.28.5, 1.46.3, 1.58.3, 1.59.6, 2.5.3, 2.10.1, 2.33.2, 2.71.1, 2.80.2, 3.6.3, 3.16.3, 3.17.2, 3.18.2, 3.45.2, 3.47.1, 3.50.2, 3.54.3, 3.69.3, 13.55.2, 13.56.1, 14.20.5, 14.54.1, 14.56.2, 15.1.4, 15.2.3, 15.6.2, 15.20.3, 15.21.4.
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, 36.3, 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.

4.1.1, 2.2, 3.5, 5.4, 6.2, 8.4, 8.5, 25.2, 31.3, 36.3, 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.

6.1.2, 3.4, 6.2, 8.4, 19.2, 19.3, 24.1 ter, 35.1, 35.2 bis, 38.1.

11.6.2, 12.3 bis, 16.2, 16.3, 18.3, 19.1, 24.2, 24.6, 26.2, 27, 30.2,  
38.3.

12.1.1, 6.1, 12.1, 17.2, 22.1, 29.3, 33, 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, 19.2, 42.4, 44.3, 46.1, 57.2, 57.3.

14.8.1, 31.3, 33.2, 36.1, 47.1, 55.3.

15.12.3, 19.2, 27.3, 34.2, 48.1, 54.1 bis, 55.1.

16.13.1, 26.3, 28.2, 28.3, 29.1, 32.3.

40. 1.6.3, 8.3, 10.2, 11.1, 13.3, 28.2, 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, 33.3, 37.4, 41.1, 43.5, 44.2, 55.5,  
55.6, 65.3.

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, 51.1.

5.1.3, 9.1.

6.29.4, 32.4, 44.1, 46.1, 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, 53.5, 60.4.
- 15.5.1, 19.2, 20.3.
41. On which in general see Ho. - Sz., 726ff.
42. The figures comprise examples of parallel finite clauses (e.g. 2.19.1 pugnam volunt, arma rapiunt) and of parallel phrases or word-groups within finite clauses (e.g. 1.2.1 militem donis, populum armena ... pollexit).
43. Ho. - Sz., 689 ff.
44. 3.2 n., 29.1 n.
45. 3.2 n.
46. Some words (e.g. pulcher) are used by Cicero almost exclusively in the superlative in the speeches.
47. Narrativ: 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, 2.58.2 bis, 2.75.1, 3.57.2, 3.59.2, 4.67.2, 4.68.4, 6.4.1, 6.7.1, 6.25.2, 6.33.1, 11.36.4, 11.38.4 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, 4.8.5, 4.14.3, 4.34.2, 4.39.2, 4.56.2, 6.22.2 (indirect quotation), 11.24.7, 12.5.3, 12.53.2, 13.2.3, 13.42.2, 13.49.1 (Tacitean comment), 13.50.1 (thoughts of Nero presented in an indirect question), 14.48.4, 14.49.2, 16.31.1, 16.31.2.

48. De usu verbi substantivi Tacitino (Leipzig, 1876).
49. Quibus condicionibus Tacitus ellipsim verbi admiserit et qua ratione excoluerit (Würzburg, 1900).
50. See 5.1 n.
51. o.c., 30.
52. Der Satznachtrag bei Tacitus (Würzburg, 1960), 118f.
53. See 5.3 n.
54. Philol. 24 (1866), 118. quasi is the word preferred by the imperial archaisers Fronto and Apuleius : see Ho. - Sz., 596.
55. The former appears again only once, in 13. See Philol. 25 (1867), 104.
56. See on velut. 37.1 n.
57. Philol. 27 (1868), 116.
58. ib. 25 (1867), 124.
59. ib. 27 (1868), 148.
60. On quo see Ho. - Sz., 679f.
61. AJP 19 (1898), 255.
62. Über die tacit. Inconcinuität (Olmütz, 1882).
63. o.c. 13.
64. See e.g. Kü. - St. I, 700 ff.; Löfstedt, Synt., II, 262f.;  
Ho. - Sz., 362.
65. See B. Lupus, Der Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos (Berlin, 1876),  
2, referring to S. Fritsch, Über den Sprachgebrauch des Velleius  
Paterculus (Arnstadt, 1876), 15.

66. Dial. 21.5, 32.2, Agric. 43.2, Germ. 45.5.

I.13.2, 20.1, 39.2, 41.1, 41.2, 45.2, 50.3, 51.4, 54.2.

II.1.1, 9.2, 13.2, 18.2, 32.2 bis, 61.

67. III.2.1, 10.2, 13.3, 20.2 bis, 25.1, 36.2, 54.3, 75.1, 77.1, 80.1.

IV.14.4, 19.2, 20.1, 22.1, 25.1, 34.5, 52.2, 56.1, 56.3, 57.2, 59.3,  
76.3, 82.2, 84.4.

V.24.2.

1.4.4, 7.4, 8.4, 9.4, 10.2, 17.1, 17.3, 19.4, 25.3, 28.2, 32.3, 34.3,  
35.4, 35.5, 37.1, 68.1, 69.2, 70.5, 79.3, 80.2.

2.9.1, 17.5, 35.1, 40.2, 40.3, 50.2, 58.1, 63.1, 63.2, 69.2, 70.1,  
70.4, 71.5, 79.1, 82.1, 82.2, 83.2, 83.3.

3.1.2, 3.3, 4.1, 5.1, 8.2, 11.2, 14.4, 16.3, 22.4, 33.3, 44.4, 47.2,  
49.1, 58.2, 59.3, 72.2.

4.1.2, 2.1, 8.3, 10.2, 12.3, 30.1, 38.1, 39.2, 39.4, 40.3, 40.4, 40.5,  
57.3, 58.3, 60.3.

5.9.1, 9.2, 10.2, 10.3.

6.3.2, 23.1, 25.2, 25.3, 26.2, 34.2, 43.2, 46.4, 48.2, 50.3.

11.2.2, 3.2, 6.2, 16.3, 17.1, 18.1, 25.3, 30.2, 32.1.

12.2.2, 5.2, 6.2, 7.1, 14.3, 19.3, 22.2, 34, 44.4, 45.1, 47.1, 47.3,  
65.2.

13.14.3, 16.4, 19.2, 32.2, 38.1, 38.3, 42.3, 42.4, 46.2, 49.4 bis,

56.1.

14.1.2, 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.

15.5.4, 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, 28.2.

67. See, e.g. L. Kühnast, Die Hauptpunkte der livianischen Syntax (Berlin, 1872), 108; H. Lindgren, Studia Curtiana (Uppsala, 1935), 56. See also the examples quoted from Cicero and Caesar by J. Lebreton, Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron (Paris 1901), 377f.

68. I.50.3, II.9.2, 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, 5.9.1, 6.48.2.

11.25.3, 11.30.2, 12.7.1, 12.34, 12.45.1, 12.47.1, 13.14.3, 13.38.3,  
13.42.4, 13.56.1, 14.1.2, 14.29.1, 15.5.4, 15.29.1, 15.42.2,  
15.43.2, 15.52.1, 16.24.1, 16.28.2.

69. I.51.4, II.18.2, IV.25.1.

1.8.4, 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, 13.38.1, 13.46.2, 13.49.4, 14.35.1,  
14.48.2, 15.17.2, 15.27.2, 15.36.3, 15.51.2, 15.55.1, 15.62.1.  
16.25.1.

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

71. See 33.1 n. Lego was also falling out of use, but retained a limited currency.

72. See Philol. 25 (1867), 108.
73. Unconscious repetitions are likely to occur in any composition, particularly one of extended length. For examples from Livy, see Gries, CP 4.6 (1951), 36f.; cf. Tränkle, Wien. Stud. 81 (1968), 121 (on hiscere). Repetitions of a word otherwise absent from a writer's vocabulary are of particular interest (see on impertio, 21.3).
74. See 8.2 n.
75. 8.2 n.
76. See 9.3 n.
77. Ho. - Sz., 607 do not sufficiently emphasise the rarity of the word in this sense in ordinary prose.
78. See Lex. Tac. 1503.
79. The figures given by Löfstedt, Roman Literary Portraits (Oxford, 1958), 160, are inaccurate (64 times minor works and Histories, 8 times Annals).
80. See TLL II. 1568. 1ff.
81. See Lex. Tac. 923b, 935b. Nec ... aut is preferred in the Histories (20:5). neque ... aut in the Annals (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. Löfstedt, Synt. I, 332 ff.

83. admoneo, agito, certo, cohortor, do, edico, hortor, impello,  
impetro, induco, mando, mereo, moneo, oro, panco, perpello, postulo,  
suadeo, subigo, urgeo. I omit permitto as a special case (see 12.4 n.)
84. See Lex. Tac. under the words mentioned above and also under  
accingo, adnitor, aemulor, ambio, conitor, dehortor, denuntio,  
deposco, exposco, impero, incumbo, inlicio, insto, nitor, nuntio,  
praecopto, praescribo, scribo.
85. See K. van der Heyde, 'Flumen, Fluvius, ammis', Mnem. 60 (1932), 135ff.
86. 34.2 n.
87. 6.1 n.
88. 12.3 n.
89. 9.3 n.
90. Noted by Gerber and Greef, Lex. Tac., 911b; cf. the more detailed  
statistics given by Goodyear, o.c., 31.
91. See Goodyear, o.c., 30.
92. See G.O. Tingdal, 'Andelsen is i Akrus. Plur. hos de Efteraugusteiska  
Författarne (Göteborg, 1916), 70ff.
93. See H.C. Nutting, 'The use of forem in Tacitus', Univ. of Cal.  
Publ. in Class. Phil. 7, 209-219.
94. See Löfstedt, Synt. II, 285; R.H. Martin. CR 82 (1963) 144-146.
95. See Eriksson's Index, s.v. Cf. 22.1 n.
96. See Syme, 739 n.7.
97. See Brakman, Mnem. 53 (1925), 179f., 183f.
98. See Wölfflin, Philol. 25 (1867), 124.
99. See Eriksson's Index, s.v.

100. Cf. Wölfflin's remarks on dean and deinde (Philol. 25 (1867), 105f.)
101. Cf. 1.36.2, 4.25.3, 4.51.1, 6.1.2. The only similar example of adversus is at 13.10.1.
102. See TLL I.850.63ff.
103. See Löfstedt, Synt. II, 291.
104. A usage found frequently in Pliny the Elder (Thes. nat.) and Tacitus' Annals, but elsewhere rarely; on locitus, see Wölfflin, Philol. 25 (1867), 120.
105. e.g. omnis (6 times Annals, 7 times Histories), tris (3 times Annals, twice Histories), pluris (4 times Annals), partis (3 times Annals), resistentis (twice Annals), insignis (twice Annals), ingruentis (twice Annals), hostilis (twice Annals), hostis (3 times Histories), pontificis (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. Gellius quotes and discusses a remark of Valerius Probus that in deciding between -es and -is a writer should be guided by his ear.
107. Kü - St. II, 33; on Tacitus, see L. Kiessle, Die Kopulativpartikeln 'et, que, atque' bei Tac., Plin., Sen. (Tübingen, 1906), 17ff., 21ff. (on atque in Tacitus).
108. Kü - St., l.c.; cf. G. Merten, De particularum copulativarum apud veteres Romanorum scriptores usu (Marburg, 1893), 2.
109. TLL II.1050. 10ff.; Löfstedt, Peregrinatio, 25ff.
110. Gotzes (see n.31), 112; Merten, o.c., 4.

111. The following statistics are not exhaustive, but comprise the examples of the two words linking pronouns, substantives, and adjectives.
112. Ho. - Sz., 542.
113. See 44.1 n.
114. See 10.3 n.
115. In the minor works there are no uncontracted forms, but 22 syncopated. In the Histories there are only 5 uncontracted forms (I.78.2, II.78.2, III.84.4, IV.41.3, V.24.2), but 49 syncopated. However, in Annals 1-6 uncontracted forms predominate by 60 : 16, and in 11-16 by 48 : 16.
116. Uncontracted forms: 1.6.1, 1.6.2, 1.9.1, 1.10.2, 1.25.3, 1.44.5, 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, 2.76.1, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.9.1, 3.16.1, 3.22.1, 3.31.4, 3.33.2 bis, 3.34.6, 3.36.3, 3.37.1, 3.49.2, 3.58.2, 3.61.1, 3.61.2, 3.67.2, 3.76.1, 4.8.3, 4.18.2, 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, 6.4.2, 6.9.2, 6.28.4, 6.29.2, 6.43.1, 6.48.1 bis, 6.50.4, 11.6.1, 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, 12.65.1, 12.69.1, 13.8.3, 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, 14.11.1, 14.20.2, 14.28.1, 14.62.3, 15.6.2, 15.10.3, 15.16.1, 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.

Syncopated forms: 1.6.3, 1.8.5, 1.73.3, 2.40.3, 2.60.3, 3.12.1, 3.18.1, 4.15.2, 4.28.3, 4.42.3, 4.43.1, 5.19.1, 6.30.2, 6.37.2, 6.37.4, 6.40.1, 11.8.1, 11.15.1, 11.27, 13.23.2, 13.25.2 bis, 13.32.2, 13.44.4, 13.56.3, 14.14.3, 14.20.5, 14.41, 15.20.1, 15.35.3, 15.43.3, 16.30.3.

117. On the analogists, see F.H. Colson, 'The Analogist and Anomalist Controversy', CQ 13 (1919), 24-36.
118. On archaic forms as a characteristic of the style of Sallust rather than that of Livy, see Tränkle, Wien. Stud. 81 (1968), 133. On Virgil's sparing use of archaic forms, see M. Leumann, Mus. Helv. 4 (1947), 126f. Sallust was probably following the annalistic tradition in using unusual forms: see, e.g., the fragments of Cn. Gellius.
119. On quis in Sallust, see Wölfflin, Philol. 25 (1867), 105; Löfstedt, Synt. II, 290; on adversum, see Synt. II, 291; -avisset seems to be used without exception in the Jugurtha, but in the Catiline there are isolated instances of -asset.
120. On quis in Livy, see Tränkle, o.c. 127; on adversus, -a, see Fugner's Lexicon, 653; -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 Wölfflin'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: 1.2.1, 1.5.1, 1.7.7., 1.23.1, 1.41.2, 1.64.2, 1.71.1, 1.71.2, 1.76.4 bis, 6.3.2, 6.46.5, 6.48.2, 6.50.4, 11.9.1, 12.8.1, 12.10.1, 13.8.3, 14.5.1, 14.23.1, 14.36.3, 14.38.1, 14.39.1, 15.4.3, 15.53.3, 15.56.2, 15.66.2, 16.14.1, 16.19.3, 16.22.1, 16.24.1 bis, 16.32.3 bis. In the following passages it has been possible to see a reason for the avoidance of the dative + gerundive: 2.6.3 (variation), 2.43.4 (Wölfflin, l.c.), 2.77.1 (ad dicendam causam; this phrase is always used by Tacitus instead of the dative with the gerundive), 3.30.2 (Wölfflin, l.c.), 3.38.2 (ad dicendam ... causam), 3.39.1 (variation), 3.49.2 (ad dicendum testimonium), 3.56.4 (Wölfflin, l.c.), 3.63.4 (euphony), 4.16.4 (Wölfflin, l.c.), 4.41.1 (used with impello, which always takes ad rather than the dative in Tacitus), 4.48.2 (Wölfflin, l.c.), 4.73.1 (clarity), 5.11.1 (variation), 11.37.2 (dicendam ad causam), 12.14.1 (exuendam ad fidem; Tacitus avoids fides in the dative with a gerundive, but uses ad fidem with a gerundive a number of times), 13.5.1 (ad causam orandam), 13.31.2 (ad retinendam ... fidem), 13.38.3 (variation), 13.39.1 (clarity), 14.26.1 (Wölfflin, l.c.), 14.51.1 (clarity), 15.58.3 (dicendam ad causam).

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. Krebs-Schmalz, s.v. 'tueor'.
127. The remaining instance in the speeches is at Best. 90.
128. Sometimes tutor is found in passages of heightened tone in the philosophica. It occurs in the Somnium Scipionis (rep. 6.13) in a passage describing the abode reserved in heaven for patriae conservatores; at nat. 2.20 in a simile which also contains annis; at nat. 2.127 near the archaism torpedo; and at Tusc. 1.32 in a passage similar in spirit to rep. 6.13 (above).
129. Counting only forms in which both words are used: tutaba(n)tur, tutabor, tutandus, tutans, tuta(n)tur, tutare(n)tur, tutari, tutatus, and the corresponding forms of tueor.
130. The latter 2 examples are at 3.6.1 and 6.22.3. For the others, see Lex. Tac. 394-5.
131. 11.24.1, 12.30.1, 14.25.1, 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., l.c.
133. See 12.4 n. Only literal examples of the two words are dealt with here.
134. The simple verb corresponding to each occurs at least once in 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 (num, -is

accusative plural) have been seen above which are used in the Histories but rejected in the Annals.

The first of these is the use of the accusative plural of the names of the months, which is found in the Histories but not in the Annals. The second is the use of the accusative plural of the names of the days of the week, which is also found in the Histories but not in the Annals. The third is the use of the accusative plural of the names of the seasons, which is found in the Histories but not in the Annals.

Although these forms are not used in the Annals, they are still found in some of the later MSS. of the Annals, and it is possible that they were used in the original text of the Annals. However, they are not used in the Annals as printed, and it is therefore probable that they were not used in the original text of the Annals.

The fourth of these forms is the use of the accusative plural of the names of the months, which is found in the Histories but not in the Annals. The fifth is the use of the accusative plural of the names of the days of the week, which is also found in the Histories but not in the Annals. The sixth is the use of the accusative plural of the names of the seasons, which is found in the Histories but not in the Annals.

### III. WERE THE LATER BOOKS OF THE ANNALS REVISED?

It was first suggested by E. Koestermann, in a review of Eriksson's Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus,<sup>1</sup> that Tacitus may not fully have revised the later Annals. More recently Syme has argued this view in some detail.<sup>2</sup> It has been shown by Goodyear<sup>3</sup> 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 Tacitus strives after variatio more than most writers,<sup>4</sup> he sometimes inadvertently admits repetitions<sup>5</sup> which have no special point.<sup>6</sup> 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. Excipio is used at 4.2 and 4.4. of Nero's welcome to Agrippina. The historiographical expression facinus patrare, elsewhere found only twice in Tacitus (1.45.2, 2.66.1), is used at 7.1 and again in the next chapter (8.4).<sup>7</sup> Venio occurs twice with the same subject

in chapter 8 (2,4), fungor + abl. twice within a few lines in 12 (3,4) (in different phrases), the characteristically Tacitean vocabulum (= nomen) twice in 15 (1,5), and edo twice in successive sentences in 17 (1). Evado 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. flacuit 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 (= interficio) occurs at 5.3 (describing the death of Acerronia, who is mistaken for Agrippina), and at 8.2 (describing the death of Agrippina herself), but only twice elsewhere in the whole of Tacitus. Incitamentum adferre (nowhere else in Tacitus) is found at 14.3 and 21.3. Hactenus (1,3), an infrequent word in Tacitus, promotus (3,5), propere (2,5), and auctor (1,5) are all used twice in 7. Impertio, 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), grator (a very rare word) (8.1, 10.2), summa (subst.) (7.5, 10.3), accio (6.1, 7.2), exstruo (12.4, 13.2, 15.2), exanimor (rare in Tacitus) (5.1, 12.2), perpetro (7.4, 11.1), infensus (10.2, 11.1), exterreo (6.2, 8.2), respicio (7.3, 8.4), lumen (8.1, 8.3), viso (6.2, 8.4), exitium (3.2, 7.6, 9.2, 10.2), opperior (7.1, 10.1), meditum (1.1), meditatio (2.2), immanitas (2.2, 11.3) (only once elsewhere in the Annals), invenio (11.2, 13.2) (comparatively rare in Tacitus for the more recherché reperio),<sup>8</sup> dissuadeo (7.3, 11.1), promitto (13.2, 14.4), exsolvo (12.4, 13.2).

Equally remarkable are the repetitions in the account of the Pisonian conspiracy (15.48 ff.). In 59 there are 3 examples of dum in anaphora, of which 2 are in successive sentences (3 bis; cf. 1). In the same chapter adverbial adversus (-m) also occurs 3 times (2,4,5); overall in 48-68 it is used no less than 11 times (cf. 48.3, 52.3, 58.3, 62.2, 63.1, 64.3, 64.3, 66.2, 68.3). Ventito is found at 52.1 and again at 53.1; in the former passage it is superfluous (crebro ventitabat). 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 56.3. Interrogans occurs twice in 61 (2,3), caedes twice in successive sentences at 52.1, and domus twice in successive sentences at 54.1. There are 3 negative final clauses (introduced by ne) in 63 (1,2,3), another at the beginning of the next chapter (64.1), and two in successive sentences in 52 (2-3). At 54.4 in adjoining sentences there are two examples of the same kind of hyperbaton (consilium adsumpserat, muliebre ac deterius; multos astitisse libertos ac servos). Relative clauses in which the relative pronoun stands in agreement with a word in its own clause (e.g. 50.3 quem vita famaue laudatum ...) are found at 59.4 and 59.5, in successive sentences, and also at 56.2, 56.2, and 66.1. At 74.1 there are 3 successive relative clauses in the same sentence.<sup>9</sup> The expression vocare senatum, for which in the Annals 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 oratione ... habita (73.1). Coepti, with abstract subject, is used at 48.1, 54.1, 55.1, and 68.3; edo at 56.3, 58.1, and 60.4; visendo at 61.1 and 63.3; conqueror (uncommon in Tacitus) at 60.3 and 61.1; creber (crebro) at 50.4, 51.2, 52.1, 60.3, and 73.1; metaphorical traho at 67.1 and 68.2; gnarus with the genitive (coniurationis, conspirationis) at 54.3 and 56.2; ut ... tradidere at 53.2 and 54.3, fama at 49.3 and 49.4, retineo at 50.2 and 50.4, and ex in the sense 'in accordance with' at 70.2 and 72.1. In 50-52 scelus is found 4 times (50.1, 51.2, 51.3, 52.2), but its synonyms not at all. Finally quasi (tamquam) followed by an adjective or participle is used at 50.2, 52.2, 58.2, 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 Annals,<sup>10</sup> is found twice within a short space (4,5). Is is excessively used.<sup>11</sup> Scribo occurs twice in successive sentences (5,6). Interficio 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 coniurationis scientia fingitur, adsimulatis Lucani litteris: quas inspectas Nero ferri ad eum iussit; 5 exsolvit venas, scriptis codicillis, quibus grandem 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 inspectas; 6 quae composita).

In the same book a few chapters later there occurs an unusually inept piece of writing: 24.1 codicillos ad Neronem composuit, requirens obiecta et expurgaturum adseverans, si notitiam criminum et copiam diluendi habuisset. Notitiam criminum is superfluous (cf. requirens obiecta), as is diluendi. Tacitus could have written, with no loss of sense, requirens obiecta et expurgaturum adseverans, si copiam habuisset. There is a similarly otiose sentence early in book 14 : 15.3 vix artibus honestis pudor retinetur, necum inter certamina vitiorum pudicitia aut modestia aut quicquam probi moris reservaretur. A full stop could have been placed after vitiorum, and the remaining words omitted. Pudicitia .... moris needlessly reproduces the idea contained in pudor, and reservaretur is a repetition of retinetur.

There are a number of repetitions in the first 18 chapters of book 3 (only one chapter, however, has more than one repetition),<sup>12</sup> but otherwise the first 13 books contain no accumulations at all comparable with those 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 mutinies 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

1. Gnomon 11 (1935), 322.
2. Tac. 740 ff. (especially 745).
3. JRS 58 (1968), 28.
4. See Sorbon, Variatio sermonis Tacitei aliaeque apud eundem quaestiones selectae (Upsala, 1935), pass.
5. See Nipp. - Andr. 1.81 n.; J. Müller, Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erkl. des Corn. Tac. (Innsbruck, 1867-75), 11ff.
6. According to rhetorical theory it was artistic to repeat a word in a different sense (Landgraf, S. Rosc., 20); see also 20.4 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 scelus 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.
8. Lörstedt, Peregrinatio, 233 ff.
9. On Tacitus' reluctance to allow more than one relative clause in a sentence in the historical works, see 17.1 n.
10. Lörstedt, Synt. II, 286.
11. Syme, 741.
12. 3.1.3 egredientem, 1.4 egressa; 3.3 crediderim, 4.1 crederes; 6.2 amissa, 6.3 amissas; 12.5 obiecta, 13.1 obiciendis, 13.2 obicere; 14.1 ne ... quidem bis; 14.1 visus est, 14.2 videbatur; 17.4 concederetur, ib. concessa, 18.1 concessit; 18.1 eximeretur; ib. exemit.

1.1-2 The first group of papers, which constitute the  
historically earliest group (nos. 1-10), are a few  
pages which date from the first half of the century (nos.  
1-5) and the second half (nos. 6-10).

1.1-3 The second group of papers (nos. 11-20) are  
all but one of which were written during the century  
(nos. 11-19) in a historical period. One of the papers  
contains a list of names of persons who were active in  
the century, p. 22.

1.1-4 The third group of papers (nos. 21-30) are  
confined largely to the century, and are of a  
highly historical character. They are of a  
highly historical character, and are of a  
highly historical character. They are of a  
highly historical character, and are of a  
highly historical character.

1.1-5 The fourth group of papers (nos. 31-40) are  
of a highly historical character, and are of a  
highly historical character. They are of a  
highly historical character, and are of a  
highly historical character. They are of a  
highly historical character, and are of a  
highly historical character.

1.1-6 The fifth group of papers (nos. 41-50) are  
of a highly historical character, and are of a  
highly historical character. They are of a  
highly historical character, and are of a  
highly historical character.

1.1-2 The short speech of Poppaea, though containing some characteristically artificial usages (e.g. patrum, 2 n.), has a few touches which distinguish the style from that of plain narrative (see on saltem, 2, and on the asyndeton, 15.).

1.2 saltem: there are 7 examples of saltem 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 Historias and Annals. 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 Historias and Annals of autem, 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 6 times in the historical works in textually unquestionable passages, all of which are in speeches.<sup>1</sup> Hercule (12 times Dialogus) is found 5 times in speeches in the historical works, once in the narrative (1.3.5), 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 (4.4.1, 14.59.2) in narrative. Plane (4 times), porro (4 times), neque (twice), immo (5 times) and atque (once) are all restricted without exception to speeches. Of the 14 examples of propterea, only 5 are in narrative, and of these 4 are in books I-III of the Histories (II.5.1, II.62.1, III.9.4, III.83.2) and the other is in a digression (4.6.3). Quidem is found 77 times in the Histories and Annals and 16 times in the Dialogus. Since the historical works are more than 15 times as long as the Dialogus, the comparative frequency of the word in the latter work is remarkable. Moreover 37 of the examples in the historical works are in speeches<sup>2</sup> and 19 are in an expression particularly favoured by Tacitus (et ... quidem) (Lex. Tac. 1322bbl). Denique (27 times historical works) is used 17 times in speeches,<sup>3</sup> once in a philosophical digression (6.22.1), and once in a rhetorical comment by Tacitus (4.11.1). Quodsi (also here in Poppaea's speech, 2) is found 13 times in speeches, but only 3 times (always in Histories I-III) in the narrative (Lex. Tac. 1307a fin.). Minime, profecto, duntaxat and utique are all confined to the minor works. Of the 3 instances of omnino 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 later work 4 of the 8 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 certe 2 are in speeches, as are 3 of the 7 of quodsi, 7 of the 17 of vero, 7 of the 13 of profecto, 3 of the 6 of minime and the single case of inmo. Hercule, atque and nenpe are avoided completely. However omino, sane, porro, 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 3 columns of examples of autem, most of which are in narrative.

Tacitus' avoidance of particles is comparable with that of the poets. See Axelson, Unpet. Wort., e.g., 47f., 85f., 92, 94ff., 103f.

- 1.2 iniurias patrum 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, 2.14).<sup>4</sup> 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 haruspices in official style (har. resp. 40); a number of times, mainly in the Republic, in passages dealing with the ancient Roman (usually regal) senate;<sup>5</sup> and 6 times in laws in the De legibus<sup>6</sup> (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.<sup>7</sup>

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

Thus vocare patres (1.7.3, 2.28.3, 11.4.1, 12.78.1, 13.5.1, 16.24.2), patrum consultum (2.85.4, 5.5.4, 11.25.1, 12.69.2, 14.60.1, 16.22.1), patrum auctoritas (4.14.3, 13.4.1),<sup>8</sup> comitio patrum (1.75.1), consensus patrum (15.73.3), iudicia patrum (3.32.1), cogere patres (4.19.3), patres decernunt (2.52.5, 2.64.1, 3.47.3, 4.15.2, 16.26.2) and the antitheses patres/miles (-ites) (13.4.1, 14.11.1) and patres/eques (-ites) (1.7.1, 4.74.3) are all used in the Annals only, while the equivalent expressions with senatus are found either in the Histories as well as the Annals or in the Histories alone.

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

The overall figures for the distribution of patres and senatus are:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u>
<u>patres</u>	18	112
<u>senatus</u>	91 (5:1)	201 (1.8:1)

The relative rarity of patres in the Histories is obvious.

The words iniurias patrum, iram populi are arranged in the alliterative pattern abab (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 in Tacitus,<sup>9</sup> most of which are in special contexts: Agric. 31.4 Brigantes femina duce exurere coloniam, exurnare castra; II.27.1 haud proinde id damnum Vitellianor in metum compulit quam ad modestiam composuit (in an antithesis); III.60.2 Antonius docuit esse adhuc Vitellio vires, ambiguas, si deliberarent, acres, si desperassent (in antithesis in a speech); 1.59.2 sibi tres legiones totidem legatos procubuisse; 1.70.3 nihil strenuus ab ignavo, sapiens ab imprudenti ... differre (storm description); 2.20.3 utrisque ... spes in virtute, salus ex victoria (in a sententia); 14.56.2 non tua moderatio si reddideris pecuniam, nec quies, si reliqueris principem ... in ore omnium versabitur (in antithesis in a speech; note the homoeoteleuton (-eris)).

There are 2 striking examples of alliteration in Poppaea's speech (see below, on filio infestam ferre, 1.2). It is unlikely that both were accidental.

Asyndeton binembre of the type consisting of two substantives with qualifying or dependent words (adjectives or genitives) (as in iniurias patrum, iram populi)<sup>10</sup> is frequent in the Annals (over 80 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 Historiae it is still rare (16 times).<sup>11</sup>

Tacitus' liking for the device is an idiosyncrasy derived neither from Sallust (who in other respects provides the model for Tacitean 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 binembre formed of two unqualified words (on which, see 36.1 n.). In the pro Sestio, e.g., note 133 discessu meo, luctu vestro; 143 virorum fortium, magnorum hominum. Cf., ib. 17, 19, 49, 86, 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. 42.31.4 duodecim milia sociorum peditum, sescenti equites (cf. e.g. 42.35.5). Otherwise he rarely does so.

In ps. Quintilian (decl. min.) there are about 8 qualified asyndetic

pairs of substantives in 225 Teubner pages (p. 64.27, 68.13, 89.19, 144.17, 159.12, 202.7, 207.22, 210.15), a low incidence in comparison with 18 examples in 44 pages of Annals 1.

Some other writers who admit the usage at least as sparingly as the above are Sallust, Quintilian, Senecae the Elder, Seneca 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<sup>12</sup> (for the tendency of Tacitus and other historians to put asyndeton 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 hexad, however, a higher proportion of instances are in the narrative (about two-thirds).<sup>13</sup>

- 1.2 filio infestam 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 it as insuavissima littera and criticises its use by an old poet in a long alliterative series: sed proximus (versus) inquinatus insuavissima littera:

finis frugifera et efferta arva Asiae tenet.

Cf. the remarks of Quintilian at 12.10.29: nam et illa, quae est sexta nostrarum, paene non humana voce vel omnino non voce potius inter discrimina dentium efflanda est: quae, etiam cum vocalem proxima accipit, quassa quodam modo, utique quotiens aliquam consonantium

frangit, ut in hoc ipso 'frangit', multo fit 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  $4\frac{1}{2}$  times as many words as f in the Lexicon Taciteum, it is found in triple or multiple alliteration about 12 times as often in the Annals (37:3);<sup>14</sup> similarly c starts only twice as many words yet is used in alliteration 7 times as often (21).<sup>15</sup>

The other 2 examples of f in triple alliteration in the Annals (both followed by vowels) are: 2.75.1 anxia sui et infelici fecunditate fortuna totiens obnoxia (in a description marked by pathos); 11.13.2 lege lata saevitiam creditorum coercuit, ne in mortem parentum pecunias filiis familiarum faenori darent (in a law). The present example is appropriate in an abusive speech.

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

- 1.2 ferre: 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.<sup>16</sup>

1.2 coniugio: used here for variation: cf. matrimonium 1, nuptias 2. On coniugium, see 27.2 n.

1.3 cupientibus cunctis: 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 ps. Quintilian (at 33.19, almost alongside omnis), once by Petronius (101.11), and 9 times by Quintilian (in most places for variation near omnis<sup>17</sup>). In historians and artificial writers, however, it is more common. Livy has it 57 times, Pliny the Elder 90 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.<sup>18</sup> In Tacitus there are only 4 instances in the minor works (3 Agricola, 1 Dialogus<sup>19</sup>), 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 -red. sen. 24, leg. agr. 2.23 - close to omnis, perhaps for variation), but almost 90 times as an adjective; in the letters twice as a substantive (Att. 2.21.3, fam. 8.4.3), and 12 times as an adjective; and in the rhetorica once as a substantive (de inv. 2.3), and 3 times as an adjective. In the philosophical works the substantival use is proportionately more frequent, but is nevertheless outnumbered (8:13).

All but 20 of the adjectival instances in the speeches are collective singular (= totus), as are 9 of the 12 in the letters, 2 of the 3 in the rhetorica and 7 of the 13 in the philosophica. 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, suffragia, sententiae, al.).

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, cunctus is used above all as a plural substantive (more often neuter than masculine). Curtius avoids the adjectival use completely (substantival 25) 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. 28) 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 cuncta animalia and c.genera).

Moreover the adjectival use as it appears in Tacitus (see 11.2 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: 11.2 n.), as are all but 1 in Valerius Maximus and 1 in Pliny.

But if the use made by Cicero and Caesar of cunctus 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 19 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. 2.87.D; cf. 2.87.C cunctis ... praesentibus). Ablative absolutes comprising cunctis 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.48.3, 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, 8.1. absol.5, 8.10. ext.1, 9.5.4), Seneca the Younger 2 (clem. 1.19.7, dial. 6.26.7), Curtius 1 (6.6.15), Pliny the Elder 3 (2.162, 6.91, 26.13), Pliny the Younger 2 (epist. 2.5.10, pan. 64.1) and Suetonius 14 (see Howard and Jackson).<sup>20</sup>

Cf. also the following: cuncta agere: (Sall. Cat. 42.2, 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. or. 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); res cunctae (Sall. Cat. 8.1, Jug. 2.1, Val. Max. 4.4.9, Col. 12.59.5, Plin. epist. 2.6.3); cuncta parare (Sall. Jug. 23.1, 73.1, Liv. 8.25.2); cuncta

miscere, permiscere (Sall. Jug. 5.2, Tac. I.53.2, II.23.5, III.73.2, IV.29.2, 4.51.2); cuncti mortales (Sall. Cat. 51.12, Sen. benef. 1.13.3); cuncta portendere (Sall. Jug. 92.2, Liv. 1.55.4); cuncta gignere (Sall. Jug. 93.4, Val. Max. 1.8.ext.18, 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, quae cuncta, and cunctis with the present participle appear to have been more generally formulaic.

It is of note that quae cuncta is found not only in Sallust and later writers, but also in Plautus (Pseud. 189). Moreover Plautus' cuncta ... processerunt (Most. 734) can be paralleled in Sallust (Jug. 65.5), and his cuncta proveniant (Most. 414) in Seneca (epist. 107.9) and Tacitus (IV.69.2).

It would seem that the imperial use of cunctus 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 archaizing 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

officiales), after which it survived only in the archaisers.

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 Wölfflin (Philol. 25(1867), 107) that cuncta tends to replace omnia from Histories to Annals. 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 substantival form) are in formulaic phrases or phrase-types (some of which have been seen above) from which omnia is largely excluded in both the Histories and Annals. 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 Histories 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 flammum, missi auspices;  
dos et genialis torus et faces nuptiales, cuncta denique spectata  
 (cuncta summarises 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 omnis is at 13.42.4, in a  
 speech: crimen, periculum, omnia potius toleraturum); IV.68.1 cuncta  
in deterius audita (cf. 2.32.1 cuncta .... in deterius adferentur;  
 3.44.1 cuncta .... in maius credita; 14.39.3 cuncta ... in mollius  
relata; 15.30.1 cuncta in maius attollens (there is a similar example  
 of omnis at III.13.1)); cuncta complere, implere (III.61.2, 12.47.4;  
 cf. Cic. rep. 6.17, Liv. 2.17.2, 5.37.8, 9.24.12, Curt. 3.13.10);  
cuncta complecti (3.69.3; cf. Cic. nat. 2.87, Val. Max. 1 praef.,  
 Sen. dial. 7.8.4, Plin. nat. 2.2); cuncta turbare, disturbare (IV.22.2;  
 cf. Cic. nat. 2.41, Curt. 3.8.26, Suet. Galb. 10.4, Tit. 5.1);  
cuncta vertere, convertere, (III.44, 2.34.1; cf. Sen. nat. 3.13.1);  
cuncta trahere (IV.11.1, cf. Sen. epist. 77.12); cuncta eveniant  
 (IV.19.3, V.17.1; cf. Sall. Jug. 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, penetrare (IV.65.4; cf. Sall. Cat. 53.4); cuncta ...  
opportuna (III.20.2; cf. Sall. hist. frg. 1.108); cuncta infesta, infensa  
facere (3.74.2; cf. Liv. 9.13.11);<sup>21</sup> cuncta tractare (1.31.1, 4.15.2);  
cuncta fluere (III.48.3, 11.9.2); III.77.2 cuncta pari formidine  
implicabantur (cf. 1.70.3 cuncta pari violentia involvebantur); 6.11.2  
cunctis ... praeposuit (cf. 6.32.4 cunctis ... praefecit); 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); I.71.1 cuncta ad decorem ... composita (cf. 3.1.3 cunctis ad tristitiam compositis); III.84.1 cuncta validissimarum urbium excidiis reperta (cf. V.13.4 cuncta expugnandis urbibus reperta; 3.5.1 cuncta a maioribus reperta); 4.64.3 cunctis circum flagrantibus (cf. 15.39.1 cuncta circum haurirentur; Curt. 4.10.13 incendio cuncta praeciperet; 7.5.3 incendio cuncta torrentur; Liv. 2.17.2 incendioque cuncta complent; 26.13.7 cuncta bello arderent; 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, Wölfflin 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 M has au in the text, and quoque in the margin. Heubner (ad.loc.) has shown convincingly that quoque is the correct reading. At 13.25.3 M has tū (i.e. tum), which was retained by Orelli, Ritter and Jacob, and changed to tamen by Petersen (followed, e.g., by Halm, Furneaux, and Fisher) and to autem (taking tū as a corruption of au) by others (including Koestermann). Tum is impossible, for though in Tacitus it constantly precedes (e.g. Agric. 35.4, II.26.1, III.20.1, V.8.3, 2.4.1, 12.24.2, 12.35.2, 12.39.1, 12.66.1, 15.14.2, 16.25.1; see Lex. Tac. s.v., passim), it never follows a proper name which is the subject of its sentence. Autem is also unlikely. Julius Montanus and Nero are not contrasted pointedly enough to justify the antithetical (and most common) use of the word (see Lex. Tac. 129b); and the looser (introductory) 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 Annals. Read tamen: despite the incident, Nero nevertheless continued his activities.
2. I.15.4, I.84.1, II.53.2, III.54.3, IV.14.3, IV.58.4, 1.22.1, 1.42.2, 1.43.1, 2.38.2, 3.36.2, 3.35.3, 3.69.2, 3.73.3 (indirect construction), 4.8.3, 4.28.3, 4.34.5, 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, 14.20.3, 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.

3. I.32.2, III.38.3, III.66.2, III.66.4, IV.8.3, IV.32.3, IV.58.5, IV.81.2, 1.26.2, 1.28.4, 2.10.1, 13.21.4, 13.44.2 (quasi-speech), 14.58.4, 14.61.4, 16.22.5, 16.28.2.
4. 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., Leg. XII Tab. 12.1, Liv. 4.1.1, Cic. rep. 2.63, Cf., e.g. Sall. Cat. 53.3, Cic. Brut. 54,56, Planc. 8 bis, fam. 9.21.3, ad Brut. 1.5.4, Tac. 3.27.1, Cf. Weiss.-Müll. on Liv. 4.1.1.
5. rep. 1.64, 2.14 bis, 2.20, 2.23, 2.25, 2.35 bis, 2.38, 2.50, 2.56, leg. 3.19, 3.24, Tusc. 4.1. Occasionally also in the Republic the word appears in general philosophical passages on forms of government (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.
6. 3.9., 3.10. (4 times), 3.40.
7. Only at har. resp. 43 is it used in application to the senate of relatively modern times (the Gracchan period), and even there it is in an historical exemplum.
8. 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 populus ... bellum fieri iussit; 8.29.6 bellum ex auctoritate patrum populus... iussit; 10.45.7 ex auctoritate patrum iussu populi bellum ... indictum est; 7.17.9 sine auctoritate patrum populi iussu. Cf. 8.21.10 ex auctoritate

patrum latum ad populum ...; 27.6.7 ex auctoritate patrum ad plebem latum.

9. Not all the examples collected by W. Renz, Alliterationen bei Tacitus (Aschaffenburg, 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 asyndetically. I have omitted such examples from consideration in this note. It is also usual after a proper name to place appositional pairs in asyndeton (e.g. Cic. Sest. 38 C. Marium, terrorem hostium, spem subsidiumque patriae); examples of this type have also been omitted here.
11. I.38.3, II.22.1, II.56.1, II.70.3, II.77.1, II.93.2, II.99.2, III.2.3, III.33.1, III.63.2, III.77.1, IV.18.3, IV.29.3, IV.64.2, V.6.4, V.16.2.
12. 11.17.1, 11.23.4, 12.10.1, 12.19.2, 12.20.1, 13.27.1, 14.53.5, 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, 1.14.3, 1.64.4, 2.26.1, 2.62.1, 2.82.1, 3.20.2, 3.33.1, 3.43.1, 4.15.2, 6.44.1, 11.20.3, 11.25.4, 11.31.1, 12.14.3, 12.29.2, 12.36.1, 12.57.1, 13.7.1, 13.16.1, 13.17.3, 13.29.2, 13.36.2, 13.37.3, 13.38.3, 13.39.2, 13.43.1, 14.2.1, 15.12.2, 15.19.1, 15.36.3, 15.52.1, 15.53.2, 15.54.4, 15.74.3, 16.22.3.
15. c: 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, 6.14.1, 11.8.4, 11.31.1, 12.43.1, 12.55.2, 13.18.2, 14.35.2, 15.8.2,

- 15.23.4, 15.52.1, 15.65.1, 15.71.4.
16. 1.17.3, 1.20.1, 1.46.3, 3.6.3, 3.62.2, 4.34.5, 12.11.3, 12.64.4, 13.42.2, 14.35.2, 14.64.1, 15.31, 16.28.2 bis.
17. 2.10.2 (variation), 3.3.3, 3.4.6 (variation), 4.2.38 (variation), 5.10.122 (variation), 10.4.69 (variation), 10.3.9, 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 agunt feruntque cuncta, which is elsewhere found only in history (Liv. 40.49.1, Tac. I.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. 3.54.1, 4.13.12, 4.48.10, 5.47.10, 6.20.1, 23.22.4, 37.16.3, 37.52.6, 45.11.7), particularly in the expression adprobantibus cunctis (e.g. 4.13.12, 4.48.10, 5.47.10, 6.20.1, 37.16.3, 37.52.6), which is used a number of times of the unanimous approval given to a measure (cf. cunctis suffragiis, cunctis sententiis) by the senate or other body. Note too the context at Val. Max. 8.1.absol.3 (adprobantibus cunctis) 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 potentiae: Koestermann, following L., removes the hyperbaton by reading Agrippinam ardore retinendae; Ritter deleted Agrippinam.

Hyperbaton usually places emphasis on the word which precedes the enclosed word or words:<sup>1</sup> e.g. II.31.1 exitum, quo eeregiam Otho fanam, Vitellius flagitiosissimam meruere (highlighting the antithesis);

1.28.1 nam luna claro repente caelo visa languescere (it is paradoxical that the moon should fade though the sky is clear);<sup>2</sup> 1.39.1 interea legati ab senatu regressum iam apud aram Ubiorum Germanicum adeunt (cf. 37.3 Germanicus superiorum ad exercitum profectus); 1.75.3

Propertio Celeri praetorio veniam ordinis ob paupertatem petenti decies sestertium largitus est, satis comperto paternas ei angustias esse (Propertius' poverty was inherited rather than due to his own extravagance); 3.18.3 ob externas ea victorias sacrari dictitans, domestica mala tristitia operienda (antithesis); al.

Here there is a clear contrast between retinendae and infringi in the preceding sentence (1.3 cupientibus cunctis infringi potentiam matris): 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 epulas incalesceret: a slight variant of the Livian vino incalescere (1.57.8, 39.42.10), which Tacitus himself has used twice earlier (IV.29.1, 11.37.2); cf. Curt. 5.7.5 incaluerant mero; 8.1.22 incaluisset mero; Hor. carm. 3.21.12 mero caluisse. The expression vinum et epulae is a traditional combination, by no means confined to history (Cic. Phil. 3.20, Sall. Jug. 76.6, Nep. Pelop. 3.1, Liv. 8.16.9, Sen. epist. 12.8, Curt. 8.3.8, Stat. silv. 4.6.6).

It is characteristic that Tacitus should have substituted per + accusative for Livy's instrumental ablative vino. In the historical works the modal and instrumental uses of per are exploited to an extent unparalleled in extant pre-Tacitean 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 praeterire and with those denoting actions (e.g. B. Alex. 61.2, Sall. Cat. 1.1, 53.6, Jug. 106.4, Sen. contr. 10.2.9, Sen. dial. 4.14.4, epist. 14.4, Curt. 4.13.33, 6.9.7, Quint. 2.3.1, 5.12.23). 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, 2.38.4, 4.53.1, 11.37.4, 14.10.1, 16.25.2). Cf. e.g. Cic. Cluent. 156

vos attenditis et auditis silentio; Tac. 1.34.3 silentio haec vel murmure modico audita sunt; II.74.1 ut praesentem sacramentum et fausta Vitellio omnia praesentem per silentium audierint. There is only one comparable example of per silentium in prose before Tacitus, and that is a special case: Liv. 25.23.16 armati tenui agmine per silentium eo deducti (the juxtaposition of silentio and the adverb eo 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, 6.3.8, 6.5.1, 8.1. amb.1, 9.1.9, 9.2. ex.6), but per venenum is nowhere found. Tacitus, however at 12.52.2 writes per venenum exstinctus esset, and at 14.65.3, crepto per venenum patre. With the former example, cf. 3.19.3 veneno aut fame exstinctos.

The expression per gaudium (modal) at 5.1 below for gaudio cannot be paralleled before Tacitus in prose: paenitentiam filii et recuperatam matris gratiam per gaudium memorabat. For gaudio, see, e.g. Cic. Cluent. 14.

A favourite Tacitean phrase is per artem (-tes) with instrumental force (Lex. Tac. 1093b). It is almost completely avoided by earlier writers (found only once: Vitruvius 2.1.7), in whom arte is frequent with

the same sense (e.g. Cic. Verr. 4.103, har. resp. 19, Sest. 120, Petron. 102.15, 132.6, Quint. 9.2.27, 9.4.116, 10.2.12).

Promissis (instrumental) is not uncommon before Tacitus with, e.g., corrumpere, excitare, impellere and inducere (for examples from Cicero's speeches, see Merquet, III, 799b). With verbs of this kind Tacitus uses per promissa as well as the ablative (Lex. Tac. 1211a-b). Cf. the following pairs: II.20.2 temptata Othonianorum fide per colloquium et promissa/I.75.1 promissis simul ac minis temptabantur; 2.67.1 Flaccus ... per ingentia promissa quamvis ambitum et scelera sua reputantem perpulit ut .../II.29.3 largitione ac promissis ... perpulit delationem subire.

Instrumental per does not appear to occur before Tacitus with impello, with which the ablative is common (TLL. VII.1.539.36ff.). But note I.83.1 per turbas et raptus facilius ad civile bellum impellerentur.

Finally, cf. Cic. Balb. 37 si ad eam retinendam Gaditanos praemiis elicere non possumus (cf. 22, Tusc. 5.20); Tac. 4.30.3 delatores ... per praemia eliciebantur.

- 2.1 temulento: ebrius was the everyday word, temulentus an archaism.<sup>3</sup>  
The latter alone is used by Tacitus in the historical works (11 times; cf. ebrietas, Germ. 23).<sup>4</sup> Livy also avoids ebrius (temulentus 3 times),

and Curtius has it only once (temulentus 6 times).<sup>5</sup>

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

Most of the sporadic instances of temulentus in ordinary prose are in special contexts. Caelius uses the word with the posticism 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 Ciceronian examples (Sest. 20) may have been introduced for its sonorous effect in an alliterative passage of abuse (tempestatem impendentem intueri temulentus):<sup>6</sup> 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. contr. 9.2.4 inter temulentas reliquias sumptuosissimae cenae; 9.2.24 inter temulentas ebriorum reliquias humanum evertitur caput; Sen. epist. 47.5 alius reliquias temulentorum (toro)subditus colligit.<sup>7</sup>

2.1 Senecam contra muliebras inlecebras subsidiam a femina petivisse:

on Tacitus' use of femina to place strong emphasis on the sex of the person referred to (in contrasts, explicit or implied, with vir) see 35.2 n.

- 2.1 simul suo periculo et infamia Neronis anxia: anxius is synonymous with sollicitus. Both can mean either 'providus', 'diligens', 'cautus' etc.<sup>8</sup> or, more commonly (as anxius here), 'trepidus', 'suspensus', 'plenus angoris', etc. The following selection of passages illustrates the similarity between the two words and their derivatives in this second sense:

suspensa ac sollicita tota civitate (Cic. dom. 96).  
 si valere est suspensum et anxium vivere (Plin. epist. 3.17.3; cf. 6.4.5).

solliciti ... verentur (Plin. pan. 80.2; cf. B.Call. 8.34.1).  
 est enim suspensum et anxium de eo ... vereor omnia (Plin. epist. 6.4.5f.).

est ... metus futurae aegritudinis sollicita expectatio (Cic. Tusc. 5.52).

ipse valeo, si valere est suspensum et anxium 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 adnuat tandemque 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. adficio 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 scire. nunc vero me cum absentiae tum infirmitatis tuae ratio incerta et varia sollicitudine exterret (ib. 6.4.3f.).

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

With the present passage, cf. Cic. Cat. 4.1 video vos non solum de vestro 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 is in a direct speech (IV.58.1), in an antithesis used elsewhere in imperial prose (sollicitior/securior; cf. Plin. pan. 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 archaists (e.g. Sallust, 9:3); in ordinary prose sollicitus predominates markedly. Note the practice of the following imperial writers:<sup>9</sup>

	<u>sollicitus</u>	<u>anxius</u>
Seneca the Elder	11	1
Quintilian	19	3
ps. Quintilian ( <u>decl. min.</u> )	17	-
ps. Quintilian ( <u>decl. mai.</u> )	5	-
Petronius	2	-

The single example of anxius in Seneca the Elder (contr. 2.1.12) is in a high-flown passage containing various archaisms and poeticisms (e.g. forent 10, ammis 13, marcidus 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):

audentior et poetarum quam oratorum similior oratio.

- 2.2. Dominatio: dominatus, the preferred word in the ordinary prose of the late Republic (in Cicero's early speeches dominatio only is used, but in the later it is gradually replaced by -tus: see the table at TLL V.1.1878) 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 archaisers (see the table, l.c.). The only example in Tacitus is in the ablative singular form (6.34.2 a Parthico dominatu), as are the only 2 in Livy (24.4.2, 30.33.10). Substantives in -tus are especially common in the ablative singular, and many are confined to that case alone;<sup>10</sup> 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

1. See e.g. E. Fraenkel, Iktus und Akzent (Berlin, 1928), 163 ff.; J. Marouzeau, L'Ordre des Mots dans la Phrase Latine, I (Paris, 1922), 111ff.; 215ff.

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 ego + substantive (e.g. 1.42.4, 4.20.2, 15.2.1; cf. Fraenkel, Leseproben 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. 1.6.2, 3.16.2).

At 1.42 (Titum inde Vinium invasere; cf. 15.18.3) hyperbaton is introduced to create anastrophe of the introductory adverb.

2. The highly appropriate emphasis achieved by the hyperbaton gives strong support to the emendation of Lipsius (clamore pena N).
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 temulentus at Curt. 8.10.18 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. 83.27) has apparently been used for variation immediately after ebrius and inebriari.
  8. For anxius, see TLL II.203.111ff.; for sollicitus, cf., e.g. Plin. epist. 1.4.2, 1.19.4, Quint. 5.11.22.
  9. Anxius is not found in either Caesar or the speeches of Cicero. In the letters of the latter it occurs once (sollicitus 35 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 Plautus the only examples of natura are both alongside the regular Plautine term ingenium: Poen. 302, Trin. 812. The one instance of anxius in the Caesarian corpus (B. Afr. 71.2) is also coupled with sollicitus).
- In Cicero's philosophica, which contain many literary and archaic words avoided in the speeches, anxius is used as often as sollicitus (9 times).
- Livy, unlike Sallust and Tacitus, prefers sollicitus (40:17). He repeatedly has anxius in the expression anxius curis (see Packard).
10. See, e.g., F. Cooper, Word Formation in the Roman sermo plebeius (New York, 1895), 19.

cc.3-10 Tacitus' account of the murder of Agrippina has a number of close verbal similarities with that of Suetonius (Nero 34). Both writers probably used the same source.<sup>1</sup> Cf. the following:

- (1) Tac. 3.1 interficere constituit.  
Suet. Nero 34.2 perdere statuit.<sup>2</sup>
- (2) 3.2 praesumendo remedia munierat corpus  
Nero 34.2 antidotis praemunitam.
- (3) 3.3 cuius (navis) pars ipso in mari per artem soluta ...  
Nero 34.2 solutilem naver.
- (4) 3.3 naufragio intercepta sit.  
Nero 34.2 naufragio ... periret.
- (5) 4.1 illuc matrem elicit.  
Nero 34.2 iucundissimis litteris Baias evocavit.
- (6) 4.1 quo rumorem reconciliationis efficeret.  
Nero 34.2 reconciliatione simulata.
- (7) 4.4 tracto in longum convictu.  
Nero 34.2 protraxit convivium.
- (8) 4.4 artius oculis et pectori haerens.  
Nero 34.2 papillas quoque exosculatus.
- (9) 4.4 prosequitur abeuntem.  
Nero 34.2 hilare prosecutus.

(10) 5.1 ruere tectum loci.

Nero 34.2 camerae ruina.

(11) 6.2 misitque libertum Agerum, qui nuntiaret ...

evasisse gravem casum.

Nero 34.3 L. Agerum libertum eius salvam et

incolumem cum gaudio nuntiantem.

(12) 7.1 adfertur evasisse.

Nero 34.3 nandoque evasisse eam comperit.

(13) 7.1 nuntios patrati facinoris opperienti.

Nero 34.3 opperiens coeptorum exitum.

(14) 7.2 pavore exanimis; cf. 10.1 mentis inops.

Nero 34.3 inops consilii.

(15) 7.6 audito venisse ... nuntium Agerum, .. gladium..,

dum mandata perfert, abicit inter pedes eius, tum quasi  
deprehenso vincula inici iubet, ut exitium principis  
molitam matrem et pudore deprehensi sceleris sponte  
mortem sumpsisse confingeret.

Nero 34.3 L. Agerum .. salvam et incolumem .. nuntiantem,

abiectione clam iuxta pugione ut percussorem sibi

subornatum arripi constringique iussit, matrem occidi,

quasi deprehensum crimen voluntaria morte vitasset.

Tacitus has the simple verb trahere and the compound protrahere (see below).

(16) 9.1 aspexerint matrem exanimem Nero et formam corporis laudaverint, sunt qui tradiderint, sunt qui abnuant.

Nero 34.4 ad visendum interfectae caeaver occurrisse. contrectasse membra, alia vituperasse, alia laudasse.

(17) 10.2 cum prima centurionum tribunorumque adulatio ad spem firmavit.

Nero 34.4 quanquam et militum et senatus populi gratulationibus confirmaretur.

Some of the differences in phraseology between the two groups of passages emphasise certain features of Tacitus' style.<sup>3</sup> Where Suetonius has the Greek words antidotis (2) and camarae (10), Tacitus prefers the native remedia and the periphrasis tectum loci:<sup>4</sup> the standard expression for destruction by shipwreck (neufragio perire) is found in Suetonius but varied slightly by Tacitus (4), in keeping with his liking for the unusual; the simple verb traho, coupled with the typically Tacitean in longum (see Draeger on 1.69), is used by Tacitus instead of the compound protraho (7); pectus (8) and matrem exanimem (16) are the Tacitean equivalents of Suetonius' less elegant papillas and cadaver,<sup>5</sup> and the euphemistic haerens of exosculatus (8); the historiographical formula patrati facinoris (see Tränkle, Wien. Stud. 81 (1968), 126) corresponds to Suetonius' coeptorum exitum (13),

Tacitus has the simple verb firmit and the archaism grator (see Kuntz, 123) where Suetonius writes confirmit and gratulatio (17); Tacitus, in his customary manner (Introduction, p.39), omits the subject accusative eam which Suetonius has with the infinitive evasisse (12); the stock Tacitean phrase per artem (see 2.1 n.) is linked with soluta to give a virtual equivalent of Suetonius' solutilis (3); Tacitus uses the Virgilian evadere casum<sup>6</sup> where Suetonius has the hackneyed salvam et incolumem (11); and, finally, vincla inici, with the archaic form vincla, is preferred by Tacitus to Suetonius' constringi (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 archaisms, 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 ignotus. 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' pavillas .. exosculatus is far too specific to have been derived from a general phrase in the ignotus such as Tacitus' pectori haerens; Tacitus must have generalised words which he found offensively explicit. The sentence aspexeritne ... abnuant (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 camarae, which, however, was of longer standing in Latin) was introduced by Suetonius for a Latin word in the ignotus.<sup>7</sup>

- 3.2 ministros temptare arduum videbatur mulieris usu scelerum adversus insidias intentae: 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).<sup>8</sup> With the present example, cf. e.g. 1.54.2 Maecenati obtemperat effuso in amorem Bathylli; 3.1.1 insulam advehitur litora Calabriae contra sitam; 4.72.1 tributum iis Drusus iusserat modicum pro angustia rerum; 4.21.2 Fiscenae .. secreti sermonis incusavit adversum maiestatem habiti; 4.47.1 ad hostem pergit, compositum iam per angustias saltuum; 6.1.2 imota antea vocabula reperta sunt sellariorum et spintriarum; 11.33 Cetae praetorii praefecto haud satis fidebant, ad honesta seu prava iuxta lovi; 12.31.3 locum pugnae delegere saeptum agresti aggere et aditu angusto;<sup>9</sup> 13.39.1 per montes ducebantur praesidiis nostris insessos; 14.24.1 itinerata sola ducis patientia mitigabantur, eadem pluraque gregario milite tolerantis; 14.26.2 in Suriam abscessit, morte Umidi legati vacuum ac sibi permissam; 14.45.1 dissonae voces respondebant numerum aut aetatem aut sexum .. miserantium; 14.63.2 recentior Iuliae memoria obversabatur a Claudio pulsae; 15.37.3 lupanaria adstabant illustribus feminis completa; 15.50.4 impunitatis cupido retinisset, magnis semper conatibus adversa.<sup>10</sup>

The same pattern is also found fairly frequently in Sallust,<sup>11</sup> but elsewhere seems to have been comparatively rare, even in history.<sup>12</sup> Tacitus probably picked up the mannerism directly from Sallust. Cf., e.g., the following Sallustian instances: Cat. 3.4 animus aspernabatur insolens malarum artium; 29.1 rem ad senatum refert. iam antea vulgi rumoribus exagitata; Jug. 44.1 exercitus ei traditur a So. Albino

proconsule iners inbellis, neque periculi neque laboris patiens;

89.6 Metellus oppidum Thalam magna gloria ceperat, haud dissimiliter  
situm munitumque; 94.3 in castellum perveniunt, desertum ab ea parte.

When an attribute consists of only one or two words, however, both Tacitus (in the historical works) and Sallust,<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup>

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

Verbs other than esse provide the separating element about as many times in the more conventionally rhetorical Dialogus (13)<sup>16</sup> as in the whole of the Annals (12),<sup>17</sup> which are almost 20 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 Annals, on the word preceding the verb.

At c.14.4 below, Koestermann, with no manuscript authority, reads donis subegit ingentibus for subegit donis ingentibus (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

the Annals.

Tacitus and Sallust also admit only very sparingly various other types of hyperbaton which are common in rhetorical prose.<sup>18</sup> 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).<sup>19</sup> It is of note that Coelius Antipater in the preface (addressed probably to the scholar L. Aelius)<sup>20</sup> 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 Aelius his excessive use of the device according to the hitherto accepted canons of the historical genre, for we know from Mer. 4.18 (quo in vitio .. assiduis) that he failed to fulfil his claim.

Livy obviously broke away from the annalistic/Sallustian tradition (see further 29.1 n.).

3.3. pueritiae Neronis educator: Tacitus seldom has one genitive dependent on another.<sup>21</sup> Here pueritiae and educator together perform the function of a single word (the Greek term paedagogus, which Tacitus avoids; cf. Suet. Nero 35.2 Anicetum paedagogum suum).<sup>22</sup>

The expedients adopted by Tacitus to avoid the double genitive construction are sometimes observable. The fossilised expression

ira deum, for instance, which occurs 6 times when ira is in cases other than the genitive (Lex. Tac. 284a; see 6.2 n.), is twice replaced by caelestis ira when ira 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 regis at 2.57.4. Genus mortaliu, a variant for the classical genus humanu, is never used when genus is in the genitive case; genus humanu, conversely, is used only in the genitive (Lex. Tac. 497a). At 6.27.1 memini has an accusative object: cuus avus Tiburtem equitem Romanu plerique meminert. Elsewhere in Tacitus, however, it always takes the genitive of personal objects (Lex. Tac. 818b). At 3.19.2 - is finis fuit ulciscenda 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 Nipp. - Andr. ad loc.). Note finally 11.29.1 Annianae caedis molitor; 14.62.2 maternae necis petitor.

With the present passage, cf. 13.2.1 rectores imperatoriae inventae.

- 3.3 et si naufragio intercepta sit: the only other variant for the formula naufragio perire (interire)<sup>23</sup> found down to at least the time of Suetonius is at Nep. Hann. 8.2 - alii naufragio, alii a servolis ipsius interfectum eum scriptum reliquerunt - where the verb interfectum

has been chosen under the influence rather of the nearer expression  
a servolis ipsius than of naufragio.

- 3.3 defunctae: Tacitus does 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, 68.8, 71.3, 71.8, 74.17 bis, 78.3). Seneca the Elder uses mortuus 17 times, defunctus not at all; ps. Quintilian (decl. min.) mortuus 14 times, defunctus once; and Quintilian mortuus 4 times, defunctus once.

## Notes

1. On the question of sources, see Koestermann 2.1 n. and the literature referred to there.
2. Note that both omit eam with the verb of killing.
3. Cf. Norden, Ant. Kunstpr., 331 n.2.
4. Camara is used once in the Histories, unavoidably: III.47.3 fabricatis repente navibus: camaras vocant. On Tacitus' avoidance of Greek words, see further 3.3 n.
5. On cadaver, a word largely avoided both by Tacitus and the poets, see Norden, Aen. VI, 178; Axelson, Unquat. Wort., 49f. Favilla is not in itself a vulgarism (used by Virgil, Aen. 11.803), but Tacitus would probably have found the expression favilla exosculatus too explicit for his tastes (see further below).
6. Cf. Georg. 4.485; see H. Schmaus, Tacitus ein Mecklener Vorfahr (Bamberg, 1887), 42.
7. Note however that at 13.31.1 Tacitus appears to be criticising 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 ignotus, like his Natural History, were composed in a style compounded of archaisms and technical language.
8. 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 14.31.4: nec arduum videbatur excindere coloniam nullis munimentis saeptam.
10. Cf. e.g. 1.7.3, 2.56.4, 3.67.2, 4.27.2, 4.47.2, 4.58.2, 4.60.1, 4.67.1, 11.22.4, 11.23.2, 12.7.3, 12.12.3, 12.17.2, 12.18.1, 12.54.2, 12.57.1, 13.6.3, 13.38.3, 13.42.2, 13.45.1, 14.10.2, 14.12.3, 14.33.1, 14.59.1, 14.59.3, 15.18.1, 15.31, 15.40.2, 15.54.4 bis, 16.16.1, 16.21.3, 16.28.2.
11. See Ahlberg, Eranos 11 (1911), 99, 101 f. for examples and discussion.
12. It is used occasionally by Cicero (e.g. imp. Pomp. 4, 32, S. Rose. 28, Mil. 7, Phil. 1.10, 2.94), but proportionately far less often than by Tacitus. I have noted few instances in Livy.
13. See Ahlberg, o.c., 99.
14. Hyperbaton of this kind is found 15 times, for instance, in the first 50 chapters of Cicero's imp. Pomp., and 12 times in Livy 40, chaps. 1-10. On its frequency in the Rhet. Het., see G. Golla, Sprachliche Beobachtungen zum Auctor 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 mediocre (4.13) and genus dissolutum (4.16).
15. Speeches: 1.6.3, 1.17.3, 1.53.2, 1.59.5, 1.66.2, 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.

16. Dial. 5.5, 9.1, 9.5, 10.7, 16.4, 18.3, 19.5, 22.4, 25.2, 26.4, 30.2, 36.4, 37.6.
17. Ann. 1.35.5, 1.39.6, 2.21.1, 2.37.4, 2.70.1, 3.30.2, 4.22.3, 4.54.1, 4.55.3, 13.4.2, 15.67.3, 16.5.2.
18. On Tacitus, see further 29.1 n., and Draeger Synt., 92, on 1.10.1 simulata Pompeianarum eretiam partium (pattern a b a b); on Sallust, see Norden, Ant. Kunstw., 203 n.1 (inaccurate) and particularly A. A. Ahlberg, 'De traiectionis figura ab antiquissimis prosae scriptoribus latinis adhibita', Eranos 11 (1911), 88-106 (comparing the practice of Sallust with that of the earlier annalists).
19. See Ahlberg, o.c., 91ff.
20. See Peter, HR, I, CCXV.
21. On the usage in general, see Ho. - Sz., 65.
22. On Tacitus' avoidance of Greek words, see Wolfflin, Philol. 26 (1867), 141; Nipp. - Andr. 14.15 n.
23. Cic. Deiot. 25, div. 1.56, 2.14, 2.30 (interire), Tusc. 1.107, Att. 12.2.1, 12.20.2, Caes. civ. 3.27.2 (interire), Liv. 42.41.5, Ascon. in Pis. p.12, Quint. 7.3.33, ps. Quint. decl. min. 157.6, Suet. Jul. 89, Aug. 274, Nero 34.2, Cf. Cic. Pis. 44 perit in mari, fat. 33, nat. 3.89.

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 14 of the 19 in Livy (TLL V.1.1008. 29ff). Cicero, conversely, uses only forms other than dictitans.

Dictito is found mainly in the Annals (29 times).

4.2 promunturium Misenum inter et Baianum lacum: 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 Caesar<sup>1</sup> (perhaps an annalistic archaism preserved in the commentarii?)<sup>2</sup> and Livy (24.3.3), but is otherwise largely avoided (see TLL VII.1.2147.28ff.).

In the minor works when construed with two accusatives, inter always precedes both (Agric. 24.1, Germ. 28.2, 46.2); in the Histories it occasionally stands in anastrophe (Lex. Tac. 664a), but usually retains its more normal place (I.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 (1.59.4, 2.7.3, 2.16.1, 2.22.1, 2.63.6, 11.20.2, 12.56.1, 12.63.1).<sup>3</sup>

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 Histories II, between chapters 7 and 22 of Annals 2, and towards the end of Annals 12 (see above for references). Similarly in anastrophe it occurs 4 times in 20 chapters of Annals 4 (see Lex. Tac., l.c.). With the present example of cf. 9.1 below: viam Miseni propter et villam Caesaris dictatoris. Cf. also penes at V.8.2 and inter at V.19.2.

4.4 satis constitit: from Annals 12 onwards Tacitus has constitit exclusively (9 times: 12.17.2, 12.43.2, 13.16.4, 13.35.1, 14.35.2, 15.16.1, 15.67.3, 16.5.2) for the more usual constat, but in the minor works and Histories he almost always prefers the latter (10:1) (Diab. 16.5, 18.4, 25.1, 39.5, Agric. 13.2, 41.4, I.18.3, I.41.3, III.29.2, IV.69.2; cf. III.75.1). Neither word is frequent in the first 11 books of the Annals (constat: 1.13.6, 11.31.1; constitit: 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. Rosc., 221).
2. On the kinship between commentarii and annales, and on the isolated archaisms in Caesar, see Eden, Glotta 40 (1962), 77, 83ff., 88f., 92f.
3. On the increase of anastrophe in general in the Annals, see Wcliffin, Philol. 25 (1867), 116.

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

cum placidum ventis staret mare,

scito illud non stare, sed succuti et dici tranquillum, quia neque huc neque illo impetum 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 dii praebuere: a substitute, perhaps unparalleled, for the normal and very frequent di dederunt (dant, etc.),<sup>3</sup> which occurs once in the Dialogus (10.5) and twice in direct speeches in the Annals (4.38.3, 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: Iuvenalium ludicro parum spectabilem 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. eaque offensio altius penetrabat, quia idem Thrasea Patavi, unde ortus erat, ludis octastis a Troiano Antenore institutis habitu tragico ceciderat),<sup>4</sup> a closely comparable example of operam dare (denoting the performance on stage of actors) is to be found at Vitruvius 5.6.2 omnes artifices in scaena dant operam. Livy also has operam praebere once: 5.4.5 molesto antea ferebat miles se suo sumptu operam rei publicae praebere. Operam dare is found in Tacitus only at Dial. 31.5; elsewhere operam offerre and operam navare are preferred.

Effugium praebere (15.63.3) is used by no extant writer before Tacitus. Effugium dare occurs in the B. Alex. (16.1), Livy (23.1.8), 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 (benef. 1.9.2), and Columella (5.5.13, 8.11.4), for the common aditum dare,<sup>5</sup> which Tacitus does not have.

Materiam praebere occurs 5 times in the historical works (IV.4.1, 3.31.2, 4.59.1, 6.28.1, 13.49.1), materiam dare only at Dial. 3.2.

The latter alone is used by both Cicero (div. 2.12, de orat. 2.242) 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[m] 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. I.84.1, Iv.65.1, 6.5.1). Cicero uses only facultatem dare (26 times), as do Nepos (Phoc. 4.2), Livy (3.56.10, 29.27.4, 32.26.18, 38.51.9), Seneca (benef. 4.6.1, 7.8.3, dial. 1.4.2, nat. 1.17.4, epist. 90.1), et al; Caesar and the ps. Caesarian writers have facultatem dare 26 times, facultatem praebere twice (Gall. 8 pr. 5, civ. 1.49.2). Similar to facultatem praebere are casum (= occasionem) 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 excusationem praebere: Agric. 16.3 interventus civilium armorum praebuit iustam segnitiae excusationem; cf. Cic. Verr. 4.126 Sappho ... dat tibi iustam excusationem. Elsewhere excusationem dare is found, e.g., at Cic. fam. 6.7.6, sen. benef. 3.36.2, dial. 4.34.5.

Finally, note the use at 37.1 below of terga praebere, an expression found previously only at Curt. 4.14.4 (see Fletcher, Annotations, 45), for the more common terga dare and terga vertere.<sup>6</sup>

5.1 cum dato signo ruere 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, 3.26.2, 11.34.2, 11.37.2, 12.51.2). If the subject precedes the verb (2.31.1, 2.40.1, 6.44.2, 13.57.3), it is generally accompanied by a long attribute.<sup>7</sup>

Inversion of subject and historic infinitive in subordinate clauses does not seem to have been the rule in the other historians.<sup>8</sup>

5.1 pressusque Crepereius et statim exanimatus 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 ellipse of the verbal substantive with both verbs is more frequent in the first 6 books of the Annals than in the later:<sup>9</sup>

	<u>ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
Verbal subst. omitted with both veros <sup>10</sup>	15 (4:1)	8 (1:1)
Verbal subst. expressed with one verb <sup>11</sup>	4	10

Whereas est is expressed with exanimatus here, in a very similar passage in the first hexad double ellipse occurs: 3.51.1 ductusque in carcerem Priscus ac statim exanimatus.

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<sup>12</sup> and, to a lesser extent, valens (a less common word, with a more restricted range of employment).<sup>13</sup>

In Cicero, for instance, firmus is found very frequently, but validus only 3 times: at rep. 2.4, in a passage dealing with Romulus: oppressisse Loncam Albam, validam urbem et potentem (on another archaism, patres, used in the Republic under the influence of the remote subject matter, see above, 1.2 n; valida urbs is a stock expression in history: cf. Sall. hist. frg. 1.113, Liv. 1.15.4, Tac. 11.8.3, 15.4.2; cf. Skard, 1.2.); at fam. 16.4.3, in an expression of concern addressed to the sick Tiro: omnia videris, 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 mature videro, si plane confirmatum videro;  
 16.2 voluptati fore, si te firmum quam primum videro; 16.10.1 ibi te  
ut firmum offendam, mi Tiro, effice; 16.13 omnia a te data mihi  
putabo, si te valentem videro; 16.3.2 omnes cupimus, ego in primis,  
quam primum te videre sed, mi Tiro, valentem); and at fin. 3.33.

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. 8), 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 (Lex. Tac. 470a), of which 5 are in the minor works and 6 in the Historiae. Note that, whereas validus is used with paries in the present passage, at Dial. 22.3 firmus is preferred with the same word (cf. Plin. nat. 35.169). In the Annals firmus is found at 3.18.1 and 4.62.1.

Valens is used 5 times in the minor works and twice in the early Historiae (I-II), but is then dropped (Lex. Tac. 1734b). In the

minor works it occurs 3 times in phrases in which validus is later found: Germ. 40.1 valentissimis nationibus; cf. IV.17.6

validissimarum ... nationum; Agric. 24.1 valentissimam imperii partem; cf. III. 53.3 validissimam terrarum partem; Germ. 43.2 valentissimas (civitates); cf. II.82.7 validae civitates.

- 5.3 utque subveniretur matri principis clamitabat: 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 hexad (25 times).<sup>14</sup>

## Notes

1. Enn. ann. 384, Sen. Troad. 201, poet ap. Sen. nat. 1.17.5, 5.1.1, Lucan 8.245, Sall. hist. frg. 3.8, Liv. 44.28.3, Val. Max. 4.2. praef., Curt. 3.1.4, Plin. nat. 10.90, Plin. epist. 9.26.4.  
On the last passage, see Norden, Ant. Kunstpr., 319.
2. Cato arr. 112.1, Plaut. Cist. 14, Poen. 507, Varro ling. 7.88, Cic. Cluent. 136, rep. 1.11, Sen. contr. 7.1.7, Sen. dial. 6.5.5, 9.2.1, nat. 5.1.1, 5.1.3, ps. Quint. decl. min. 436.19. 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 spectabilem operam praebuerat, if the reference is to acting, can hardly be taken (with Furneaux) to mean that Thræsea had not appeared on stage at all; rather, the performance which he gave was parum spectabilem (or parum expectabilem, if the alternative suggestion for the Med. parum et expectabilem is accepted; spectabilem however is particularly apt in application to a stage performance).
5. See, e.g., Cic. don. 123, Att. 14.14.3, de orat. 3.7, B. Alex. 17.4, Nep. Paus. 3.3, Liv. 4.5.5, 22.44.2, 35.12.15, 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. Terga vertere was probably the normal military term, terga dare

an elaborate or unusual equivalent. Caesar and the Caesarian corpus have only the former, but Virgil only the latter. See TLI VI.1.1668. 61ff. for numerous examples of terga dare 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 P. Perrochat, RhL 14 (1936), 43f.
8. See the examples from Sallust and Livy given by O. Riemann, Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live (Paris, 1879), 219.
9. Other evidence has been found to suggest that the ellipse of esse is less common in the later than in the early books of the Annals: see G. Stuhl, Quibus condicionibus tacitus ellipsam verbi admisit et qua ratione excoluerit (Würzburg, 1900). The statistics given by G. Wetzell, De usu verbi substantivi Tacitino (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, 3.28.3, 3.38.2, 3.51.1, 3.74.2, 4.32.2, 4.72.3, 6.18.1, 6.45.2, 13.29.1, 14.4.4, 14.9.1, 14.32.1, 14.32.3, 15.35.3, 15.47.1, 16.33.1.
11. 2.82.4, 4.21.2, 4.47.3, 4.63.1, 11.1.3, 12.36.1, 13.36.3, 13.41.2, 13.41.3, 14.5.1, 14.24.3, 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 (TLI VI.1.813.26ff., ib. 815. 11ff.; cf. Lex. Tac.

1735a), military/numerical (TLL VI.1.814.6ff.; cf. Lex. Tac. 1735b), that conferred by fortifications (TLL VI.1.815.66ff.; cf. Lex. Tac. 1736a), mental, etc. - and power (TLL VI.1.816.14ff.; cf. Lex. Tac. 1736a). The derived sense 'fidelis', however, which firmus sometimes has (TLL VI.1.818.18ff.), may be alien to validus.

13. Valens (34 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, 1.8.3, 1.14.1, 1.40.3, 1.48.2, 2.58.2, 1.66.1, 1.78.1, 2.9.1, 2.9.2, 2.32.2, 2.40.3, 2.50.3, 2.78.2, 3.10.1, 3.29.1, 3.48.1, 4.6.4, 4.8.3, 4.14.1, 4.20.1, 4.21.3, 5.3.2, 6.8.1, 6.15.2, 12.43.2, 13.8.1, 13.15.3, 13.44.1, 16.26.3.

6.1 reputans: this word, which is often approximately synonymous with cogito (note, however, the literal usage at II.50.2) is used in prose mainly by historians and archaisers. It occurs 18 times in Tacitus (only in the historical works), 9 times in Sallust, 11 times in Livy,<sup>1</sup> 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 philosophica and twice in the letters.

Tacitus uses cogito 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 accitam: 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:<sup>2</sup>

	<u>epistula</u>	<u>litterae</u>
Livy	-	286
Seneca the Elder	22	-
Velleius	4	-
Valerius Maximus	2	1
Seneca the Younger	82	3
Curtius	13	31

	<u>epistula</u>	<u>litterae</u>
Pliny the Elder	19	-
Quintilian	22	1
ps. Quintilian ( <u>decl. min.</u> )	2	-

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

The phrase litteris accire is Livian (10.18.7, 22.31.7; see 21.1 n.).

- 6.1 honore praecipuo habitam: praecipuo has full superlative rather than intensive (= 'special') force here: Agrippina was the guest of honour at Nero's dinner. Cf. III.38.1 sciscitanti causam apud Caecilianum Muscum epulari multos, praecipuum honore Iunium Blaesum nuntiatur.

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

13.30.2 at I. Volusius egregia fama concessit, cui tres et nonaginta anni spatium vivendi praecipuaeque opes bonis artibus, inoffensa tot imperatorum amicitia fuit; 14.57.3 Sullam inopem, unde praecipuam audaciam; 16.14.1 neque nescium habebat Anteiium caritate Agrippinae

invisum Neroni opesque eius praecipuas ad eliciendam cupidinem.

Tacitus rarely uses the hackneyed maximus in the historical works other than in expressions in which it is unavoidable (circus maximus, pontifex maximus, with multo, and after quam). In the Annals it is found 6 times in the first 6 books (2.56.1, 3.19.2, 3.40.2, 4.6.2, 4.10.1,<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 populatio lucem intra sisteretur noctemque in castris tutam et vigilem capesserent (lucem and noctem are contrasted); 6.41.2 certantibus gaudio cui Artabanum Scythas inter eductum ob saevitiam execrati come Tiridatis ingenium Romanas per artes sperabant (Scythas and Romanas are contrasted); 3.75.2 illi, quod praetura intra stetit, commendatio ex iniuria, huic, quod consulatum adeptus est, odium ex invidia oriebatur (antithesis: cf. consulatum adeptus est); 15.37.2 volucres et feras diversis e terris

et animalia maris Oceano abusque petiverat (antithesis: cf. diversis e terris); 6.39.2 haec Tiberius non mari, ut olim, divisus neque per longinquos nuntios accipiebat, sed urbem iuxta (Tiberius was near the city rather than on Capri); 11.20.3 quaeque in aperto gravis, humum infra moliri (in aperto and humum infra are antithetical); 15.47.2 et in agro Placentino viam propter natus vitulus, cui carui in crure esset; secutacue haruspicum interpretatio, parari remum humanarum aliud carui, sed non fore validum neque occultum, quia in utero repressum ac iter iuxta editum sit (according to the interpretation of the haruspices it was of significance that the calf was born near the road: note neque occultum); 12.21 Mithridates ... ferocius quam pro fortuna disseruisse apud Caesarem ferebatur ... vultu quoque interrito permansit, cum rostra iuxta custodibus circumdatus visui populo praeberebatur (the demeanour of Mithridates before Caesar in private (apud Caesarem) is compared with that in public before the Roman people); 5.9.2 tradunt temporis eius auctores, quia triumvirali supplicio adfici virginem inauditum habebatur, a carnifice laqueum iuxta 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 metum Graptus ex libertis Caesaris, usu et senecta Tiberio abusque domum principis edoctus, tali mendacio intendit (Graptus had seen four reigns); 3.5.1 ipsum quippe asperissimo hiemis Tiberis usque progressum neque abscedentem a corpore simul urbem

intravisse (the attentiveness of Augustus in accompanying the body of Drusus as far as Ticinum is contrasted with Tiberius' refusal to mourn Germanicus publicly); 2.30.1 consultaverit Libo, an habiturus foret opes quis viam Appianam Brundisium usque pecunia operiret (Brundisium lay at the end of the Appian way); cf. 16.19.1 forte illis diebus Campaniam petiverat Caesar, et Cumas usque progressus Petronius illic attinebatur.

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 coram (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 TLF IV.9:2.11ff.).

There remain 12 examples of the device which convey no particular emphasis.<sup>5</sup> In 5 cases the substantive is a river name, either by accident or in reflection of a formulaic - perhaps official - usage (1.60.3, 2.41.1, 2.63.6, 4.5.1, 15.17.3).

- 6.1 observans etiam Acceroniae necem, simul suum vulnus adspiciens:  
the usual construction would have been simply observans ... et ... adspiciens or perhaps simul observans ... et ... adspiciens (or simul ...

-que, ac, simul).

In ordinary prose simul can link (1) two sentences: e.g. Caes. Gall. 6.23.2f. hoc proprium virtutis existimant, expulsos agris finitimos cedere neque quemquam prope audere consistere; simul hoc se fore tutiores arbitrantur, repentinae incursionis timore sublato; (2) two parallel, or nearly parallel, subordinate clauses: e.g. Cic. Verr. 5.44. cum ipsa (navis) quoque esset ex praeda, simul cum ipse decederet; Caes. Gall. 6.34.8 ut ... simul ut; Quint. 1.1.12 quia ... simul quia; cf. Cic. Verr. 1.124. ne ... simul ut; or (3) (only very rarely) two long phrases between which a copulative particle would be awkward: Cic. Verr. a. pr. 12 cuius praetura urbana aedium sacrarum fuit publicorumque operum depopulatio, simul in iure dicundo bonorum possessionumque contra omnium instituta addictio et condonatio; Pis. 76 vestrae fraudes, vestrum scelus, vestrae criminaciones insidiarum mearum, illius periculorum nefarie fictae, simul eorum qui familiaritatis licentia suorum improbiissimorum senorum domicilium in auribus eius impulsu vestro conlocarant, vestrae cupiditates provinciarum effecerunt 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 Annals (on its increasing frequency, see Introduction, p. 43); cf., e.g. 1.70.2 impulsu aquilonis, simul sidere aequinoctii ... rapi atque agmen; 3.24.3 sci

aliorum exitus, simul cetera illius aetatis memorabo; 11.21.2  
largitione amicorum, simul acri ingenio quaesturam ... adsequitur;  
 12.8.2 veniam exilii ... simul praeturam impetrat; 12.29.1 omnino  
accolarum, simul domesticis discordiis circumventus (see lex. Tac.  
 1503a-b).

It is found first in a prayer in Plautus (Stich. 405 Neptune  
gratis habeo et Tempestatibus; simul Mercurio), then in Cicero's  
 verse (arat. 36 Electra Steropeque, simul sanctissima Maia; cf. ib.  
 101) and occasionally in Sallust (see below), Livy (33.3.12 muta iam  
saepe memorata de maiorum virtutibus, simul de militari laude  
Macedonum cum disseruisset), and Pliny the Elder (nat. 7.91 scribere  
aut legere, simul dictare et audire).<sup>6</sup> Tacitus uses it considerably  
 more often than any earlier writer of either prose or verse.

Kroll (Glotta 15 (1927), 285) counted 22 instances of simul - et  
 in Sallust. Almost all, however, are unremarkable, for they belong  
 either to classes (1) or (2) above.<sup>7</sup> 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 proelio intentos,  
simul oppidum et operibus et loco murum videt. The rest (Cat. 56.5  
fretus ... simul ... existumans; 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. I.70.1, I.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, 12.43.2), 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).<sup>8</sup> Since benignitas is one of only two words with which Cicero allows deum;<sup>9</sup> 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. 13.4.1), 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, Pers. 390, Trin. 346, 355), pro deum atque hominum fidem and variants 3 (Curc. 694, Epid. 580, Men. 1053), metus deum one (Amph. 841) and pax deum another (Poen. 254).<sup>10</sup> Terence has deum only in the formula pro deum atque hominum fidem (7 times: see McGlynn, 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<sup>11</sup> - 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. Caesarian writers (-orum 9 times), Vitruvius (-orum 22 times), Seneca the Elder (-orum 14 times),<sup>12</sup> Celsus (-orum twice), and ps. Quintilian (-orum 13 times), and found only once in Seneca the Younger (epist. 91.6; -orum 48 times), once in Petronius (at 117.3, in the sacral phrase mater deum;<sup>13</sup> -orum 7 times), 3 times in Quintilian (1.6.18,<sup>14</sup> 2.4.34, 7.2.3; -orum 11 times) and once in Pliny the Younger (pan. 82.7; -orum 20 times).

Tacitus, in contrast to the above writers and even to the historians and archaisers (-orum 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 (32:9; see Lex. Tac. 284a). It has been argued<sup>15</sup> that as he advanced he turned progressively from deorum to deum:

	minor works	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>deorum</u>	5	4	4	1
<u>deum</u>	1	5	11	16

However, the statistics are misleading, for there is a clear distinction in usage between the two forms. Of the 9 instances of decorum in the historical works, 8 are in speeches, and the other is 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 decorum, 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 decorum: e.g. IV.85.2 (benignitas), 1.39.6 (ira), 3.58.3 (munus), 4.64.3 (meter).

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

Notes

1. It could be added to the list of artificial words cited by Tränkle (Wien Stud. 81 (1968), 118ff.) 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-Schmalz, s. v. 'epistula' that litterae could be used of both private and public correspondence, but epistula 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 epistulis.

3. For the Med. plurimis maximeque fideis auctoribus, Pitter, followed e.g., by Koestermann, reads maximeque fidei. Maximeque fidis (Beroaldus) is less plausible, for Tacitus has fidissimus 9 times, but maxime fidus nowhere else.
4. Kü.-St. I, 585 ff.; J. Marouzeau, 'Place de la preposition', REL 25 (1947), 307ff.; Landgraf, S. Rosc., 221.
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. Simulque is a common Plinian usage which could have been substituted (nat. 12.116, 15.51, 15.124).
7. Examples are assembled in Dietsch's index, s.v. 'simul', fin.
8. 5.20.3, 7.13.5, 8.4.6, 8.5.3, 8.13.11, 24.38.2, 26.41.6, 26.41.14, 28.11.8, 29.15.1, 31.31.20, 37.54.10, 39.9.4, 41.24.8, 45.23.1.
9. Q. Rosc. 33; cf. Plancus ap. fam. 10.8.6, 10.23.3. Deum also occurs in the expression pro deum atque hominum fidem (Q. Rosc. 23, 50, div. Casc. 7, Verr. 1.25, 3.137, 4.7), in which the analogists advocated the substitution of deorum: Cic. orat. 155 atque etiam a quibusdam sero iam emendatur antiquitas, cui haec reprehendunt. nam pro deum atque hominum fidem deorum sunt. ita credo hoc illi nesciebant: an dabant hanc consuetudo licentiam (see Sandys ad loc.); cf. Quint. 1.6.10. Cicero himself sometimes writes deorum ... fidem: Q. Rosc. 29, Font. 4, Lael. 52.
10. Similarly Livy has pax 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, 24.11.1, 27.23.4, 38.46.12, 42.2.3); pax deorum only once (6.41.9; cf. 39.10.5).
11. Note, e.g., (1) ira deorum (har. resp. 39, Mil. 86, nat. 1.45, leg. 2.22, off. 3.104): Tacitus has only deum with ira (Lex. Tac. 284e 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, 25.6.6, 40.37.2), deorum only twice (8.9.10, 8.33.7); Quintilian also provides an instance of ira deum (7.2.3); (2) metus deorum (Font. 30, Fin. 2.21): cf. Plaut. Amph. 841 (see above);

(3) donum deorum (Arch. 18, Tusc. 1.64, rep. 3.4): Livy has only deum with donum (1.54.3, 5.22.3, 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 suas 6.24 in a quotation from Pollio.
13. The only example of deum in the minor works of Tacitus is in the same expression (Germ. 45.2). Cf. Liv. 29.11.7, 37.9.9, Val. Max. 4.1.1, 2.4.3, 6.15.3, Plin. nat. 2.37, 5.147, 7.120, 11.261, 14.54, 18.16, 35.108. None of the latter three authors ever has mater deorum (which occurs perhaps only at Sen. dial. 2.18.5). Valerius Maximus has only one other example of deum (1.6.3) and Pliny only 6.
14. In a discussion of the phrase fidem deum (see above).
15. Seitz, K. Studien zur Stilentwicklung und Satzstruktur innerhalb der Annalen des Tacitus (Marburg, 1958), 21.

7.2 pavore exanimis: in this metaphorical sense exanimis is found in Virgil, Horace, Livy, certain imperial poets, and once in ps. Quintilian (ILL V.2. 1774. 39ff.); 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. per silentium defixus (10.1), mentis inops (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. 8.211ff.; see Mayor ad loc.) with the slaying by Orestes of his mother. Suetonius accordingly includes a description of Nero hounded by the Furies after the event (Ner. 34.4). Tacitus omits any mythological reference,<sup>1</sup> but makes use of certain suitably poetic phrases to describe the guilty feelings of the emperor.

7.2 sive servitia anaret: servitia (= servi) is found mainly in archaizing 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 (decl. 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 servitia frequently in the historical works.

The two words overlap in usage to some extent in Tacitus,<sup>2</sup> 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, Germ. 25.2, 1.7.3, 1.22.1, II.49.3, IV.59.1, 5.56.1, 6.21.1, 11.12.3, 13.2.2, 13.21.4, 15.54.4, 15.64.1, 15.72.2). The only comparable example of servitia 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, 2.30.3 bis, 3.22.3, 3.23.2, 3.67.3, 4.29.1, 4.29.3, 6.47.3); (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 manumission (15.54.2, 15.55.2).

Servitia is never used in any of these latter ways.

Apparently servi placed stronger emphasis on legal status than servitia.

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,<sup>3</sup> 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 iniussu populi et (ac) senatus (Verr. 2.14, 3.19, Pis. 48; cf. off. 3.109), one is in a formula (populi senatusque iudicio) found also in Caesar (leg. agr. 1.12; cf. Caes. civ. 3.10.10), and another has clearly been adopted because of the special weight given to populus in the context: Verr. 2.121 quas enim leges sociis amicisque dat is cui habet imperium a populo Romano, auctoritatem legum dandarum ab senatu, esse debent et populi Romani et senatus existimari (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 populisque 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 exuere

viderentur, senatus populiue Romani oblitterata iam nomina sacramento  
advocabant; I.57.1 et superior exercitus speciosis senatus  
populiue 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, 11.30.2, 14.11.1), senatus populusque  
(II.90.1, 1.2.2, 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., Kü. - St. II, 10f.

8.1 In depicting the crowd scene Tacitus makes use of one of the longest successions of historic infinitives in the historical works.<sup>1</sup> 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 clamore), the alliteration of the littera canina, r (rogitantium ... respondentium)<sup>2</sup> and the homoeoptoton with accompanying isocolon (diversa rogitantium aut incerta respondentium). For a similar passage containing a combination of asyndeton and homoeoptoton, see 1.64.1 laccessunt circumgrediuntur occursant: miscetur operantium bellantiumque clamor.<sup>3</sup>

questibus votis clamore: the conjunction of questus and vota in asyndeton may have been quasi-formulaic: cf. 1.11.3 questus lacrimas vota.

Tacitus frequently uses asyndeton of the type comprising juxtaposed unqualified words<sup>4</sup> in passages of rapid description or of some emotional content.<sup>5</sup> In the later books of the Annals 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 arduum cruentum; 48.1 vastare urere, trahere praedas; 48.2 clamore telis; 49.2 saxa hastae ignes; 49.3 bellatorum imbellium; ib. equi armamenta; ib. sanie odore contactu; 50.4 circumire hortari; 51.1 prensare detrahere (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 Wölfflin, 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.).<sup>6</sup>

- 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 (3.8.18, 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 magna (20 times Caesarian corpus; Vitr. 10.4.1, 10.13.6), maxima (Cicero, ps. Quint. decl. min. 295.29), infinita (Cicero, Caesar, Varro ling. 9.85), and innumerabilis (Cicero, B. Alex. 2.1, Her. 3.38). Tacitus has magna 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 principiis iuris et quibus modis ad hanc multitudinem infinitam ac varietatem legum perventum sit, altius disseram.<sup>7</sup>

For multitudo innumerabilis he uses m. innumera at 12.56.3 (cf. Plin. nat. 6.59).<sup>8</sup>

Adfluo (of crowds) occurs first in Virgil and is then used mainly by historians and archaisers (TLL I.124.2. 51 ff.). Cf. Liv. 35.3.1 adfluente ... multitudine; Val. Max. 3.2.23 ingenti multitudine ... adfluente. The Ciceronian and Caesarian expression most nearly equivalent to multitudo adfluit is m. concurrat: e.g. concurrat ad me maxima multitudo (Cic. Verr. 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:<sup>9</sup> cf. 1.19.1 pervicacia victi; 15.4.2 amnis ... ambit (cf. Virg. Aen. 6.550; Varro ling. 5.28 amnis id flumen quod circuit aliquod. nam ab ambitu amnis); 1.70.2 agique agmen (cf. Virg. Aen. 5.833f., 7.707, 804, 8.683, 11.433, 12.457; Isid. 9.3.64); ib. discerni ... incerta (perhaps accidental; see E.-M. s.v. 'cerno', 'certus'); III.25.1 auxiliis aucti (cf. 4.23.1, 6.34.1; Varro ling. 5.90 auxilium appellatum ab auctu); 3.72.4 dignae decore (see E.-M. s.v. 'decet'); II.21.2 casu accidit; 1.13.6 casu ... prociderat; Agric. 3.2 casibus ... interciderunt;

Agric. 36.3 currus ... incursabant; 2.9.1 flumen ... interfluebat (cf. III.5.2); 15.30.2 tantum itineris aditurus (cf. 15.36.3); 15.61.3 itinerere reditum; 12.16.2 moenibus ... munitam; 4.8.2 sede ... sedentis; 5.1.1 pace ... pacta;<sup>10</sup> 11.14.3 tres litteras adiecit, quae in usu imperitante eo, post oblitteratae, adspiciuntur etiam nunc; III.38.1 conlucere ... luminibus; I.16.4 dominorum domus; I.5.1 dari donativom; III.13.3 donum darentur (cf. 13.50.1); II.10.1 accusatorum causae (cf. 12.65.2; perhaps accidental: see E.-M., s.v. 'causa'); 2.83.1 carmine 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 formulaic instances (pace pacta is an exception) (see Landgraf, o.c., pass.).

The prepositional prefix of exterritis has full local force here (= 'frighten away'). In extant pre-Tacitean literature exterreo is used in this way only by Virgil and Ovid (see TLL V.2.2025.65ff.). But note Enn. ann. 36 exterrita somno; Cic. 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),<sup>11</sup> Silius Italicus (13 times) and, above

all, Tacitus (37 times).<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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 Annals 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 Erucius, et homines impune occidebantur. quid? ea multitudo quae erat? ... sin eos (putas) quos cui leviore nomine appellant percussores vocant, quare ... (see Landgraf ad loc.). It denotes a person who stabs or strikes someone with a weapon (= 'is qui percutit') without necessarily inflicting death.<sup>14</sup> 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 dixit? L. Sergium et M. Lollium nominavit ... quis est Sergius? 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.<sup>15</sup>

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

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 patris: quam gravis plaga, quam alte adactus est gladius! sic ego novercam percussissam; cf. ps. Quint. 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, Sen. dial. 1.3.7, 6.20.5, Quint. 6.2.31, ps. Quint. decl. min. 66.4), and hence in practice is indistinguishable from sicarius.

In Republican prose interfector is a neutral term which implies no disapproval on the part of the user. Cicero usually applies it to tyrannicides and to those who have committed justifiable homicide: e.g. Brut. 128 nam invidiosa lege C. Calpum sacerdotem et quattuor consularis L. Bestiam, C. Catonem, Sp. Albinum civeaque praestantissimum L. Opimium, Gracchi interfectorem, a populo absolutum, cum is contra populi studium stetit, Gracchani iudices sustulerant; Mil. 72 quorum interfectores impleverunt orbem terrarum nominis sui gloria; ib. 79 huius ergo interfector si esset, in confitendo ab aeternae poenae timeret quos liberavisset?; Phil. 1.35 beatus est nemo qui ea lege vivit ut non modo impune sed etiam cum summa interfectoris gloria interfici possit; epist. ad Brut. 1.16.5 Caesaris interfectores.<sup>17</sup> Under the Empire it can still be used neutrally (e.g. Liv. 24.22.16, 24.23.2, 25.25.3, Val. Max. 3.2.11, Sen. benef. 5.16.6, epist. 7.4), but it also commonly refers to murderers and assassins (e.g. at Val. Max. 3.2 ext.9, 4.1.15, and usually in Tacitus).

## Notes

1. See P. Perrochat, REL 14 (1936), 43f. for a collection of historic infinitives in Tacitus.
2. Admitted only sparingly by Tacitus: see above on filio infestam ferre (1.2); cf. W. Renz, Alliterationen bei Tacitus (Aschaffenburg, 1905), 22.
3. Occasionally elsewhere Tacitus has striking examples of homoeoptoton in significant contexts: e.g. 1.70.3 sternuntur fluctibus, hauriuntur gurgitibus (stom description).
4. In the present note only asyndeton of this kind will be dealt with.
5. Cf., e.g. 1.27.2, 1.35.1, 1.41.3, 1.49.1, 1.70.2-3, 2.17.4, 2.19.1, 2.23.4, 3.1.4, 4.25.2, 4.46 ff. (see below), 4.63.1, 4.69.3, 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 Sallust has been found on 4.46-51: see Heraeus, AIL 14 (1906), 273ff.; Syme, 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. Innumerus 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 innumerabilis.

9. See Landgraf, 'De figuris etymologicis linguae latinae', Act. Sem. Phil. Erlang. 2 (1881), 4, where it is maintained that Tacitus very rarely uses the device. Similarly Gudeman (on tacto tegi, Dial. 22.4) found only 2 instances in the minor and historical works together (cf. facinora fecere, 12.31.4), and Sorbon (65 n.1) could add only the present example.
10. Common elsewhere: see Landgraf, o.c., 18; O.E.W. Müller, Syntax des Nominativus und Akkusativus im Lateinischen (Leipzig u. Berlin, 1908), 26.
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, 9.41.14), and 3 times in the fourth (37.24.3, 39.15.8, 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 Tränkle, Wien. Stud. 81 (1968), 118ff.
12. There are also 9 instances in Seneca the Younger, 4 in Valerius Flaccus, and 6 in Statius. Lucan, who shuns numerous traditional epic terms (see J. Obermaier, Der Sprachgebrauch des M. Annaeus Lucanus (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 (3), Val. Flacc. (2), Silius (7), and Statius (once) use the active as well.

14. Sicarius, however, means 'murderer'. Quint. 10.1.12 nam per abusionem sicarios etiam omnis vocamus, qui caedem telo quocumque commiserunt.
15. Words which have a particularly strong connection with a technical (e.g. legal, medical, religious) vocabulary may become too stylised for ordinary use: cf. 'sin' in mod. Eng. Among legalisms avoided by both archaising and everyday prose may be numbered condemno (see 41 n.) and caedo (43.4 n.). The former is common enough in Ciceronian prose but is dropped from use in the first century A.D.
16. Percussor: Livy 2, Seneca the Elder 11, Seneca the Younger 6, Curtius 2, Pliny the Elder 2, Quintilian 1, ps. Quintilian 5, Petronius 2; interfector: Livy 10, Seneca the Elder 6, Velleius 3, Valerius Maximus 6, Seneca the Younger 3, Curtius 7, Pliny the Elder 5, Quintilian 3, ps. Quintilian 1. Tacitus has percussor 17 times, interfector 15.
17. There remain red. sen. 4, fam. 12.23.2.

- 9.3 hunc sui finem multos ante annos crediderat Agrippina: the use of finis for mors is mainly poetic (see TLL VI.1.792. 1ff.). The fuller expression finis vitae is classical, if rare (TLL VI.1.791 67ff.). Tacitus uses both, the former more often proportionately in the Annals, and particularly the later books:

	minor works	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.1-6</u>	11-16
<u>finis vitae</u>	2	2	6	-
<u>finis</u>	-	3	12	6

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 initio Neronis; 1.31.4 igitur audito fine Augusti vernacula multitudo ... laqueis ceterorum rudes animos; 2.59.1 Postumi Agrippae servus ... conserto fine Augusti pervenire in insulam Planasiam. But usually the word is interchangeable with mors.

- 9.3 consulenti super Nerone: in prose from the Augustan age down to at least the late second century A.D. super + abl. (= de) occurs only in archaising writers,<sup>1</sup> and then predominantly in a formulaic 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 (15 times), always with res as object and usually in official contexts. Later Tacitus uses it 28 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).<sup>2</sup> His contemporary the Younger Pliny uses it twice (epist. 2.11.11, 2.16.4), both times in the expression super tanta re (note the context at epist. 2.11.11: super tanta re in illo coetu praesente Caesare dicendum erat). After Tacitus, there are 3 instances in Suetonius, of which 2 have res as object (Jul. 5, Pib. 13.2) and the other is in an official context: Jul. 20.1 nec quovism reperto, qui super tali consternatione referre aut censere aliquid auderet (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 archaizer Gellius, 52 of which govern res.<sup>3</sup> It is probably an indication of the formality of the word that Gellius 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 hac super re,<sup>4</sup> and once - ib. 14.22.2 - in official phraseology), twice in Sallust (Jug. 71.5, hist. frg. 3.86), and once in Nepos (at Paus. 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 (amica: Bacch. 177, 367, 562, 607; anu: Aul. 683, Cist. 660; ancilla: Cas. 254; vicina: Mil. 1212). Even if it 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 legasset super pecunia tutelave suae rei, ita ius esto; see Cir. inv. 2.148, Her. 1.23), Cato (at orat. frg. 109, in the phrase super tali re; the passage apparently refers to the censor's custom of consulting a consilium: see Malcovati ad loc.), Pacuvius (237 qua super re), 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, Unpoet. 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, 4.2.42, carm. saec. 18) are in official passages.

- 9.3 responderant Chaldaei fore ut imperaret matremque occideret;  
atque illa 'occidet' inquit, 'dum imperet': when intransitive, impero

is usually, as here, found in speeches in the Annals (4 times in 6 examples).<sup>5</sup> The rare frequentative imperito (see Fraenkel, Horace, 191 n.5) is the preferred word in narrative.<sup>6</sup> But as a transitive verb impero is common in narrative, for the transitive use of imperito is almost completely avoided (used only at 12.54.1, governing enden).

Note also the use of the commonplace occido here for interficio in a speech (see Löfstedt, Peregrinatio, 256f.).

## Notes

1. P.C. Walsh, Livy, His Historical Aims and Methods (Cambridge, 1961), 263, errs 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 O. Gotzes, De quibusdam sermonis Gelliani proprietatibus observationes (Halis, 1863) 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. 26.15.5).
5. Twice in a speech at 1.6.3; in narrative at 1.7.3, 11.22.4.
6. The predominance of intransitive imperito begins in the second half of the Histories. In books I - II impero is found 7 times, imperito never; but in III- V imperito is used 6 times, impero twice in speeches (III.38.4, IV.66.2).

10.1 per silentium defixi: cf. Liv. 8.7.21 silentio defixi.<sup>1</sup>

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

In this sense defixus occurs mainly in poetry and artificial prose (TLL V. 341.62ff.).

10.1 mentis inops: a poeticism (Ovid. ars 1.465, 3.684, Sen. Agam. 721, Sil. 5.631, Stat. Theb. 10.820; cf. inops animi: Virg. Aen. 4.300, Sil. 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 vecors and vecordia (on which, see Degel, 17). He also has rabies (6 times),<sup>2</sup> alienatio mentis, furans (6 times),<sup>3</sup> turbida mens and turbata mens.<sup>4</sup> Amens, amentia, demens, insanus and insania are all avoided, and daemntia occurs only once (6.24.2). The only commonplace term used freely is furor (11 times).

10.1 lucca opperiebatur: oprerior 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. Her.,

Cicero in his speeches, philosophica, 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),<sup>5</sup> and Tacitus (49 times) both use opperior freely. There are also sporadic instances in Valerius Maximus (1), Seneca the Younger (6), 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. 788, Trin. 744). But in Tacitus (23 times), and also in Seneca (benef. 2.25.3, 7.14.4, dial. 6.8.3, epist. 30.12, 58.32, 94.42), Curtius (3.12.9, 8.2.32, 8.12.5), and Columella (2.4.8, 2.20.5, 3.20.5) the accus. rei construction is considerably more frequent proportionately.<sup>6</sup> Numerous verbs show a similar widening of function in the artificial prose of the Empire (see on audeo, 25.1 n., and oro, 33.1 n.).

The classical/non-artificial word which corresponds to opperior

is exspecto.<sup>7</sup> Tacitus and Livy often have opperior in expressions in which Caesar, Cicero and others use exspecto in the same sense: e.g. adventum opperior (Liv. 30.10.8, Curt. 8.12.5) / a. exspecto (Cic. Quint. 27, Caes. Gall. 1.27.2 and often: see Merguet 46b); classam opperior (Liv. 31.28.3) / c. exspecto (Caes. Gall. 3.14.1); navem opperior (Liv. 36.44.2) / n. exspecto (Caes. civ. 1.29.2); tempus opperior (Liv. 1.56.8) / t. exspecto (Cic. Verr. 1.81, inv. 2.174, Caes. civ. 1.32.2); diem opperior (IV.81.1) / d. exspecto (Cic. Phil. 3.2); eventum opperior (Liv. 35.43.10) / e. exspecto (Caes. civ. 1.53.2, 3.94.6); noctem opperior (4.50.4) / n. exspecto (Cic. Mil. 52, Her. 4.48); copias opperior (13.36.2) / c. exspecto (Caes. civ. 1.18.4, 2.37.6); epistulas opperior (1.30.4) / litteras exspecto (Cic. Fam. 14.4.5); mortem opperior (14.59.1) / m. exspecto (Cic. Mil. 16).

Tacitus rarely uses exspecto with the same sense as opperior (see Lex. Tac. 431b B for exspecto in the subjective sense), except when a passive or a tense of the perfect stem is required.<sup>8</sup> In the active and in the present tenses he has it as an apparent synonym of opperior 3 times in the minor works (Dial. 19.5, 26.6, Germ. 14.3; opperior is found only at Agric. 18.2), twice in the first 2 books of the Historiae (I.55.1, II.30.1), and once early in the first book of the Annales (1.7.6).<sup>9</sup>

Lucem opperior is Livian (7.36.6).

10.2 centurionum tribunorumque: -que (the standard connective in the official language: see on senatum et populum, 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.<sup>10</sup> In the Annals, however, he uses the other copulative particles 6 times, but -que only 4 times.<sup>11</sup> 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 tribunisque only 3 times). Tacitus, who often reverses the order of set expressions, places centuriones first 15 times in the historical works.<sup>12</sup>

10.2 mortis parentis inlacrimans: when employed in the singular for either pater or mater, parens is often emotive, 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.<sup>15</sup>

Note the following Tacitean examples: 16.30.2 acciderat sane

pietate Serviliae ... quae caritate erga parentem, simul imprudentia  
aetatis, non tamen aliud consultaverat quam de incoluntate domus;  
 1.9.3 pietate erga parentem;<sup>14</sup> 1.10.1 pietatem erga parentem;  
 1.7.4 de honoribus parentis consulturam; III.25.3 simul attollere  
corpus, aperire humum, supremo erga parentem officio fvari;<sup>15</sup>  
 4.8.4 'patres conscripti, hos' inquit 'orbatos parente tradidi patrio  
ipsorum precatusque sum, quamquam esset illi propria suboles, ne secus  
quam suum sanguinem foveret attolleret; III.67.1 obrubatur animus  
miseratione curaque, ne pertinacibus amnis minus placabilem victorem  
relinqueret coniugi ac liberis. erat illi et fessa aetate parens;  
 Agric. 45.4 sed mihi filiasque eius tracier acerbiter parentis  
erepti auget miserationem, quod assidere valetudini, fovere  
deficientem, satiari vultu complexaque non contigit.

Parallels can be multiplied from pre-Facitean writers: cf.,  
 e.g. Cic. Cael. 4 nam quod de pietate dixistis, est ista quidem nostra  
existimatio sed iudicium certe parentis; Planc. 29 ut vivat cum suis,  
primum cum parente-nam meo iudicio pietas fundamentum est omnium  
virtutum-quem veretur ut deum-neque enim multo secus est parens  
liberis. Phil. 13.47 Caesar, adulescens summa pietate et memoria  
parentis sui; Liv. 7.5.1-2 quin contra se quoque parenti causam  
invidiae atque criminum esse aegre passus, ut omnes di hominesque  
scirent se parenti opera latam quam inimicis eius male, capit  
consilium ... pietate laudabile; 8.22.3 per speciem honorandae

parentis; 26.49.13 eam pro parente colebant; 44.1.10 orsus a  
parricidio Persei perpetrato in fratrem, cogitato in parentem  
(violation of pietas); Vell. 2.100.3 filia eius Iulia, per omnia  
tanti parentis ac viri immemor (neglect of the duties of pietas);  
Val. Max. 5.4.1 uniuscuius parentis aspectus bellum atrox salutari  
pace mutavit (in the section de pietate erga parentes et fratres et  
patriam; cf. 5.4. ext.6); Sen. benef. 4.19.3 hunc vis videri colere  
non aliter quam parentem grato, ut opinor, animo; dial. 6.1.2 mortem  
A. Cremuti Cordi, parentis tui (in a passage on the pietas of Marcia);  
Quint. 11.1.63 fecit itaque nomen parentis non filio invidiosum, sed  
ipsi, in quam dicebatur (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 Cluentius).<sup>15</sup>

10.3 paravisset: the syncopated forms of the perfect infinitive  
active and the pluperfect subjunctive active of first and fourth  
conjugation verbs, and of certain analogous second and third  
conjugation verbs (e.g. compleo, cupio, concupisco, peto, quaero)  
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 retinere insolentiae cuiusdam est et frivoliae in parvis  
incontinentiae, multum enim litteratus, qui sine aspiratione et

producta secunda syllaba salutarit ('avēre' est enim), et  
'calefacere' dixerit potius quam quod dicimus et 'conservavisse',  
his adiciat 'face' et 'dice' et similia. recta est haec via :  
quis negat? sed adiceet et mollior et magis trita; cf. ib. 17  
inhaerent tamen ei quidem molestissima diligentiae perversitate,  
ut 'audaciter' potius dicant quam 'audacter', licet omnes  
oratores aliud sequantur. et 'emicavit', non 'emicuit', et 'conire',  
non 'coire'. his permittamus et 'audivisse' et 'scivisse' 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 Annals, however, they predominate (see Introduction, p. 50). Sallust also prefers the contracted forms (particularly in the Jugurtha), but Livy seems to have syncopation throughout.

## Notes

1. Cf. 1.58.2 ob metum defixo. Tacitus seems to have been the only author to have varied the standard construction (abl. of cause or manner) found with defixus in this sense: see TLL V.341.69ff.
2. Rabies is used only twice by Cicero, both times in the philosophica (Tusc. 3.63, 4.53). In the former passage it is applied to the madness of a dog.
3. On furens, see TLL VI.1.1626.37ff. Cicero prefers furiusus in his speeches (25:14) and letters (6:1), but furens in the philosophical works (13:7). Tacitus avoids furiusus. All 3 examples of furens 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 TLL VIII.718.71ff.
5. Livy uses opperior more frequently in the later books (especially the fourth and fifth decades) than earlier.
6. Livy, however, has it only 6 times: 1.56.8, 5.6.2, 7.36.6, 30.10.8, 35.48.10, 44.26.7.
7. Exspecto, however, possesses a subjective (= 'expect') as well as an objective sense: TLL V.2.1895.24ff.
8. Opperior is hardly ever used in tenses of the perfect stem (never by Tacitus): see Neue-Jagener, III, 534, 579.

9. There is an accumulation of uncharacteristic words in the early chapters of Annals 1: see on impero, 9.3 n. and on hercule, in the note on saltem, 1.2.
10. But ac is used at I.83.4, 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; ac: 4.2.2. -que is also replaced at 1.61.3 (centuriones is qualified), 2.67.1 (after -que), and 11.37.2 (tribuno, sing.).
12. I.30.3, I.82.1, I.83.3, I.83.4, II.18.2, II.19.1, III.19.2, IV.61.3, 1.17.1, 1.42.4, 2.55.5, 4.2.2, 11.37.2, 12.41.2. For tribuni + centuriones (26 times), see Lex. Tac. 162b fin. - 163a.
13. Not all instances of parens (sing.) fall into these categories. Sometimes it is general, expressing a parent of either sex (e.g. 4.34.2, 6.1.2, 13.20.3); or it may be used for variation in the vicinity of pater, mater, paternus, or maternus (see below, n.14).
14. Landgraf, S. Roser, 118f. suggests that Tacitus used parens here in order to distinguish Julius Caesar, the adoptive father of Augustus (parens) from Octavius, his real father (pater, ib.1). It is undoubtedly true that Tacitus has deliberately varied his terminology, but it is incorrect to suppose that parens is more appropriately used of an adoptive father than is pater. In Tacitus at least pater is more frequent than parens in this sense (Lex. Tac. 1054a B, 1068a B). Octavius is designated pater and Caesar parens because the reference

to Octavius is purely factual, while that to Caesar emphasises the notion of pietas. Similarly (against Landgraf, *ib.*) parentis loco is the standard expression rather than patris 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 parens 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.
16. See further, e.g., Sall. Jug. 14.21, 85.40, Cic. B. Rosc. 53, Verr. 1.66, 1.76, 3.63, 4.41, Mur. 12, 88, 89, Sull. 89, Cluent. 200, Cael. 5, 25, 39, red. sen. 37, Lig. 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.

11.2 cuncta eius dominationis flavitia: on the comparative frequency of the adjectival and substantival uses of cunctis in the prose of the Empire, see 1.3 n.

Of the 32 adjectival examples of the word in Tacitus, 31 are plural (the exception is at 11.31.1); of these, 21 are like that here, neuter.<sup>1</sup> The neuter plural use is also disproportionately frequent in Sallust, Valerius Maximus, and the Elder Pliny:<sup>2</sup> clearly it was a stock mannerism of artificial prose.

In the Annals there is a sharp distinction in usage between adjectival cuncta and omnia.<sup>3</sup> Of the 10 examples of the latter, all but 2 are in speeches or equivalent contexts.<sup>4</sup> Conversely, of the 21 examples of cuncta, all but 2 (11.24.6, 13.14.3) are in narrative.<sup>5</sup> Sallust observes a similar distinction: 7 of 9 instances of cuncta are in narrative (exceptions at Cat. 51.20, orat. Macr. 26), but a majority of examples of omnia are in speeches.

In the Histories cuncta is used only in narrative, but omnia is not restricted to speeches (13 of 16 examples are in narrative).<sup>6</sup> The distribution of the pair in narrative throughout the historical works is as follows:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>omnia</u>	13	1	1
<u>cuncta</u>	4	6	15

There is an obvious change of practice after the Histories.

11.2 namque et naufragium narrabat: namque is usually found before vowels in the few places where it is admitted in this section of the Annals. It occurs before consonants 10 times in the Histories, but only 3 times in Annals 1-6 and once in 11-16.<sup>7</sup> The pre-vocalic use also declines after the Histories, though it remains constant in the two halves of the Annals (17:6:6).<sup>8</sup>

Namque belongs to elevated style, especially when used before consonants (cf. atque). 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)<sup>9</sup> 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 suas 6.24 in a quotation of Asinius Pollio), Seneca the Younger has it only twice in his philosophical works (7 times in the tragedies), Asconius and Celsus avoid it (both have nam frequently), Petronius uses it only in verse, and ps. Quintilian (decl. min.) has it only 4 times (3 times before vowels).<sup>10</sup>

In Sallust, however, it is found 22 times, in Livy 58, in Valerius Maximus 64, in Curtius 43, and in Pliny the Elder 182.<sup>11</sup> Livy has the pre-consonantal use 39 times, Valerius Maximus 48, Curtius 20, and Pliny 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 affectation.

A reason for the unexpected diminution of namque after the Histories may tentatively be suggested. It is of note that, like Tacitus, almost all of the archaisers 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 Histories, but rarely admits it in the Jugurtha.<sup>12</sup> Livy uses it predominantly in the first decade:

1-10	35
21-29	11
30-39	7
40-45	5

There are 53 examples in the first decade of Tliny 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 gnarus, with expressive doubling of the r (cf. varus, Varro), or a syncopated form of an old verb \*gnarurare.<sup>13</sup> 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 weakened, is secondary. The manner of its emergence can be conjectured. At an early date narrare entered the technical vocabulary of rhetoric,<sup>14</sup> 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, narro is not common in this sense (cf. memoro; see 14.1 n.). In cases where it appears to mean 'relate', the sense 'reveal', 'divulge' is often present in varying degrees.<sup>15</sup>

In Plautus the word is usually in effect the facilitive of scio. It is used, for instance, of those who tell secrets (e.g. Pers. 493, Rud. 947), bring news (e.g. Amph. 744, Stich. 300), inform on others (e.g. Men. 638, 735, Truc. 313), impart confidences (e.g. Poen. 1339), explain the true facts of a situation (e.g. Mil. 1404), etc. Note the following passages in which its proximity to scio well illustrates its sense: Amph. 744 quis igitur nisi vos narravit mi illi ut fuerit proelium? / AM. an etiam id tu scis?; Men. 638 quidnam hic narravit tibi? / quid id est? quid taces? quin dicis quid sit? AM. quasi tu nescias. / ... ME. vel hanc rem te si sciam. PE. o hominem valde / ut dissimulat! non potes celare: rem novit probe; ib. 639 quid esse illi morbi dixerat? narra, senex. / nam larvatust aut cecritus? fac sciam; Poen. 547 scitis rem, narra vobis ... Cf. also the following particularly clear examples: Pers. 493 nam est res quaedam quam occultabam tibi dicere: nunc eam narrabo; Men. 735 iam patrem accersam meum / atque ei narrabo tua flagitia quae facis. / ... iam ero aperiam istaec tua flagitia.

Cicero uses narro 13 times in the speeches, 20 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 plane nil est quod scribam; nam nec quod mandem habeo (nihil enim praetermissum est) nec quod narrem (novi enim nihil est); fam. 7.1.2 quid tibi ero alia narrem? nosti enim reliquos ludos; 9.6.6 ecce tibi ea narro, quae tu melius scis quam ipse, qui narro.

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.54.1 prohibiti per civitatem sermones, eoque plures ac, si liceret, vere narraturi, quae vetabantur, atrociora vulgaverant; 2.24.4 ut quis ex longinquo revererat, miracula narrabant; 4.69.2 interca Latianis repertum in publico Sabinum, velut recens cognita narraturus, domum et in cubiculum trahit.

The only instance of the verb narrare in II-16 is at II.16.7, in the context of the account of the Punicus conspiracy. In the same chapter there is an example of the construction quod...dicit, an expression found elsewhere only in Tacitus, and also of definite nature a comment, a usage characteristic of the style of the historian rather than of the satirist (see Journal of Roman Studies, 1957).

Notes

1. All but 1 (3.76.1) of the remaining 10 examples qualify things rather than persons.
2. In Sallust 9 out of 20 adjectival examples are neuter plural, in Valerius Maximus 5 out of 11, and in Pliny 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 cuncta and omnia.
4. Speeches: 1.42.4, 4.37.3, 6.46.4, 11.16.3, 14.12.1, 14.43.1, 15.54.1, 16.4.3; narrative: 4.11.2, 15.51.3.
5. Note that the exception of 11.24.6 is in the speech of the emperor Claudius.
6. Narrative: I.19.2, 11.23.4, 11.24.1, II.74.1, II.80.1, II.80.2, II.94.2, III.7.2, III.35.2, III.49.1, III.54.1, III.58.4, III.79.1; speeches: I.83.3, III.21.1, V.17.1.
7. The only instance of the word before a consonant in 11-16 is at 15.18.3, in the preface to the account of the Pisonian conspiracy. In the same chapter there is an example of the correlative cum ... tum, an expression found elsewhere only in the Dialorus, and also of deinde before a consonant, a usage characteristic of the style of the Historiae rather than of the Annales (see Wölfflin, 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, 54.3, 74.3; (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 Wöifflin, Philol. 25 (1867), 111.
9. See Axelson, Unpoet. Wort., 47 n. 4.
10. Quintilian uses namque considerably more often (52 times, 50 times before vowels) than the other non-archaizing writers listed here. However, it must be noted that he has nam over 1,000 times. Proportionately, therefore, the frequency of namque is insignificant. In contrast the archaisers Valerius Maximus, Curtius, and Pliny the Elder use namque almost as often as nam. In most cases Quintilian was probably moved to adopt namque by phonetic considerations. Cf. the frequency with which he uses atque before consonants, on rhythmical grounds (see 38.2 n.).
11. Valerius Maximus uses nam 155 times, Curtius 55, and Pliny the Elder 257.
12. See A. Kunze, Sallustiana III, 1 (Leipzig, 1897), 10.

13. See *R.-M.*, s.v. 'gnarus'; cf. X. Mignot, Les verbes dénommatifs latins (Paris 1969), 25.
14. See the fragment of the orator C. Titus (a contemporary of Lucilius) ap. Macr. 3.16.16.
15. As, for instance, when it is used to introduce anecdotes.

12.2 et alia in concubitu mariti fulmine exanimata: in accounts of portents exanimo(r) is the standard word describing death caused by lightning: e.g. Liv. 22.36.8, 33.26.7, 42.20.5, Suet. Aug. 29.3.

12.3 quo ... auctam lenitatem suam testificaretur: testificor is a synonym of testor (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 orat. 2.225), 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. 37.12.12 and Col. 1.4.2. Clearly Tacitus adopted the word as an archaism.

The verbal formation -ficare is not prolific until the Christian era.<sup>1</sup> 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 testificor, are short-lived (an indication of the uneasiness which the Romans felt about compound words): causificor (used by Plautus, then not again until Apuleius; the usual substitute is causor); cerifico (only in the Elder Pliny);

fructifico (at Calp. ecl. 4.91 and in Columella); largifico (only at car. ep. 934.); lucrifico (only in Laberius); mitifico (first in Cicero, then occasionally in archaisers; the regular term is mitico); modifico (first in Cicero, then in the archaisers Gellius 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); turoificatus (at Cic. off. 3.105 only); versifico (used first by Quintilian, then not again until Ammianus).

- 12.3 Valerium Capitonem et Licinium Gabolum sedibus patriis reddidit:  
sedes patria(e) is a highly emotive expression for domus, as can be seen from its only two occurrences in Cicero: Verr. 3.46 diffugerant enim penulti, id quod ostendam, nec solum arationes sed etiam sedes suas patrias istius iniuriis exagitati reliquerant; Phil. 12.14 excessurum se ex Italia dixit, deos penatis et sedes patrias relicturnm, si - quod di omni averterint! - 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 Piso's intention of leaving his ancestral

home in order to be away from Antony's tyranny; note the juxtaposition of the equally emotive deos penatis).

The poets took the phrase up for its expressiveness, using it even in passages of no particular emotional content.<sup>2</sup> 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 sedes patria(e) is found in pre-Facitean prose only at Sall. hist. 1.55.12 (emotive) and Curt. 3.7.11.

12.4 semulchrucumque exstrui permisit: the compound exstruo (with literal sense) becomes increasingly common in the second half of the Annals for struo, which is preferred in the first half (see Introduction, p. 54).

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

1.78.1 templum ut in colonia Tarracomensi 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 publice quidem nisi duo opera struxit,  
templum Augusto et scaenam Pompeiani theatri.

IV.22.1 subverse longae pacis opera, haud procul  
castris in modum municipii exstructa.

II.67.2 tertriadecimani struere amphitheatra iussi.

13.31.1 molen amphitheatri ... exstruxerat.

15.30.1 structam ante augurale aram.

II.95.1 exstructis in campo Martio aris.

The compound seems to have been the word in every day use. It predominates in the Caesarian corpus (17:4), Cicero (11:1), Quintilian (4:0), Seneca the Elder (3:0), and also in inscriptions (40:7). For inscriptional examples from the late first century A.D., see Bruns, p.255 (Episcula Vespasiani ad Saborenses, A.D. 78); id., p.268 (Lex arae urbanae, A.D. 84-96). Vitruvius, however, overwhelmingly prefers the simple verb (35:10), 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 sisto, 14.1 n.), or because it was stylistically more pretentious (see on namque, 11.2 n. for Vitruvius' stylistic pretensions).

With permitto 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 permisere, ut, perspecto iura et si qua iniquitas involveretur, rem integram rursus ad senatum referrent (the separation of permisere 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 permitto (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 46:0, and in Quintilian by 17:1). The change probably took place on the analogy of sino.

On Tacitus' use of the final infinitive with verbs, 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 permitto) 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 Annals) for compound verbs (Introduction, p. 55).

12.4 longinque ab exilio Tarentum regressa: in the sense 'return' (= redeo) regredior is an historiographical term<sup>3</sup> 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)<sup>4</sup> and Terence avoids it completely (redeo 89 times). Cicero, Vitruvius, and Seneca the Younger use it only in opposition to progredior,<sup>5</sup> and Caesar has it only as a military term in the sense 'se recipere'.<sup>6</sup> There are no examples in Petronius (redeo 21 times), Seneca the Elder (redeo 49 times), or ps. Quintilian (redeo 57 times), and only one in Quintilian (redeo 35 times).

From Histories to Annals the more commonplace words revertor<sup>7</sup> and redeo<sup>8</sup> both decrease slightly in frequency (revertor 8:4:4; redeo 16:7:7), but regredior increases (7:14:12).<sup>9</sup>

Earlier Tacitus has revertor in the same expression as that in which he here uses regredior: I.77.3 recens ab exilio reversos nobiles adulescentulos; II.92.3 reversis ab exilio. I substitutes reversa for regressa in the present passage, in keeping with its normalising tendency.

On literal instances of redeo with a personal subject are included in the figures given here; progredior is not used either metaphorically or with non-personal subjects by Tacitus. Examples of regredior = se recipere have also been omitted.

Notes

1. For a full collection of verbs of this type, see X. Mignot, Les verbes dénommatifs latins (Paris, 1969), 352ff.
2. The following poetic examples are found before Tacitus: Virg. Aen. 2.634, Sen. Agon. 282, Hercl. fur. 534, Troad. 971, Luc. 1.482, 2.574, 6.318, 7.23, Bucol. Mins. 2.31, Val. Flacc. 6.727, 811, 7.433, Stat. Theb. 10.789, 12.507, Mart. 8.3.8.
3. See Krebs-Schmalz, s.v. for examples from the historians.
4. At Capit. 1023 it occurs in the expression in memoriam regredi which follows immediately on the usual phrase in memoriam recipere (see Lindsay ad loc.); at Aul. 46, where it appears in a threat uttered against a slave, the language may be deliberately high-flown or militaristic.
5. On Cicero, see Krebs-Schmalz, l.c.; cf. Vitr. 9.1.12, Sen. epist. 116.4.
6. Krebs-Schmalz, l.c.
7. Revertor can mean 'turn back', but in Tacitus it is usually more general (= redeo).
8. On literal instances of redeo with a personal subject are included in the figures given here: regredior is not used either metaphorically or with non-personal subjects by Tacitus. Examples of regredior = se 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 remredior in the Annals remains apparent. Thus, e.g., the participles reversus and regressus are both found 4 times in the Histories, but in the Annals regressus predominates 67:12:4.

13.1 quonam modo urbem intraderetur: Tacitus invariably uses quonam modo for the normal quo modo in the historical works (Lex. Tac. 896). Livy is the only other extant author down to at least the time of Gellius who prefers the fuller expression (18:9), which is elsewhere extremely rare (used occasionally by Cicero, Gallus, Pliny the Elder, and Gellius). Tacitus may have taken it from Livy; or perhaps it had some currency in lost imperial historiography.

13.1 praegredi exposcunt: 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 archaisers and poets in the early Empire. Posco first occurs with ut in Tacitus;<sup>1</sup> exposco has ut once in Ennius (scen. 177), but is not used again with a verbal construction until the archaisers and poets of the early Empire (e.g. Virgil, Livy, epic: TLL V.2.1773. ff.); and deposco 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 Annals (Introduction, p.44). Earlier, in the Histories, 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 servitium in its abstract sense (= servitus) was not in use.<sup>2</sup> It is avoided by Cicero, Caesar, Nepos, Quintilian, ps. Quintilian, and Petronius, and employed only once by the Elder Seneca in an obviously elevated passage (2.1.11) which contains a number of archaisms.<sup>3</sup> 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, 9.17.8),<sup>4</sup> twice in the Elder Pliny (nat. 7.200, 10.47) and occasionally in Columella.

There is a clear distinction in usage between servitium 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 is in the rhetorical proemium of the Histories (1.1.2). Servitium 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 (IV.64.2). Sallust also largely restricts servitus to speeches.<sup>5</sup>

The expression publicum servitium 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 subiectas servitio / Tac. 1.59.1 subiectus servitio; Liv. 28.39.18 servitio exemerint / Tac. 12.27.3 servitio exemerant.

In the minor works Tacitus has servitus 10 times, servitium only once (Agric. 29.3).

## Notes

1. Krebs-Schmalz, s.v.
2. In early Latin Plautus avoids servitium but uses servitus frequently: Terence has servitium once (Andr. 675), but in a passage which may be high-flown.
3. Note forent (10), the old perfects in -ere (agere 10, exstruxere 11), metuo (12) for Seneca's usual tineo, and amnis (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 cupido erat curriculo quadrigarum insistere: the infinitive is used with cupido first by Ennius (scen. 222), and then by Virgil, Silius, Statius, and Curtius, who is the only prose author to have the construction before Tacitus (TLL 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 cupido) with the infinitive (in Ambrose: see TLL s.v.).

14.1 curru certare et equis regium et antiquis ducibus factitatum memorabat: a typically Tacitean use of memoro (introducing a statement about ancient history) and one which well illustrates the tone of the word at this period.

Memoro was in regular use in early Latin, for it occurs almost 90 times in Plautus (commemoro 15 times). But by the late Republic it was obsolete. Caesar avoids it, and Cicero allows it only once in his speeches (at Varr. 4.107, in an elaborate mythologising description mentioned by Quintilian<sup>1</sup> as an example of digressio (ἐκφρασις); an ἐκφρασις was traditionally composed in high

style: Quint. 10.1.33 licet tamen nobis in digressionibus uti vel historico nonnunquam nitore; cf. 4.2.19 ficta interim narratio introduci solet ...: interdum per digressionem decoris gratia, qualis rursus in Verrem de Proserpina); twice in the philosophica (at Tim. 39, in a mythological passage: ut Oceanum Salaciamque Caeli satu Terraeque conceptu generatos editosque memoremus, ex his Saturnum et Opsen, deinceps Iovem atque Iunonem; and at leg. 2.62, in a reference to the laudatory orations pronounced at the death of distinguished men: honoratorum virorum laudes in contione memorentur); and once in the letters (at Att. 8.7.2: quod enim tu meum laudas et memorandum dicis, male quod dixerim me cum Pompeio vinci quam cum istis vincere; 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. Quintilian) or used only in special contexts. Petronius has it once, in an account of a discussion about the legendary Thracian scythian Mopsus: 55.4 ab hoc epigrammate coepit poetarum esse mentio divae summa carminis penes Mopsam Thracem memorata est; Quintilian once, in reference to events narrated by famous historians: 1.8.18 his accedet narratio historiarum, diligens quidem illa, non tamen usque ad supervacuum laborem occupata: nam receptas aut certe claris auctoribus memoratas exposuisse satis est; Vitruvius 11 times,<sup>2</sup> almost always in passages

dealing with fairly remote history (especially Greek) or legend;<sup>3</sup> and Seneca the Younger twice (in prose; in the tragedies it is found 11 times), once introducing a Virgilian description of the Golden Age (epist. 90.37), and once referring to a long eulogy (nat. 4. praef. 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 memoro in two ways: (1) when referring forward or back to his own work (e.g. in the expressions ut supra memoravimus, ut memorabimus);<sup>4</sup> and (2) when, as here, quoting the utterances or writings of others.<sup>5</sup> Most examples which fall into the latter class (including that here) are used to introduce historical exempla, statements about remote antiquity, legend or myth, or high-flown pronouncements of various kinds (bombastic, eulogistic, boastful, etc.). Cf., e.g.: Germ. 3.1 fuisse apud eos et herculem memorant; 39.1 vetustissimos se nobilissimosque Sueborum Semnones memorant; 43.3 deos interpretatione Romana Castorem Pollucemque memorant; IV.83.1 Aegyptiorum antistites sic memorant. Ptolemaeo regi ... oblatum per quietem decore eximio et maiore quam humana specie iuvenem (the Egyptian priests on the origin of the god Serapis); V.2.1 Iudaeos

Creta insula profugos novissima Libyae insedissee memorant; 3.61.1  
Ephesii adiere, memorantes non, ut vulgus crederet, Dianam atque  
Apollinem Delo genitos (the Ephesians on their mythological origins);  
4.43.4 et Segostani aedem Veneris montem apud Erycum, vetustate  
dilapsam, restaurari postulavere, nota memorantes de origine eius;  
4.55.1 necue multum distantia inter se memorabant de vetustate  
generis (various Asian cities on their antiquity); 4.55.4 simul  
litteras imperatorum et icta nobiscum foedera bello Macedonum  
ubertatemque fluminum suorum, temperiem caeli ac ditos circum terras  
memorabant (the Sardians on their past history); 11.14.2 quidem  
Cecroem atheniensem vel linum Thebanum et temporibus Troianis  
Palamedem Argivum memorent sedecim litterarum formas ... reperisse  
(traditions concerning the origins of the alphabet); 12.61.1  
rettulit dein de humanitate Cois tribuenda, multaque super antiquitate  
eorum memoravit (cf. 4.55.1 above); 3.31.4 memorabantur exempla  
maiorum (historical exempla; cf. the following 5 passages); 3.71.3  
memorabaturque L. Metelli pontificis maximi exemplum; 11.23.2 quin  
adhuc memorari exempla, quae priscis moribus ad virtutem et gloriam  
Romana indoles prodiderit; 13.4.1 exempla carissendi egregie imperii  
memoravit; 3.62.3 et memorabantur Persemae, Isaurici multaque alia  
imperatorum nomina; 15.14.2 tum Paetus Lucullos, Pompeios et si qua  
Caesares obtinendae donandaeve Armeniae egerant ... memorat.<sup>6</sup>

In similar contexts dico is used only 3 times (I.1.3, I.1.2, 12.61.2), and then for variation after both refero and memoro; and refero 5 times, 3 times for variation near memoro (3.63.2, 4.55.2, 12.61.1), and twice independently (2.60.3, 11.6.1).

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

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

3.61.1 Ephesii adiere, memorantes non, ut vulgus crederet,  
Dianam atque Apollinam Delo genitos (on the origin of two  
gods).

15.69.2 ingressi milites vocari cum a tribuno dixere (factual).

11.17.1 (Italicus se) accitum memorabat quando nobilitate  
ceteros anteciret (boastful).

14.2 nec iam sisti poterat: in the sense 'stop' (transitive) sisto  
is frequent as a medical technical term (denoting in particular the  
staunching of blood, as at 15.54.3),<sup>7</sup> but is otherwise found only  
in poetry and poeticising prose, often in stock phrases:<sup>8</sup> e.g. fugam  
sistere (Liv. 1.12.6, 10.29.1, 30.12.1, Sen. epist. 69.1, Curt. 4.16.2,

8.3.2, 8.14.37, Val. Flacc. 8.144, Tac. 12.39.1); gradum sistere (Virg. Aen. 6.465, Prop. 4.10.36, Liv. 9.2.10, Sen. Herc. fur. 772, epist. 40.7, Curt. 4.6.11, Sil. 10.367); innotum sistere (Liv. 4.38.3, Sen. Agam. 203, benef. 6.34.5, Plin. nat. 28.118); bellum sistere (Ovid met. 14.803, Tac. III.8.2), fletus (et sim.) sistere (Ovid met. 7.711, 14.835, fast. 1.357, 1.480, 6.154, Sen. Phaedr. 1263).

The expression which Tacitus has in the present passage (nec sisti posse) is also formulaic. It is first found in Plautus (Trin. 720), where it is impersonal and virtually has the sense 'it is unendurable' (see Dix 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. 3.16.4),<sup>9</sup> Curtius (4.16.2, 5.3.11), and Pliny the Younger (epist. 10.55.9). It is found 5 times in Tacitus (cf. II.91.2, III.79.5, V.21.1, 15.39.1), always with a subject (here Nero).

14.2 ut est vulgus cupiens voluptatum: with cupiens the genitive is frequent in old Latin (Ennius, Plautus, Terence: see TLL IV.1430.15ff.), but from the late Republic onwards is admitted only by archaists (Sallust, Tacitus, Gellius, Fronto, al.: TLL IV.1430.15ff.; 1435.45ff.)

Cupiens is used by Tacitus only in the Annals (7 times: 6 times with the genitive). The more common cupidus (cupiens is Ciceronian, but comparatively infrequent, see TLL, l.c., and also at 14.29.83ff.;

14.34.60ff.) is found only in the Dialogus (31.4) and first book of the Histories (80.2).

- 14.3 evulgatus pudor non satietatem, ut rebantur, sed incitamentum attulit: the compound evulgo is found in Livy and Tacitus but nowhere else in extant Latin (TLL V.2.1802.3ff.). Tacitus has it once in the Histories and 3 times in Annals 13-14. On the frequency of emphatic compounds in the later books of the Annals, see Introduction, p. 55.

The nominative use of the ab urbe condita construction (evulgatus pudor), in which the participle is not predicative but has the role of a verbal substantive,<sup>10</sup> occurs in books 13-15 of the Annals only here and at 13.9.3: ipse dux bello delectus spes eius ad metum mutaret. However, it is a striking mannerism of the early books. The following examples are found in 1-3: 1.8.6 occisus dicitur Caesar aliis pessimum, aliis pulcherrimum facinus videretur; 1.16.1 mutatus princeps licentiam turbam ... ostendebat; 1.19.5 filius legati orator publicae causae satis ostenderet ... (on Tacitus' variations of the standard type with past participle, see Nipp. - Andr. on 3.9); 1.24.1 haec audita ... Tiberium verpulere; 1.33.3 accedebant muliebres offensiones ... ipsa Agrippina paulo commotior;

1.36.2 augebat metum gnarus Romanae seditionis ... hostis; 1.42.1  
neve occisus Augusti pronepos, interfecta Tiberii nurus nocentiores  
vos faciat; 1.52.1 nuntiata ea Tiberium laetitia curaue adfecere;  
1.59.1 Arminium ... raptu uxor, subiectus servitio uxoris uterus  
vecordem agebant; 1.63.2 nova acie turbatus eques, missaeque  
subsidiariae cohortes et fugientium agmine impulsae auxerant  
consternationem; 1.72.4 hunc quoque asperavere carmina incertis  
auctoribus vulgata; 2.2.3 accendebat dedimantes et ipse diversus a  
maiorum institutis; 2.47.2 asperrima in Sardinios lues plurimum in  
eosdem misericordiae traxit; 2.57.1 cunctaque socialia prospere  
composita non ideo laetum Germanicum habebant ob superbiam Pisonic;  
2.82.2 hos vulgi sermones audita mors ... incendit; 2.84.2 auctus  
liberis Drusus domum Germanici maris urgeret; 3.5.1 cuncta a  
maioribus reperta ... cumulata; 3.9.3 fuit inter irritamenta invidiae  
domus foro imminens festa ornatu conviviumque et epulae; et  
celebritate loci nihil occultum; 3.22.1 Quirinius post dictum  
reudium adhuc infensus quamvis infami ac nocenti miserationem  
addiderat; 3.24.1 adverse ... solacio adfecit D. Silanus Iuniae  
familiae redditus; 3.28.4 exsoluti plerique legis nexus modicum in  
praesens levamentum fuere; 3.31.2 parva res magnum ad certamen  
progressa praebuit iuveni ...; 3.46.4 incensa super villa omnes  
crenavit; 3.50.3 necue servatus in periculum rei publicae necue  
interfectus in exemplum ibit; 3.52.1 paratus adsiduis sermonibus

vulgati fecerant curam, ne ...; 3.52.3 indecorum adtractare quod non  
 obtineret vel retentum ... infamiam virorum illustrium posceret;  
 3.54.2 leges ... contemptu abolitae securiorem luxum fecere; 3.54.5  
haec omnia funditus rem publicam trahet; 3.71.2 quae principe  
Augusto constituta satis ostendebant ...

The construction is slightly more usual under the Empire than it had been in the Republic but is by no means common.

- 14.3 maioribus eorum tribuendum puto: puto is rare in the Annals, where the archaism reor<sup>11</sup> is preferred. The distribution of the two words in the historical works is as follows:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u>
<u>puto</u>	8	7
<u>reor</u>	7	19

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 rebantur (see Lex. Tac. 1380 b). Of the 15 instances of puto, all but 2 are found in forms in which reor is not allowed. Both exceptions are of note. In the present passage puto has clearly been used for variation after rebantur and ratus in the preceding sentence; and at Jl.4.7.1 it is in

a direct speech.

Similarly existimo 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 nam et eius flagitium est, qui pecuniam ob delicta potius dedit, quam 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 praemium, sed ut me perfidia exsolvam.<sup>12</sup>

Antitheses with parallelism of construction are common only in direct speeches (e.g. 3.16.3, 3.50.3, 3.54.3, 11.4.3, 13.21.2, 13.56.1, 14.54.1, 14.56.2).

- 14.4 notos quoque equites Romanos operas arenae promittere subegit donis ingentibus: Plautus frequently has subigo with a final construction (usually ut + subj.; but the infinitive is also Plautine) in a sense indistinguishable from that of cogo (see Degel, 33). Thereafter, however, the usage is restricted largely to the historians;

it is avoided even by Terence, who uses cogo often.

This passage shows that for Tacitus the word was not exactly synonymous with cogo. The clause nisi quod merces ab eo, qui iubere potest, vim necessitatis adfert would be pointless if subegit carried a strong notion of compulsion. Note also that Tacitus prefers cogo to subigo in antithesis with words expressing freedom of will (libens, sponte: 11.36.2, 14.61.4). In Plautus, however, subigo undoubtedly meant 'compel' rather than 'induce': see in particular Pseud. 7f. necessitas/me subigit ut te rogitet.

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.praef.1, 4.1.9, 7.praef.3, 7.praef.9, 7.praef.17, 8.3.16, 9.5.3, 10.13.1, 10.16.2.
3. Note, e.g., 2.6.2 memorantur antiquitus crevisse ardores et abundavisse sub Vesuvio monte; 2.6.3 loca ab antiquis memorantur; 7.praef.3 nee tamen haec res non vindicatae curiosius ab antiquis memorantur.
4. Refero is only a little less common in analogous expressions:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>memoro</u>	10	18	14
<u>refero</u>	6	15	14

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 (= 'monendo revocare in memoriam': see Lex. Tac. 820a). 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 (TLL VIII.691.61ff.).

Certain imperial poets occasionally use memoro in other ways which indicate that its etymological connection with memoria was felt. In the sense 'memoriter narrare' the word is found in both

Stattius (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 (TLG VIII.691.82).

6. Cf. I.1.1 (preface of the Histories), II.50.2 (a portent), IV.81.3 (eyewitnesses on the miracles of Vespasian), 1.1.2 (preface of the Annals), 1.52.2 (multaque de virtute eius memoravit, magis in speciem verbis adornata quam ut ...), 4.32.1 (on the dramatic subject matter available to earlier Roman historians), 4.34.2 (quorum res gestas ... nemo sine honore memoravit), II.17.1 (a boastful statement by Italicus on his nobilitas and virtus), 12.44.4 (King Pharasmenes on Iberian history).
7. Cf. Sen. epist. 95.15, dial. 5.9.4, Scrib. Larg. 240, Plin. nat. 7.63, 9.79, 20.44, 20.59, 20.102, 20.137, 20.148, 20.158, 20.160, 20.162, 20.179, 22.32.
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, 3.20.8, 26.6.16 (corrupt), 29.10.1, 30.12.1, 45.19.13.
10. See Stolz - Hofmann, 608f.; E. Laughton, The Participle in Cicero (Oxford, 1964), 59ff.
11. Reor is classified by Quintilian (3.3.26) as archaic but tolerabile. His statement is presumably intended to apply not merely to the form quoted (reor) but to the verb in general. Cicero, however, (de orat.

3.153) refers only to the form rebar as an archaism. On

Cicero's use of the verb, see Laurand, Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron (Paris, 1936-38), 96f.

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.49.4, II.19, II.33.2, II.58.3.

15.2 exstructaque apud nemus ... conventicula et cauponae: Norden<sup>1</sup> mentions cauponae as one of the few examples of a sordidum vocabulum used by Tacitus. But though cauponae were frequented only by the lower classes,<sup>2</sup> there is no reason to suppose that the word itself was intrinsically vulgar. Tacitus does not use vulgarisms, even for effect (sellarius and spintria 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 sordid or as a possible source of embarrassment. Observe, for instance, the following direct references to the body and its functions:<sup>3</sup> 1.60.3 castiora esse muliebria Octaviae respondit quam os eius; 13.15.4 transisitque exsoluta alvo parum validum (venenum); 12.67.1 soluta alvus; 14.8.5 centurioni ... protendens uterum 'ventrem fori' exclamavit; II.13.2 uterum ostendens latere (filium) respondit; 1.40.3 uterum eius ... complexus; V.6.3 sanguine, quo feminae per menses exsolvuntur; 16.4.3 ut nulla oris aut narium excrementa viscerentur; IV.81.1 respergere oris excremento; 4.57.2 ulcerosa facies ac plerumque medicamentibus interstincta.

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 low-class occupations. Note his description of Vatinius as sutrinae tabernae alumnus (15.34.2). Sutrina taberna (with adjective rather than genitive) was no doubt a stock phrase: cf. taberna libraria (Cic. Phil. 2.21); argentaria taberna (Liv. 26.11.7).<sup>4</sup> Similarly, lupanaria and scorta are occasionally introduced (Lex. Tac. s.v.).

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

Finally, despite the general relief<sup>5</sup> that the words per quae egeritur humus aut exciditur caespes (1.65.7) are a paraphrase springing from his reluctance to call a spade a spade, he includes a detailed reference to agricultural implements at III.27.2 e proximis agris ligones dolabras et alii falces scalasque convectant.<sup>6</sup>

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

15.2 posita veno inritamenta luxui: high-flown phraseology juxtaposed with causonae (cf. sutrinae tabernae alongside alumnus). On inritamentum (Livy, Sallust, poets, al.), see TLL s.v.; on venum, see

L.S., and Nipp.-Andr. on 4.1.

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 denominative luxor (a verb whose existence is confirmed at Fest. 107L). 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,<sup>7</sup> Caesar, Petronius, and ps. Quintilian, and is used only 3 or 4 times by Livy (twice in the same expression within a few chapters in book 7: 7.29.5 fluentes luxu; 7.32.7 luxu fluentes),<sup>8</sup> 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 - luxu fluente - perhaps reminiscent of Livy's fluentes luxu), 3 times by Sallust, once by Quintilian (3.8.28), 7 times by Seneca the Younger (once in a Virgilian and twice in Livian expressions),<sup>9</sup> 8 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 synonymy of luxus and luxuria in Tacitus, compare the following passages:

Agric. 15.4 avaritiam et luxuriam (cf. II.62.1).

IV.14.1 avaritia ac luxu (cf. IV.74.2).

13.30.1 luxuria saevitiaque

11.10.4 saevitiam ac luxum

1.71.1 dilatae voluptates, dissimulata luxurie.

12.5.3 non luxu aut voluptatibus aduefactus.

16.3.1 gliscebant interim luxuria spe inani, consumebanturque  
veteres opes.

13.34.1 per luxum avitas opes dissipassent.

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

	<u>Dial.</u>	<u>Agrie.</u>	<u>Germ.</u>	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>
<u>luxuria</u>	-	2	1		6	2	-	-	-
<u>luxus</u>	-	-	-		3	7	4	4	-

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

15.5 vocemque deum vocabulis appellantes: vocabulum is usually  
employed of common nouns, but Nipp.-Andr. (12.66), 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:

nat. 1.40 idemque disputat aethera esse eum cum homines Iovem appellarent ... similique ratione persecuitur vocabula reliquorum deorum; 1.83 age et his vocabulis esse deos facimus quibus a nobis nominantur? (variation before nominantur?); 2.61 quo ex genere Cupidinis et Voluptatis et Lubentinae Veneris vocabula consecrata sunt;<sup>10</sup>  
Tim. 38 cui (viri) se progeniem deorum esse dicebant, itaque eorum vocabula nobis prodiderunt. Cf. div. 1.2 Chaldaei non ex artis, sed ex gentis vocabulo nominati.<sup>11</sup>

Vocabulum is used of proper names 16 times by Tacitus, always in the Annals.<sup>12</sup> With the example here, cf. Germ. 9.2 deorumque nominibus (note the ordinary genitive plural form as well as the more usual nomen).

Notes

1. Ant. Kunstpr. 331 n.2.
2. Mau, P.-W. III.1806ff.
3. The standard Roman discussion of obscenity is at Cic. fam. 9.22. Cicero argues that when referring to sex and the body it is best to use veiled language (5 tectis verbis). Again, at off. 1.127 he advises the use of euphemism in dealing with the body and its natural functions. Although Cicero in theory has no objection to the mention of sex, etc. (he is arguing against the employment of excessively vulgar language, which the Stoics - see fam. 9.22.1, off. 1.128 - maintained was acceptable), his strictness is well seen at Tusc. 5.112, where he describes as paullo obscenius a non-explicit sexual allusion, presumably on the grounds that it was suggestive: nam illud Antipatri Cyrenaici est quidem paullo obscenius, sed non absurda sententia est: cuius caecitatem cum mulierculae lamentarentur: 'quid agitis?' inquit 'an vobis nulla videtur voluptas esse nocturna?' Similarly at fam. 9.22.1 he describes a scene from the Demianus of Turpilius as imudentior, though verbis tectus.
4. Tacitus elevates the tone of the phrase by juxtaposing the high-flown alumnus.
5. Since Norden, l.c.
6. Pointed out by Prof. F.R.D. Goodyear at a seminar in the University

of London, October 1968.

In order to express adequately the burdens faced by the soldiers, Tacitus needs (at 1.65.7) 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 (COT) at Verr. 3.62.
8. cf. 1 pr. 12. At 1.57.9 the more likely reading is lusu (Ogilvie ad loc.).
9. dial. 3.11.4, 10.1.3, nat. 1.17.5 (in libidinem luxumque; cf. Liv. 1. praef.12), 4.13.6, epist. 71.15, 78.25 (luxu fluentibus; see above), 83.25 (luxumque 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. 1.8.3, 1.23.3, 1.41.2, 2.6.4, 2.56.3, 4.55.3, 4.59.1, 4.65, 6.41.2, 12.27.1, 12.62, 12.66.2, 13.12.1, 14.15.1, 16.12.2. In many places it has apparently been adopted only as a variant in the vicinity of cornimentum, nominare, 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 cenati considerare: the reading of hi is nequum insignis aetatis nati considerare. For the variety of emendations, none of them certain, which have been proposed, see Furneaux ad loc. Hi cenati (Halm), which has been adopted by Koestermann and Fisher, must remain doubtful on stylistic grounds, although it gives an excellent sense. With only two exceptions, both of which are special cases, Tacitus prefers epulae and epulor throughout the historical works to the less dignified cena and ceno.<sup>1</sup> Ceno is found nowhere else either in the minor or historical works (epulor 13 times).<sup>2</sup> Of the 2 instances of cena one is in a hackneyed expression (redeuntem a cena)<sup>3</sup> in the early chapters of Histories 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 epularetur, novendialem eam cenam dixisse.<sup>4</sup>

16.2 tempus impertiebat: the phrase tempus impertio occurs a number of times in other writers (TLL VII.1.592.61f.). 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, 12.42.3). 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 utque contraria adseverantium discordia frueretur: 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 at contra reus nihil infracto animo obversus in filium quatero vincla, vocare ultores deos ... adseverabatque innocentem Cornutum et falso exterritum (Vibius Cerealis replies to charges made by his son).<sup>5</sup>

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

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u>
<u>adfirmo</u>	11	1
<u>adsevero</u>	5	15

But the figures give a false impression, for each word has its own distinctive sense in Tacitus. Most instances of adfirmo support the observation of Bannier (TLL I.1222.67ff.) that the word designates in particular the assertion of a 'rem incertam, falsam, addubitatem': I.22.1 urgentibus etiam mathematicis, dum novos motus et clarum Othoni annum observatione siderum adfirmant, genus hominum potentibus infidum, sperantibus fallax; I.34.2 rex, ut in magnis mendaciis, interfuisse se cuidam et vidisse adfirmabant; I.35.1 nemo scire et omnes adfirmare; I.45.2 ita simulatione irae vinciri iussum et maiores poenas daturum

adfirmans praesenti exitio subtrahit (the last three words imply the insincerity of the statement introduced by adfirmans); I.54.2 inde atrox rumor, adfirmantibus plerisque interfectos ...; II.54.1 recente Coenus libertus Neronis atroci mendacio universos percudit, adfirmans ...; II.33 ergo Narcissus adscriptis quibus idem metus non aliam spem incolumitatis Caesari adfirmat, quam si ius militum uno illo die in aliena libertorum transferret.

## Notes

1. Axelson, Unpoet. Wort., 106f. shows that cena is unpoetic.
2. Cicero has ceno 58 times, epulor only 11 times.
3. cf. Plaut. Most. 485, Ter. Ad. 26, Cic. S. Rosc. 18, 97, 98, 126, Cael. 20, Cat. mai. 11, Val. Max. 3.6.4, Phaedr. 2.8.20, Petron. 64.1, Suet. Nero 26.1, Flor. epit. 2.2.10, Gell. 15.20.9, Ulp. dig. 23.2.6.
4. Alternatively cena may be a variant introduced after epulor; or novendialis cena may be a fixed expression.
5. cf. II.96.2, 2.83.3, 3.49.2, 4.55.2, 6.28.3, 11.23.2, 12.53.3, 14.51.1, 15.63.1, 16.24.1.

c. 17-19 In the annalistic manner Tacitus usually appends some brief miscellaneous material (e.g. obituary notices,<sup>1</sup> 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 idem tempus (Lex. Tac. 545 b.), eadem anno (Lex. Tac. l.c.), fine anni, isdem consulibus (mainly in the later books),<sup>2</sup> 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,<sup>3</sup> 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 edo (for repetitions in annalistic chapters, see 47.2 n.), and the use of multi e for multi with the genitive (1).

17.1 levi contentione orta atrox caedes: levis is occasionally used by Tacitus for the colourless parvus, which is all but eliminated from the historical works by modicus.<sup>4</sup> With this passage, cf. I.80.1 parvo interim initio unde nihil timebatur, orta seditio.

See also 9.1 above: mox domesticorum cura levem tumulum accepit;

III.9.1 levi proelio (cf. III.69.2 modicum ibi proelium); 2.59.3 levi praesidio (cf. 2.25.1 modico praesidio).

- 17.1 quod ... quem: 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 Dialogus (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 Dialogus, which is similar in length to Annals 14, contains more than 40 examples.

- 17.1 multi e Nucerinis: the classical multi ex, which is used twice in the Histories (I.88.1, III.13.2), is found only here in the Annals for multi + part. gen. (2.11.3, 3.6.1, 3.30.2, 4.73.3, 5.10.3, 5.11.2).<sup>5</sup>

- 17.2 seditionem conciverant: the expression seditionem concire is

Livian (4.48.12). The equivalent in less artificial prose is seditionem concitare (Cic. Sest. 77, Mur. 83, B. Hisp. 37.2, Frontin. strat. 3.6.7).

Concio 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.<sup>6</sup> Livy uses it 23 times (with declining frequency after the first and third decades),<sup>7</sup> Tacitus 19 times. The frequentative concito also occurs in Livy (108 times); but in Tacitus it is restricted to the minor works.

In the Histories concio is used 4 times as a past participle (by far the most common form in which it occurs),<sup>8</sup> and 3 times in other forms. In the Annals the other forms predominate by 9:5. Livy similarly shows no tendency to confine himself to concitus (other forms 16 times).

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

I.4.2 finis Neronis ... varios motus animorum ... conciverat.  
Cic. part. 67 disputandi genus ad eosdem illos animi motus ...  
vel gignendos vel concitandos (cf. de orat. 1.220, off. 1.73,  
Sen. epist. 85.11).

1.23.1 tantum consternationis invidiaeque concivit.

Cic. Verr. 5.21 nullam in te invidiam ne ex illis  
quidem rebus concitabo (cf. Phil. 2.33).

16.32.2 et quantum misericordiae saevitia accusationis  
permoverat, tantum irae P. Egnatius testis concivit.

Quint. 6.1.14 concitare quoque invidiam, odium, iram  
liberius in peroratione contingit (cf. 3.8.12, Liv. 24.31.15;  
see too Sen. dial. 4.31.1).

Notes

1. See Syme, AJP 79 (1958), 18-31 (= Ten Studies, 79ff.).
2. First at 4.28.1; Lex. Tac., 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 1.53f., 2.39ff., 3.30, 3.75f., 4.14ff., 4.44f.
4. Lofstedt, Peregrinatio, 71f.
5. See TLL VIII.1610.68ff. on the construction (first Cat. 66.9); cf. Nipp.-Andr. on 3.39; Ho.-Sz., 54.
6. There are sporadic examples in Sisenna, Velleius, Pliny the Elder, the Younger Seneca and Quintilian (11.1.65 concita; 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. TLL IV.36.

19        orando causas: The expression causam oro was not in use in the classical period. It occurs only once in the speeches of Cicero (in the early pro Quinctio),<sup>1</sup> in which causam dicere is used over 70 times. But in the technical language of the imperial rhetoricians oro 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 oro had been resurrected in the schools to express the function of the orator, rather than to provide a needless synonym for dico.

Notes

1. 43. See Landgraf, S. Rosc., 69, for a list of all examples of oro in the sense 'speak' from the late Republic.

20.4 per accitam lasciviam: it has long been recognised that the language of Tacitus is highly metaphorical.<sup>1</sup> But it needs pointing out that most of his metaphors are commonplace.<sup>2</sup> The only instances in book 14 which cannot be paralleled from earlier literature are: 2.2 ad libita Pallantis provoluta (vice often attracts metaphorical language in Tacitus); and 3.3 venti et fluctus deliquerint.<sup>3</sup>

However, the metaphorical use of accio is, if not without parallel, extremely rare. From pre-Tacitean literature only Vell. 2.38.6 can be cited: regis morte, quam ille conscientia acciverat (Velleius may have sought a variant for the usual conscisco 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 accitis quae usquam egregia).<sup>4</sup>

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: coalitam libertate irreverentiam co prorupisse - a rare example of a metaphor continued in a second word (prorupisse); not surprisingly it occurs in a speech: see below); 4.3.2 (senatus consultum) supplicium ... minitabatur (mainly poetic: see TLL VIII.1025.4Off.); 52.2 principem supergrederetur (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 tego, which is mainly confined to the first hexad of the Annals).

Note that in the present passage (an indirect speech) accitam lasciviam adjoins some further metaphorical language: abolitos paulatim patrios mores funditus 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: 35.1 provectas ... cupidines, ib. virginitatem impollutam; in the speech of C. Cassius Longinus: 43.2 quicquid hoc in nobis auctoritatis est, ... destruendum existimabam. ut maneret integrum; ib. concusso senatus consulto, quod supplicium ... minitabatur; and in the speech of Seneca: 53.2 tantum honorum ... in me cumulasti; 53.3 laboribus iactatus; ib. studia, ut sic dixerim, in umora educata, et quibus claritudo venit; 53.5 gratiam ... circumdedisti; ib. intra me volvam; ib. novitas mea enituit; 54.2 itinere vitae; ib. opes ... sustinere; 54.3 me in paupertatem ... detrudam; ib. traditis quorum fulgore praestringor; ib. quod temporis ... seponitur (the expression iter vitae is taken from Seneca himself:<sup>5</sup> it occurs 4 times in his extant writings - benef. 3.31.5, dial. 10.9.5, epist. 44.7, 77.4 - but nowhere else in Tacitus).

20.4 corrumpti et corrumpere: the natural order in polyptoton<sup>6</sup> of this kind is active followed by passive. So at Germ. 19.1 Tacitus writes corrumpere et corrumpti. Cf., e.g. ib. 38.2 ament amentur; Dial. 13.4 quod timent, an quod timentur; 3.55.2 colere et coli; 6.35.1 pellere et pellerentur; Plaut. Poen. 337 spectare ... et spectari; Catull. 45.20 amant amantur; Cic. Cat. 2.23 amare et amari (cf. Lael. 27); Lael. 91 et monere et moneri; ib. 102 diligamus et ... diligamur; Tusc. 2.5 refellere ... et refelli; Ov. met. 2.781 carpit carpitur; Liv. 4.46.2 contemere ... et contemni.

The order is also reversed at 5.6.2: miserius sit ob amicitiam accusari an amicum accusare: cf. 3.51.1 corruptus simul et corruptor; 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.<sup>7</sup> It also occurs in proverbs, in which word play of all kinds is common: note, e.g. Cic. nat. 3.7 paret, vetere proverbio, cum paribus; fam. 7.5.3 de manu, ut aiunt, in manum. Tacitus has it frequently in the Dialocus (about 23 times),<sup>8</sup> but comparatively rarely in the Annals (about 57 times).<sup>9</sup> 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 sua ... suis ...

suum). But there are occasional more striking examples: note, e.g. 1.28.6 legionem a legione dissociant (substantival polyptoton of this and other kinds had a slightly affected character, as can be seen from its rarity in Cicero's letters;<sup>10</sup> the only parallel instance in the Annals is diem ex die (6.42.4));<sup>11</sup> 4.35.1 dictis dicta ultus 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 poterant); 1.68.1 egredi egressosque (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 permutatio of the kind iugulastis, occisum (S. Rose. 32);<sup>12</sup> Tacitus has it nowhere else).

20.4. queat: from early Latin onwards queo usually follows a negative.<sup>13</sup>

Tacitus for the most part has it after nihil, neque and ne ... quidem.

After non he largely avoids it, preferring nequeo to non queo.<sup>14</sup>

Nequeo and queo thus complement each other. It is of note that

Sallust observes the same distinction between the two words.<sup>15</sup>

Plautus, Terence, and Cicero, however, use non queo frequently.

The only other affirmative instance of queo in Tacitus is at 3.54.5.

Queo and nequeo had once been in regular use,<sup>16</sup> 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 Agric. 38.2, in the high-flown account of the aftermath of the battle of Mons Graupius: see Ogilvie and Richmond on 38, pass.).

Neither queo nor nequeo is used freely in all parts by Tacitus or his predecessors. Some forms are very rare or completely avoided, others disproportionately common.<sup>17</sup> Within the restrictions imposed by the availability of forms, Tacitus uses queo whenever possible for possum in both Histories and Annals. The only 3 instances of possum after neque, nihil, or ne ... quidem for which queo could have been substituted are in direct speeches (I.16.1, I.16.4, IV.64.2).

20.5 noctes quoque dedecori adiectas, ne quod tempus pudori  
relinquatur, sed ... audeat: 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 4.7.1 praeumbrante imperatoris fastigio. Praeumbro is a Tacitean coinage; the simple verb umbro is frequently metaphorical.
4. I omit II.3.1: scientiam artemque haruspicum is obviously a periphrasis for haruspices, which is formulaic with accio (see 21.1 n.).
5. Syme, 335.
6. The repetition of a word in a different form: see Quint. 9.3.37; Ho.-Sz., 707f; Landgraf, 'Substantivische Parataxen', ALL 5 (1888), 161-191.
7. Ho.-Sz., l.c.
8. 6.4, 8.3, 9.5, 10.4, 12.2, 13.4, 23.6, 26.6, 27.2, 27.3, 30.3, 32.2, 33.5, 33.5, 34.2, 35.3, 36.5, 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, 4.66.2, 6.35.1, 6.42.4, 12.30.2, 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, 1.68.1, 1.68.3, 1.73.4, 3.12.5, 3.12.6, 3.17.4, 3.54.2, 4.16.2, 4.34.2, 4.35.1, 4.38.2, 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, 14.54.2, 14.56.2, 15.21.1-2, 15.54.4, 16.28.2, 16.31.1, 16.31.2.

10. Ho.-Sz., 708.
11. See further Landgraf, o.c., 165; cf. Dial. 35.3.
12. For a full discussion of the usage, see Landgraf, S. Resc. 80ff.
13. See Krebs-Schmalz, s.v. 'quire'.
14. The only instance of non queo is at 1.69.4.
15. Sallust has non queo only at Jug. 14.11.
16. Plautus has queo over 60 times, and nequeo almost as often; Terence has queo 25 times, nequeo 18 times.
17. On the forms in use, see Neue-Wagener, III,<sup>3</sup> 623ff.

21.1 a Tuscis accitos histriones: in a passage deriving ultimately from the Annales Maximi Gellius (4.5.2) has the phrase aruspices ex Etruria acciti. The only example of accio in the speeches of Cicero is identical: har. resp. 25 si examen apium ludis in scaenam caveamve venisset, haruspices acciendos ex Etruria putaremus. Cf. Liv. 27.37.6 id vero haruspices ex Etruria acciti foedum ac turpe prodigium dicere. The whole expression undoubtedly owes its origin to the official/religious language.

Accire ex Etruria seems also to have been formulaic with objects other than haruspices.<sup>1</sup> Note the following: Liv. 1.35.9 equi puerilesque ex Etruria maxime acciti; 1.55.6 vates ... ex Etruria acciverant;<sup>2</sup> 1.56.1 fabris undique ex Etruria accitis; 2.49.10 accito ex Etruria exercitu; 7.2.4 ludiones ex Etruria acciti; 29.38.2 ex Etruria ... acciri placuit; Tac. 11.24.2 Etruria Lucaniae et 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 officialese in various other expressions. Varro has it once (ling. 6.89) in reference to a summons issued by a praeco; and again (ap. Gell. 13.12.6) in a discussion of the right of summons possessed by various magistrates (in an expression -

acciri iubeo - used often by both Livy and Tacitus).<sup>3</sup>

But in ordinary usage the word had little or no currency.<sup>4</sup> It is used most frequently by Livy (over 90 times)<sup>5</sup> 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) accitis auxiliis (cf. Liv. 2.53.1, 10.19.1; perhaps in use in the military language: cf. B. Afr. 26.3 copiis auxiliisque accitis); III.52.1 placuit ... acciri (cf. Liv. 3.46.5, 5.8.12, 5.46.7, 23.22.10, 23.25.10, 29.38.2; perhaps official: note the contexts in which it is used by Livy); 12.14.4 accitusque in regnum (cf. Liv. 1.35.3); 14.6.1 litteris accitam (for parallels, see above, 6.1 n.); 11.36.3 accitus ultro (cf. Liv. 10.19.1); 13.38.4 accita ... ex castris (cf. Liv. 3.46.5, 5.8.12).

21.1 honesto loco ortum: 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. Caesarian writers, for instance, have natus 14 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: cf. Agric. 6.1 splendidis natalibus ortam; 3.30.2 aquestri ortum loco; 4.52.2 caelesti sanguine ortam; 12.37.1 claris maioribus ortum; 12.53.2 regibus Arcadiae ortus; 14.35.1 tantis maioribus ortam; 14.53.5 equestri et provinciali loco ortus; 15.72.2 matre 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 deinde apud illos dis genitos sacrosque reges, inter quos neminem caesidicum, sed Orpheum et Linum ac, si introspicere altius velis, ipsum Apollinem accepimus (from the speech of Maternus 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 mittam alios, Orpheus et Linus: quorum utrumque dis genitum;

3.7.5 ut genitum (Romulum) praeside bellorum deo incredibile non esset; 3.7.8-9 addunt etiam diis honorem parentes, ut si quis sit filius Iovis, addit antiquitas, ut iis, qui sunt ex Chao, progenies quoque, ut Apollo ac Diana Latonae laudandum in quibusdam, quod geniti immortales ...; 5.2.1 nam cui dubium est, quin sermonem ab ipsa rerum natura geniti protinus homines acceperint; 10.1.109 donec quodam providentiae genitus.<sup>6</sup>

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 (26.2.11, 40.9.2).

21.2 perpetua sedes theatro locata sit: Tacitus has been careful to vary the expression mansuram theatri sedem posuisset (20.2), though some 30 lines have elapsed since its occurrence.

21.3 The three short sentences oratorum ... queat (observe that they form part of an indirect speech) contain a number of examples of alliteration: vatum victorias incitamentum ingenis (juxtaposed alliterative pairs: see 30.3 n.); laetitiae magis 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 dehonestamento: a Sallustian word (hist. frg. 1.88, 1.55.22) for dedecus. In the Annals it occurs only in the later books.

21.4 Graeci amictus, quis per eos dies plerique incesserant, tum exoleverunt: most modern editors (e.g. Nipperdey, Fisher, Hala, Furneaux, Fuchs, Drexler, Koesterwamm), following Heinsius, change exoleverant (M) to exoleverunt. 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.<sup>7</sup> Moreover the usage tends to occur in statements which are incidental to the writer's main subject.<sup>8</sup> So here Tacitus has added a parenthetical remark to his account of the games. Cf. II.75 tum ipse exercitusque, ut nullo exemplo, saevitia libidine raptu in externos mores proruperant (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 officialese; or it may have been a literary generalisation of the original haruspices ex Etruria acciti.
2. cf. Lucan 1.585 placuit Tuscos ... acciri vates.
3. e.g. Liv. 3.38.13, 7.39.13, 10.38.7, 10.42.3, 23.22.10, Tac. I.71.1, I.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. 13.48.1, and in the passage quoted above.
5. See ALL 9 (1894), 582f.
6. The other example of genitus in Quintilian is at 2.4.19: aut de serpente, quo Scipio traditur genitus (also denoting a supernatural birth).
7. Ho.-Sz., 321; Weiss.-Müll. on Liv. 2.18.9; Draeger, 11.
8. Löfstedt, Peregrinatio, 155.

22.1 inter quae: while interea (-in) often indicates a complete change of scene, inter quae 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.<sup>1</sup> Here, however, it could have been replaced by interea.

Inter quae occurs first in Livy and is then found mainly in history and artificial prose (TLL VII.1.2132./ff.). Inter haec, which Livy prefers to inter quae, replaces inter quae in Tacitus when there is a preceding word in its clause (Dial. 39.3, 11.35.1).

22.1 adeptus: the past participle of the simple verb apiscor is never used by Tacitus (and is elsewhere confined to early Latin). All examples of adeptus should be disregarded in a comparison of the distributions of apiscor and adipiscor. The compound all but replaces the simple verb in the later books.

22.2 hunc illum numine deum destinari credebant: the highly unusual construction hunc illum (= hunc esse illum qui)<sup>2</sup> 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 fati externa ab

sede profectum/portendi generum paribusque in regna vocari/auspiciis;

7.272 hunc illum poscere 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 repast.

22.3 permotus his: an idiom much liked by Tacitus in this section of the Annals: see Heubner on Hist. II.2.1.

22.3 componit ad Plautum litteras, consuleret quieti urbis: the omission of final ut is, from the classical period onwards, mainly historiographical.<sup>3</sup> It also occurs in official style: cf. Sall. Cat. 29.2 senatus decrevit, darent operam consules; Caes. ciy. I.7.5 sit decretum darent operam magistratus.<sup>4</sup> Tacitus has the construction only in the historical works,<sup>5</sup> and there largely in the Annals.<sup>6</sup>

<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
4	20	23

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 chiasmic, with the verb of the first in the initial position, and that of the second enclosing the whole construction:

e.g. 12.25.1 stimulabat Claudium, consuleret rei publicae, Britannici pueritiam robore circumdaret (cf. 1.68.1, 2.72.1, 13.27.3, 15.11.3, 15.17.3, 16.10.4).

At 12.49.2 - cum rediret in Syriam iubetur - Koestermann 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 inversa.

Notes

1. e.g. 2.34.1, 3.33.1, 3.58.1, 6.4.2, 12.53.1. Eriksson (45f.) makes no allowance for the difference between inter quae and interea.
2. TLL VI.2-3.2742.82.
3. Ho.-Sz., 529f., 532f.
4. See Ho.-Sz., 533 and Weiss.-Müll. on Liv. 27.10.2. It is unnecessary to add ut at Liv. 3.4.9 (see Ogilvie ad loc.): negotium daretur videret ne quid res publica detrimenti caperet.
5. The formula vellen + plup. 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, 3.36.4, 3.73.3, 4.74.2, 5.11.2, 6.17.1, 6.36.2, 6.37.4, 11.15.3, 11.25.3, 11.31.1, 11.34.2, 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 occurere), 13.9.1, 13.15.2, 13.27.3, 14.38.3, 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 quis would hardly have been possible here.<sup>1</sup> Quibus is almost invariably preferred when (1) there is a word in agreement in the same clause (especially, as here, in ablative absolutes) (16 times);<sup>2</sup> or (2) there is no expressed antecedent (27 times).<sup>3</sup>

metum intenderet: for intendo in this sense (almost = augeo), see TLL VII.1.2115.1ff. (first in Sallust, then in imperial - mainly artificial - prose). Augere metum (timorem, etc.) is the usual expression in ordinary prose (Cic. red. sen. 33, Caecin. ap. Cic. fam. 6.7.4, Caes. civ. 2.29.1, 3.64.2).

23.1 illuc pergit, non infenso exercitu: it has been shown by Wölfflin<sup>4</sup> and others<sup>5</sup> that the monosyllabic forms of ire (and certain other forms such as ii) are avoided in late popular Latin for the corresponding forms of vado and ambulo. In the Vulgate, for instance, the singular imperative i is not used, but vade occurs 181 times; the plural ite, however, is found 68 times, but vadite never. Hofmann sought to trace the beginnings of the disappearance of i and it back to Vitruvius, Löfstedt to the letters of Cicero.<sup>6</sup>

In certain respects the view of Wölfflin and his followers, now

generally accepted, requires modification. The avoidance of 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 ire, but only 2 monosyllabic forms, of which one (Rab. perd. 13) is in a formula (i, lictor) from the official language (see below), and the other is linked with a supine in a fixed expression: nat. 3.74 sessum it praetor. Similarly, of over 450 instances of ire in Livy, only 6 are monosyllabic (1.26.7, 1.26.11 bis, 3.48.3, 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 Elder, and Suetonius all use ire more or less frequently but avoid the monosyllables completely.<sup>7</sup> There is one example of it in Petronius, but it is in what was undoubtedly a popular formula: 47.6 anathymiasis in cerebrum it.<sup>8</sup> Finally, both monosyllabic examples in Quintilian (6.5.78, 9.2.49), who uses ire 47 times, are in quotations.

Tacitus has ire well over 100 times, but avoids the monosyllabic forms as well as ii.<sup>9</sup>

One of the words employed as a partial substitute for the avoided forms of ire is pergo.<sup>10</sup>

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): leg. agr. 2.48 perge in Siciliam; Cat. 1.10 perge quo coepisti; ib. 23 recta perge in exsilium; Flanc. 98 in Macedoniam ad Flancinumque perrexi. Note that, while Cicero has ire 6 times in polysyllabic forms with the phrase in exsilium 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 pergit and perge very frequently. That pergit 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 urbem ... 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.

2.26.6 Arician infesto agmine itur (cf. 26.26.10).

4.39.9 ad urbem ... pergit (cf. 37.13.10).

7.39.17 issentque confestim ad urbem (3.50.13, 3.51.9).

28.1.9 citato agmine ad hostem pergit (cf. 7.23.5).

37.37.5 consilium erat ire ad hostem.

35.36.1 ad regiam occupandam pergit.

26.44.6 ire ad oppugnandam urbem (cf. 28.29.1).

9.12.9 consules inter se partiti provincias, Papirius  
in Apuliam ad Luceriam pergit.

10.25.16 si consul malit in suam provinciam ire (cf. 21.63.9).

28.2.14 in ultimam Hispaniam adversus Hasdrubalem pergit.

27.2.2 ire adversus eum (cf. 10.35.15).

It is of note that after the first decade Livy largely replaces pergit by pergit 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.<sup>11</sup> Observe in particular the following: 22.19.4 ire obviam hosti pergit (for the usual obviam ire: cf. 2.6.5, 9.23.4);<sup>12</sup> 23.28.11 (cf. 21.57.9) pergit ire ... ad urbem ... oppugnandam (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 agmine infestis signis ire ad urbem pergit (cf. 1.23.4 above).

Sallust has pergit 8 times, Tacitus 14. The following passages show that for Tacitus pergo and ire were interchangeable in sense:

II.59.2 exercitum itinere terrestri pergere iubet.

II.66.3 legionem ... eo flexu itineris ire iubet, quo ...

6.44.1 nec ultra moratus ... pergit properus.

II.48.1 irent propere neu remanendo ... (cf. 13.19.4, 14.7.5).

15.59.1 fuere qui ... hortarentur Pisonem pergere in castra (cf. I.18.1).

11.31.1 ceteri circumstrepunt, irent in castra (cf. I.17.2, 13.14.3).

With the present passage, cf. Liv. 1.23.4 infesto exercitu in agrum Albanum pergit. 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 TLL VII.1.1406.30.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).

23.1 gnarus facilem mutatu gentem, ut sernem ad pericula, ita infidam ad occasiones: the accus. c. infin. is used 10 times with gnarus by Tacitus (only in the historical works), but is rare in earlier Latin. It is found first in Sallust, who has it once (hist. frg. 3.98), then twice in Livy (23.28.5, 33.5.4), and occasionally in imperial poetry and artificial prose (TLL VI.2-3.2123.24ff.).

Gnarus is not particularly common in Republican or early imperial prose,<sup>13</sup> but is a favourite word of Tacitus. Here, as elsewhere, he uses it in a context in which scio, in a subordinate clause (e.g. after cum) would have been expected in less affected prose. Most instances of scio in Tacitus either occur in the minor works or in speeches in the historical works, or perform functions for which gnarus would have been impossible. None is found after cum, quod, quia, sim. Gnarus frequently follows a verb, as here, and expresses a reason for the action described by the verb: cf., e.g. II.20.2 consilia curasque in obpationem Placentiae magno terrore vertit, gnarus, ut initia belli provenissent, famam in cetera fore; 4.60.3 ut non in eum quoque semina futuri exitii meditaretur, gnarus praeferozem et insidiis magis oportum.

23.2 adversum ... adversus: for variation of this type, cf. 1.9.5 apud ... apud; 4.13.1 apud ... apud.

23.3 atque illum fines suos praegredientem incursavere Mardi:

praegredior here = praetergredior. The use of prae = praeter in verbal compounds occurs first in Augustan poetry (Propertius, Horace) and is then found in writers of artificial prose under the Empire.<sup>14</sup> Note the high-flown context of the only instance of the usage in Petronius: 99.3 incultis asperisque regionibus diutius nives haerent, ast ubi aratro domefacta tellus nitet, dum loqueris levis pruina dilabitur, similiter [in pectoribus] ira [considit] feras quidem mentes obsidet, eruditas uae labitur.

It has been argued<sup>15</sup> that the equivalence of prae to praeter in such compounds is apparent rather than real: in an example such as Tac. 5.10.3 Toronaeum Thermaeumque sinum praefestinans (a Tacitean coinage), prae has the sense 'forward' and the accusative is that of distance covered.<sup>16</sup> But this view fails to explain the metaphorical case quoted above from Petronius; moreover even if it were correct, there is no doubt that praefestino + acc. in effect has a sense indistinguishable from that which would be given by praeterfestino.

There is only one instance of a compound in praeter with literal sense in Tacitus, and that is found early in the Historiae. III.71.1 cito agmine forum et imminetia ioro templa praetervecti (praevehor is used 3 times elsewhere with the same sense). Tacitus prefers the more abstruse prae- formation (10 times).<sup>17</sup>

23.3 hostilemque audaciam externo sanguine: Cicero uses hostilis a number of times in a qualitative sense ('befitting an enemy') or with a meaning approaching that of infestus (TLL VI.2-3.3052.28ff.), but rarely as an equivalent of hostium. In the latter sense the word belongs to high, though not necessarily archaising style (see TLL VI.2-3.3051.7ff. for examples). It occurs, for instance, in the example given by the Rhet. Her. of the grand style (4.12).<sup>18</sup>

Tacitus uses hostilis for hostium 19 times (Lex. Tac. 536b). Observe that here two successive adjectives perform the function of genitives; often however Tacitus alternates adjective with genitive.<sup>19</sup>

Notes

1. On the distribution of quis and quibus in Tacitus, see now R.H. Martin, 'Quibus and quis in Tacitus', CC 82 (1968), 144-6. 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, 12.37.4, 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.
3. I.2.3, I.20.2 bis, 1.30.1, I.72.1 bis, III.1.2, IV.6.1, IV.46.4, V.6.3, V.20.2, 1.31.3, 2.20.2, 3.40.2, 4.50.2, 6.8.2, 6.44.2, 11.3.2, 11.20.3, 11.25.2, 11.33, 13.16.3, 13.35.2, 14.16.1, 15.73.2, 16.19.2, 16.25.1. quis is so used only once (2.20.2), and then for variation.
4. AEI 4 (1887), 261.
5. Wackernagel, Nachr. v.d. Götting. d. W.phil. - hist. Kl., 1906, 181ff.; J.B. Hofmann, Indog. Forsch. 43 (1926), 97ff.; Löfstedt, Persepinatio, 287ff.; id. Synt. II, 38ff.
6. See Synt. II.40.
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. Önnarfors, Pliniana, 49f.

8. See Löfstedt, Peregrinatio, 288 n.
9. In poetry both i and it are common.
10. When used as a verb of motion pergo is usually accompanied by an expressed goal of motion (but see II.59.2, 6.44.1). Since ire is often absolute, the two words are not completely interchangeable.
11. The first instance of ire pergo, in any form, is found at 9.2.8. For ire pergit see 22.19.4, 22.53.9, 23.27.3, 23.28.11, 23.43.5, 25.15.10, 26.11.8, 26.17.3, 29.32.12, 30.8.2, 30.11.5, 33.1.2, 34.25.9, 34.51.3, 35.22.7.
12. cf. Her. 4.64 ego illi obviam pergam.
13. Caesar avoids it, and Cicero has it only a few times in the rhetorica. Livy uses it 10 times, Sallust 4 times.
14. See, e.g., Weiss-Müll. on Liv. 1.45.6, 44.10.12; Draeger on Tac. 2.6; C. E. W. Müller, Syntax des Nominativus und Akkusativus im Lateinischen (Leipzig u. Berlin, 1908), 140f.; and, for a large collection of examples, H. Blase, W. Kl. Ph. 33 (1916), 280-88, 306-10.
15. By Blase, l.c.
16. On which see Kü.-St. II.1.282ff.
17. See Lex. Tac., s.v. 'praefero', 'praegredior', 'praefestino', 'praefluo', 'praevechor', 'praelego'.
18. The only other instance of the word in the Rhet. Her. is in a passage illustrating the figure descriptio (4.51), which is defined thus: descriptio nominatur quae rerum consequentium continet perspicuam et

dilucidam cum gravitate expositionem.

19. See J. Molager, 'Un procédé de style propre à Tacite',  
Orpheus 11 (1964), 25-32.

24.1 toleranti(s): 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, 1 closely follows perfero (Cat. 2.23), and another is immediately paraphrased by fero and patior: Verr. 3.201 quodsi hoc minus et hoc vectigal aratio tolerare, hoc est Sicilia ferre ac pati 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 (decl. min. 6.28), 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 (Jug. 82.3) and twice in speeches (Jug. 31.11, 85.10).

25.1 ferox iuventus: for this phrase, cf. Lucan 4.534, Sen. Phoen.

44.5. On ferox, see below, 34.2 n.

25.1 proelium ... ausi erant: in ordinary prose the only objects used with audeo are neuter adjectives and pronouns.<sup>1</sup> 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 (Aen. 6.624), at 23.14.3 capitalis fraudem ausi, and in a number of places facinus audere (8.24.9, 8.35.6, 23.2.3, 28.27.16), a phrase found previously in both Plautus (Pseud. 542) and Terence (Eun. 959), and used later by Curtius (4.6.15), Valerius Maximus (5.4.ext.3), Suetonius (Cal. 49.2), and also by Tacitus (Agric. 28.1, I.28, II.85.2, III.23.2, IV.34.2).

Since Livy has over 200 examples of audeo, he has obviously made only a restricted use of the substantival construction.

Tacitus, however, had audeo with substantives more than 20 times in the historical works. With the present instance, cf. Stat. Theb. 9.651 ausum ... pugnas (cf. III.73.2 pugnam ausi; 13.36.1); ib. 10.430 bella audere.<sup>2</sup>

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 Tiberius poenam eius palam ausus (= eum punire);

12.55.1 vim cultoribus et cupidinis ac plerumque in mercatores et navicularios audebant (= vim inferre); II.45.1 (cf. 2.12.1) non ausis ducibus eadem die obpugnationem castrorum (= oppugnare castra); 2.62.2 eius ultionem ausus (= eum ulcisci).

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 societatem 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.).<sup>3</sup> Tacitus uses it thus 60 times, always in the historical works. Rogo, the current term, is largely avoided, except in the minor works (3 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. oraret, 1.13.6), at 2.31.1, in an indirect speech, at 3.16.4, in a direct speech (and soon after oro and precor), and at 15.63.1 in the expression ro'at oratque. 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;<sup>4</sup> previously only neuter pronouns 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 oro, only 1 (12.7.1 eadem) is non-substantival; in Livy 6 of 21 are pronominal.<sup>5</sup>

- 25.2 attineri a se Vologaesen pro pignore amicitiae ostentantes:  
 something of the literal sense of transitive attineo can still be seen at Plaut. Men. 730: eadem (pallam) ante oculos attiner and at Capt. 266 senex est in tostrina, nunc iam cultros addinet (= 'hold near', 'hold at').<sup>6</sup> Moreover in two other places in Plautus the prefix seems to retain a certain figurative force: Bacch. 181 ita me vadatum amore vinctumque attines ('you hold me bound (to you)'); Mil. 1327 si forma huius, mores, virtus attinere animam hic tuam ('held your heart bound (to him)'). At Truc. 837 reu' solutus causam dicit, testis vinctos attines. / CA. solvite istas ('hold (in custody)') and Men. 589 ita me attinit, ita definit ('detain', almost 'delay') 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 convictamque attineri publica custodia iussit; 6.19.2 qui carcere attinebantur; 6.23.2 in Palatio attinebatur; 15.57.1 Volusii Proculi iudicio Epicharin 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. (subigo) on the modifications of sense which resuscitated words are prone to undergo.

After Plautus attineo (trans.) fell into disuse.<sup>7</sup> It makes its next appearance in Sallust<sup>8</sup> (Jug. 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 Histories,<sup>9</sup> but 26 times in the Annals, usually with the meaning 'aliquo loco retinere'. In this sense retineo is common in the Histories, but rare in the later books of the Annals in particular (Lex. Tac. 1400b).

25.2 patrias in sedes remeare: in epic remeo is found a number of times in expressions similar to that here: Virg. Aen. 2.95 si patrias unquam remeassem victor ad Argos; 11.793 patrias remeabo in gloriis urbes; Ov. met. 15.480 in patriam remeasse; Sil. 14.152 patrias venerat ad oras; Luc. 1.690 patrias sedes remeamus in urbis.

Tacitus seems to have recalled this almost formulaic use of the word.<sup>10</sup>

Remeo 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. 2.118 cum umore consumpto neque terra ali possit nec remearet aer; for the disproportionate frequency of the simple verb meo in reference to such incorporalia, see ELL 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 sive haustus ignis cursum animae remeantis interscidit; epist. 36.11 observa orbem caelum in se remeantium; ib. 68.15 agit illa continuus ordo factorum et inevitabilis cursus per statas vices remeant et effectus rerum omnium aut movent aut notant. Cf. ps. Quint decl. mai. p.10,16 nec remeare viventes a cinere sensus.<sup>11</sup>

Livy has remeo only 3 times (9.3.7, 9.16.3, 24.3.5) and Sallust avoids it. Clearly Tacitus' liking for the word is to be ascribed to his poeticising tendency rather than to the influence of the historiographical tradition.

## Notes

1. See TLL II.1254.18ff. Quint. 3.8.45 rem sceleratissimam (cf. Liv. 2.10.11, 25.23.15) may be disregarded.
2. Twice in 5 chapters in book 12 Tacitus has the striking variant aciem audere (28.1, 32.1).
3. See the full discussion by F. Heerdegen, Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Semasiologie III (Erlangen, 1881), 8ff.; esp. 72ff. (on the decline of the word in ordinary imperial prose).
4. o.c., 52f.
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 adtenuanda idonearum rerum facultas - attinenda (P<sup>c</sup>) is possible, for the early De inventione contains words which were archaic by the later period of Cicero's career (see P. Thielmann, De sermonis proprietatibus quae leguntur apud Cornificium et in primis Ciceronis libris (Strassburg, 1879), 4), but adtenuanda (gRKL) gives a far better antithesis.
9. II.14.3 deletaque omnes copiae forent, ni victorem exercitum attinisset obscurus noctis, obtentui fugientibus. Note the Virgilian phrase obscurum noctis (Georg. 1.478).

10. Note that the Virgilian phrase reneare victor (in the first passage quoted above) also became formulaic in later poetry: Val. Flacc. 4.589 reneat qui victor ab oris/Bebryciis; 6.344 Bebryciis propius reneavit ab hospite victor; Luc. 2.553 Scythicis Crassus victor reneasset ab oris; 3.73 si reneasset in urbem victor; Sen. Agam. 412 reneatque victo similis, exiguae trahens/lacerasque victor classe de tanta rates.
11. Varro has reneo twice (rust. 3.5.7, 3.7.1) (of the flight of birds: for meo in this sense, see THE VIII. 735.44f<sup>o</sup>.), Columella 4 times, and Mela 5 times. Caesar, Nepos, Vitruvius, Seneca the Elder, Petronius, Quintilian, and ps. Quintilian (Decl. min.) et al. avoid it.

26.1 caedibus et incendiis perpopulatus: perpopulor, used only here by Tacitus (populor 13 times), is found elsewhere only in Livy (8 times). That Tacitus took the word directly from Livy is highly likely, for at 34.56.10 - eum usque ad ipsa coloniae moenia et Padis ripas cum caedibus et incendiis perpopulatos esse - Livy has it with the same expression (caedibus et incendiis) as that with which it is used here.

caedibus et incendiis: a stock alliterative phrase used 20 times by Cicero, once by Hirtius, 4 times by Tacitus,<sup>1</sup> 9 times by Livy (2.17.2, 2.64.3, 5.39.11, 22.3.6, 22.14.4, 25.25.6, 34.56.10, 38.43.5, 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 caedes),<sup>2</sup> 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 Livian passage quoted above.

Cicero usually has caedes in the singular, incendium in the plural;<sup>3</sup> Livy however prefers the plural of both words.<sup>4</sup>

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 TLL). Cf. 14.33.2 caedes patibula, ignes cruces, where

caedes goes naturally with in, and patibula with cruces (see note ad loc.).

- 26.2 superbiam Parthorum perosi: perosus is a rare and mainly poetic word which is found first in Virgil but is undoubtedly older.<sup>5</sup> The present example looks like a reminiscence of Liv. 2.39.4: superbiam violentiamque iam perosos regis (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 Wölfflin, Ausgewählte Schriften (Leipzig, 1933), 255.
2. Cicero has caedes before incendia 15 times, the reverse order 5 times (Wölfflin, l.c.); in Livy caedes always precedes. It is natural in Latin to arrange words linked by copulatives in order of ascending length.
3. Caedes is plural at Cat. 3.21; incendium is singular at Cat. 4.4, Phil. 1.30.
4. Caedes is singular at 2.17.2, 5.39.11; incendium is singular at 2.17.2.
5. See Norden, Aen. VI, 246.

27.2 neque coniugiis suscipiendis neque alendis liberis sueti:

coniugium is standard in poetry for the normal matrimonium<sup>1</sup> (which is impossible in dactylic verse), but is very rare in prose. It is avoided by Caesar, Sallust, Cicero in his speeches, Livy, Velleius, Seneca the Elder, Seneca the Younger (in prose; in the tragedies it is found 11 times), Petronius, Quintilian, and Pliny the Younger, al. The single instances in Nepos (Cim. 1.3) and ps. Quintilian (decl. 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, 11.84) by the elder Pliny (and also by certain late authors: TLL IV.325.7ff.) 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 iungo (coniungo) is uppermost in the author's mind. The remaining 4 examples in Cicero's philosophical works (off. 1.54, Tusc. 5.5, fin. 4.17, 5.65) fall into this category, as does the one instance in Columella (12.pr.1).<sup>2</sup>

When applied to normal Roman matrimonia coniugium may have had a certain emotive content (cf. 'union', the English word to which it

most nearly corresponds). Unlike matrimonium, it is particularly common in grave inscriptions (see TLL 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: omnibus deinde dimissis, dum advenientes ab urbe de Drusi filia aegra interrogat, repente in osculis Liviae et in hac voce, deficit: 'Livia, nostri coniugii memor vive, et vale' (perhaps a reminiscence of inscriptional 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 eius in eodem coniugio manebat - Tacitus may have had in mind the sepulchral formula uno coniugio vixerunt (e.g. CIL VI.35469; cf. TLL 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 Histories and Annals, except in the expression neque enim and and parentheses (on which see below, n.3). Its use here, however, was almost unavoidable, without a recasting of the sentence. Non sometimes follows nam in Tacitus, but only when it can be placed alongside the verb (see Lex. Tac. 966af.). 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.<sup>3</sup> Of these, 20 are found in speeches.<sup>4</sup> Clearly the word had a strong oratorical ring, for it is largely confined to speeches by Sallust also.<sup>5</sup> 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 early in the Histories (1.51.3), and 2 follow verbs (3.36.1, 3.60.1).<sup>6</sup> There remain 3.38.1, 5.3.1, and 6.38.1.

27.3 per sine affectibus mutuis: affectio rather than affectus was the standard word in Republican prose (see TLL I.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. affectus almost completely displaces affectio, in all genres:

	<u>affectus</u>	<u>affectio</u>
Seneca (rhet.)	29	-
Seneca (phil.)	153	5
Valerius Maximus	19	-
Celsus	15	-
Pliny the Elder	9	1
Quintilian	148	2
ps. Quintilian	33	1
Tacitus	18	3

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 (Caes. Gall. 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 TLL IV.658). Again, actus is rare in certain senses before Seneca the Elder and Valerius Maximus, but thereafter it encroaches noticeably on actio (as indicated by Klotz, TLL I.499.47ff.). We owe to Quintilian the information that egressio (= 'digression') was at his time of writing being replaced by excessus: 3.9.4 egressio vero vel,

quod usitatus esse coepit, excessus. Ambitus and ambitio are for the most part distinctive in sense (see OID, 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 tractatus overtakes tractatio in Quintilian (see Bonnell, 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 affectus, even though he could have used an old fashioned word, affectio. 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 dominatio is the striking exception: see above, 2.2 n.; cf. actio, actus, Lex. Tac., s.v.). Thus auditus, contemptus, egressio, positus, relatus, and venatus are all generally used instead of their synonyms in -tio. Also, astus is preferred to astutia, contactus to contagio, and raptus to rapina.

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:-), Pliny 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 Eriksson (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).

egressus: unlike egressus, egressio is not found until late Latin with literal force. But both words, according to Quintilian (4.3.12) were employed as rhetorical technical terms to translate παρέκβασις ('digression'): hanc partem παρέκβασις vocant Graeci, Latini egressum vel egressionem. Quintilian himself uses only egressio (see Bonnell, s.v.), while Tacitus prefers egressus 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. 16.7 eadem positio caeli siderumque; ann. 6.21.2 positus siderum ac spatia 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 (13.38.2).

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 contagio.

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 rapinam tolerantibus vitam; 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.<sup>7</sup> In Tacitus, however, it is 1:1. These figures well 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 coins a number of others; he does not, however, admit neologisms in -tio. I have found the following in -tus: adrestus, adnexus, advectus, dispositus, distinctus, escensus, provisus, subvectus.<sup>8</sup>

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:<sup>9</sup>

	<u>-tio</u>	<u>-tus</u>
Vitruvius	94	11
Seneca the Elder	12	4
Seneca the Younger	74	23
Pliny the Elder	97	74
Celsus	21	5
Scribonius Largus	18	1
Petronius	5	-
Quintilian	37	2

Clearly -tus was relatively infertile: it provides a proportionately large number of new words only in the highly affected stylist Pliny 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.<sup>10</sup>

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 archaizer 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: cf. ps. Quint. Decl. min. 11.4. uxor est, quae per nuptias a parentibus in matrimonium tradita in societate multis annis fuit.
2. Columella may have taken the word from Cicero's translation of Xenophon's Oeconomicus, to which he is referring.
3. I omit instances of (a) at enim and neque enim, to neither of which there is a corresponding use of nam; (b) parenthetical enim, which for the most part is employed differently from parenthetical nam: the former (Lex. Tac. 34.7a) follows iam 4 times, is (id, etc.) 5 times, hic twice, and utraque, ipse, and tot once; nam, however, with very few exceptions, is found before substantives, adjectives, and, occasionally, verbs (Lex. Tac. 891b); and (c) enim in direct questions (Lex. Tac. 348a-b): almost without exception, the few examples of nam in questions are separated from the interrogative word of the sentence (Lex. Tac. 895a); enim, however, frequently comes immediately after the interrogative.
4. I.30.1, II.48.2, I.59.3, I.69.3, 2.26.2, 2.38.2, 2.55.1, 3.6.1, 3.33.2, 3.70.2, 4.26.3, 4.39.4, 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 TLL V.2.570.63ff.; Kunze, Sallustiana (Leipzig, 1897), 46. Axelson, Unpoet. Wört., 122f. has shown that enim was unpoetic.

6. When a finite verb is placed at the beginning of its clause, it is far more likely to precede enim than to follow nam. Livy, e.g., has verbs almost 70 times before enim, but never after nam; the practise of Caesar is similar (Merguet, 311 b 4). In Tacitus finite verbs follow nam at 2.36.1 and 4.27.5 (at 3.7.2 and 12.52.1 the verb is the only word of its clause); for the frequent use of enim after verbs, see Lex. Tac. 346 b A.
7. See Cooper, Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius (New York, 1895), 3, 18 for statistics.
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 (Gell. 4.15.1). Aemulatus (13.46.3 ne in urbe aemulatus ageret, provinciae Lusitaniae praeficitur), which would be alien in kind to the above words were it a Tacitean creation for aemulatio, as it has almost universally been regarded (e.g. by the TLF, GD, Lex. Tac., and by C. Parcker, Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte, II (Berlin, 1884), 9; of the editors only Walther and Hitter 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. Draeger, 84): e.g. 11.5.1 monente Claudio in regnum

removet, fisis Pharasmanis copibus. Moreover ago, accompanied by an adverb, adjective, or participle frequently has the sense 'se gerere' in Tacitus (Lex. Tac. 61a): e.g. 14.15.5 quasi per virtutem clari honoratius agere. Finally, if aemulatus is a substantive, why is it plural? There is only one rivalry which Nero hopes to prevent Otho from prosecuting by sending him to Lusitania: that with Nero himself. Furneaux's objection to the participial interpretation, that aemulor does not appear to be used absolutely by Tacitus elsewhere, carries little weight: see TLL I.975.46ff. for the absolute use of the word (both in the Republic and the first century A.D.).

At TLL I.1401.71 (s.v. 'ago') aemulatus is taken as a perfect passive participle (sc. a Nerone). But this interpretation destroys the force 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, o.c., 5ff.
10. I have omitted Petronius' seviratus and bonatus, for both are denominatives rather than verbal abstracts. Denominatives in -atus belong mainly to the legal language (seviratus; cf. consulatus, etc.); otherwise they are vulgar (bonatus is put into the mouth of Trimalchio; cf. Laberius' licentiatus, and Caelius' parricidatus, which is branded by Quintilian (1.6.42) as vir tolerabile. Messala's coinage reatus (Quint. 8.3.34 nam et quae vetera nunc sunt, fuerunt olim nova, ut Messala primus 'reatum, manerarium' Augustus primus dixerunt) was apparently acceptable as a legalism.

29.1 subiecturum ei provinciam fuisse, se biennio proximo vixisset:

this type of hyperbaton (the verbal substantive is separated from its verb) is frequent, for instance, in Cicero (particularly in the later speeches)<sup>1</sup> and Livy,<sup>2</sup> but comparatively rare, like most types of hyperbaton, in Sallust<sup>3</sup> and Tacitus (cf. 3.2 n.). There are only 22 instances in the whole of the *Annals*, and of these 13 are, like that here, in speeches or similar contexts.<sup>4</sup> Accompanying inversion, which is common in rhetorical prose (see n.1), is found only twice: once in a speech - 2.26.4 simul adhaerebat, si foret adhuc bellandum, relinqueret materiam Drusi fratris gloriae - and once in a statement made by Tacitus in the first person (4.4.3: see *Introduction*, p.15 ).

In 8 places, including this,<sup>5</sup> of which 6 are in speeches (see n.4), the usage occurs in the protasis or apodosis of conditional sentences (traditional: Liv. 3.22.9 deletusque exercitus foret ni fugientes silvae texissent; cf., e.g. 2.23.10, 2.32.1, 2.51.2, 2.56.15). Similar conditions without hyperbaton are common in the narrative.<sup>6</sup>

29.2 rumore populi, qui neminem sine aemulo sinit: in the historical works Tacitus uses sino 3 times with a plain accusative (= 'allow': e.g. 2.55.5 desidium in castris, licentiam in urbibus, vagam ac lascivientem per agros militum sineret) and 6 times, as here, with an accusative and accompanying predicate (= 'leave').<sup>7</sup> 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. Men. 351, Most. 346),<sup>8</sup> 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 facitus only 3 times by Livy (4.2.8, 28.28.11, 34.24.2) and once by the Elder Pliny (6.43). 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 Iuppiter optimus maximus sineret regiae maiestatis imperium eo recidere; 28.28.11 ne istuc Iuppiter optimus maximus sirit, urben ...; 34.24.2 'ne istuc' incuit 'Iuppiter optimus maximus sirit Iunoque 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 (12.56.1 sale ... aspersa triduo sinito; 12.57.1 duabus horis in aqua sinito), which should be compared with Cato agr. 113.1: sinito dies XV operta (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 aemulus.

About half of Tacitus' 88 coinages<sup>9</sup> 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 -tor formation which Tacitus has used here.<sup>10</sup> 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 Gell. 4.15.1).

29.2 Paulinus Suetonius ... Corbulonis concertator, receptaque Armeniae decus aequare domitis perduellibus cupiens: perduellis is an archaism, used only here by Tacitus: cf. Varro ling. 5.3 multa verba aliud nunc ostendunt, aliud ante significabant, ut hostis: nunc tum eo verbo dicebant peregrinum cui suis legibus uteretur, nunc dicunt eum quem tum dicebant perduellem (cf. 7.4.9, Cic. off. 1.37). It occurs 6 times in Plautus,<sup>11</sup> but was probably already obsolescent,

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 carmen; at 29.27.3, in a prayer; at 38.50.3, in official style; at 42.20.4, 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 officialesse: 7.166 Q. Fabius Maximus consul apud flumen Isaram proelio commisso adversus Allobrogum Avernoracum gentis a.d. VI Augustas, CXXVI perduellium caesis, feбри quartana 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 perduellis (in an ablative absolute) occurred in the official phraseology describing the award of a triumph after victory; seniorum ... necantium exemplum proditum memoriae esse, ut imperator, cui devictis perduellis, confecta provincia exercitum reportasset, sine curru et laurea privatus inhonoratusque urbem iniret; cf. 29.27.3 salvos incolonesque victis perduellis victores spoliis decoratos praeda onustos triumphantesque necum domos reduces sistatis (a general's prayer that he may return from a campaign in triumph).<sup>12</sup>

Tacitus implies by his use of the formula here that the glory sought by Suetonius was that of a triumph. Hartman's perdomitis rebellibus is unnecessary.

Notes

1. See Norden, Ant. Kunstpr., 203 n. In the early pro S. Rosc. 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 N. Schneider, De verbi in lingua Latina collocatione (Munster, 1912), 27). Later, however, he allows the device more frequently in positive sentences, often with inversion:

	Total no. of examples	No. with negative interposed	No. with inversion
<u>S. Rosc.</u>	15	10	1
<u>Mil.</u> (1-70)	23	2	10
<u>Phil.</u> 2-3	32	2	18

2. See Kühnast, 315.
3. For a collection of Sallustian examples, see H. Fankhanel, Verb und Satz in der lateinischen Prosa bis Sallust (Leipzig, 1938), 167ff. The usage occurs only twice in the Catiline (add 31.1 to F's instances), is slightly more frequent in the Jugurtha, and may have been common in the Histories.
4. Speeches: 2.26.4, 2.70.1, 3.16.1, 5.5, 6.8.1, 11.24.5, 13.41.4, 14.7.3, 14.12.1, 15.21.4, 15.35.3, 16.26.2; other contexts: 3.47.2, 4.4.3, 6.3.4, 12.16.2, 13.20.1, 13.27.3, 14.4.3, 14.7.3, 15.28.2.

5. 2.26.4, 2.70.1, 3.16.1, 6.3.4, 12.16.2, 14.7.3, 15.35.3.
6. e.g. 2.39.1, 3.14.4, 4.13.3, 11.10.1, 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 Lex. Tac. 1355a for the instances referred to here.
8. Sino is still found occasionally in old Latin in its original sense ('let go': Löffstedt, Peregrinatio, 190), with which it takes the accusative (Plaut. Aul. 425). I am not concerned with examples of this type here.
9. See Draeger, 116f., for a list.
10. On which see Faucker, Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte II (Berlin, 1864), 11ff.
11. Amph. 250, 642, Cist. 201, 111. 222, Pseud. 583, 589.
12. See E. Fraenkel, Plautinisches in Plautus (Berlin, 1922), 238.

c.30 The account of Suetonius Paulinus' attack on the Druids is composed in a heightened style marked by numerous poeticisms, of which some are explicit Virgilianisms.

Tacitus' battle descriptions, unlike those of Livy,<sup>1</sup> 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 acies, densa armis virisque: in combination with the ablative (almost = 'impletus', 'coccertus'), densus is almost exclusively poetic (TLL V.1.546.68ff.). It is particularly common in descriptions of foliage, forests, groves, etc.: e.g. Dirae 27 optima silvarum, formosis densa viirectis; Ov. met. 3.155 vallis ... piceis et acuta densa cupressu; 14.360 densum trabibus (fast. 6.9 arboribus) nemus. For an example more similar to that here, cf. Virg. Aen. 10.173 mille ruit densos acie atque horrentibus hastis.

armis virisque: the formula arma equi viri (with and without copulative participles), and in particular the derivatives arma equi,

arma viri and equi viri are found frequently in prose and poetry of all genres and at all periods: e.g. in Plautus (Bacch. 927, Most. 152), Sisenna (frag. 115), Cicero (Caec. 33, Phil. 8.21, 12.9, off. 3.116, fam. 9.7.1), Sallust (Cat. 52.20, Jug. 51.1, 57.1, 92.7, hist. frag. 4.69.16), ps. Sallust (rep. 2.10.7), Caesar (Call. 7.12.3), Nepos (Ham. 4.1), Virgil,<sup>2</sup> Ovid (met. 8.22), Livy (over 30 times: see Fugner, 1315), Seneca the Elder (contr. 2.1.10), Valerius Maximus (5.1.ext.5, 7.3.3 bis), Seneca the Younger (dial. 2.4.3, epist. 88.19, Agam. 221), Curtius (3.2.13, 3.3.26, 4.13.1, 4.14.12, 5.10.3, 8.14.1, 8.14.27), Silius Italicus (17.102), Statius (Theb. 7.798, Ach. 2.80), ps. Quintilian (decl. min. 115.22), Suetonius (Aug. 83), and Tacitus (almost 30 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 audito successoris adventu cum arma viros equos cum cura inspexisset, ornato exercitu obviam venienti 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 bimembre) bears witness to the antiquity and fossilised nature of their connection.<sup>3</sup>

At least one combination, viri equi, had become so familiar that it could be used proverbially: Cic. off. 3.116 cum his viris equisque,

ut dicitur, ... 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, 368 n.2), that Ennius had the expression arma viri, Virgil's arma virumque 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 (Caec. 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 viri (cf. Germ. 44.2, I.67.1, II.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 Fugner, l.c.).

30.1 preces ... fundentes: Virgilian: cf. Aen. 6.55 fudit ut preces. For the various less striking verbs used elsewhere by Tacitus with preces, see Lex. Tac. 1180 a; cf., e.g. 14.23.2 preces offerre.

30.2 muliebre et fanaticum agmen: a typically Tacitean expression, for which fanaticum mulierum agmen could have been substituted. Cf. 1.40.4 muliere et miserabile agmen. Livy always writes mulierum agmen (2.40.3, 9.17.16, 34.2.8).

30.2 sternuntque obvios: as a masculine substantive obvius makes its first appearance in extant literature (prose and verse) in Livy (17 times).<sup>4</sup> Thereafter in the early Empire it is found in Velleius (2.120.2), Valerius Maximus (2.2.9, 7.3.9), Seneca (dial. 9.12.4, epist. 3.1, 3.4., 29.1), Curtius (4.16.21, 5.6.6), Mela (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: Lex. Tac. 1004 ab).<sup>5</sup>

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 caederentur: cf. Curt. 5.6.6 passimque obvii caedebantur (clearly a direct reminiscence of Livy); Liv. 39.49.9 summoventes obvios; cf. Val. Max. 7.3.9 obvios summovit; Liv. 22.7.7 obvicos percontantur (cf. 22.55.4); cf. Tac. IV. 82.2 percunctatur obvios.

With the present example, cf. Liv. 7.33.10 obvios sternite. Note Seneca's similar stravitque obviam (dial. 3.11.2) (in a passage recounting historical exempla).

30.2 igni suo involvunt: apparently from Virgil: cf. georg. 2.308  
totum involvit flammis nemus.

30.3 The remarkable alliteration, unparalleled elsewhere in the Annals (and perhaps in the whole of Tacitus), in the two sentences praesidium ... habebant can hardly have been accidental. It was probably introduced to enhance the poetic colour of the description.

30.3 praesidium posthac impositum ... saevis superstitionibus sacri: the Romans were undoubtedly sensitive to triple alliteration of this kind. Donatus noted an example in Terence (Eun. 780 solus Sannio servat)<sup>6</sup> and Servius remarked (on Aen. 3.183 casus 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 (3.82) 'Anchisen agnovit amicum' et (5.866) 'sae saxa sonabant'. 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.<sup>7</sup>

The device is particularly common in the religious and official languages: e.g. Cato agr. 14.1.1 sive circumagi sive circumferenda censeas; Cic. div. 1.102 quod bonum faustum felix fortunatumque esset

(cf. Plaut. Trin. 41); Verr. 4.67 dare donare dicare consecrare Iovi Optimo Maximo; Cluent. 157 (law) COIERIT ... CONVENERIT ... CONSENSERIT; Liv. 1.16.3 pacem precibus exoscunt, uti volens propitius suam semper sospitet progeniem; 1.32.13 censuit consensit conscivit; 3.13.6 (tribuni) sisti reum pecuniamque ni sistatur populo promitti placere pronuntiant. In prose it varies in frequency from writer to writer. Quintilian, for instance, has it so rarely<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> Both writers, moreover, commonly have series of more than three alliterative words.<sup>10</sup>

In the Annals 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 20). The present passage, with two examples close to each other in the same sentence, is without parallel in the Annals (cf. Cic. Quinct. 51 navoluit commemorari se cum posset perdere pepercisse, quam cum parcere potuerit perdidisse).

30.3 saevis superstitionibus: in prose of all genres saevus is the vox propria describing wildness of the sea, wind or weather.<sup>11</sup> 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 philosophica: leg. 3.23, rep. frg. 5),<sup>12</sup> 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 contest),<sup>13</sup> Petronius (crudelis 7 times) once (at 107.4, for variation near crudelitas), and ps. Quintilian (crudelis 17 times) twice (at 216.6 and 294.9, in both cases supported by juxtaposed crudelis). 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 saevus 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 argumento est quod imperia Manliana, non Postumiana appellata sunt, cum qui prior auctor tam saevi exempli foret, occupaturus insigne titulum crudelitatis fuerit; Sen. dial. 4.5.3 origo huius mali ab ira est, quae ubi frequenti exercitatione et satietate in oblivionem clementiae venit et omne roedus humanum eiecit animo, novissime in crudelitatem transit: rident itaque gaudentque et voluntate multa perfruuntur plurimumque ab iratorum

voltu absunt, per otium saevi; epist. 83.20 ubi possedit animum nimia  
vis vini, quicquid mali latebat, emergit. non facit ebrietas vitia,  
sed protrahit ... crescit insolenti suberbia, crudelitas saevo,  
malignitas livido; Suet. Tib. 61.1 mox in omne genus crudelitatis  
erupit ... ; post cuius interitum vel saevissimus extitit; ib. 61.2  
singillatim crudeliter facta eius exequi longum est; genera, velut  
exemplaria saevitiae, enumerare sat erit.

Tacitus uses crudelis only once and then for variation.<sup>14</sup> Livy, in contrast, has it 19 times, and Sallust 12 times. Tacitus often goes further than his predecessors in eliminating a commonplace word. Of extant writers of prose, only Pliny the Elder has such a marked preference for saevus (20:1).

- 30.3 cruore captivo, adolere aras: the juxtaposition of alliterative pairs was common in the religious language: e.g. Cato agr. 141.2 viscos invisosque viduertate vastitudinemque; ib. 2 fruges frumenta, vineta virgultaque; ib. 3 pastores pecuariae serua servassis; Liv. 10.23.16 cum secundum sollemnes preces adiecisset prae se agere esse romidinem ac furiam caedentem ac cruorem. It may also have been characteristic of Saturnian verse: Naev. Foen. 6 eorum sectam secuntur multi mortales; ib. 57 marinae metus tumultus pectora possidit.

Examples are found in the poets and in rhetorical prose, but are by no means frequent: e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 6.683 fataque fortunaeque virum moresque manusque (cf. Naev. 57 above, and see Norden ad loc.); Cic. *Rosc.* 88 ardens avaritia feratur infestus; *Verr.* 5.32 cupiditatem, crudelitatem, superbiam, scelus; 5.89 vitae virumque fames fecerat; *Sen.* 16 fraternis flagitiis, sororiis stupris; *Mil.* 77 leges libertas pudor pudicitia; *Sall. Jug.* 42.4 multos mortalis ferro aut fuge; *Liv. praef.* 12 per luxum atque libidinem pereundi pendendique.<sup>15</sup>

Tacitus uses the device only sparingly in the *Annals*. Note, e.g. 1.46.1 patres et plebem, invalida et inermia (speech); 1.59.1 subiectus servitio uxoris uterus; 3.69.3 neque rosae principem sua scientia cuncta complecti (speech); 4.60.3 congressus conloquia, notae ignotaque aures; 6.23.2 nuru ac nepoti conciliaretur Caesar; 14.21.3 vatum victorias incitamentum ingenis (speech). The present example is remarkable in that it immediately follows two triple alliterative sequences.

cruore captivo: captivus here is the equivalent of the genitive captivorum. The phrase is modelled on Virg. *Aen.* 10.520 captivorum roci perfundat sanguine flammam (see J. Molager, *Orpheus* 11 (1964), 25), where the context is similar to that here (in both cases the reference is to the sacrifice of captives).

Tacitus' substitution of cruur for Virgil's sanguis is of note. He thereby both created an alliteration and introduced a noble term into the passage.

At all periods cruur is a specialised 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 cruur.<sup>16</sup> 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 cruur 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 cruur to those of sanguis (for statistics, see TLL, s.v. 'cruur') is, e.g., in Cicero 1 to 12, in Celsus 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 cruur to 72 of sanguis. Valerius Maximus, whose prose is highly coloured, has cruur 21 times, sanguis 69.

In Tacitean usage sanguis would undoubtedly have been possible here: cf. II.3.2 sanguinem arae obfundere vetitum: precibus et igne puro altaria adolentur.

Note that Tacitus also has crucor (in an alliterative series) at 1.65.7, in another chapter marked by an accumulation of poeticisms (see the commentators ad loc.): infectos caeno aut cruore cibos. For the use elsewhere of sanguis in similar collocations, cf. II.55.1 cuem locum Galba moriens sanguine infecerat; V.6.3 vestemque infectam sanguine; 1.42.4 infecta sanguine castra flumina.

Notes

1. On which see Ogilvie, Livy, 21. The battle account at Plaut. Amph. 188ff. 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).
2. See Norden, Aen. VI, 368 n.2; E.L. Bassett, CP 54 (1959), 13.
3. See, e.g. Cic. Phil. 8.21, 12.9, fam. 9.7.1, Liv. 10.16.6, 22.39.11, 23.24.9, 28.37.8, 35.35.7, 35.44.5, 44.1.6, Tac. 13.57.2. See further S. Preuss, De bimestris dissoluti apud scriptores Romanos usu sollemni (Edenkoben, 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, 28.3.10, 28.3.10, 28.3.14, 28.26.7, 28.33.6, 32.26.11, 32.29.2, 39.49.9.
5. In poetry, however, it is extremely rare.
6. haec figura πρόμοιον dicitur.
7. See Wölfflin, 'Die dreifache Alliteration in der zweite Vershälfte', ALL 14 (1905), 515-523.
8. There about 5 examples in 40 pages (Teubner) of book 2.
9. For some examples from Cicero, see, e.g. J. Straub, De tropis et figuris quae inveniuntur in orationibus Demosthenis et Ciceronis (Würzburg, 1883), 131ff; on Livy, see A. Lambert, Die indirecte Rede als künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livius (Zurich, 1946), 25ff.

10. See Straub, l.c.; on Livy, see P. Petzke, Dicendi genus Tacitum quatenus differat a Liviano (Regimont, 1888), 76.
11. Note, e.g., the recurring expressions saeva tempestas (Cic. Sest. 60, Liv. 24.8.12, 30.39.2, 31.45.14, 40.21.5, Val. Max. 9.1.1, 9.8.2, Sen. dial. 10.7.10; cf. Plin. nat. 2.125 saevitia tempestatum); saevus ventus (Cic. Att. 5.12.1, Liv. 28.18.12, Gell. 2.22.20; cf. Caes. Gall. 3.13.7 cum saevire ventus coepisset); saevum mare (Sen. contr. 7.1.10, Sall. Jug. 17.5; cf. Sen. dial. 4.27.2, Vell. 1.2.3 saevitia maris); saeva hiems (Sen. benef. 7.15.1, Col. 2.20.5, 11.3.42, Mela 3.26, Plin. nat. 18.209, 18.265; cf. Sen. epist. 90.41, Col. 7.3.14, 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 Renard, I Collection Latomus, vol. 101, 793.
12. The following statistics do not include the technical instances of the word discussed above.
13. 9.3.48 congeruntur et diversa: 'mulier, tyranni saeva crudelitas, patris amor, ira praecipua, temeritatis dementia'; 2.10.5 saeviores tragicis novercae.
14. At 6.4.4. Saevissimae follows in the next sentence. Syme (726) noted the rarity of crudelis among odd phenomena of word selection in Tacitus. Tacitus' avoidance of tranquillus and fidelis, mentioned by Syme in the

- same connection, can be explained in the same way as that of crudelis; 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.
16. See Ernout, Aspects du Vocabulaire Latin (Paris, 1954), 123.

31.1 regnunoue et donum: polysyndetic -oue et is an archaism found in poetry and the historians.<sup>1</sup> Tacitus has 16 examples of the construction (Lex. Tac. 395b, 1278b), of which only this has as its first member a word other than se or ipse. However, cf. seque et donum (1.4.1) and seque regnumoue (2.3.2). The present example is a conflation of the two and is thus only a minor variation of the standard type.<sup>2</sup>

31.1 quod contra vertit: in this sense (= evenit) 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,<sup>3</sup> but may have faded out of use later. In Livy and Curtius it usually prefaces official proclamations.<sup>4</sup> 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.848b); and (quas) res bene vortat, in which the verb is intransitive (Lodge II.849a). 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, fulget, etc. from Iuppiter tonat, fulget (the

personal expressions were still retained in the augural language at the end of the Republic).<sup>5</sup> The secondary quae res bene vortat is already predominant in Plautus.

Tacitus' quod contra vertit 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 violatae sunt: the euphemism violo is approved by Cicero (in reference to a passage from tragedy) in his discussion of obscenity (fam. 9.22.1).

31.1 quasi cunctam regionem muneri accepissent: on the change of subject, which prompted Ritter to add Romani before the verb and Nipperdey to delete the whole clause, see Sorbon, 141.. Abrupt changes of subject have an archaic flavour and are frequent, for instance, in Sallust.<sup>6</sup>

But the carelessness of the sentence is undeniable. Had Tacitus followed his usual practice of employing quisque with a singular superlative (praecipui quisque is the only instance of its kind in the historical works: cf. Agrie. 36.2 proximos quosque) 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 (praecipuus quisque Icenorum, quasi cunctam regionem ... accepissent, avitis bonis exiit).

31.2 rapiunt arma: this phrase (= arma raptim capere, sumere) is used a number of times by Virgil (Aen. 7.340, 8.220), from whom Tacitus probably borrowed it<sup>7</sup> (it had not found its way into earlier historiographical or archaizing prose).

Arma capere 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 sedes patriae, 12.3 n.). Tacitus uses arma rapere more often (5 times) in the historical works than both arma capere and arma sumere together (the former is found twice in the Historiae, the latter twice in the Germania: Lex. Tac. 98a fin).

31.2 comotis ad rebellionem Trinovantibus: rebellatio (only here in Tacitus) is used earlier only by Valerius Maximus (twice, in the same expression - crebris rebellionibus - 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),<sup>8</sup> a parallel to which is perduellio (of the same root).<sup>9</sup> Reballatio, a normal -tio substantive, would have had a stronger verbal notion,<sup>10</sup> and hence is especially apt here; comnotis ad rebellantionem = comnotis ad rebellandum..

61.3 recens deducti: adverbial recens is employed by Tacitus only with past participles or, occasionally in the Annals, with equivalent words.<sup>11</sup> It is found in early Latin, but from the late Republic onwards is restricted to archaising writers (Sallust, Livy, Gellius, al.).<sup>12</sup>

Nuper often has a sense indistinguishable from that of recens (Lex. Tac. 987aAa).<sup>13</sup> 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),<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

Recens had apparently not attained such strong adverbial force

that it could be freely detached from its verb.

31.4 nec arduum videbatur: as a metaphor arduus is almost debased by Tacitus. Other writers use it only rarely, and then usually for effect, but Tacitus has it constantly (17 times) for difficilis. There are only 6 examples of the latter in the historical works, of which 5 are in the first two books of the Histories. Moreover 3 are in either the comparative or superlative, forms in which arduus is not used. There remain 2 instances early in Histories I, and one at 37.1 below, in a perfunctorily written military chapter.

Arduus (met.) is found only twice in the speeches of Cicero (in which difficilis is used more than 70 times), both times in passages in which the metaphor is maintained at some length: Verr. 1.36 cum sibi omnia ad istum alteraciones difficilis, omnia aditus arduos ac potius interclusos viderent; Best. 100 hanc ego viam ... si aut asperam atque arduam aut plenam esse periculorum ... nequa, mentiar. In the philosophica it is used 3 times (difficilis over 90 times), in the rhistorica 5 times, and in the letters not at all. Caesar has it once (difficilis 20 times).

Under the Empire Seneca the Elder has difficilis about 20 times, but arduus never, Quintilian difficilis 66 times, arduus 4 times (1.1.10, 11.1.75, 12.3.6, 12.11.25), and ps. Quintilian (decl. 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 (arduum 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. Köhm, Altlateinische Forschungen (Leipzig, 1905), 34f.
4. See the examples referred to by L.-S. s.v., IIB.
5. Ho.-Sz., 415.
6. Ho.-Sz., 733; on Sallust, Kroll, Gl.15 (1927), 285f.
7. See H. Schmaus, Tacitus ein Nachahmer Vergils (Erlangen, 1887), 11f.
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. 988ab). Compare the following; IV.68.4 recens conscriptis/III.22.4 nuper ... conscripta; 4.69.2 recens cogitata (cf. 6.2.1)/13.15.1 nuper cogitam; 11.25.3 recens repertam/4.19.2 nuper reperta (cf.16.15.1).



32.1 externosque fremitus: externos here is not equivalent to the genitive externorum ('of foreigners'), but has the sense 'in a foreign language': TLL V.2.2023.7ff.

32.3 templum, in quo se miles conglobaverat: Tacitus has the metaphorical use of conглоbo (historiographical: TLL IV.283.56ff.), 6 times in the later Annals, 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 fudit lacrimam: Tacitus never combines fundo with fugare, with which it is very common in earlier historians, particularly Livy.<sup>1</sup> He probably avoided the full expression not because it was hackneyed,<sup>2</sup> 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 Annals, see Introduction, p.35.

32.3 quod peditum interfecit: the partitive genitive (particularly of plural personal names) is common at all periods after quod,<sup>3</sup> but only

if the verb in the relative clause is expressed (quod peditum erat would have been more natural here). With accompanying ellipse of the verb, it may well be original to Tacitus.<sup>4</sup> Non-elliptical examples occur 5 times in the Histories, and 6 times in the Annals; elliptical, only twice in the later books of the Histories, but 7 times in the Annals (Lex. Tac. 129<sup>b</sup>).

Notes

1. Examples collected by Wölfflin, Ausgewählte Schriften, 261f.
2. Many commonplace alliterative pairs used by Tacitus as well as earlier historians are to be found in Wölfflin's list, o.c., 253ff:  
e.g. arma animus, caedes incendia, fama fortuna, fames fortuna,  
fames ferrum, ferrum flamma, flagitium facinus, al.
3. Kü.-St. I.430.
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.

33.1 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.<sup>1</sup> In the philosophical works admirabilis predominates by 33:5;<sup>2</sup> 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 philosophica 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 quidam or in exclamations (about 10 times), a further indication of its emotive quality.<sup>3</sup>

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, benignitas, clementia, constantia, dignitas, gloria, gravitas, industria, and misericordia, for instance, only magnus, multus, notabilis, conspicuus, priscus, and mirus are used in the historical works. With the same words Cicero in the speeches has summus, divinus, inauditus, clarissimus,

gravis, magnus, immortalis, inlustris, 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 conspicuous  
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 ambiguus an: with a verbal construction (here and elsewhere an  
indirect question; at 4.65, acc. c. infin.) ambiguus is not uncommon  
in Tacitus (Lex. Tac. 70b), but is otherwise rare in both prose and verse  
(TLL I.1844.11ff.). In all pre-Tacitean instances of the usage  
ambiguus is impersonal, but in Tacitus it is usually personal.

For a comparable example of the use of an adjective for a verb,  
see on gnarus, 23.1 n. Tacitus often makes one part of speech perform  
the functions of another: cf. on audeo, 25.1 n. (substantive for  
infinitive).

33.1 illam sedem bello deligeret: by the first century A.D. deligo, 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 (deci. min. 143.25). All of these writers (particularly Seneca the Elder and ps. Quintilian) have eligo more or less frequently.

Sedes belli, bello is a stock phrase in the archaizing historians (for locus b.): c.f., e.g. Liv. 4.31.8, Vell. 2.74.3.

33.1 fessa aetas: a phrase (here = senectus) found 6 times in Tacitus (Lex. Tac. 460b, fin.), but never previously.

33.2 quod uberrimum spoliant et defendentibus intutum: the substantival present participle, which is common at all periods in cases other than the nominative singular,<sup>4</sup> is for the most part used to fill gaps in the language by providing a word with substantival force when no apposite noun exists. Here, however, Tacitus has chosen defendentibus despite the existence of the -tor substantive defensor, which he elsewhere has 5 times (twice in military contexts: III.30.1, 15.4.2). Cf. also 2.5.3 longum impedimentorum armen opportunum ad

insidias, defensantibus 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.<sup>5</sup> Thus at Liv. 1.25.4 - ut primo statim concursu increpuere arma micantesque fulsere gladii, horror ingens spectantes perstringit - the participle spectantes denotes men who happened to be onlookers; spectatores, 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<sup>6</sup> which were only casually defended (= 'unsafe for those who happened to defend them'); it is explicitly stated that he avoided regularly garrisoned places: omissis castellis praesidiisque. The use of defensoribus would perhaps have suggested an organised defensive force.<sup>7</sup>

Defensoribus would have been possible at 2.5.3, but by substituting defensantibus 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 obpugnantis (in antithesis to defensoribus: clearly the participle does not differ in function from a substantive in -tor; Tacitus has deliberately avoided

concinnity); IV.22.3 oppugnantium (opposite obsessi; for the similar use of oppugnator, cf. II.21.1, III.71.4); V.11.3 obpugnantium; Germ. 24.1 spectantium; 1.77.4 spectantium (spectantes is not general in either of these passages, as in the Livian example quoted above, but designates spectators in the theatre); 3.10.3 accusantium (in the same chapter (1) and also at 3.12.3 and 3.12.6 accusatores is used of the same prosecutors); 12.54.5 accusantium (in reference to formal prosecutors; cf. accusator at, e.g. 2.79.1, 15.4.2); 2.71.4 accusantibus; Agric. 28.3 exantium; Agric. 10.5 remigantibus; Dial. 39.5 audientium (depending on voluntate; cf. Cic. part. 72 ad voluptatem auditoris); 4.9.1 audientium (depending on animos; in Ciceronian prose auditor is common in the genitive with animus: cf., e.g. inv. 1.20 ter, 1.23, 1.32, Her. 1.4, 1.6, 1.9 bis, 3.18 etc.); 2.33.4 audientium; 3.29.1 audientium; 4.15.3 audientium (all Tacitean instances of audiens denote formal audiences, usually in the senate); 2.33.3 possidentis; 12.56.2 gubernantium (depending on artes; cf. V.23.2 gubernatorum arte); 16.28.1 imperitantis (the Roman emperor); 12.54.2 regentium (denoting provincial governors; for Tacitus' use of rector in this sense, see Lex. Tac. 1362b fin.); 1.57.3 obsidentis; 3.39.2 obsidentes; Dial. 6.5 orantibus (for the revived use of oro = 'speak' in the technical prose of the Empire, see 19 n.; orantibus here is a variant of orator at 6.4; cf. Quint. 1.2.31); 1.52.2 faventes (for the equivalent general use of fautores = 'partisans',

'supporters', cf., e.g. 4.60.2), III.33.1 rapientium (for raptor in the same sense, cf. 1.58.2); 3.43.2 venantibus; 3.40.3 praesidentium (= 'provincial governors'; cf. praeses at 12.45.4); Dial. 30.1 discentium (discipuli is used in the preceding sentence (29.4) with no difference in sense); Dial. 41.3 medentis; ib. regentis; V.6.1 modentium; II.6.2 medentibus; I.1.1 dominantes; I.21.1 dominantibus; IV.74.2 dominantium; 3.75.2 dominantibus; 4.11.2 dominantium; 14.56.3 dominante (for the political use of dominus, with a sense often equivalent to tyrannus, see III. V.1.1920.82); II.60.2 criminales; IV.52.1 crimantium; 4.41.1 crimantibus.

Although the superfluous substantival 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:<sup>8</sup> audientis (orat. 55, 132), audientium (off. 1.137, 2.66, Brut. 89, 279, Tusc. 2.3), consolantium (Tusc. 3.75), consolantis (Tusc. 3.76, Att. 11.17a.1), consulentibus (leg. 1.10, orat. 143), discentibus (orat. 143), discentium (off. 1.132, de orat. 1.16), gubernantibus (div. 2.123), existimantium (Brut. 92), docenti (off. 1.13), docentis (rep. 1.70), praecipienti (off. 1.13), praecipientis (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, O.C.T.), I have found only these examples: legendium (1 praef.4), scribentis (ib.5), oppugnantium (2.65.7), comisantium (3.29.5).

Quintilian, however, has the device almost 40 times in the first two books alone.<sup>9</sup> Note, for instance, that while auditor predominates over audiens 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 audiens 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.<sup>10</sup> In none of the three writers does audiens 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 animus: see above for examples of animus auditoris). Similarly, in books 1, 2 and 12 Quintilian prefers docens to doctor by 8:1.<sup>11</sup> Cicero, however, in all genres uses doctor almost exclusively in both singular and plural; his only 2 instances of docens (see above) were probably adopted for concinnity.

Other substantival participles used frequently by Quintilian but rarely by Cicero are discens<sup>12</sup> and praecipiens.<sup>13</sup>

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 regentes equos adornabant (regentes is the object of adornabant and equos of regentes; Curtius could have written rectores equorum); 3.5.14 medentium; 3.13.4 custodientium; 3.13.11 praedantibus; ib. praedantium; 4.2.23 marientibus; 4.3.15 promugnartes (cf. 25 propugnatores); 4.7.15 ducentium itergue monstrantium ritu (the text is uncertain); 5.4.18 adiuvantes; 6.5.17 venantium; 7.1.24 militantium; 7.4.14 audientium; 7.4.28 navigantium; 7.8.16 viventibus (= incola); 7.9.6 navigantes (cf. ib. nautarum); 8.1.12 venantium; 8.2.22 propugnantium; 8.8.21 assentantium; 8.10.19 incolantium (cf. ib. incolae); 8.14.25 regentibus eos (drivers of elephants; for rector in this sense, see L.-S., s.v.); 8.14.27 regentibus; 8.14.40 spoliantes; 9.10.27 comissantes; 10.10.11 incolantium.

33.2 caedes patibula, ignes cruces: asyndetic pairs are often combined in Latin.<sup>14</sup> Here the first word goes naturally with the third (cf. 2.8.4 igne et caedibus), the second with the fourth. For a similar

arrangement, see Ball. Cat. 20.6 pericula repulsas, iudicia egestatem.<sup>15</sup>

33.2 caedas ... festinabant: festino is another verb of which the transitive use is found mainly in poetry and archaizing prose (first in prose in Sallust: TLL VI.1.618.36ff.). Cf. 25.1 n., 25.2 n., 29.2 n.

Notes

1. Mirus is perhaps most common in the neuter singular in expressions such as neq mirum, mirum videtur; in the present note I am concerned only with examples which qualify nouns.
2. Sometimes admirabilis is used in the form admirabilius, 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'.
4. Mo.-Sz., 156; E. Laughton, The Participle in Cicero (Oxford, 1964), 72.
5. Laughton, o.c., 74.
6. The text is uncertain. M has militarium, for which Madvig, followed by Koestermann (whose text is quoted here) read militare horreum.
7. Defensores usually means almost 'defensive garrison': TLL V.1.311.42ff.
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, 1.11.19, 1.12.11, 1.12.13, 2.2.2, 2.5.5, 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, 2.8.8, 2.9.1, 2.10.3 bis, 2.10.10, 2.16.13, 2.17.29.
10. 1.2.27, 1.2.29, 1.10.25, 2.3.11, 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. docens: 1.1.17, 1.1.36, 1.2.25, 2.2.2, 2.5.5, 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 discioulus and discens 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.
14. Wölfflin, ALL 11 (1898), 31f.
15. Wölfflin, o.c. 32.

34.2 animo 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.<sup>1</sup>

Animus ferox is a stock historiographical/epic phrase (perhaps from Ennius) found in Sallust (Cat. 5.7, 38.1, Jug. 11.9, 106.3), Virgil (Aen. 10.610), Livy (e.g. 3.68.2, 8.1.8, 10.9.7), Silius (16.530), and also once in the Younger Seneca (in reference to Alexander the Great, clen. 1.25.1). In the present passage M reads adeo fero; clearly the emendation of Doederlein is certain.

Tacitus has ferox in various other traditional expressions: e.g. provincia ferox (Agric. 8.1; cf. Liv. 40.35.13); gens ferox (I.59.1, 3.47.4; cf. Liv. 21.60.4, 36.17.5); miles ferox (III.69.4; cf. Liv. 29.9.5); ferociter loquens (IV.57.3; cf. Liv. 2.28.8, 26.15.5); ferocius agitare (4.46.1; cf. Sall. Cat. 23.3); iuventus ferox (14.25.1; cf. Sen. Phoen. 445, Luc. 4.534, Vell. 2.114.4). Sometimes he varies slightly a phrase found in one or more his predecessors: e.g. 4.12.2 ferox scelerum (cf. Sall. Jug. 14.21 sceleribus ... ferox); 1.35.1 linguae 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: 1.3.4 robore corporis stolidi feroem. (cf. Liv. 7.5.6 stolide feroem viribus suis);<sup>2</sup> 11.10.3

recreditur ingens gloria atque eo ferocior (cf. Liv. 2.56.7 ferocem faciebat belli gloria ingens).

34.2 coniuges quoque testes victoriae secum traherent: 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.<sup>3</sup> Cf., e.g. parenti, coniugibusque omnibus (Cic. fam. 6.22.2); coniugem ... domum ... patriam (Att. 1.14.3); coniugis ... filiae ... filique (red. Quir. 8); parentibus, liberis, coniugibus, fratribus (Phil. 14.38); fili ... 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 uxor only once, in the Eclogues, but coniux very frequently). Before Tacitus it is found in prose 3 times in Cicero (twice for variation after uxor - Phil. 3.16, off. 2.25 - and once ironically: Phil. 2.113 etenim ista tua minime avara coniux quam ego sine contumelia describo),<sup>4</sup> 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 (contr. 10.3.2 adeo tibi vetera exempla exciderunt bonarum coniugum),<sup>5</sup> once in Velleius (2.75.3), 4 times in Valerius Maximus (2.1.7, 2.6.14, 4.3.3, 4.6.pr.), 3 times

in Seneca the Younger (benef. 1.9.3 bis, nat. 1.17.7), and 3 times in ps. Quintilian (decl. min. 4.7.4, 329.20, 368.18).<sup>6</sup>

Tacitus does not use coniux on its own before book 12 of the Annals, but in 12-14 he has it 8 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 secue et coniugem abstulit; 12.51.2 coniux gravida primam

utcumque fugam ... toleravit; 12.64.2 fatale sibi ut coniugem

flagitia ferret; 12.65.1 coniugem principis devotionibus petivisset;

13.32.2 propinquis coram de capite famaque coniugis cognovit;

14.59.3 Octaviamque coniugem anoliri; 14.60.5 coniugem revocavit

Octaviam. Note the clusters at 12.51, 12.64-5, and 14.59-60.

## Notes

1. See E. Skard, Enn. u. Gallustius (Oslo, 1933), 32f. It is found 8 times in Cicero, not at all in Caesar, once in Seneca the Elder (suas. 5.2, in a passage on Xerxes), once in Quintilian (2.2.3), and 9 times in the prose of the Younger Seneca (cf. the tragedies).
2. Sync 733.
3. See TLL IV.342.65.
4. For a similar ironical use of an elevated term in a Ciceronian speech, cf. iuuenis at Cael. 67 (on iuuenis as a stylistically higher word than adulescens in the late Republic, see E. Axelson, 'Die Synonyme adulescens und iuuenis', Mélanges Marouzeau (Paris, 1948), 7-17).
5. Seneca habitually falls into high-flown language when giving exempla from the past. cf. contr. 1.6.4, 2.1 8.
6. In the last passage for variation.

35.2 id mulieri destinatum: viverent viri et servirent: femina and mulier scarcely ever overlap in usage in Tacitus.<sup>1</sup> 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:<sup>2</sup> e.g. Agrie. 45.1 nobilissimarum feminarum; 1.57.4 feminae nobiles; 2.75.1 femina nobilitate princeps; IV.42.4 conspicuas feminas; 1.41.1 feminas industres (cf. 1.72.3, 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. 455a. So at 12.53.1 - refert ad patres de poena feminarum, quae servis coniungerentur - the reference is not to women in general but to freeborn women who marry below their status (cf. ib. statuiturque, ut ignaro domino ad id prolapsae in servitute, sin consensisset, pro libertis haberentur). For this sense see Liv. 39.8.7 stupra promiscua ingenuorum feminarumque.<sup>3</sup>

(2) (a) in juxtaposition or antithesis with vir; and (b) when emphasis is placed on the sex of the woman in question.<sup>4</sup>

For vir/femina, see Lex. Tac. 454 b (17 times, in minor and historical works).

For the emphatic use, see, e.g. III.69.3 subierunt obsidium etiam feminae; 1.69.4 nihil relictum imperatoribus, ubi femina manipulos intervisat, signa adeat; 2.55.6 nec ... se intra decora feminis tenebat; 3.53.3 praesedissee nuper feminam exercitio cohortium; 12.7.3 versa ex eo civitas, et cuncta feminae oboediebant; 12.37.4 novum sane et moribus veterum insolitum, feminam signis Romanis praesidere; 14.35.1 solitum quidem Brittanis 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:<sup>5</sup> Varro ling. 8.78 nam virum dicimus sapientissimum et diligentissimum, feminam sapientissimam et diligentissimam (variation: cf. ib. uno vocabulo dicimus virum et mulierem sapientem et diligenter); Cic. inv. 1.52 neque vir melior neque femina lectior (here and in the following two passages femina indicates a woman of distinction); Cael. 34 cur te fraterna vitia potius quam bona paterna et avita et usque a nobis cum in viris tum etiam in feminis repetita moverunt? (in reference to the distinguished

ancestors of Clodia); Tusc. 1.27 in claris viris et feminis.

Vir/mulier, however, is found 11 times in Flautus,<sup>6</sup> once in Cato (agr. 156.6), 17 times in Varro,<sup>7</sup> about 12 times in the speeches of Cicero,<sup>8</sup> twice in the philosophica (Tusc. 2.55, leg. 2.65), and twice in Sallust (Cat. 13.3, Jug. 85.40). Note also S.C. de Bacchanalibus 10 (Bruns, Font., 165) neque vir neque mulier; ib. 19 virei atque mulieres (cf. 20).

Similarly, in the whole of the Republic the independent emphatic use of femina occurs only twice outside verse: Cic. Cluent. 199 cuius ea stultitia est ut eam nemo hominem, ea vis ut nemo feminam, ea crudelitas ut nemo matrem appellare possit (perhaps = 'female'); Tusc. 2.36 illi, qui Graeciae formam rerum publicarum dederunt, corpora iuvenum firmari labore voluerunt; quod Spartiatae etiam in feminas transtulerunt, quae ceteris in urbibus mollissimo cultu 'parietum umbris occuluntur' (an elaborate passage,<sup>9</sup> in which the word may have been admitted as a poeticism).<sup>10</sup> The corresponding use of mulier, however, is commonplace in prose: e.g. Cato agr. 83 mulier ad eam rem divinam ne adsit; C. Gracchus orat. frg. 58 en, quouis auctoritatem sequimini, qui propter mulierum cupiditatem ut mulier est ornatus; Tusc. 2.46 exclamabis ut mulier, non constanter et sedate feres; off. 1.113 cum (Ulixes) et mulieribus ... inserviret; ai.

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 (2 times); but in the later books femina/pueri is preferred by 8:3 (see Packard for all these pairs).<sup>11</sup> The distribution of all emphatic instances of the two words is as follows:<sup>12</sup>

	<u>mulier</u>	<u>femina</u>
books 1 - 5	10	4
6 - 29	7	12
30 - 45	12	24

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 Livy 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).<sup>13</sup> In Seneca the Elder it outnumbers mulier by 8:0,<sup>14</sup>

(these 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<sup>15</sup> (at 9.4.23 he comments on viri ac feminae in terms which imply that it had become a fixed phrase: est et alius naturalis ordo, ut 'vires ac feminas, diem ac noctem, ortum et occasum' dicas potius, quamquam et retrorsum),<sup>16</sup> continues to use mulier emphatically as often as femina.<sup>17</sup> 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 Ciceronian rule of style (see 36.1 n., 38.2 n.).

Mulier complements femina in Tacitus. It is almost always employed either neutrally<sup>18</sup> or with a slightly pejorative tone: V.22.3 ob stuprum Claudiae Sacratae mulieris Ubiae (neutral); 12.51.4 id nomen mulieri (neutral); 13.13.3 insidias mulieris semper atrocis, tum et

falsae; 13.44.1 Pontiae mulieris nuptae amore vacors ... sed ubi mulier vacua fuit (neutral); 14.11.2 muliere naufraga (neutral); 14.12.2 anguem enixa mulier (neutral); 12.66.2 Locusta, nuper veneficii damnata 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 huic mulieri cuncta alia fuere praeter honestum animum; 14.3.2 mulieris usu scelerum adversus insidias intentae; 15.51.2 is mulieri olim cognitus (cf. 1 neque illi (mulieri) ante ulla rerum honestarum cura fuerat); 15.57.2 libertina mulier (see above for the use of femina in reference to freeborn women); 15.59.5 nomen mulicri Satria Galla (cf. ib. quam degenerem et sola corporis forma commendatam amici matrimonio abstulerat).<sup>19</sup>

Occasionally also it is used for variation (1.69.4, 3.33.2, 3.33.4).

In the present passage mulier is uncharacteristically placed in antithesis to viri. Tacitus' intention may be conjectured: Boudicca, 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 metuas, qui suorum ipse flagitiorum proditor non virorum animis, sed muliercularum adrepat.

Tacitus has mulier with vir only twice elsewhere, in both places for a special purpose: Agrie. 38.1 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 libertina mulier ... ingenui et viri (the epithet libertina necessitates the use of mulier rather than femina: see above).

At 37.1 below mulier is used independently with emphasis: et miles ne mulierum quidem neci temperabat. 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 (1.69.4) 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. Wört., 55) is therefore to be ascribed not to a shift of preference but to the demands 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 P.B. Linderbauer, Studien zur lateinischen Synonymik (1905-4), 20; Axelson, Unpoet. Wört., 53ff. 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 (Pers. 208, Truc. 131) and 3 with laudatory epithets (Aul. 135, Mil. 958, 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, Pers. 208, Truc. 131 - are in abusive or laudatory addresses, only 2 of 297 examples of mulier - Asin. 521, Most. 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, Altlateinische 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, probris).
  4. It is convenient here to distinguish examples in explicit (a), from those in implied contrasts with vir (b). Both types, however, are emphatic.
  5. Femina ('female') is frequently placed in antithesis to mas (masculus): e.g. Plaut. Mil. 486, 1113, Most. 1047, Rud. 104, Varro rust. 1.1.4, 1.41.4, Cic. rep. 1.38, nat. 1.95.
  6. Amph. 814, Cas. 1911., Men. 659f., Merc. 536a, 829, Mil. 1273f., 1392, Rud. 1115, Truc. 134, 610, 811.
  7. ling. 5.114, 133, 8.36, 41, 51 bis, 56, 78, 80, 9.92, 40, 68, 10.4, 27 bis, frg. ap. Non. p. 498 L, p. 853 L.
  8. Veir. 1.66, 2.192, 4.76, 4.99, 4.102, 4.107, Cluent. 143, Cael. 55, dom. 179, Pis. 52, Mil. 55, Phil. 13.45.
  9. Note the poetic quotation (see the whole context) and the use of the artificial word iuenis for adulescens (on which pair, see Axelson, 'Die Synonyme adulescens und iuenis', Mélanges Marouzeau (Paris, 1948), 7-17).
  10. On the marked preference of the poets for femina, see Axelson, Unpoet. Wort., 56.

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.
12. mulier: 1.9.1, 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, 34.1.5, 34.2.7, 34.2.8, 34.4.6, 34.4.10, 38.22.8, 39.8.5, 39.15.9, 39.15.12, 39.17.6, 39.18.5, 43.3.2; femina: 1.9.5, 1.46.7, 2.13.6, 2.13.11, 7.13.6, 9.19.10, 10.23.2, 10.28.4, 22.7.12, 22.60.2, 25.36.9, 26.49.11, 27.51.8, 28.19.13, 28.20.6, 28.23.2, 32.40.10, 34.2.1, 34.2.7, 34.2.11, 34.2.14, 34.4.1, 34.5.12, 34.7.3, 34.7.9, 36.24.11, 37.5.1, 37.20.14, 38.21.14, 39.13.8, 39.13.10 bis, 39.13.14, 39.14.7, 39.17.5, 39.49.3, 40.38.6, 41.11.5, 45.2.7, 45.24.11.
13. Femina is never used emphatically either by Vitruvius or by the freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis. But note the following instances of mulier: Vitruvius 2.8.14 itaque post mortem Mausoli Artemisia uxore eius regnante Rhodii indignantes mulierem imperare civitatibus Cariae totius, armata classe profecti sunt; 6.7.4 in his viri sine interpellationibus mulierum versantur; 6.7.5 Graeci enim  $\alpha\upsilon\delta\rho\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma$  appellant oecus, ubi convivia virilia solent esse, quod eo mulieres non accedunt; Petron. 39.10 in virgine mulieres (nascuntur); 42.7 sed mulier quae mulier milvinum genus; 67.10 mulieres si non essent, omnia pro luto haberemus; 74.13 codex, non mulier.
14. 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, suas. 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. 2.14.1, 4.30.1 (mulier); Velleius: 2.88.2, 2.100.3, 2.111.1 (femina); Mela: 1.46, 1.57, 1.114, 2.19, 3.34 (femina); ps. Quintilian: 10.14, 61.15, 79.15, 80.19, 80.23, 80.24, 81.2, 81.4, 81.10, 81.13, 81.15, 114.9, 114.13, 115.28, 116.29, 203.22, 285.23, 328.9, 329.6, 332.9, 337.26 (femina); 78.5, 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, 25.2, 44.2, Tib. 2.3, 50.3, 61.4, Cal. 17.2, Claud. 15.4, 19, 35.2, Nero 29, Vesp. 19.1, Dom. 4.1, 8.3 (femina); Jul. 52.3, Aug. 44.3 (mulier).
15. 5.10.25, 5.11.10, 7.4.21, 9.4.23, 11.1.3 (vir/femina).
16. Note that at I.81.1 - feminis virisque - Tacitus reverses the order, in keeping with his practice of varying set expressions.
17. 4.1.13, 6.pr.5, 8.3.87, 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 frailties of the sex (the emphatic use): e.g., 6.49.2 imbecillum tali super casu feminarum animus. I have taken the

examples of II.13.2 and 12.2.3 to be complimentary; and those at 11.31.2, 12.42, 14.32.1, and 15.44.1 to be emphatic. At 13.45.2 the word is used for variation.

*[Faint, illegible text]*

*[Faint, illegible text]*

*[Faint, illegible text]*

36.1 silebat: used 20 times by Tacitus (19 times in the historical works). Its synonym taceo<sup>1</sup> occurs, outside the minor works, only once in the Histories, in a poetic phrase: III.84.4 terret solitudo et tacentes loci (the metaphorical use of taceo is confined almost exclusively to poetry: with this example cf. Virg. Aen. 6.265 loca ... tacentia; Tacitus seems to have enhanced the bare detail which he found in his source: cf. Suet. Vit. 16 cum deserta caenia repperisset);<sup>2</sup> and once in the Annals, probably for variation (before silentium): 4.60.2 seu loqueretur seu taceret iuvenis, crimen ex silentio, ex voce.

In early Latin sileo had no currency. It is used only twice in Plautus (once in an introductory formula: Poen. 3 siletique et tacete atque animum advertite; and once in what may have been a technical sense: Capt. 480 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),<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

Sileo enjoyed no lasting popularity. It is avoided by Seneca the Elder, Quintilian, and ps. Quintilian, all of whom employ taceo frequently (Seneca 65 times, Quintilian 33, ps. Quintilian 41), and used only once by Petronius (taceo 11 times), in an obviously high-flown phrase: 110.6 Emolpus, et periclitantium advocatus et praesentis concordiae auctor, ne sileret sine fabulis hilaritas, multa in muliebrem levitatem coepit iactare. The stylistic difference between sileo and taceo at this time can most clearly be seen from the works of Seneca the Younger. In the tragedies sileo is found 24 times, taceo 18; but in the philosophica taceo 39 times, sileo only once, in an extended personification: dial. 3.19.2 ratio ... silens.<sup>5</sup> Sileo survived only in poetry and archaising prose.

Only Pliny the Elder has a liking for sileo as marked as that of Tacitus (28:8). Livy prefers taceo.

- 36.1 ut spernerent sonores barbarorum: sonor is a very rare poetic (Lucretius, Virgil, Valerius Flaccus) and Sallustian (hist. 2.87.D, 3.96.D) word (for sonus, sonitus) 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. Liv. 5.37.8 iam omnia contra circaque hostium plena erant et nata in vanos

tumultus gens truci cantu clemoribusque variis horrendo cuncta complerent sono; see Ogilvie ad loc. for parallels): 1.65.1 nox per diversa iniquis, cum barbari festis epulis, laeto cantu aut truci sonore subiecta vallium ac resultantis saltus complerent; 4.48.2 ut clamore telis suo quisque periculo intentus sonorem alterius proelii non acciperet.<sup>6</sup>

One of the Sallustian examples of the word is applied to similarly exotic sounds: hist. 2.87.D Servilius ... de improviso montem, ex quo in iuga oppidi teli coniectus erat, occupavit sacrum Matri magnae; et in eo credebatur epulari diebus certis dea, cuius erat de nomine, exaudiri sonores ... The other is in a battle description.

Two other highly artificial terms which Tacitus employs exclusively in reference to barbarians are the poeticism ductor<sup>7</sup> and the archaism proles.<sup>8</sup> Recherche phraseology would have helped to suggest the strangeness of foreign tribes.

36.1 imbelles ineracs: On the marked decline of asyndeton in the later books of the Annals, see Introduction, p.36.

Asyndeton bimembre of this type (adjectival, with at least one compound in in-) was formulaic. There are 9 pairs of adjectives in asyndeton in the Histories and Annals, and of these all but 3 (of which

2 are in the Histories) comprise at least one word in in-: cf. 1.17.4 gravem, infructuosam; 2.48.1 locupletis intestatae; 6.8.4 inlicitum, anceps; 12.48.2 invisus infamis; 16.26.3 inteneratus, impollutus. Cf. also 4.36.3 leves ignobiles (substantival); 6.19.2 inlustres, ignobiles (part of a longer series). The exceptions are IV.60.2 leves abeuntes; V.5.1 sinistra foeda; 4.37.3 ambitosum, superbum.

Half of the 27 instances of longer adjectival asyndeta in the historical works also include a compound in in-: II.11.3 horridus, incomptus famaeque dissimilis;<sup>9</sup> II.46.3 atrox lugubre incertum; II.68.1 indisposita temulenta, pervigiliis ac bacchanalibus quam disciplinae et castris propiora; III.39.2 sanctus inturbidus, nullius repentini honoris; IV.56.1 turbidos infidos sanguine ducum pollutos; V.16.2 perfidum ignavum victum; 1.51.1 semisomnos, inermos aut palantis; 1.53.2 extorrens, infamen et post interfectum Postumum Agrippam omnis spei egenam; 1.74.2 egens ignotus inquiet; 2.64.2 incultum ferocem adnexum hostibus; 4.46.3 impeditum arduum cruentum; 12.64.3 impudica infamis violenta; 13.1.1 insontem, nobilem et ... e Caesarum posteris.

In Sallust's Catiline and Jugurtha 8 of the 15 examples of adjectival asyndeton bimembre are of the same kind: Cat. 11.3 infinita insatiabilis; 15.4 impurus, dis hominibusque infestus; Jug. 2.3 incorruptus aeternus; 14.7 deformatus aerumnis, inops;

17.5 saevum, importuosum; 44.1 iners inbellis (cf. the present Tacitean example); 66.3 pelantis inermos (cf. Tac. 1.51.1 above); 91.7 mobile infidum. Cf. also the following longer series: Cat. 19.4 iniusta superba crudelia; 48.2 crudelle immoderatum ac ... calamitosum; Jug. 51.1 varia incerta, foeda atque miserabilis; 85.1 industrios supplices modicos; 85.3 invidos occursantis factiosos.

In the ordinary prose of the late Republic asyndeton bimembre 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 bimembre (14,90). Similarly in the pro Milone I have noted only 3 examples of asyndeton bimembre (47, 87 bis), but 28 of longer asyndeta.<sup>10</sup> In the whole of Caesar,<sup>11</sup> and in the pro Sestio, pro Milone, and the letters of Cicero<sup>12</sup> there are perhaps only 3 examples of adjectival asyndeton bimembre, of which 2 include a compound in in-: Att. 7.20.1 inanes, imparati; fam. 2.13.3 summis infimis; cf. Att. 9.15.3 crudelam iratum. But a change is apparent by the first century A.D. In the Declamationes Minores ascribed to Quintilian asyndeton bimembre occurs more often than longer asyndetic series;<sup>13</sup> and in Seneca the Elder it is only slightly outnumbered.<sup>14</sup> Moreover both writers admit adjectival examples freely, without any tendency to restrict themselves to the formulaic type.<sup>15</sup>

Clearly Tacitus has disregarded contemporary developments in

educated usage<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> Cicero's liking for the device is even more marked than that of Sallust.<sup>18</sup>

In the Annals about 50 examples of asyndeton of the type which consists of juxtaposed unqualified words are, like that here, in speeches.<sup>19</sup> 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, 85.41, 110.4, 111.2).<sup>20</sup> 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;<sup>21</sup> and in Livy 40-42, 11 of the 20.<sup>22</sup>

(= conicere) of intorqueo is metaphorical: Cic. Tusc. 4.77 alternis  
... versibus intorqueuntur inter fratres gravissimae contumeliae.

The literal usage appears slightly later, in Augustan poetry (Virgil, Ovid).<sup>23</sup> It remains chiefly poetic throughout the next century (TLL VII.2.32.26ff.); the only pre-Tacitean instance in prose is at Sen. epist. 45.9, in a personification: quem fortuna, cum quod habuit telum nocentissimum vi maxima intorsit, pungit, non vulnerat. Tacitus has intorqueo only here.

The regular words (as seen from Caesar and the Caesarian corpus) for the discharging of weapons were conicio (26 times Caesar and Caes. 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: TLL VII.1.72.38ff.); libro twice; vibro twice; ingero 3 times (Sallust, Livy, Curtius, poetry, al: TLL VII.1.154.9.73ff.); torqueo once (mainly poetic).

Notes

1. It is possible that originally the two words differed in sense (see E.-M., 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 quid taces? Quinct. 79, Cat. 1.8, Plan. 48, and cur tacuisti? Sull. 69), sileo when a more abiding silence is meant (div. Cacc. 32, Verr. 5.57, 5.126, Mil. 11; cf. Plaut. Capt. 480).
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.-M., l. c.
6. cf. Kuntz, 194ff.
7. On which see M. Leumann, Mus. Helv. 4 (1947), 137 n. 30.
8. See Norden, Aen. VI.321; on its use by Tacitus, Syme, 725.
9. Tacitus, like Sallust, commonly has a pair of words inasyndeton followed by a third word or phrase which is connected by aut or a copulative particle. I have not classified such examples as asyndeton 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 apud scriptores Romanos usu sollemni (Edenkoben, 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, Eranos 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 quae 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 bimembre 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. Quintilian, probably in imitation of Cicero, continues to avoid asyndeton bimembre, though freely admitting longer asyndeta.
17. Tac. 2.30.2, 2.41.2, 3.33.3, 4.25.2, 16.28.3; cf. Sall. Cat. 2.7, 5.5, 12.2, 19.4, Jug. 14.15, 41.5, 49.4, 51.1, 66.1, 85.45, 89.5.
18. See, e.g. Bes. 1, 12, 15, 51, 56, 57, 84, 95, 128, 131, 135, 137, 138, 144, 145.
19. 1.4.4, 9.5, 17.4 bis, 42.4, 51.3, 59.6, 67.2, 2.5.3, 14.3, 15.3, 17.2, 33.1, 33.3, 36.3, 71.1, 73.3, 3.17.2, 22.1, 33.3, 33.4 bis, 4.8.4, 8.5, 37.3, 43.3, 6.6.2, 8.4, 11.6.2, 16.3, 24.2, 24.6, 26.2, 30.2, 12.6.1, 22.1, 37.2, 48.2, 65.2, 13.1.1, 18.1, 27.1, 42.4, 46.1, 14.31.3, 55.3, 15.19.2, 16.26.3, 28.2, 28.3.
20. On the frequency of asyndeton in speeches in Sallust, see Wölfflin, ALL 11 (1898), 34.
21. Speeches: 4.11.3, 4.11.21, 4.13.4, 4.14.12, 4.14.22, 4.14.25, 4.14.25, 4.15.7, 5.5.14, 5.5.18, 5.5.19, 5.12.11, 6.3.5, 6.9.12, 6.9.21, 6.9.30, 6.11.14; narrative: 3.2.14, 4.10.7, 4.15.19, 4.16.10, 5.2.10, 5.9.17. Note the accumulations in 4.14, 5.5, and 6.9.
22. Speeches: 40.8.11, 40.8.19, 40.10.1, 40.11.7, 40.11.8, 40.12.6, 40.12.7, 40.13.3, 40.13.4, 41.23.10, 42.62.10. 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, 40.48.6, 41.3.1, 42.30.9.

It is well known that Livy favoured asyndeton in official passages (Ho.-Sz., 829), but it has not been pointed out that he often uses it in speeches.

25. For a comparable pattern of semantic change, see D.A. West, *CC* 15 (1965): 272ff., on haurio (the derived sense 'drink' appears first metaphorically, then literally at a much later date).

37.1 velut cuneo erupit: the modification of metaphors and striking expressions by velut is more characteristic of the Dialogus than of the historical works, where boldness of expression is constantly sought after. Velut is so used 15 times in the Dialogus, but only 17 times in the Annals, which are 4 times as long (Lex. Tac. 1746b).

37.1 terga praebuere: for terga do or verto (see above, 5.1 n.).

37.1 difficili effugio: an unexpected use (without parallel in the Annals) of difficilis for Tacitus' normal arduus (31.4 n.).

37.1 ne mulierum quidem neci temperabat: on this uncharacteristic use of mulier 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.

38.1 ad reliqua belli perpetranda: before Tacitus perpetro is found only in Plautus, Varro (ling. 7.110), Livy (24 times), and Curtius (3 times, twice in phrases taken from Livy).<sup>1</sup>

It seems to increase in the third hexad at the expense of patro, also an archaism.<sup>2</sup> 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)<sup>3</sup> in which patro is used.

It is of note that, while patro occurs a number of times in Tacitus with bellum as object (a stock phrase), perpetro twice (at IV.51.2 as well as here) governs reliqua belli. The prefix of the latter may (for Tacitus) have retained some force (= 'put the finishing touches to' rather than 'carry out').

38.2 igni atque ferro: atque is usually found before vowels, but many writers employ it at least occasionally before consonants as well, chiefly under the influence of the rhythm of the clausula. No less than 92.9 per cent of pre-consonantal examples in a representative selection of Cicero's works have been shown to occur in the clausula;<sup>4</sup> and a considerable proportion of examples in Livy, Curtius, Seneca the Elder, Seneca the Younger, Mela, ps. Quintilian, Quintilian, and Pliny the Younger are similarly placed.<sup>5</sup>

But there are other authors, including Tacitus (who pays little attention to clausulae)<sup>6</sup> who admit pre-consonantal atque anywhere in the clause rather than predominantly at the end. Some non-rhythmical factors motivating its use are as follows:

(1) Of the 25 examples in Valerius Maximus, 18 precede c, g or q, before which ac was apparently regarded as cacophonous. On the use by certain other writers of atque before gutturals, see TLL II.1048.73; no one else, however, employs it thus as often (proportionately) as Valerius.

At 4.4.11 Madvig's atque nocturnis (the MSS. have simply diurnis, 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).<sup>7</sup> In Cato's speeches and Origines (but not in the De agricultura), 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. 163, Sall. Cat. 2.5, 23.6, Jug. 14.11, 41.3, 85.45); a. pecunia (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),<sup>8</sup> 11 link proper names.<sup>9</sup> About one-quarter of the 26 examples in Caesar are similarly used,<sup>10</sup> as are one-sixth of the 72 in Livy.<sup>11</sup> 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 (Gall. 5.21.3), Sallust (Jug. 23.1, 45.3), Valerius Maximus (9.1.ext. 6), and (probably) Livy (38.4.6).<sup>12</sup> 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 formulas are: fuga atque formido (Sall. Jug. 55.7, Liv. 22.38.4);<sup>13</sup> atque ieiunus (Cic. Verr. 3.84, Quint. 1.4.5, 2.4.3, 2.5.21, 2.8.9, Pallad. 1.5.1, 5.4.2); a. flagitium (Cic. div. Cacc. 6, Verr. 1.82, 2.2, 4.83, Tusc. 1.72, ps. Quint. decl. min. 122.20, ps. Quint. decl. maior. 3.1, Pac. 6.6.1); a. vehemens (Cic. imp. Pomp. 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);<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

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;<sup>16</sup> 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<sup>17</sup> (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)<sup>18</sup> admit it with greater freedom.<sup>19</sup>

Since atque (both before vowels and consonants) was falling into disuse in the early Empire,<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup>

In the Histories Tacitus has atoue 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).<sup>22</sup>

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 incuriose: cf. Sall. hist. frg. 2.42 incuriose egit; Liv. 29.3.8 incuriose agentibus; Tac. IV.13.3 incuriose ... egerat (cf. IV.28.2).

38.3 gentesque praeferoces: there are 12 emphatic adjectival compounds in prae- in Tacitus,<sup>23</sup> giving a total of 40 examples,<sup>24</sup> not one of which is in the minor works.<sup>25</sup>

There is some evidence that in the early imperial period adjectives and adverbs in prae- 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<sup>26</sup> (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 prae- but not in per-.<sup>27</sup>

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.

Notes

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, 45.5.5, 45.5.11).
2. On the word in general, see Tränkle, Wien. Stud. 81 (1968), 126.
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. Wört., 83 n. On the other writers I have consulted the Thesaurus material.
6. See Norden, Ant. Kunstpr., 332.
7. A full collection of examples is to be found in A. Kunze, Sallustiana (Leipzig, 1892), 4ff.
8. See Lex. Tac. 106a; Wölfflin, 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. Gall. 3.8.2, civ. 1.7.6, 1.18.2, 3.4.3, 3.19.1, 3.30.1.
11. See Fugner, 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), 251f.).
13. The Livian instance is in an oath, in the archaizing 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 (Gall. 4.1.8, Liv. 3.38.3, 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.
16. See Novak, Wien. Stud. 15 (1893), 257ff.
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. Volkssprache (Lund, 1935), 37.
20. Ho.-Sz. 477.
21. Apart from atque periculum, above, note aequabilis atque constantius (15.21.4; cf. Sall. Cat. 2.3).
22. I omit instances of haec atque talia.
23. praealtus, -calidus, -dives, -durus, -ferox, -fervidus, -gracilis, -gravis, -longus, -potens, -properus, -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 adverbess 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.

39.2 mirabanturque, quod dux et exercitus tanti belli confector  
servitiis oboedirent: 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.

40.1 longa senecta ... insidiis obnoxius: it was argued by Wölfflin<sup>1</sup> that the poeticism senecta<sup>2</sup> increases from Histories to Annals at the expense of the commonplace prose term senectus.<sup>3</sup> 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 examples) 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:

	<u>Hist.</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>senectus</u>	2	3	-
<u>senecta</u>	-	7	3

The table does not establish convincingly a change between Histories and Annals.

The disproportionate frequency of senecta in the ablative, and its absence in the nominative, can be paralleled in other prose authors. Before Tacitus 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),<sup>4</sup> and ps. Quintilian (decl. mai. 4.16). The nominative occurs only 3 times (Liv. 2.40.6, Plin. nat.

8.116. 30.69),<sup>5</sup> but the ablative once in Nepos, once in Varro, 4 times in Livy, and no less than 28 times in Pliny. Pliny has senectus 10 times in the nominative, but only 5 times in the ablative.<sup>6</sup>

Senecta had originally been an adjective. In Plautus it is still found 7 times in the fossilised ablative expression senecta aetate, as well as 3 times on its own (always in the phrase in senecta). Apparently, when detached from aetate 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,<sup>7</sup> but Livy shows greater freedom. One of his expressions, senecta invalidus (6.8.2), is taken up, perhaps directly,<sup>8</sup> by Tacitus (I.9.1, III.65.1, 3.43.3, 13.6.3).

Notes

1. Philol. 25 (1867), 101.
2. See in general Krebs-Schmalz, s.v.
3. Senectus 4:7:3, senecta 4:10:12. The statistics seem to indicate a progression towards senecta continuing throughout the whole of the Annals.
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.

41. iuvenem quaestorium: it has been shown by B. Axelson<sup>1</sup> that there is no evidence in the classical period for the traditional view that adulescens denotes a younger man than iuvenis; rather, the difference between the words is stylistic. Adulescens is the regular prose term, while iuvenis is an elevated word, used only twice, for instance, in Cicero's speeches, and then for special effect. But from the Augustan age onwards iuvenis becomes more frequent in ordinary prose at the expense of adulescens, without, however, completely displacing it.

More questionable is Axelson's assertion that under the Empire there is no apparent distinction between adulescens and iuvenis.<sup>2</sup> In Tacitus, while iuvenis is, as here, always a neutral term, expressing simply a man who is not yet senex, adulescens can take on an emotive colouring. It may designate a youth who is too young and immature (nondum adultus) for a task which he is doing, or for an honour, office, etc. which he has received. Note, e.g., 1.46.1 trepida civitas incusare Tiberium quod ... dissideat interim miles necesse duorum adulescentium nondum adulta auctoritate comprimi (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 igitur haec ... (Tiberius) apud patres disseruit, nec posse motum Orientem nisi Germanici sapientia componi; nam suam aetatem vergere, Drusi nondum satis adolevisse); 4.17.2 Tiberius ... aequari adulescentes

senectae suae impatienter indoluit; cf., ib. monuit ... ne quis mobiles adolescentium animos praematuris honoribus ad superbiam extolleret (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 quoque et Drusum isdem 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 ... paratam ab adolescente privato exercitum (Octavian was subject to the charges that he was (a) privatus, and (b) too young when he first raised an army); 1.4.5 serviendum feminae duobusque insuper adolescentibus (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 neque rerum experientia tantae moli parem); 1.47.2 simul adolescentibus excusatum quaedam ad patrem reicere (mere adolescentes can be excused for referring questions to their father); 1.3.1 Claudium Marcellum ... admodum adolescentem pontificatu et curuli aedilitate ... extulit (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 iuvenis is also observable in Petronius. All 7 instances of adulescens are in speeches, and 5 are in the vocative case (3.1, 20.6, 90.5, 129.6, 137.7). The tone adopted by the speaker is usually abusive, sympathetic, condescending, or affectionate: 90.5 'o mi' inquit 'adulescens ...' (affectionate); 134.8 'o' inquit 'Oenothea, hunc adolescentem quem vides, malo astro natus est' (sympathetic; cf. ib. 9 nunquam tu hominem tam infelicem vidisti. Oenothea in her reply (11) refers to Encolpius as adulescentulus); 137.7 'imisce' inquit 'adulescens, sollicita sum tua causa' (sympathetic); 3.1 'adulescens' inquit 'quoniam sermonem habes non publici saporis ...' (Agamemnon the rhetorician condescendingly praises the style of Encolpius); 81.4 adulescens omni libidine impurus (in an abusive speech); 129.6 narrabo tibi, adulescens, paralyisin cave (Proselenos adopts a didactic tone); 20.6 ancilla risu meo prodita composuit manus et 'apposui quidem' adulescens, ...' (the ancilla of Quartilla addresses her prisoner).

Iuvenis 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 unemotional addresses.

The difference between iuventa and adulescentia is also stylistic. Iuventa is common in poetry and poeticising prose, but in ordinary prose of both the late Republic and early Empire is largely avoided for adulescentia.<sup>3</sup> It is of note that Livy, who has both words,

sometimes employs adulescentia with a tone similar to that of adulescens in Tacitus. It denotes the period of immaturity rather than simply of youth. Observe the following formulaic examples: 3.12.8 veniam errori atque adulescentiae petendo; 8.35.2 ut veniam errori humano, veniam adulescentiae Q. Fabi daret; 40.15.10 (ooortebat) te adulescentiae, te errori veniam impetrare meo; 31.11.13 excusantes errorem adulescentiarque. Livy does not use iuventa in similar expressions.

41 additur senatus consulto, qui talem operam emptitasset vendidissetve, perinde poena teneretur ac publico iudicio calumniae condemnatus: -ve belongs above all to the language of law. In the Lex agraria (111 B.C.), for example, it outnumbers aut by about 140:2, in the Lex Acilia repetundarum (123 or 124 B.C.) by 70:4 (cc. 1-71 Bruns), 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.<sup>4</sup>

The present example is in a senatus consultum. Observe that it connects words of contrary meaning. -ve is frequently used thus in laws: e.g. plus minusve (Lex XII tab. 3.6); minora maiorave (Lex Silia de ponderibus publicis, Bruns, 46); sumpsit reliquitve (Lex agraria 2, Bruns, 74); detur exigaturve (Lex agraria 20, Bruns, 77);

supra infrave (Edict. imp. Caes. Aug. 10, Bruns, 250); publica preivatave (Lex Antonia de Termessibus I, 1.12, Bruns, 93). For the joining by -ve of emo and vendo in a senatus consultum, see S.C. de aedificiis non diruendis II.26 (Bruns, 201) eneret venderetve. 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.<sup>5</sup> Tacitus has the usage about 20 times elsewhere in non-legal contexts (Lex Tac. 1739b IA - 174Ca).

The following are the other common formulaic uses of -ve taken over into prose from the law:<sup>6</sup>

(1) linking two tenses of the same verb: e.g. Ter. Heec. 739, de orat. 2 306, part. 57,64, Tusc. 1.9, Att. 7.10, 11.7.5, Liv. 1.praef.6, Quint. 5.9.4; cf. oportuerit oportebitve (Lex Latina tabulae Bantinae 2.8, Bruns, 54); siet fueritve (Lex Acilia 13, 16, 17, 22, Bruns, 61ff.); obvenit obveneritve (Lex agraria 23, Bruns, 78); emit emeritve (Lex agr., l.c.).

(2) linking a simple verb or adjective with a prepositional compound of the same root: e.g. Cic. inv. 1.107, Liv. 34.2.10, 34.40.14, Sen. dial. 6.18.3, Plin. epist. 2.17.18, pan. 3.5, Tac. 13.49.2; cf. dari reddive (Lex agraria 12, Bruns, 75); rogando subrogandove (Lex Julia municipalis 99, Bruns, 107).

(3) linking numerals or words expressing quantity: see Ho.-Sz., 503

for literary examples; cf. duo pluresve (Lex municipalis Malacitana col.2, l.33, Bruns, 149; S.C. Ostorianum, Bruns, 195; Lex Iulia et Papia Poppaea, Bruns, 115); alter ambove (S.C. de ludis saecularibus 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 deminutaeve fuissent (S.C. Iuventianum, Bruns, 205); ea maceria parsve quae eius maceriae (Edict. imp. Caes. Aug. 18, Bruns, 250); homo mortuus ossave 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 Iulia municipalis 73, 83, 122, 137, 144, Bruns, 106ff.; Lex Iulia et Papia Poppaea, Bruns, 116; Lex Ursonensis Tab.I, col. 4, l.22, Bruns, 124; id. Tab. IV, col. 1, l.37, Bruns, 136.

(6) attached to qui: see Ho.-Sz., 503 for literary examples; cf. Lex Iulia de vi publica et privata, Bruns, 111 (7 times); Lex Iulia 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 damno in Seneca the Elder (129:4), Seneca the Younger (70:3), Pliny the Elder (73:2), Petronius (9:1), Quintilian (55:-), ps. Quintilian (183:2), the Younger Pliny (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 damno alone. Only damno goes into the Romance languages.

Condemno seems to have been the more legalistic word. It predominates over damno in laws<sup>7</sup> and also in the lawyer Gaius (37:15) and in the Cod. Just. (70:49). Moreover it was familiar enough in legal documents to be abbreviated simply as C (see TLL IV.123,72f.). Another legalism avoided by prose writers of all types under the Empire is sicarius (see on percussor, 8.5 n.). Legal words were naturally felt to be unpoetic (see on super, 9.3 n.).

Condemno was probably the word used in the senatorial decree which Tacitus is paraphrasing. For the expression iudicio publico condemnare in laws, see TLL IV.124,17ff. The other two Tacitean examples of condemno (one of which is juxtaposed with sicarius) are in legalistic passages expressing verdicts of the senate (13.44.5, 14.48.2).

The only instance of condemno in Pliny the Younger is also in a legal context (epist. 2.11.2).<sup>8</sup>

## Notes

1. 'Die Synonyme adulescens und iuvenis', Mélanges Marouzeau (Paris, 1948), 7ff.
2. o.c. 15.
3. Cicero, Caesar, Seneca the Elder, and Quintilian all avoid iuventa completely.
4. Ho.-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, dcm. 73, de orat. 3.116, 3.203, orat. 122, part. 137, opt. gen. 15, inv. 139, 2.31, 2.68, Liv. 3.14.4, 3.34.4, 4.52.8, 6.23.5, 7.41.3, 8.21.1, 8.23.15, 8.38.10, 9.37.3, 21.35.2, 30.23.4, Sen. dial. 6.18.3, nat. 1.1.9 (cf. 7.23.2), 1.8.3, 2.1.2 (cf. epist. 22.8), 2.39.1 (cf. epist. 98.2), 3.26.8, 7.28.1, epist. 65.5, Quint. 3.4.15, 2.4.38 (cf. 3.6.42), 9.1.29, 11.1.27, 12.3.1, 12.6.15, Plin. epist. 2.17.18, 2.17.21, 6.27.4, 8.15.2, pan. 3.5, 4.8, Suet. Iul. 27.2, 42.1, Auz. 77, 84.2, Cal. 36.2, Claud. 14, 15.2.
6. Not all of which were pointed out by Ho.-Sz., l.c.
7. The Thesaurus material gives about 35 inscriptional examples of condemno, almost all from laws, but only about 10 of damno.
8. In the expression ob innocentes condemnandos. On the legalism ob + gerundive, see G.P. Shipp, Glotta 31 (1951), 244ff.

43.1 in hoc ordine interfui: Tacitus uses intersum with in instead of the dative (a usage which occurs 12 times: Lex. Tac. 676a)<sup>1</sup> only here. No doubt he departed from his usual practice in order to put unchanged the conventional senatorial expression in hoc ordine (12 times Cicero's speeches) into the mouth of Cassius.

43.1 omnibus negotiis: on Tacitus' use of omnia (adjectival) in speeches for cuncta, see 11.2 n. At 3.18.4 in the narrative he writes cunctis in negotiis.

43.2 quod hodie evenit: read rather venit (M). Cf. 12.32.3 and see Löfstedt, Coniectanea (Uppsala - Stockholm, 1950), 101.

43.3 quem dignitas sua defendet: dignitas and dignatio are distributed thus in Tacitus:

	Minor Works	<u>Histories</u>	<u>Ann.</u> 1-6	11-16
<u>dignitas</u>	8	11	7	8
<u>dignatio</u>	1	3	6	2

The table gives the misleading impression that the less usual dignatio (see below) increases in the first hexad of the Annals, but

declines in the later books.<sup>2</sup> 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 (I.77.1, 2.35.2, 11.22.6, 13.31.1), but ex dignatione is avoided. For ex dignatione, see, e.g. Her. 2.20, Cic. epist. ad Brut. 1.2.2, fam. 5.8.4, Liv. 5.23.11, Sen. dial. 4.6.2.
- (3) Only dignitas is used with the adjectives senatoria and equestris (II.57.2, IV.39.1, 3.30.2, 16.17.1). Senatoria dignitas and e. dignitas are common during the Empire (TLL V.1.1138.4ff.; *ib.* 17ff.).
- (4) Dignitas is twice used in the expression dignitas formae (11.28.1, 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/actas (II.48.1; cf. III.33.1), dignitas/fama (6.17.3), and dignitas/salus (IV.42.3), are elsewhere commonplace.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup>

43.3 quae ne in metu quidem pericula nostra advertit: at the time of Donatus the elliptical adverto was regularly used for the full form animadverto: on Ter. Eun. pr. 44 nos ελλειπτικῶς dicimus <advertite ut> attendite, veteres plene animum advertite. But in the early Empire it is rare and largely restricted to writers of mannered prose and to the poets (TLL I.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 animadverto only in the minor works and Histories (5 times),<sup>5</sup> adverto, with one exception (III.25.3),<sup>6</sup> only in the Annals (11 times).

In one of the senses ('punio') possessed by animadverto, Tacitus is the only extant writer to use adverto (TLL I.864.23ff.), by a simple analogical extension.

Other archaic or artificial words which Tacitus assigns to Cassius in this speech are super (43.1),<sup>7</sup> venit (43.2), patrare (44.1), nesciis (44.1), and insontes (44.4). See Introduction, p.13.

43.4 pronuntianus ultro dominum iure caesum videri: iure caesus is the standard legalism expressing a verdict of justifiable homicide. It

occurs first in the Twelve Tables: 8.12, si nox furtum faxsit, si im occisit, iure caesus esto. Later it is found, for instance, in Livy's version of an Athenian decree: 31.44.8 additum decreto ... si quis contra ignominiam prove honore eius dixisset fecissetve, qui occidisset eum iure caesurum;<sup>8</sup> 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 indignum vindicta indicavit, cum a servis occisus esset, et tantum non pronuntiavit iure caesum videri; in a reference to the judgement passed by Antonius on the murderers of Caesar; Sen. benef. 5.16.1 ingratus Antonius in dictatorem suum, quem iure caesum pronuntiavit, interfectores eius in provincias et imperia dimisit; and in a rescript of Gallienus: Cod. Iust. 9.16.3 dubium non est eum, qui inferendae caedis voluntate praecesserat, iure caesum videri. It is also attributed by six sources to Scipio Aemilianus as a comment on the killing of Tiberius Gracchus.<sup>9</sup> There are 9 other examples of the usage found in prose from the beginning of the historical period down to the time of Suetonius.<sup>10</sup>

A legal verdict was traditionally given in the form 'he seems to have committed the deed' (fecisse videtur) rather than 'he committed the deed'.<sup>11</sup> e.g. Cic. Verr. 2.93 pronuntiat STHENIUM LITTERAS PUBLICAS CORRUPTISSE VIDERI. The whole expression iure caesum videri thus belongs to the language of law (cf. Sen. nat. 1.16.1, Liv. 24.24.8, Cod. Iust.

9.16.3, and the examples, other than Vell. 2.4.4, given at n.9).<sup>12</sup>

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,<sup>13</sup> sacral,<sup>14</sup> and legal languages,<sup>15</sup> and in descriptions of the slaughter of animals.<sup>16</sup> The exceptions are: Cic. Phil. 9.5 qui a Veientium rege caesi sunt; Liv. 4.17.6 legatorum qui Fidenis caesi erant statuæ publice in rostris positæ sunt. Both passages refer to the same event (the murder of the Roman legati at Fidenæ by Lars Tolumnius 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.<sup>17</sup>

Occido is often substituted for caedo in juxtaposition with iure,<sup>18</sup> 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. Eriksson, 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 animadverto 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 videri (43.4).
8. Note the alternation of compound and simple verb (occidisset ... caesurum), as in the law from the Twelve Tables.
9. Cic. de orat. 2.106, Mil. 8, Liv. epit. 59, Grillius Comm. in de inv. Cic. (p. 598 Halm), Val. Max. 6.2.3, (Victor) vir. ill. 58.8, Vell. 2.4.4. Discussed by A.E. Astin (CQ N.S. 10 (1960), 135-7): but see below, n.12.
10. Cic. Phil. 13.2, off. 2.43, Att. 15.3.2, Liv. 1.26.9, 4.15.1, 24.24.8, 39.36.16, Val. Max. 6.1.12, Suet. Jul. 76.1; cf. Liv. 1.14.3.

11. Mommsen, Römisches Strafrecht (Leipzig, 1899), 448f.; D. Daube, Forms of Roman Legislation (Oxford 1956), 73ff.
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 fecisse 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.
14. Denoting the sacrifice of victims: OLD, s.v.
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.
18. e.g. Cic. inv. 2.79, Verr. 1.72, Tull. 53, Phil. 11.14, Sen. exc. contr. 4.7.1, ps. Quint. decl. min. 103.10, 105.15, 105.21. Cf. Cic. Phil. 2.86 iure interfectum.

44.1 omnibus nesciis: 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 inconditque 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 nescius.

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  
effunderet ignaram ('off her guard').

Both words occur in the passive as well as the active in the historical works (Lex. Tac. 552c, 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. 1.10.3.27, Sull. 28, fin. 1.1, 5.51, de orat. 1.45, fam. 5.12.2, 13.7.1, Att. 16.15.2);<sup>1</sup> and ne forte sis nescius (Font. 2, Att. 15.11.4). The exception is in Varro: rust. 5.16.7 neque tamen nescia suae imbecillitatis.

In imperial prose before Tacitus the word occurs only twice in Livy (27.7.5 haud nescius; 43.13.1 non sum nescius), twice in Columella (1.praef.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. 49f.)

44.3 postquam vero nationes in familiis habemus: the only other instance of vero in Annals 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 Histories (exception III.2.3). In the minor works the word is more numerous than in the Histories and Annals together (21 times; 16 times Dialogus).

On Tacitus' avoidance of particules in the narrative, see 1.2 n.

4.4.4 at quidam insontes peribunt: neither sons nor insons had any currency from at least as early as the late Republic onwards.<sup>2</sup> 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 nocens and innocens), 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).<sup>3</sup> Seneca the Younger has sons 7 times and insons 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 16 times, Curtius 11, Valerius Maximus 9, Tacitus 23).

The following groups of passages show that for Tacitus sons/insons and nocens/innocens were interchangeable:

15.35.3 quamvis sontem ... victurum tamen fuisse, si clementiam iudicis expectasset.

II.10.2 quamvis invisum ac nocentem more tamen audiendum censebant.

2.31.3 iuravitque Tiberius petiturum se vitam quamvis nocenti,

nisi voluntariam mortem properavisset.

6.29.2 quam etsi nocentem periculi tamen expertem fuisse,

15.44.5 unde quamquam adversus sones et novissima exempla  
meritos miseratio oriebatur ...

3.22.1 Quirinius post dictum repudium adhuc infensus quamvis  
infami ac nocenti miserationem addiderat.

With the present example cf. I.6.1 inaditi atque indefensi  
tamquam innocentes perierunt.

On Tacitus' increasing preference for sons/insons in the later  
Annals, see Introduction, p.40. Note that the examples of sons/insons  
above are from the third hexad, but those of nocens/innocens are all  
in the Histories or first hexad of the Annals.

Notes

1. With a few variations of number and gender. Notice also Deiot. 8 non erant nescii, which is of the same structure, but in the third person.
2. In Plautus insons is almost as frequent as innocens (7:11). Cf. Capt. 476 (sons).
3. Comprehensio sontium; cf. Liv. 4.45.2 indicioque duorum comprehensio sontes poenas dederunt. The remaining 3 examples are at Tusc. 2.41, off. 1.82, fam. 4.13.3.

47.1 eo anno mortem obiit Memmius Regulus: obire mortem (obire)<sup>1</sup>

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 ob rem publicam mortem obire, which is found 3 times in Cicero (Phil. 9.4, 9.5, 9.16), 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 decreed to the dead Germanicus, the second in a paraphrase of an imperial edict. The whole expression probably had some currency in officialese. Cf. the tone of the following: Cic. Phil. 9.2 ceteri qui in legatione mortem obierunt ad incertum vitae periculum sine ullo mortis metu profecti sunt: de orat. 3.116 sine honorum gloriae causa mortem obire;<sup>2</sup> Liv. 5.52.3 non minore hostium admiratione quam vestra conspectum est, cum inter Gallicae tela depressae ex arce sollemne Fabiae gentis in colli Quirinali obiit;<sup>3</sup> Vell. 1.9.3 tam fortiter in ea mortem obierat;<sup>4</sup> Sen. epist. 82.20 in aciem educturus exercitum pro coniugibus ac liberis mortem obiturum.<sup>5</sup>

(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 claritudine generis; 5.1.1 Iulia

Augusta mortem obiit ... nobilitatis per Claudiam familiam et adoptione Liviorum Iuliorumque clarissimae; 6.27.4 obiit ... M. Lepidus, de cuius moderatione atque sapientia ... conlocavi.<sup>6</sup> Similarly Cicero applies the expression to the death of Alexander the Great (Phil. 5.48), and Velleius to the deaths of Cato (1.13.1), Scipio Aemilianus (2.4.6), and Q. Catulus (2.22.4). In Nepos supremum Jicm obire 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 dien) in camina epigraphica and grave inscriptions also fall into this second category.<sup>7</sup> Roman obituaries are invariably eulogistic. Of particular interest is the formulaic sepulchral antithesis vixit/obiit,<sup>8</sup> for Petronius puts it into the mouth of one of his freedmen: 43.1 honeste vixit, honeste obiit; cf. CIL X.4629 beate vixit, beate obiit.<sup>9</sup>

The only pre-Tacitean prose writer who uses obire (usually independently) indiscriminately is Pliny the Elder.

47.2 eo anno: the repetition of this expression (cf. 1) looks clumsy. Syme (742) has argued that the sentence is a later insertion by Tacitus, prompted by the remark at 15.22.2 that the gymnasium here referred to was struck by lightning; the death of Memmius 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 eodem anno, 6 eo anno, 8 eo anno; 34.53.3 eo anno; 7 eo anno; 39.55.6 eodem anno, 56.1 eodem anno; 41.13.1 eo anno, 4 eo anno; 42.10.1 eo anno, 6 eo anno. Tacitus may have been imitating the old annalistic manner.

Notes

1. I am not concerned here with the variant obire (suum) diem, which occurs mainly in colloquial Latin: see W. Schulze, Kleine Schriften (Göttingen, 1934), 140: Russo on Sen. apoc. 1.1. In Cicero it is confined to the letters. Note however that at 1.53.1 Tacitus writes supremum diem obiit. The addition of supremum seems to have made the expression acceptable in non-colloquial genres (Cf. Nep. Alc. 10.6, Dion. 2.5, Mil. 7.6, reg. 1.2, Timol. 5.4). Supremus dies is a more accurate euphemistic variant of mors than the elliptical dies.
2. Cf. Sest. 83, Phil. 11.24.
3. Cf. 28.22.8 (the only other Livian example).
4. Cf. 2.61.4.
5. In the sense 'die' Seneca has obire elsewhere only at epist. 93.4.
6. The examples at 1.53.1, 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 (fato, morbo, abruptis ... venis), a change which may have altered the tone of the expression.
7. e.g. CIL 3.9631, 6.31965, 8.591, 8.8641, 11.1421, 12.907, 12.5819, 13.8850.
8. CIL 2.4315, 6.33456, 10.4629, 12.907, 12.954, 12.955, 12.957, 12.962, 12.967, 12.977, 12.1213, 12.1504, 12.2060, 12.2091.
9. W. Heraeus, Kleine Schriften (Heidelberg, 1937), 122.

48.1 exim a Cossutiano Capitone: Tacitus seems to have been the first writer to use exim with markedly greater frequency than exin (24:12).<sup>1</sup> Even if the reading in any one passage remains doubtful, the large number of cases of exim attested by M 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: Cure. 363, Pseud. 680, Truc. 82), the former twice in the same proverb.<sup>2</sup> Exim is found in the prose of Ennius.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup>

Cicero has the two words 8 times in his translation of Aratus, but only a further 3 or 4 times in his prose,<sup>5</sup> 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<sup>6</sup> 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;<sup>7</sup> praetores exinde facti:<sup>8</sup>) 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 (OCT) ad loc.

Suetonius and Varro both commonly use archaisms.

Tacitus avoids exin and exim in the minor works, and has them only very rarely in the Histories (twice). But in the Annals they occur 34 times.<sup>9</sup>

48.2 censuitque Iunius Marullus consul designatus adinendam reo praetorem necandumque 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 altera lex: tyrannic occiso quinque eius proximos cognatione magistratus necato; rep. 2.53 (lex) ne quis magistratus civem Romanum adversus provocationem necaret neve verberaret; Liv. 10.9.4 Porcia ... lex ... gravi poena, si quis verberasset necassetve civem Romanum sanxit; Vell. 2.34.4 iussu consulis in carcere necati sunt; Val. Max. 5.4.7 praetor apud tribunal suum capitali crimine damnatum triumviro in carcere necandam tradidit; Plin. epist. 4.11.7 missi statim pontifices qui defodiendam necandamque curarent (cf. Liv. 22.57.2).<sup>10</sup>

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 nex.

The paterfamilias had the right, for instance, to put deformed infants to death. For the use of neco in this connection see, e.g. Cic. leg. 3.19 deinde cum esset cito necatus tanquam ex duodecim tabulis insignis ad deformitatem puer, Curt. 9.1.25 si quos (liberos) insignes, aut aliqua parte membrorum inutiles, notaverunt, necari iubent; cf. Plaut. Truc. 399 si quod peperissem id <non n> ecarem ac tollerem (in reference to the exposure of an unwanted, but not deformed infant); cf. Ovid met. 9.679 edita forte tuo fuerit si femina partu-/invitus mendo; pietas ignosce! - necetur.

It was also possible for the paterfamilias to inflict capital punishment on his offspring for some offence:<sup>11</sup> e.g. Sall. Cat. 39.5 in iis erat Fulvius, senatoris filius, quem retractum ex itinere parens necari iussit; Quint. 12.1.37 liberos necare nonnumquam pulcherrimum est.<sup>12</sup>

A husband who found his wife in adultery could put her, along with her lover, to death: Cato ap. Gell. 10.23.5 in adulterio uxorem tuam siprehendisses, sine iudicio impune necares; Liv. 1.58.4 ut in sordido adulterio necata dicatur; Plaut. Bacch. 860 nihil est lucri quod me hodie facere mavelim, / quam illum cubantem cum illa opprimere, ambo ut necem (the soldier speaks as if the meretrix (illa) is his legal wife).<sup>13</sup>

A dominus possessed the ius vitae necisque over his slaves (Gaius 1.52). Hence the point of neco at Plaut. Truc. 781 in a threat

addressed to two slaves: edico prius/ne duplicis habeatis linguas, ne ego bilinguis 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. 2.7.58 quid refert, uri virgis ferroque necari/auctoratus eas; Sen. epist. 37.1 eadem honestissimi huius et illius turpissimi auctoramenti verba sunt: 'uri, vinciri ferroque necari'; Petron. 117.5 in verba Mamolpi iuravimus: uri, vinciri, verberari ferroque necari.

Wölfflin,<sup>14</sup> apparently following Festus (158.17; 190.7), sought to show that neco denotes killing without the use of a weapon.<sup>15</sup> This view, which was accepted by Löfstedt<sup>16</sup> and Axelson,<sup>17</sup> 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 Lucretia: cum mortua iugulatum servum nudum positurum ait, ut ... (cf. ib. 2 Sex. Tarquinius cum; ferrum in manu est; moriere, si emiseric vocem); as too for the adulteress at Juv. 10.316. 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 cum eum qui provocasset virgis caedi securique necari vetuisset ... Finally, cf. Liv. 9.6.2

gladii etiam plerisque intentati, et volnerati quidam necatique  
 (note the juxtaposition of volnerati with necati and cf. Fest. 158.17,  
 quoted at n.15).

Clearly neco was a generic term for execution, whatever its  
 method of infliction.<sup>18</sup>

Of the Tacitean instances of the word, 2 are used in application  
 to private executions: V.5.3 necare quemquam ex agnatis nefas;  
 Germania 19.2 quemquam ex agnatis necare flagitium. 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 agnatic descendants that the Roman pater familias had patria  
potestas,<sup>19</sup> and hence the ius vitae necisque.

At 3.21.1 - raro ea tempestate et e vetere memoria facinore  
decimum quemque ignominiosae cohortis sorte ductos fusti 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. frg. 4.22 sorte ductos fusti necat.

With the present passage cf. Suet. Ner. 49.2 quaeri, ut puniatur  
more maiorum, interrogavitque quale id genus esset poenae; et cum  
comperisset nudi hominis cervicem inseri furcae, corpus virgis ad  
necem caedi ...

The only other example of interest is at 12.47.5: Radamistus

quasi iuris iurandi memor, non ferrum, non venenum in sororem et  
patrum expromit, sed proiectos in humum et veste multa gravique  
opertos necat. Lofstedt,<sup>20</sup> 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  
(Radjamistus is under oath not to use a more conventional means of  
putting his sister and uncle to death).

## Notes

1. Lex. Tac. 422b; TLL V.2.1506.63.
2. Epid. 49 utcumque in alto ventust ... exim velum vortitur;  
Poen. 754 ut quomque est ventus exim velum vortitur. See Otto,  
Sprichwörter, 363. The remaining example is at Most. 227.
3. E. Fraenkel, Eranos 49 (1951), 50.
4. TLL V.2.1506.66ff. Both words occur in the poets.
5. I omit the 2 instances at orat. 154: dein . . . et exim pro deinde et  
pro exinde dicimus.
6. See TLL V.2.1507.9f.
7. 28.10.9, 31.6.2.
8. 31.4.4, 37.47.8, 42.9.8. 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. Rabir. 8, Liv. 8.20.7, 29.19.5, Val. Max. 9.8.ext.2,  
9.15.1, Curt. 6.11.20.
11. For the ius vitae necisque inherent in patria potestas, see, e.g.  
Cic. dom. 77, Just. 8.46.10.
12. cf. Sall. Cat. 52.30, Val. Max. 6.1.3.
13. cf. Juv. 10.316.
14. ALL 7 (1890), 278.

15. Wölfflin 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 proprie dicitur, qui sine vulnere interfectus est, ut veneno, aut fame).
16. Late Latin (Oslo, 1959), 191.
17. Unpoet. 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 sicariis et veneficiis of 81 B.C. neco is used of murder with a weapon: eius, qui cum telo ambulaverit hominis necandi ... causa (Bruns. 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. scaen. 212 quis parentem aut hospitem necasset; Plaut. Host. 479 hospes necavit hospitem; Cic. S. Rosc. 70

cur nullum supplicium constituisset in eum qui parentem necasset;

Cael. 51 ad hospitem ... necandum; inv. 2.48; Deiot. 15; Att. 9.9.2;

Fest. 174.27 iubere caput eius obnubere, qui parentem necavisset;

Her. 1.23 et lex: 'qui parentem necasse iudicatus erit, ut is devolutus et obligatus corio devehatur in profluentem'. The last passage in

particular suggests that the phrase parentem necare was a legalism.

For some other general examples, see Cic. Mil. 8.9.17 bis, Fiv. 3.13.5,

Quint. 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 Philippics Cicero never uses neco to describe the deaths of the elder Roscius, Clodius, 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,

off. 3.86, Her. 2.8, 2.44, 3.33 bis, Sen. contr. 9.2.13, Val. Max.

6.3.8, 6.5.1, Curt. 10.10.14, Quint. 7.8.2, Suet. Ner. 43.1.

Wölfflin and Festus 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.

19. See J. Crook, CQ N.S. 17 (1967), 113.

20. Late Latin, 192.

49.2 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).<sup>1</sup> 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 33.1 n.

49.2 pro magnitudine delicti poenam statui par fuisse: according to Mommsen,<sup>2</sup> delictum (denoting an offence, whether public or private) came into use in jurisprudence only at a late date (in the late jurists it far outnumbers scelus). 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 Germ. 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 relegantur aut capite puniuntur. Mod. 893.19 miles pro modo delicti castigatur; Mod. 316.35 praesides secundum delictum admissum libertis 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.

Notes

1. Histories: narrative: II.86.2, III.31.2, IV.68.2; speeches: I.37.2, I.38.2, II.46.2, II.76.5, IV.24.2.  
Annals: narrative: 2.58.2, 4.68.4; speeches: 1.22.1, 2.63.1, 2.70.1, 3.34.6, 4.8.5, 4.34.2, 6.22.2, 16.31.1, 16.31.2.
2. Römisches Strafrecht (Leipzig, 1899), 11.

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, commilitiones, ex quo (Ogilvie and Richmond ad loc.); I.29.2 sextus dies agitur, commilitiones, ex quo.

53.2 medio temporis: Seneca never uses medius as a substantive with a dependent genitive. For numerous Tacitean examples of the construction, see Lex. Tac. 818a.

53.3 pro ingentibus meritis. Some Ciceronian epithets of meritum are magnum, maximum, praecipuum, praestantissimum, summum, singulare, egregium, amplissimum, and praeclarum. Seneca has ingens meritum once

(benef. 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 Annals (see on velut, 37.1 n.). Elsewhere ut sic dixerim is found only in the minor works (4 times: Lex. Tac. 286b-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 quibus claritudo venit: Seneca does not use the archaism 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 Neroni amor eorum venisset. The usage has been repeated unconsciously.

There are other repetitions in this section of book 14: e.g. 54.2 levissimis quoque curis impar; cf. 55.4 haudquaquam artibus tuis pares; 55.3 versata est; cf. 56.2 versabitur (only once elsewhere in the Annals); 51.3 validior Tigellinus; cf. 57.1 validiorque ... Tigellinus; 55.3 iuventa; cf. ib. iuventam; 57.3 ingere; cf. 58.1 ingebant; 59.3 graven; cf. 59.4 gravioribus; 57.4 interficitur; cf. 58.2 interficerentur; 61.1 venerantur; cf. ib. venerantium.

53.5 innumeram pecuniam: Tacitus largely avoids the usual epithets expressing magnitude which are found with pecunia (magna, ingens,<sup>1</sup> infinita,<sup>2</sup> grandis<sup>3</sup>). 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

53.5 intra me ipse volvam: the phrase intra me volvo is found in prose before Tacitus only at Curt. 10.8.9. It may have been historiographical.

53.5 proceribus civitatis: proceres had been a word of high style since the time of Plautus.<sup>6</sup> It is common in Tacitus, but is not typical of the style of Seneca (found only at dial. 7.3.2, epist. 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: 1 praef. 18 illis enim temporibus, ut ante iam diximus, proceres civitatis in agris morabantur.

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.<sup>7</sup> 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 raptu primores Argivorum/coeperat ad sese Troia ciere viros), and is then used only by poets and archaisers.

No doubt Tacitus departed from his usual practice here for variety.

53.5 ubi est animus ille modicis contentus?: an appropriate sentiment

in the mouth of Seneca. The phraseology can be paralleled from Seneca's own works: nat. 1 prol. 11 sursum ingentia spatia sunt, in quorum possessionem animus admittitur, et ita, si secum minimum ex corpore tulit, si sordidum omne deterisit et expeditus levisque ac contentus medico emicuit (note that animus is subject, as in the present passage). Medico(-is) contentus may have been a common stoic catchery.

Extended personifications of this kind (animus is subject of  $\bar{s}$  expressed and  $\bar{l}$  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.
6. Löfstedt, Synt. II, 298.
7. See Packard for references. On the adjectival use of primor, see Madvig on fin. 3.52.

54.1 et tu ... accipere: antithesis with parallelism of construction, in a speech (14.3 n.).

54.1 ut omnia mortalia: omnia for cuncta, 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 (1v.8.4, IV.64.3, IV.74.2, 15.21.1), and the other follows final ut: 16.16.2 detur hoc inlustrum virorum posteritati, ut, quo modo exsequiis a promiscua sepultura separantur, ita ... So 2 of the 4 instances of quo modo ... sic in the historical works are in speeches (4.35.2, 4.70.2), and another follows ut (11.6.2).

54.2 in hoc itinere vitae: a metaphor undoubtedly taken from Seneca: see Syme 335 and 20.4 n., above.

54.3 traditis eorum fulgore praestringor: also perhaps deliberately Senecan: Syme, l.c.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY(1) EDITIONS OF TACITUS

The following list comprises editions which I have found most useful. For a fuller list see E. Koestermann, vol. 1<sup>5</sup> (cited below, s.v. Halm), pp. XXXff. Quotations of Tacitus have been made from the most recent Teubner text (that of Koestermann: see below, l.c.).

Abbreviations used in the dissertation are shown in the final brackets.

- Anderson, J.G.C.      Corneli Taciti de origine et situ Germanorum,  
Oxford 1938.
- Draeger, A.            Die Annalen des Tacitus, Leipzig 1868. Revised by  
F. Becher (books 3-6, ed. 6, 11-16, ed. 4) and  
W. Heraeus (books 1-2, ed. 7-8), Leipzig - Berlin  
1917ff., 1933 (Draeger).
- Drexler, H.            Ab excessu divi Augusti, Heidelberg, books 1-2 1955,  
3-6 1956, 11-16 1957.
- Fisher, C.D.           Cornelii Taciti annalium ab excessu divi Augusti libri,  
Oxford 1906 (Fisher).
- Cornelii Taciti historiarum libri, Oxford 1910.
- Fuchs, H.              P. Cornelius Tacitus, annalium ab excessu divi  
Augusti quae supersunt, Frauenfeld, I 1946, II 1949.
- Furneaux, H.          Cornelii Taciti annalium ab excessu divi Augusti libri.  
The Annals of Tacitus, Oxford, vol. 1, ed. 2 1896,

- vol. 2, ed. 2 1916; revised by H.F. Pelham and C.D. Fisher (Furneaux).
- Furneaux, H. and Anderson, J.G.C. Cornelii Taciti de vita Agricolae<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1922.
- Cornelii Taciti opera minora<sup>3</sup>, Oxford 1939.
- Gudeman, A. P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de oratoribus, mit Prolegomena, Text und Adnotatio critica<sup>2</sup>, Leipzig - Berlin 1914 (Gudeman).
- Halm, C. P. Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt, Leipzig, ed. 1 1850, ed. 2 1857, ed. 3 1874, ed. 4 1884; ed. 5 by G. Andresen, Leipzig, 1913ff.; further editions by E. Koestermann (2 vols.), Leipzig, 1934-6, 1949-52, 1957-59, 1960-62, 1964-.
- Heraeus, K. Cornelii Taciti historiarum libri qui supersunt, Schulausgabe, Leipzig - Berlin, ed. 3 1887; revised by W. Heraeus, Leipzig, 1904ff.; vol. 1, ed. 6 1929, vol. 2, ed. 4 1927 (Heraeus).
- Heubner, H. P. Cornelius Tacitus, Die Historien, Kommentar, Heidelberg, vol. 1 1963, vol. 2 1968 (Heubner).
- Koestermann, E. Cornelius Tacitus, Annalen, erläutert und mit einer Einleitung, Heidelberg, vol. 1 1963, vol. 2 1965, vol. 3 1967, vol. 4 1968.
- Lenchantin de Gubernatis, M. Cornelii Taciti ab excessu divi Augusti sive annalium libri, books 1-6, Rome 1940.

- Nipperdey, K. Cornelius Tacitus, ab excessu divi Augusti, Leipzig 1852; ed. 5 revised by G. Andresen, Berlin 1892; vol. 1, ed. 11, 1915, vol. 2, ed. 6, 1908 (Nipp.-Andr.).
- Ogilvie, R.M., and Richmond, I.A. Cornelii Taciti de vita Agricolae, Oxford 1967 (Ogilvie and Richmond).
- Walther, G.H. C. Cornelii Taciti opera, 4 vols., Halis 1851-33.

(2) OTHER WORKS

- Andresen, G. 'Tacitus in Livius', Woch. für cl. Phil. 1916, 210ff., 401ff., 688ff., 758ff.
- Axelsson, B. Unpoetische Wörter, ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache, Lund 1945 (Axelsson, Unpoet. Wört.).
- Boeticher, G. Lexicon Taciteum, Berlin 1830
- Brekken, C. 'Tacitea', Mnem. 53 (1925), 177ff.
- Bruns, G.G. Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui<sup>7</sup>, Tübingen 1909, revised by O. Gradenwitz (Bruns).
- Cooper, F.T. Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius, New York 1895.
- Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Berlin 1863-(CIL).
- Degel, F. Archaistische Bestandteile der Sprache des Tacitus, Erlangen 1907 (Degel).
- Dorey, T.A. (ed.) Tacitus, London 1969.

- Draeger, A. "Über Syntax und Stil des Tacitus"<sup>3</sup>, Leipzig 1882  
(Draeger, Synt.).
- Eisenhardt, K. "Über die Reden in den Historien und Annalen des Tacitus", Ludwigshafen 1911.
- Enghofer, R. Der Ablativus Absolutus bei Tacitus, Würzburg 1961.
- Eriksson, N. Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus, Lund 1934  
(Eriksson).
- Ernout, A. 'Les enclitiques -que et -ve', Rev. Phil. 32 (1958),  
189ff.
- Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots<sup>4</sup>, 2 vols., Paris 1959-60 (E.-M.).
- Fischer, E. "Über den pluralistischen Gebrauch der Substantiva bei Tacitus", Jena 1933.
- Fletcher, G.B.A. 'Assonances or Plays on Words in Tacitus', CR 54  
(1940), 184ff.  
— Annotations on Tacitus, Collection Latomus, vol. LXXI,  
Brussels - Berchem 1964.
- Gerber, A. and Greef, A. Lexicon Taciteum, Leipzig 1877-1900 (Lex. Tac.).
- Goodyear, F.R.D. 'Development of Language and Style in the Annals of Tacitus', JRS 58 (1968), 22ff.
- Greef, A. De praepositionum usu apud Tacitum I, Göttingen 1869.
- Hartman, J.J. Analecta Tacitea, Lugd. Bat. 1905.

- Henriksen, H. 'Remarques sur l'emploi de l'ablatif et du génitif de qualité chez Tacite', Symb. Osl. 10 (1932), 99ff.
- Hensell, F.C. De praepositionis 'per' usu Taciteo, Marburg 1876.
- Heraeus, W. 'Tacitus und Sallust', ALL 14 (1905), 273ff.
- Hesele, H. Necare, Wien 1949.
- Heubner, H. 'Sprache, Stil und Sache bei Tacitus', Gymn., Beiheft 4 (1964), 133ff.
- Hofmann, J.B. and Szantyr, A. Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, Munich 1965 (No.-Sz.).
- Ingvarsson, K.E. 'Ingens dans la poésie et chez Tacite', Eranos 48 (1950), 66ff.
- Jax, K. 'In componendis synonymis quae ratio adhibita sit in Taciti Germania et Agricola', Studi in Onore di U.E. Paoli, Firenze 1955, 423ff.
- Kienzle, L. Die Kopulativpartikeln et que atque bei Tacitus Plinius Seneca, Tübingen 1906.
- Klein, C. De verbis separandi apud Tacitum, Halis 1878.
- Klingner, F. 'Beobachtungen über Sprache und Stil des Tacitus, am Anfang des 13. Annalenbuches', Hermes 83 (1955), 187ff.
- Kohl, A. Der Satznachtrag bei Tacitus, Würzburg 1960.
- Krebs, J.P. and Schmalz, J.H. Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache<sup>7</sup>, 2 vols., Basel 1905 (Krebs-Schmalz).
- Kroll, W. 'Die Sprache des Sallust', Gl. 15 (1927), 280ff.

- Kučera, E. Über die taciteische Inconcinnität, Olmütz 1882.
- Kühnast, L. Die Hauptpunkte der livianischen Syntax, Berlin 1872.
- Kühner, R. and Stegmann, C. Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre, 2 vols., ed. 3 revised by A. Thierfelder, Darmstadt 1955 (Kü.-St.).
- Kuntz, F. Die Sprache des Tacitus und die Tradition der lateinischen Historikersprache, Heidelberg 1962 (Kuntz).
- Kunze, A. Sallustiana, Leipzig 1892-98.
- Landgraf, G. 'De figuris etymologicis linguae latinae', Act. Sen. Phil. Erlang. II (1881), 1ff.
- Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino<sup>2</sup>, Leipzig - Berlin 1914 (Landgraf, S. Rosc.).
- Laughton, E. The Participle in Cicero, Oxford 1964.
- Laurand, L. Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron, Paris 1936-8.
- Lebreton, J. Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron, Paris 1901.
- Leeman, A.D. Orationis Ratio, 2 vols., Amsterdam 1963.
- Lindholm, E. Stilistische Studien zur Erweiterung der Satzglieder im Lateinischen, Lund 1931.
- Löfstedt, E. Philologische Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae, Uppsala 1911 (Löfstedt, Peregrinatio).
- Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins, Lund, vol.1, ed. 2, 1956; vol. 2,

- 1933 (Löfstedt, Synt.).
- 'On the Style of Tacitus', JRS 38 (1948), 1ff.
- Coniectanea: Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Antiken und Mittelalterlichen Latinität, Uppsala Stockholm 1950.
- Roman Literary Portraits, Oxford 1958.
- Late Latin, Oslo 1959.
- Malcovati, H. (ed.). Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta<sup>2</sup>, Turin 1955 (Malcovati).
- Marouzeau, J. L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine, 3 vols., Paris 1922-49.
- 'Mots longs et mots courts', Rev. Phil. 48 (1924), 31ff.
- Traité de stylistique latine<sup>4</sup>, Paris 1962 (Marouzeau, Stylistique).
- Martin, R.H. '-ere and -erunt in Tacitus', CR 60 (1946), 17ff.
- 'Variatio and the Development of Tacitus' Style', Eranos 51 (1953), 89ff.
- 'The Speech of Curtius Montanus: Tacitus, Historiae IV, 42', JRS 57 (1967), 109ff.
- 'Quibus and Quis in Tacitus', CR N.S. 18 (1968), 144ff.
- Mebs, O. Über den Gebrauch der Anaphora bei Tacitus, Erlangen 1918.
- Mendell, C.W. Sentence Connection in Tacitus, New Haven 1911.

- Merten, G. De particularum copulativarum apud veteres Romanorum scriptores usu, Marburg 1893.
- Miller, N.P. 'Virgil and Tacitus', Proc. of the Virgil Society 1 (1961-62), 25ff.
- Molager, J. 'Un procédé de style propre à Tacite', Orpheus 11 (1964), 25ff.
- Moore, F.G. 'Studies in Tacitean Ellipsis: Descriptive Passages', TAPA 34 (1903), 5ff.
- Müller, C.F.W. Syntax des Nominativus und Akkusativus im Lateinische  
Leipzig - Berlin 1908.
- Müller, J. Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des C. Tacitus,  
Innsbruck 1865-75.
- Neue, F. and Wagener, C. Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache<sup>3</sup>, 4 vols.,  
Leipzig - Berlin 1892-1904 (Neue-Wagener).
- Norden, E. Die antike Kunstprosa<sup>2</sup>, 2 vols., Leipzig 1909.  
(Norden, Ant. Kunstpr.).
- P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI<sup>3</sup>, Berlin 1926  
(Norden Aen. VI.).
- Nutting, H.C. 'The Use of foren in Tacitus', Univ. of Cal. Publ.  
in Class. Philol. 7 (1923), 209ff.
- Odgers, M.M. Latin Parens, Its Meanings and Uses, Philadelphia  
1928 (Language Dissertations Published by the  
Linguistic Society of America).

- Ogilvie, R.M. A Commentary on Livy, Oxford 1965 (Ogilvie, Livy).
- Onnerfors, A. Pliniana: in Plinii Maioris Naturalium Historiam studia grammatica semantica critica, Uppsala 1956.
- Otto, A. Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer, Leipzig 1890 (Otto, Sprichwörter).
- Oxford Latin Dictionary, Oxford 1968- (OLD).
- Faucker, C. Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte, Berlin 1884.
- Perret, J. 'La formation du style de Tacite', REA 56 (1954), 90ff.
- Ferrochat, P. 'L'évolution d'un procédé de style chez Tacite', REL 14 (1936), 43ff.
- Peter, H. (ed.) Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae, Leipzig, vol. 1 ed. 2, 1914, vol. 2 ed. 1, 1906 (HRR).
- Petzke, P. Dicendi genus Tacitinum quatenus differat a Liviano, Königsberg 1888.
- Renz, W. Alliterationen bei Tacitus, Aschaffenburg 1905.
- Schanz, M. and Hosius, G. Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaiser Justinian II<sup>4</sup>, Munich 1935 (Schanz-Hosius).
- Schleckser, G.F. Der Gebrauch der Simplicia und Composita nach Tacitus, Rostock 1920.
- Schnaus, H. Tacitus ein Nachahmer Vergils, Bamberg 1887.

- Schmidt, J.H.H. Handbuch der lateinischen und griechischen Synonymik, Leipzig 1889.
- Seitz, K. Studien zur Stilentwicklung und Satzstruktur innerhalb der Annalen des Tacitus, Marburg 1958.
- Sirker, C. Taciteische Formenlehre, Berlin 1871.
- Skard, E. Ennius und Sallustius, eine sprachliche Untersuchung, Oslo 1933.
- Sörbon, G. Variatio sermonis Tacitei aliaecum apud eundem quaestiones selectae, Uppsala 1935.
- Spitta, P. De Taciti in componendis enuntiatis ratione, Göttingen 1866.
- Steele, R.B. 'Affirmative Final Clauses in the Latin Historians', AJP 19 (1898), 255ff.
- Stuhl, C. Quibus condicionibus Tacitus ellipsim verbi admiserit et qua ratione excoluerit, Würzburg 1900.
- Syme, R. Tacitus, 2 vols., Oxford 1958 (Syme).  
Ten Studies in Tacitus, Oxford 1970 (Syme, Ten Studies).
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Leipzig 1900- (TLL).
- Tringdal, C.O. Ändelsen -is ackus, plur. hos de efteraugusteiska författarne, Goteborg 1916.
- Tränkle, H. 'Beobachtungen und Erwägungen zum Wandel der livianischen Sprache', Wien. Stud. 81 (1968), 103ff.
- Voss, B. Der Pointierte Stil des Tacite, Münster 1963.

- de Waele, E. 'Quo animo Tacitus 'sive' particula usus sit',  
Mnem. 58 (1930), 309ff.
- Walde, A. and Hofmann, J.B. Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch<sup>3</sup>,  
Heidelberg, vol. 1 1938, vol. 2 1954.
- Werber, A. Der Satzschlussrhythmus des Tacitus, Tübingen 1962.
- Wetzell, C. De usu verbi substantivi Tacitino, Leipzig - Casselli  
1876.
- Winand, B. Vocabulorum latinorum quae ad mortem spectant  
historia, Marburg 1906.
- Wölfflin, E. 'Ein verkannter gräcismus bei Tacitus', Philol. 24  
(1866), 115ff.
- 'Jahresberichte Tacitus', Philol. 25 (1867), 92ff.;  
26 (1867), 92ff.; 27 (1868), 113ff.
- 'Necare', ALL 7 (1892), 278.
- Wolff, E. Die Sprache des Tacitus, Frankfurt 1879.
- Zernial, U. Selecta quaedam capita ex genitivi usu Taciteo,  
Göttingen 1864.

ABSTRACT

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, poeticisms, 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. Wölfflin found much convincing evidence for stylistic development from Histories to Annals. Löfstedt and

Eriksson attempted to show that after moving towards greater artificiality of expression in the first six books of the Annals, 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 Löfstedt 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 Annals 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.