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INTRODUCTION

What does it mean to be a moralistic historian? In an important essay on "The Uniqueness of Latin Literature" in *Arion* 6 (1967), 185 ff. Brooks Otis examines the principal Roman authors and discovers in them all a subjective viewpoint, an assumption that history is personal to them and that the categories of personality can be applied to historical events:

The Latin letter writer, poet, or historian is introspective, introverted, concerned with motive and attitude, with the state of his soul. By empathy he extends his introspection to other individuals and to his society—the Roman persona. This is why he gives us what at least closely approaches character development and a sense of history conceived as personal fate or destiny. (p. 202)

The issues raised by Otis' article are complex. The connection of moral and political concepts runs constant and deep through Roman thought; indeed, Roman political vocabulary—amicitia, fides, pietas, virtus, etc.—is moral in conception and application. This introduction can do no more than sketch one manifestation of this connection.¹

Tacitus is a moralistic historian; that is, he
presents the history of the Principate in moral terms and reveals that the same forces which govern individual human beings and turn them to good or evil work also to shape the history of their time and place. In its simplest form this linking of historical events and human personality finds expression in the attribution of an exemplary purpose to historiography: "praecipuum munus annalium reor, ne virtutes sileantur utque pravis dictis factisque ex posteritate et infamia metus sit" (3.65).2

A more complex application of the moralistic principle to history leads to the idea that events and institutions, as readily as men, can be the actors in history. In the stately and accurate review of Roman history at 1.1, abstract forces, not men, seem to have made Rome's past. This first chapter contains only one name in the nominative, that of the Republic's founder L. Brutus. The history of the Republic consists of dictatorships, decemviral power, consular authority, domination replacing domination, potency yielding to potency, arms to arms, until Augustus at last takes all things (cuncta) under his imperium while using the name of princeps. A certain contrast between the fact of imperium and the name of princeps, which was hallowed in Republican tradition, is implicit in the first mention of the first Emperor.

This contrast between name and fact, between appearance and reality, forms the broad context of this dissertation. Its existence hardly requires proof, for scholars have recognized and studied the difference
between appearance and reality in Tacitus' works under a variety of names. Some have distinguished factual from non-factual material, some have concentrated on the influence of stereotyped characters, rhetoric, or the dramatic and graphic arts upon Tacitus' distortion of fact, some have analyzed one figure—usually Tiberius—and shown what means Tacitus uses to convey that figure's dissimulation or deceit.\(^3\) Not even the phrase "difference between appearance and reality" is new.\(^4\) In this dissertation I hope only to show in some detail how four related words, species, imago, effigies, and simulacrum, convey the contrast between appearance and reality in the Annales. This introduction, then, will limit and define some important terms that will be used in the study of those four words. In addition, I shall suggest a way in which the relationship between history and personality which is characteristic of Roman historiography may be applied to Tacitus' concept of the Principate. This application may be useful in understanding the conflict of appearance and reality in the Annales, and further indications of its validity will emerge in the course of the discussion of species and imago.

The history of the Republic as outlined in 1.1 finds a parallel in the early years of the Empire, but what had been acted on the broad stage of old Rome has now shrunk within the closer confines of palace intrigue and the politics of succession.\(^5\) Chapter 3 sets forth the catalogue of potential heirs to Augustus. Again one
name in the nominative, that of the founder Augustus, heads the paragraph; all others are relegated to oblique cases or in one instance ("ut Agrippa vita concessit") to a subordinate clause, until at the end one man emerges: "Drusoque pridem extineto, Nero solus e privignis erat, illuc cuncta vergere." The similarity to "interfecto Antonio ne Iulianis quidem partibus nisi Caesar dux reliquus" (1.2) extends to many points besides the bare sentiment: the preceding ablative absolute, the following catalogue of offices and powers, the use of an unexpected, though technically correct, name ('Caesar' for 'Augustus', 'Nero' for 'Tiberius'). "Illuc cuncta vergere" recalls at once the pattern of Republican history, in which forces acted on men, and the final consolidation by Augustus; "cuncta ... accept." Later (4.33) Tacitus sets forth in more direct terms the contrast between the days of the Republic, full of scope and material for the historian, and the dreary, petty savageries of court and Senate under the Empire. The contrast is implicit in the structure of the first three chapters of Book 1, and when we read at the end of chapter 3 the motive for the one war remaining, we scarcely need to be told that the contrast in "abolendae magis infamiae ob amissum cum Quintilio Varo exercitum quam cupidine proferendi imperii aut dignum ob praemium" is between a war of Empire, conducted for appearance's sake, and the campaigns that won the world for the imperium of the Roman Republic. Just as the contrast between Republic and Empire
is fundamental to Tacitus' introductory remarks, so too is the conflict between appearance and reality. Tacitus' first mention of Augustus emphasizes the contrast between the name of princeps and the fact of imperium, and when at the close of chapter 3 Tacitus sums up the state of the commonwealth in A.D. 4, after the adoption of Tiberius, the contrast between the name of Republic and the fact of Empire again attracts his attention: "domi res tranquillae, eadem magistratum vocabula; iuniores post Actiacam victoriam, etiam senes inter bella civium nati: quisque reliquus, qui rem publicam vidisset?" Although the conflict between appearance and reality has attracted the attention of numerous scholars (above, n. 3), no one, to my knowledge, has observed that the moralistic idea of history may furnish a means of discovering in Tacitus' presentation of the Julio-Claudian Principate, and especially the reign of Tiberius, not a series of distortions of historical truth--whatever that may be--or an exercise in the assassination of Imperial characters, but a serious attempt to understand an institution, the Principate, in terms of a conceptual framework that lay ready to hand: the ancients' idea of personality. 6

Ancient biographers and historians conceived of personality as, on the whole, a static thing. A person's essential character might be concealed by craft, circumstance, or the influence of others, but it remained unchanged throughout his life. Hence a person whose character was revealed as bad at the end of his life was
likely to have had a bad character at the beginning. This model of the evil person whose true nature is gradually revealed applies, of course, to Tiberius, as Tacitus makes explicit in his summation of that Emperor:

morum quoque tempora illi diversa: egregium vita famaque, quoad privatus vel in imperiis sub Augusto fuit; occultum ac subdolum fingendis virtutibus, donec Germanicus ac Drusus superfuere; idem inter bona malaque mixtus incolumi matre; instabilis saevitia, sed obtectis libidinibus, dum Seianum dilexit timuitve; postremo in scelera simul ac dedecora prorupit, postquam remoto pudore et metu suo tantum ingenio utebatur. (6.51)

The same model, Tacitus perceived, might be applied to the Principate. That institution, which could be treated as a separate period of Roman history, a new manifestation of the Roman character like the kingship, Republic, or age of the dynasts, had by the time of Nero been revealed as evil, blatant despotism; such, therefore, must it have been at the beginning. Manifestations of liberty or indications that Republican institutions retained anything of their original force under the early Emperors must thus have been, in Tacitus' eyes, sham and fraud, just as all Tiberius' protestations of libertarian sentiments or unwillingness to rule had to be attributed to his dissimulatio. The fascination that Tiberius holds for Tacitus stems from more than the length of Tiberius' tenure of power or some affinity which the historian felt for the Emperor; Tiberius and the Principate were linked by their common character. Tacitus believed that to portray Tiberius as he must have been, given his
ultimate behavior, would be to reveal the essential nature of the Principate.

The connection between princeps and Principate was encouraged by the actual form of the state, for even under Augustus men had begun to look upon the Emperor as the government: "Igitur verso civitatis statu nihil usquam prisci et integri moris: omnes exuta aequalitate iussa principis aspectare, nulla in praesens formidine, dum Augustus aetate validus seque et domum et pacem sustentavit" (l.4). The altered condition of society compelled the historian to see beyond the patterns and terminology of Republican historiography and to look instead to the princeps. Tacitus knew that to explain events from Augustus to Nero with the traditional elements of annalistic history, magistrates, affairs at home and wars abroad, would be to obscure the true nature of government under the Principate. By choosing, moreover, to keep the annalistic framework, Tacitus made the structure of his work reflect and support its basic meaning; he chose to narrate the history of Empire within the conventions of Republican historiography. Yet the consuls with which he introduces each year are, we are told near the beginning, mere names ("eadem magistratuum vocabula"), and the only war left is not like the wars which graced the Republican annalists' rolls. A conflict between Republic and Empire, appearance and reality, is basic to the structure as well as to the expression of the Annales.
This brief analysis of Tacitus' conception of the history of the Principate raises two questions: first, if Tacitus believed that the Principate which was finally revealed as evil must have been evil at its beginning, where are we, in making this investigation, to place the revelation of despotism; with Nero, or with Domitian? Second, how could Tacitus, writing under Nerva, Trajan, and probably Hadrian, have thought of the Principate as ended? The first question must be answered on artistic grounds. Since the Annales were the last of Tacitus' works to be written, any discussion of their development must be confined to their limits. Tacitus' political career under the Flavians (I.1) and in particular his experience in the Senate during the later years of Domitian's reign (Agr. 45) certainly affected his idea of the Principate and prompted him to write the Agricola and Historiae. But the search for explanation and understanding took him back beyond his own lifetime to the Julio-Claudian dynasty, and would have taken him further still, for he proposes (3.24) to treat the times of Augustus at greater length than the "pauca de Augusto et extrema" promised in 1.1. The chronological order of events from Augustus to Domitian should not lead us to see the Historiae as in any sense a continuation of the Annales. The Julio-Claudian period, moreover, was itself well-defined, a time when the Principate had been the inheritance of a single family: "sub Tiberio et Gaio et Claudio unius familiae quasi hereditas
fuimus" (1.16), and the sixty-four years from Tiberius to Nero thus furnished a convenient scope for the historian interested in exploring the personality of Imperial government. When, therefore, I have said that Tacitus thought that the true nature of the Principate was "finally revealed," that phrase and others like it must be understood to refer to the end of the \textit{Annales}, and of Nero and the Julio-Claudian house.

The second question depends for its answer on an evaluation of the attitudes of those who lived under Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian toward their past and present governments. Tacitus himself best expresses the sense of relief and renewal which men felt after the death of Domitian:

\begin{quote}
\textit{quid, si per quindecim annos, grande mortalis aevi spatium, multi fortuitis casibus, promptissimus quisque saevitia principalis interciderunt? pauci et, ut ita dixerim, non modo aliorum sed etiam nostri superstites sumus, exemptis e media vita tot annis, quibus iuvenes ad senectutem, senes prope ad ipsos exactae aetatis terminos per silentium venimus. non tamen pigebit vel inundita ac rudi voce memoriam prioris servitutis ac testimonium praeantum bonorum composita. (Agr. 3)}
\end{quote}

On a less exalted level, Pliny (\textit{Ep.} 9.13.2) reports that the death of Domitian brought him new opportunities: "Occiso Domitiano statui mecum ac deliberavi, esse magnum pulchramque materiam insectandi necentes, miseris vindicandi, se proferendi." Earlier in \textit{Agr.} 3 Tacitus affirms that the regime of Nerva and Trajan promised a new beginning of freedom: "Nunc demum redit animus:
et quamquam primo statim beatissimi saeculi ortu Nerva Caesar res olim dissociabiles miscuerit, principatum ac libertatem, augeatque cotidie felicitatem temporum Nerva Trajanus." Suetonius chose to terminate his biographies of the Caesars with the life of Domitian, and Juvenal, although he satirizes the figures and mores of the Domitianic era, opens Satire 7 with praise of a Caesar, probably Hadrian, who will inaugurate a new and happier season for literature: "Et spes et ratio studiorum in Caesare tantum; solus enim tristes hac tempestate Camenas / respexit." These examples, and others which could be added, indicate that Tacitus and his contemporaries saw the year 98 as a definite break in the history of the Principate, and that they thought of the new regime of Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian as qualitatively different from its Julio-Claudian and Flavian predecessors. The placing of Julius Caesar's image on Trajan's 'restoration' aurei of 107 is evidence that the government shared, if indeed it did not encourage, the prevailing view that the Principate on the Augustan pattern was a thing of the past.

Since I shall have occasion to speak frequently of the conflict in the Annales between appearance and reality, or between Republic and Empire, the reader may find it helpful to know how I define these phrases, and what I conceive to be the relation between them. The conflict of appearance and reality appears whenever some word, deed, or thing seems otherwise than it is.
This conflict takes several forms; on a personal level, it may be manifest in dissimulation or in the contrast between a person's professed morals and his habits, or even in the contrast between his physical appearance and his inner nature. In broader terms the conflict between appearance and reality may be manifest in the difference between seeming liberty and real despotism, between the original intent of a law and its present execution, between the pleasant appearance of an exchange between Emperor and Minister and its actual purpose. In reading Tacitus we enter a world where few things are as they seem; the conflict between appearance and reality pervades the Annales, and other forms of it could be found. The conflict between Republic and Empire is part and origin of the conflict between appearance and reality, for Tacitus' conception of the Principate, as I have indicated, was founded on the idea that the early Principate concealed the vice of tyranny under a veneer of Republican liberty, until in the end the true nature of the despotic system was revealed. Hence a conflict between the appearance of a Republic and the reality of Imperial government is fundamental to Tacitus' narrative of the political events of the early Julio-Claudian Principate. The conflicts between appearance and reality and between Republic and Empire coincide especially in Tiberius, whose private dissimulatio personalized the public contradictions of the Principate, just as the institution of the Principate concentrated what had
been power vested in many into the hands of one; "illuc cuncta vergere."

Discovery and analysis of the conflict between Republic and Empire, however, demands some knowledge of what chronological limits Tacitus placed on the terms of that contrast.\textsuperscript{13} Part, at least, of what he meant by Empire is clear enough; by choosing to begin the *Annales* with Augustus' death and the accession of Tiberius, Tacitus emphasized the transmission of power in the moments when it became clear that the Principate was an establishment, not merely a collection of extraordinary powers delegated to Augustus for his lifetime. From the beginning Tacitus affirms that the Republic is past and the debate on the succession a sham:

\begin{quote}

nam Tiberius cuncta per consules incipiebat, tamquam vetere re. publica et ambiguus imperandi: ne edictum quidem, quo patres in curiam vocabat, nisi tribuniciae potestatis praescriptione posuit sub Augusto acceptae. . . . sed defuncto Augusto signum praetorii cohortibus ut imperator dederat; excubiae arma, cetera aulae; miles in forum, miles in curiam comitabatur. litteras ad exercitus tamquam adepto principatu misit, nusquam cunctabundus nisi cum in senatu loqueretur. (1.7)
\end{quote}

Likewise Tacitus asserts his admiration for the old Roman people in terms which leave no doubt that he refers to the period of Rome's expansion and the struggles of the orders:

\begin{quote}

sed nemo annales nostros cum scriptura eorum contenderit, qui veteres populi Romani res composuere. ingentia illi bella, expugnationes urbium, fusos captosque reges aut, si quando
\end{quote}
Continuing the same topic, Tacitus later seems to think the Punic Wars a suitable theme for those who wish to treat of the ancient Roman people: "tum quod antiquis scriptoribus rarus obtrectator, neque refert cuiusquam Punicas Romanasve acies lastius extuleris" (4.33).

But between the venerable, ancient, and virtuous Republic and the fully developed Empire intervenes a gray area the limits of which are roughly those of the first century B.C. In considering Tacitus' development of the thematic contrast between Republic and Empire, what value should we place on his references to this period?

About the events and significance of this period Tacitus has no doubts, for even in the Historiae he traces the evolution of absolutism and the decline of liberty from Sulla to Octavian. Pompey, whose valuation here departs radically from the Augustan standard best seen in Verg. Aen. 6.826 ff., which made Julius Caesar the cause of the Republic's end, marks the turning point; after his career the only question was who should hold the first place in the state:

mox e plebe infima C. Marius et nobilium saevissimus Lucius Sulla victam armis libertatem in dominationem verterunt. post quos Cn. Pompeius occultor, non melior, et numquam postea nisi de principatu quasitum. (II.38)

In the Annales Tacitus presents the same picture of
the decline begun by Sulla, ultimate anarchy initiated by Pompey, and absolutism consolidated by Augustus:

corrupti spe aut inlusi per intercessionem socii, ac ne bello quidem Italico, mox civili omnium, quin multa et diversa sciscerentur, donec L. Sulla dictator abolitis vel conversis prioribus, cum plura addisset, otium eius rei haud in longum paravit, statim turbidas Lepidi rogationibus, neque multo post tribunis reddita licentia quoquo vellent populum agitandi. . . .

Tum Cn. Pompeius, tertium consul corrigeundi moribus delectus et gravior remediis quam delicta erant, suarumque legum auctor idem ac subversor, quae armis tuebatur, armis amisit. exin continua per viginti annos discordia, non mos, non ius; deterrima quaeque impune ac multa honesta exitio fuere. sexto demum consulatu Caesar Augustus, potentiae securus, quae triumviratu iusserat abolevit deditque iura, quis pace et princepe uteremur. acriora ex eo vincula . . . (3.27-28)

But events may not be as important to the moralistic historian as people, and although one must use caution in saying that a reference in Tacitus' works to an event which happened after Sulla's dictatorship and before Actium is a reference to the Republic, it is often possible to say that some person from this period does represent the Republic. A sentimental Republicanism common in Tacitus' day invoked Cato, Brutus, Cassius, and other figures of the anarchic period as exemplars of an ideal Republic. Busts of these figures were revered by eminent senators attached to the Republic by conviction or descent, and even by a knight seeking to imitate senatorial customs. 14

Even under Augustus, moreover, Tacitus can find
traces of the Republic in the fortunes and attitudes of descendants of Republican houses like Valerius Messala Corvinus (below, App. A). Thus there is no definite point at which Republic becomes Empire; as Tacitus says, the creation of Empire by Augustus proceeded step by step through enticement of soldiers and citizenry and gradual consolidation of power: Caesar . . . militem donis, populum annona, cunctos dulcedine otii pellexit, insurgere paulatim, munia senatus magistratuorum legum in se trahere . . ." (1.2). The ellipses in quotation are inevitable, for Tacitus has reflected the gradual advance of despotism by a single sentence extending over sixteen lines of Teubner text and eighteen years, from the battle of Philippi ("Bruto et Cassio caesis") to the appointment of Marcellus as pontiff and aedile in 24 (Dio 53.28,3). An attempt to establish the chronological limits of Empire and Republic in the Annales must, indeed, prove fruitless, for these two polities were more than temporal phases of Roman history; they were ideas which could--and can--be invoked in any time to express the opposition of liberty and despotism. Tacitus can discover faint reflections of the Republic even under Nero (13.28: "Manebat nihil minus quaedam imago rei publicae").

The related conflicts between appearance and reality and between Republic and Empire pervade the Annales and are fundamental to them. A complete presentation of their antecedents and of their development
in Tacitus' work would require more than one volume.\(^{15}\)

I have tried in this introduction to define the nature of these conflicts and to set forth the assumptions and biases which will govern the main part of this dissertation. In what follows I shall concentrate on four words, *species*, *imago*, *effigies*, and *simulacrum*, and show how Tacitus uses them to convey the conflicts between appearance and reality, Republic and Empire.

A further assumption should be stated here, and it can best be given in the words of an English artist very like Tacitus, Lytton Strachey:\(^ {16}\) "The first duty of a great historian is to be an artist. . . . Uninterpreted truth is as useless as buried gold, and art is the great interpreter. . . . Indeed, every history worthy of the name is, in its own way, as personal as poetry."
NOTES


2 The claim, of course, is traditional: Sallust, Cat. 3; Livy, praef. 10; and in Tacitus also I.3 and 14.64.


4 It is used by, e.g., F. R. D. Goodyear, Tacitus,


6 Two scholars have previously hinted at links of a different sort between personality and history, and I am indebted to their insight for suggesting the idea set forth here. F. Klingner, "Tacitus über Augustus und Tiberius," SBAW 1953, Heft 7, p. 39, suggests that the notion that Tiberius was virtuous so long as some external restraint was placed on him (6.51) is a transference to the Emperor's personality of the famous political idea that Rome remained virtuous while metus hostilis hung over her. H. Drexler, Tacitus² (Darmstadt, 1970), attempts to show that the actual conditions of society in Tacitus' Rome are reflected in and can be recovered from Tacitus' account of personalities in the early Principate. Thus his treatment of the "Unterscheid zwischen Schein und Wirklichkeit" (p. 179) proceeds from a point of view which is, as it were, the inverse of mine. For a brief statement of the limits of Drexler's approach, see Momigliano's review of the first edition, JRS 36 (1946), p. 225.

7 E.g., Plutarch's analysis of Philip V (Aratus 49):


9 It is by no means certain that they continued to do so; see E. Paratore, Tacito (Milan, 1951), 625 ff.; Syme, 219 ff. for a balanced discussion.

10 See M. Grant, Roman Imperial Money (London, 1954), 197 ff.

11 Dissimulation: 1-6 passim and esp. 6.50 ff.; professed morals: 16.32; physical appearance: 1.7.

12 Seeming liberty: e.g., 13.24; original intent: 1.72; pleasant exchange: 14.53 ff.

14 For the senators see 4.35 and 16.7; the knight was Titinius Capito (Pliny, Ep. 1.17).

15 They appear at least as early as Thuc. 2.65, ἐγγέγνητο τε λέγεται μὲν δημοκρατία, ἐργάζεται δὲ ἀπό τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς άρχη.

16 Alexander, Univ. of Calif. Publications in Class. Phil. 14 (1952), 363 ff., compares Strachey to Tacitus.
1. Species in Tacitus

The word *species* occurs 126 times in the works of Tacitus, seven times in the *Agricola*, four times in the *Germania*, five times in the *Dialogus*, thirty-nine times in the *Historiae*, and seventy-one times in the *Annales*, thirty-seven of these in the first six books. *Species* usually bears one of two basic meanings in Tacitus as well as in other authors. It may signify the outward appearance, shape, or form of something. *Forma* is the natural synonym for this meaning of *species*, and indeed most authors of Tacitus' time and before avoided the plural and oblique cases of *species* and preferred to use the corresponding forms of *forma*. As an example of this first meaning of *species* we may note Cic. Rep. 3.33.45, "neque nullius deformior species est civitatis quam illa in qua opulentissimi optimi putantur." The second common use of *species* is to signify a false appearance, a semblance, pretext, or pretense. In this sense *species* is often opposed to *res*. We may note Livy 35.31.12, "Et inter dicendi contentionem inconsultius evectus proiect cum quoque species liberam Demetriadem esse, re vera omnia ad nutum Romanorum fieri."

These two basic meanings do not, of course, exhaust the range of *species*. The word may also mean in an
active sense 'seeing, sight, look' (Vitruvius 5.9,3),
in a passive sense 'image, likeness, statue' (Cic. Div.
1.12,24—quoted from de Consulatu Suo 2), 'reputation,
honor' (Cic. Dom. 33,89), 'kind, sort, species' (Varro
Rust. 3.3,3) and in later Latin 'a special case at law'
(Dig. 9.2,5) or 'goods, wares' (Cod. Iust. 1.2,10).

Tacitus uses species in both its basic meanings,
but the two are not evenly distributed throughout his
work. Species meaning appearance, shape, or form occurs
more frequently in the Historiae (twenty times in 237
Teubner pages) than in the Annales (twenty-three times
in 394 Teubner pages). Species meaning false appearance,
semblance, or pretext, on the other hand, occurs more
frequently in the Annales (forty-two times) than in
the Historiae (sixteen times).

If we consider the works of Tacitus as a whole,
species is most commonly used in the ablative to denote
'under the appearance or pretext' (Gerber-Greef D.ε.α.).
This usage appears thirty-eight times in the works of
Tacitus, sixteen times in 1-6, eleven times in 11-16,
nine times in I-V, and twice in the Agricola. Specie
usually governs a genitive, as in 6.24: "obturbabant
quidem patres specie detestandi: sed penetrabat pavor
et admiratio . . . ."

Next most frequent by a long interval comes the
simple use of species to signify the appearance or look
of something (Gerber-Greef A), as at II.99: "longe alia
proficiscentis ex urbe Germanici exercitus species."
Here the physical appearance of the German troops, debilitated by their stay in Rome, is Tacitus' concern. This use of *species* appears nineteen times in all of Tacitus' works, eleven times in the *Historiae*, three times in 1-6, twice in 11-16, twice in the *Agricola*, and once in the *Germania*.

The third most frequent use of *species* in Tacitus, occurring fourteen times, is close to the second in meaning (Gerber-Greef B.1.a.c.), but whereas the second most frequent sense was confined to the actual appearance of some person or object, the third most frequent sense denotes the resemblance of one thing to another or the outer form of some person or object. For example: in the passage, II.99, quoted above, the actual appearance of the German army is described: "non vigor corporibus, non ardor animis; lentum et rarum agmen, fluxa arma, segnes equi." At IV.83, on the other hand, *species* denotes the resemblance of an apparition to human form: "momorant Ptolemaeo regi . . . cum Alexandriae recens conditae moenia templaque et religiones adderet, oblatum per quietem decore eximio et maiore quam humana specie iuvenem"; at *Agr.* 39, "inerat conscientia derisui fuisse nuper falsum e Germania triumphum, emptis per commercia quorum habitus et crines in captivorum speciem formarentur," *species* signifies the outer form of the false captives. This third most frequent use of *species* is commonly used of supernatural apparitions (e.g., I.86; II.50; 11.21; 14.32) or divine images (e.g., *Germ.* 9; V.5)
and appears seven times in the Historiae, four times in 11-16, once in 1-6, and once each in the Agricola and Germania.

Fourth and fifth in point of frequency are per speciem used as a synonym for specie (Gerber-Greef D.ε.β.), which occurs twelve times in Tacitus' works, five times in 1-6, three times in 11-16, and four times in the Historiae; and species used with the same meaning as in the phrase specie detestandi cited above, but in cases other than the ablative. This fifth most frequent usage (Gerber-Greef D.β.) occurs ten times: four times in 11-16 and three times each in 1-6 and the Historiae. The reader will find all the foregoing data and others on the frequency and distribution of species in Tacitus' works set forth in Table I.

Statistics cannot substitute for critical understanding, but they can suggest a point of view from which to examine specific passages. The fact that species in the sense of false appearance or pretext occurs more frequently in the Annales than in the Historiae tends to confirm what my introduction has suggested, that Tacitus saw at the heart of the Principate in its Julio-Claudian origins a conflict between appearance and reality. The statistically observable change in the use of species reflects a change in content and tone between Historiae and Annales. Furthermore, the fact that specie, per speciem, and other cases of species with the meaning of false appearance or pretense (the first, fourth, and fifth most common
uses discussed above) are more common in 1-6, in which they appear 24 times, than in 11-16, in which they appear 18 times, suggests that Tacitus devoted more attention to the conflict between appearance and reality in his account of the reign of Tiberius than in his account of the remaining Julio-Claudian years. So we might expect, for the Empire under Tiberius, as Suetonius tells us (Tib. 30 ff.) did in fact preserve many features of the Republic, and Tacitus would therefore have had to demonstrate that those Republican features were actually the thinly disguised appurtenances of tyranny. The usual tradition, followed by Tacitus (4.1), emphasizes the contrast between the earlier and later years of Tiberius' reign and concentrates Republican features in the earlier years, before the death of Germanicus (Dio 57.13,6) or Livia (Tacitus 5.3). I shall now concentrate on specific passages illustrating the use of species to express the conflict between appearance and reality, and I shall pay particular attention to 1-6.

The discussion of specific passages will have a twofold purpose: to establish the connection of species with the conflict between appearance and reality, and to see if any change in the use of species between the first hexad and the later books reflects Tacitus' different conceptions of the Tiberian and later Julio-Claudian Principates. In order to fulfill the first purpose I shall begin by examining the use of species in Book
Species occurs eight times in Book 1, more than in any other book except the Second, in which it occurs ten times. Four of the occurrences in Book 1 appear in the first ten chapters. By this concentration of species in the carefully worked early chapters of the Annales, Tacitus prepares us for its importance in the rest of the work and for the importance of the themes which his use of species conveys. The word first appears in chapter 3, in connection with the account of Augustus' arrangements for the succession: "nam genitos Agrippa Gaium ac Lucium in familiam Caesarum induxerat, necdum posita puerili praetexta principes iuventutis appellari, destinari consules specie recusantis flagrantissime cupiverat." The reader who is familiar with the Roman historiographical tradition about Augustus may be somewhat surprised to find him using dissimulatio here, for both Suetonius (Aug. 54 ff.) and Dio (56.43) mention his frankness, accessibility, and easy tolerance of criticism. Specie recusantis, however, is but one in a series of references to the conflict between appearance and reality in the first three chapters of the Annales.

These references may be conveniently divided into two kinds: references to a conflict between a name and a fact, and references to veiled motives or secret machinations. In the former category we place the following passages:
(Augustus) cuncta discordiis civilibus fessa nomine principis sub imperium accipit (1.1), and Caesar . . . posito triumviri nomine consulem se ferens et ad tuendam plebem tribunicio iure contentum . . . cunctos dulcedine otii pellexit (1.2).

The first sentence contrasts the name of princeps with the fact of imperium; in the second, on the other hand, the contrast is between the appearance of normalcy implied by Augustus' assumption of civilian offices, the consulate and the sacrosanctity of a Republican tribune, and the fact that his power remained as extraordinary as it had been when he was triumvir. There is a good deal of irony in Tacitus' contentum; note, furthermore, the repetition of cuncta / cunctos and nomine principis / triumviri nomine. The following sentences, in addition to "nam genitos . . . specie recusantis flagrantissime cupiverat," represent the second category of references to the conflict of appearance and reality in 1.1-3; both are from the third chapter:

(L. Caesarem et Gaium) mors fato propera vel novercae Liviae dolus abstulit, and Nero . . . per exercitus ostentatur, non obscuris, ut antea, matris artibus, sed palam hortatu.

The phrase "specie recusantis flagrantissime cupiverat," then, begins a series of three closely spaced references to veiled motives or hidden intrigues surrounding the choice of a successor to Augustus.

Flagrantissime cupiverat, moreover, is strong
language; in fact, the present passage is the only occurrence of the adverb *flagrantissime* in Tacitus' works. Walker (pp. 62-66, p. 159) has remarked the frequency with which Tacitus uses metaphors of fire or burning; it will be enough here to note these parallels for the expression *flagrantissime cupiverat*. At 3.54 Tiberius in a letter to the Senate on the question of reviving sumptuary legislation says, "corruptus simul et corruptor, aeger et flagrans animus haud levioribus remediis restinguendus est quam libidinibus ardscit." At 13.2 after summarizing the positions of Burrus and Seneca in the state Tacitus continues, "certamen utrique unum erat contra ferociam Agrippinae, quae cunctis malae dominationis cupidinibus flagrans habebat in partibus Pallantem, quo auctore Claudius nuptiis incestis et adoptione exitiosa semet perverterat." At 14.51 Tacitus follows his account of Burrus' death with this comment: "civitati grande desiderium eius mansit per memoriam virtutis et successorum alterius segnem innocentiam, alterius flagrantissima flagitia [adulteria]." Finally, at 15.53 Tacitus comments on Pliny's account of the role of Antonia, Claudius' daughter, in the Pisonian conspiracy:

*nobis quoquo modo traditum non occultare in animo fuit, quamvis adsurdum videretur aut inane(m) ad spem Antoniam nomen et periculum commodavisse, aut Pisonem notum amore uxoris alii matrimonio se obstrinxisse, nisi si cupidus dominandi cunctis affectibus flagrantior est.*
If the foregoing passages do nothing else, they make it clear that *flagrantissime cupiverat* is in no way a compliment.

Nor is *specie recusantis*; in fact, the phrase plays an important part in Tacitus' presentation of the reign of Augustus as founded on the contrast between the name and the thing, and of Augustus and his court as shot through with dissimulation and intrigue. This contrast and these practices did not originate with Tiberius; rather, they were for Tacitus the essence of the Principate and must, therefore, appear in Tacitus' presentation of the foundation and founder of the Principate. Another princeps, furthermore, would seem to refuse something while burning with desire for it. The phrase "*specie recusantis flagrantissime cupiverat*" prepares us for Tiberius' seeming refusal of Empire (1.11 ff.) and suggests that *dissimulatio* is an Imperial, and not merely a Tiberian, characteristic.

Three other occurrences of *species* in Book 1, all referring to Augustus, confirm this suggestion. At 1.4 Tacitus reports the rumors that preceded Tiberius' succession: "*ne iis quidem annis, quibus Rhodi specie secessus exulem egerit, aliqvid quam iram et simulationem et secretas libidines meditatum.*" The emphasis lies, of course, on the anger, dissimulation, and secret lusts of Tiberius, but we cannot forget that Augustus kept him a virtual exile even while maintaining the fiction that Tiberius had retired to Rhodes (Suet. Tib. 12).
At 1.72 in an important passage Tacitus discusses the origin and growth of the **maiestas** laws:

non tamen ideo faciebat fidem civilis animi [sc. Tiberius]; nam legem maestatis reduxerat. cui nomen apud veteres idem, sed alia in iudicium veniebant: si quis proditione exercitum aut plebem seditionibus, denique male gesta re publica maiestatem populi Romani minuisset; facta arguebantur, dicta impune erant. primus Augustus cognitionem de famosis libellis specie legis eius tractavit, commotus Cassii Severi libidine, qua viros feminasque inlustres procacibus scriptis diffamaverat; mox Tiberius consultante Pompeio Macro praetore, an iudicia maiestatis reddentur, exercendas esse leges respondit.

Tacitus carefully places the blame on Augustus for extending the scope of the **maiestas** laws to cover words as well as deeds, and he makes it clear that in so extending the law Augustus acted under false pretences: "specie legis eius." Tacitus, furthermore, explicitly contrasts the Republican interpretation of the **lex maestatis** with the Imperial, and the signal difference for him is the divergence of the name and the thing, of appearance and reality, under the Empire: "nomen apud veteres idem, sed alia in iudicium veniebant: . . . facta arguebantur, dicta impune erant." This important passage unites several major themes of the *Annales* and defines the relation of the contrast between Republican appearance and Imperial reality to the **maiestas** trials which are to be so prominent a feature of Tacitus' account of the reign of Tiberius. 22 In a third passage, the
famous adverse evaluation of Augustus by the prudentes, Tacitus again uses species to point up the contrast between appearance and reality at the beginning of the Principate.

sane Cassii et Brutorum exitus paternis inimiciis datos, quamquam fas sit privata odia publicis utilitatis remittere: sed Pompeium imagine pacis, sed Lepidum specie amicitiae deceptos; post Antonium, Tarentino Brudisinoque foedere et nuptiis sororis inlectum, subdolae adfinitatis poenas morte exsolvisse. (1.10)

Critics have generally agreed that the rhetorical force and greater length of the adverse comments in 1.10 guarantee that these, and not the rather feeble apology for Augustus in 1.9, represent Tacitus' own opinion.²³ Once more Tacitus shows us an Augustus remarkably different from the portrait of the first princeps in Suetonius, Dio, and the other authors of the Roman historical tradition. The Tacitean Augustus is crafty and dissimulating, as indeed he must be if Tacitus' vision of the Principate is to remain consistent.

The expression species amicitiae deserves a digression. It occurs ten times in the works of Tacitus; once in the Agricola, once in the Historiae, twice in Annales 11-16, and six times in 1-6. We do not, however, need to rely on statistics to tell us that the theme of false friendship was important to Tacitus in the early books of the Annales. We have his own words for it, in a passage which is itself of the greatest importance for its direct statement of the contrast between Republic
and Empire. In this passage Tacitus compares his own task to that of the historians of the Republic:

nam situs gentium, varietates proeliorum, clari ducum exitus retinent ac redintegrant legentium animum: nos saeva iussa, continuas accusationes, fallaces amicitias, perniciem innocentium et easdem exitii causas coniungimus, obvia rerum similitudine et satietae. (4.33)

The fallaces amicitiae, however, are not confined to the domestic sphere, as their conjunction with "saeva iussa, continuas accusationes" might lead us to believe. In four instances Tacitus uses the phrase species amicitiae in connection with Rome's dealings with foreign nations. At Agr. 24 he relates Agricola's tentative plans to invade Ireland: "Agricola expulsum seditione domestica unum ex regulis gentis exceperat ac specie amicitiae in occasionem retinebat." Tacitus' evident regard for his father-in-law and his frequently expressed approval of campaigns to increase the Empire's territory at barbarian expense (e.g., Germ. 33; 1.3,6), as well as his theory that Domitian's jealousy of Agricola's military prowess was responsible for Agricola's recall and ultimately for his death (Agr. 39; 43), forbid us to take species amicitiae here in an adverse sense.

In the summary of Roman relations with Parthia at Annales 2.3, on the other hand, the word scelus compels an adverse interpretation of the phrase:

victo Vononi perfugium Armenia fuit, vacua tunc interque Parthorum et Romanas opes infida
ob scelus Antonii, qui Artavasden regem Armeniorum specie amicitiae inlectum, dein catenis oneratum, postremo interfecerat.

Circumstances differ from the incident reported in Agr. 24, for Agricola did not, so far as we know, shackle or kill the Irish princeling. The unfavorable sense of species amicitiae here may be attributed to two additional factors: first, the importance in this account of Tacitus' notion, so prominent in the Germania, of the so-called noble savage, and the implied contrast of foreign manners with those of the degenerate Romans. In the second chapter of Book 2 Tacitus reports Parthian criticisms of Vonones, who had been brought up in Rome as a hostage. He was, the Parthians felt, a sign of Parthian degeneration, infected with alien manners, too little fond of the hunt, and an object of scorn on account of his use of a litter, and of ridicule for his Greek attendants and closely guarded kitchen-ware. The second factor is, of course, the change in tone from the Agricola to the Annales. While in the Agricola Tacitus took care to present the actions of Agricola in a favorable light, in the Annales he has no reason to glorify the antecedents of an affair which Tiberius interpreted for his own glorification ("magnificum id sibi creditid Caesar auxitque opibus," 2.2).

It is probably fruitless to attempt to reconcile Tacitus' conflicting views on non-Roman peoples. He sees them now as enemies of Rome to be exterminated,
preferably with as little shedding of Roman blood as possible, and now as exemplars of liberty to be held up against the servitude and degeneracy of his contemporaries in Rome. We should not be surprised, therefore, to find two passages in which the phrase *species amicitiae* applies not to Roman relations with foreign nations, but to the Parthians themselves. At 6.32 Tacitus relates the measures taken by Artabanus to counter Tiberius' efforts to replace him with Phraates the younger:

```
interea cognitis insidiis Artabanus tardari metu, modo cupidine vindictae inardescere; et barbaris cunctatio servilis, statim exsequi regium videtur. valuit tamen utilitas, ut Abdum specie amicitiae vocatum ad epulas lento veneno inligaret, Sinnacen dissimulatione ac donis, simul per negotia moraretur.
```

In this case the attribution of dissimulation to the barbarian leader serves to emphasize the same quality in Tiberius. Tacitus' explication of Tiberius' foreign policy seems accurate enough at first: "ornat Phraaten accingitque paternum ad fastigium, destinata retinens, consiliis et astu res externas moliri, arma procul habere."

In the next sentence, however, these measures are called *insidiae*, and the conflict of Artabanus and Tiberius becomes a conflict between two dissimulators. It is clear, moreover, who is the more adept or persistent at *dissimulatio*; Tiberius' candidate eventually reaches the throne (6.37), and the emphatic displacement of *non* in the sentence, "sed non Tiberius omisit incepta" (6.32) affirms that the Emperor will not be outdone by
the dissimulation of his Parthian adversary. At 14.24 the Parthians are also the perpetrators of a crime based on false friendship; in this case, Parthian spies make an attempt on the life of Domitius Corbulo:

nam haud procul tentorio eius [sc. Corbulonis] non ignobilis barbarus cum telo repertus ordinem insidiarum sequae auctorem et socios per tormenta edidit, convictique et puniti sunt qui specie amicitiae dolum parabant.

Tacitus does not imply here, as he did in 6.32, that barbarian deception is a response to Roman policy. He presents Corbulo in this passage and elsewhere as a worthy successor of those ancient Roman generals whom he admired (cf. 11.20). Corbulo, like Agricola, is a virtuous figure in the employ of a bad emperor, and his adversaries' treachery does not reflect upon him.

Tacitus shows more consistency in his application of species amicitiae to domestic affairs. The phrase is used either of apparent friendship with an Emperor (IV.80; 3.30; 15.50) or of the agents of Seianus (4.54; 4.68). At IV.80 we hear of Mucianus' efforts to diminish the influence of Antonius Primus with Vespasian:

neque ipse [sc. Antonius] dearet adrogantia provocare offensas, nimius commemorandis quae meruisset; alios ut imbelles, Caecinam ut capitivom ac dediticium increpat. unde paulatim levior viliorque haberi, manente tamen in speciem amicitia.

At 3.30 Tacitus provides an obituary notice for Sallustius Crispus, the powerful minister who had assisted in
arranging the murders of Agrippa Postumus and the imposter Clemens: "igitur incolumi Maecenate proximus, mox praecipuus, cui secreta imperatorum inniterentur, et interficiendi Postumi Agrippae conscius, aetate provecta speciem magis in amicitia quam vim tenuit."

A parallel for the language of the last clause occurs at 2.36: "[Tiberius] favorabili in speciem oratione vim imperii tenuit." This parallel and the phrase secreta imperatorum affirm that the dissimulatio implied by "speciem magis in amicitia" belongs to Tiberius, not Sallustius. At 15.50, on the other hand, deception rests not with the Emperor, but with Claudius Senecio, one of several Roman knights whom Tacitus names as participants in the Pisonian conspiracy: "ex quibus Senecio, e praecipua familiaritate Neronis, speciem amicitiae etiam tum retinens eo pluribus periculis conflictabatur; Natalis particeps ad omne secretum Pisoni erat; eeteris spes ex novis rebus petebatur."

Senecio, unlike the other participants, comes into especial danger because he is compelled to maintain the appearance of friendship in accordance with his position as a favored associate of Nero.

In two passages from Book 4 Tacitus uses the phrase species amicitiae to describe the activities of Sejanus' agents in that minister's campaign against the house and friends of Germanicus. At 4.54 Sejanus sends envoys to implant in Agrippina's mind the suspicion that Tiberius is trying to poison her: "Ceterum Sejanus
maerentem et improvidam altius perculit, immissis qui per speciem amicitiae monerent paratum ei venenum, vitandas soceri epulas." This passage, a vignette which may come from the memoirs of the younger Agrippina, which have been mentioned at the end of chapter 53, illustrates not only the wiles of Sejanus and Tiberian dissimulatio, but also the pervasiveness of the conflict between appearance and reality in Tacitus' description of Rome under Tiberius. Agrippina is conspicuous because of her inability to breathe the atmosphere of fraud and deception at her father-in-law's table: 28

Tiberius does not comment openly on her refusal to eat, but whispers to Livia. This incident produces a rumor that Tiberius is contriving Agrippina's destruction, not openly but in secret. One minor but artful touch contributes further to the impression of intrigue and dissimulation conveyed by this passage. In describing how Tiberius noticed Agrippina's behavior, Tacitus adds a detail: perhaps he was informed by a third party ("forte an quia audiverat."). Our minds turn immediately to Sejanus, whose machinations set the whole scene in motion, but it is not necessary to think of the prefect himself as the agent implied by audiverat. The anonymity
of the phrase is more telling, for it reinforces the picture of Agrippina beset by the intrigues not only of Sejanus, Tiberius, and Livia, but of other, unnamed persons as well.

In the second passage in which *species amicitiae* is applied to Sejanus' intrigues, Tacitus tells how four accusers, spurred on by their desire for Sejanus' friendship and the consulate which it might bring them, attacked the Roman knight Titius Sabinus on account of his friendship with Germanicus and his loyalty to Agrippina and her children. Sejanus' backing of the accusation is made clear: "hunc Latinius Latarius, Porcius Cato, Petilius Rufus, M. Opsius praetura functi adgrediuntur, cupidine consulatus, ad quem non nisi per Seianum aditus; neque Seiani voluntas nisi scelere quaerebatur." Even though Sejanus appears only as a parenthesis explaining *consulatus*, his name receives emphasis through the alliteration "non nisi . . . neque . . . nisi" and the anaphora of "Seianum . . . Seiani." His agents, under cover of friendship, lure Sabinus into making indiscreet remarks:

```
et postquam Sabinus, ut sunt molles in calamitate mortalium animi, effudit lacrimas, iunxit questus, audientius iam onerat Seianum, saevitiam superbiam spes eius; ne in Tiberium quidem convicio abstinet. iique sermones, tamquam vetita miscuissent, speciem artae amicitiae fecere. (4.68)
```

As in 4.54, Tacitus' account here contains other elements that reinforce the conflict of appearance and reality
inherent in the phrase *species amicitiae*. When witnesses of Sabinus' ill-guarded remarks are needed, the four senatorial spies ponder a mode of eavesdropping and consider how best to preserve the appearance of solitude ("servanda solitudinis facies" 4.69,1). When people learn what nefarious methods were used to gather evidence against Sabinus, they begin to fear that their walls and roofs may not be as mute or inanimate as they seem (4.69,3). Tacitus subtly introduces the dissimulation of Tiberius; the Emperor demands revenge *haud obscure* (4.70,1), which implies that Tiberius usually veiled his demands, and that this unusual procedure deserves comment. Nevertheless, in his letters thanking the Senate for punishing an enemy of the state, Tiberius continues to conceal the true objects of his wrath. The letters disclose that the Emperor still fears some plot against his life, and although Tiberius names no one, there is no doubt that his reference points to Nero and Agrippina.

In concluding this digression on the phrase *species amicitiae*, I wish to emphasize the following points: first, the more frequent occurrence of the phrase in the first six books of the *Annales* than in the remainder of that work or in Tacitus' other works suggests what an examination of Tacitus' own evaluation of the period in 4.34 confirms, that false friendships were for Tacitus an important feature of the Tiberian Principate. The location early in Book 4 of the passage which states
the theme of *fallaces amicitiae* has a further significance, for the fourth book marks the beginning of the story of Aelius Sejanus (4.1), and that is a tale not only of Sejanus' false friendship for Tiberius and his rise to power by means of betrayed friendships, but also of Tiberius' final suppression of his too ambitious minister, and of the famous epistle from Capri which began with the appearance of friendship but progressed by imperceptible turns to condemnation. In addition to 4.54 and 68, note the following false friendships in Sejanus' career as reported in Book 4 alone: his prostitution of himself to Apicius (4.1), his seduction of Livia Drusi (4.3) and Lygdus the eunuch (4.10), his use of Agrippina's friends against her (4.12), and his employment of Germanicus' son Drusus against his brother Nero (4.60). Dio 58.3,8, in fact, informs us that Sejanus seduced the wives of all the leading men of the state. As at 6.34, the master of *dissimulatio* is not to be outdone, and false friendship, Sejanus' device for obtaining power, becomes the instrument by which Tiberius destroys him and keeps Empire: "*isdem artibus victus est*" (4.1).

Second, the phrase *species amicitiae* in the *Annales* cannot always be directly related to the conflict of appearance and reality. At 2.3 *species amicitiae* referred to events which took place long before the Julio-Claudian era; in that passage the phrase served to reinforce the theme of Roman degeneration exemplified by the Parthian nobles' criticisms of their Rome-bred prince, as reported
in 2.2. At 14.24 species amicitiae referred to Parthian treachery against one of Tacitus' heroes, Domitius Corbulo, and the context of the passage did not support any broader interpretation. One might, however, suggest that such instances of species as these, even though they do not directly reinforce the thematic conflict of appearance and reality, do contribute to a general impression that motives and intentions may at any time be veiled, and that nothing is as it seems.

The remainder of our investigation of species in Book 1 will consider the few instances where species is not used of Augustus. Species can, of course, be applied to Tiberian dissimulatio, as at 1.52, in which Tacitus records Tiberius' report to the Senate on the successful quelling of the Rhine legions' mutiny by Germanicus:

"rettulit tamen ad senatum de rebus gestis multaque de virtute eius memoravit, magis in speciem verbis adornata quam ut penitus sentire crederetur." Tacitus also applies species to the pretext by which Tiberius separated the mutinous Rhine legions from the scenes of their disgrace:

secuti exemplum veterani haud multo post in Raetiam mittuntur, specie defendendae provinciae ob imminentis Suebos, ceterum ut avellerentur castris trucibus adhuc non minus asperitate remedii quam sceleris memoria. (1.44)

The passive verb mittuntur has no indication of agent, but Tiberius, not Germanicus, probably ordered the transfer. Tacitus uses species once more in connection
with the revolt of the German legions; at 1.34 he applies the word to the ruse by which the soldiers called Germanicus' attention to the deformities brought on by their years in the service: "postquam vallum iniit, dissoni questus audiri coeperer, et quidam prensa manu eius per speciem exosculandi inseruerunt digitos, ut vacua dentibus ora contingeret; alii curvata senio membra ostendebant." The latter instance of species does not seem to be closely associated with the conflict of appearance and reality. The action described takes place far from the corrupt City, and we have already shown in our discussion of 2.3 and 14.52 that species amicitiae (and by extension species alone) need not always be interpreted as a direct reference to the conflict between appearance and reality.

The one occurrence of species in Book 1 remaining to be discussed, however, does bear directly upon the conflict between appearance and reality. At 1.8 Tacitus records an exchange between Valerius Messalinus and Tiberius during the meeting of the Senate which was convened to discuss the will and funeral of Augustus:

addebat Messala Valerius renovandum per annos sacramentum in nomen Tiberii; interrogatusque a Tiberio, num se mandante eam sententiam prompsisset, sponte dixisse respondit, neque in his quae ad rem publicam pertinenter consilio nisi suo usurum, vel cum periculo offensionis; ea sola species adulandi supererat.

Messalinus' motion falls between the individual proposals of Asinius Gallus and L. Arruntius relating to Augustus'
funeral and the collective and sycophantic proposal of the entire Senate that Augustus' body should be borne to the pyre by senators. It is thus somewhat out of place, for it does not pertain to the funerary arrangements which were the business of that session; rather it looks ahead to the adulation which would be so prominent a feature of Tacitus' account of Tiberius' reign.31 Messalinus himself, however, brings to mind the Augustan Principate and his father, M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (3.32 and Appendix A), not only in the form of his name—Messalla here, not Messalinus as everywhere else in Tacitus—but also, as Tacitus tells us later (3.32), in the style of his oratory. The explanation for the contradiction between the motion and its context as well as its proposer is to be sought in the problem which Tacitus confronted in narrating this session of the Senate. An unwary reader might suppose that the adulatory motions concerning Augustus' funeral were survivals from the time of that prince, in whose reign, Tacitus has already told us, adulation began to flourish: "temporibusque Augusti dicendis non defuere decora ingenia, donec gliscente adulatione deterrerentur" (1.1). Moreover, might not the new princeps, who was a member of the ancient senatorial aristocracy, seek to curb adulation? Tacitus therefore takes pains to include Messalinus' motion and to comment upon it, lest anyone think that the death of Augustus would put an end to the adulation which had begun during his reign, or that
Tiberius' behavior in the Senate during that first session showed any true reluctance to rule or be flattered. Messalinus, scion of an ancient Republican house and son of the man who proposed the title pater patriae for Augustus (Suet. Aug. 58), very suitably represents the continuity of adulation between Augustus and Tiberius.

Species in Tacitus' scornful comment on Messalinus' proposal retains some of the force of the meaning 'false appearance' which it has borne on its two earlier appearances in the Annales (1.3; 1.4). We cannot, however, say that Messalinus' proposal presents a false appearance of adulation; its adulatory nature is clear enough, and it is its false appearance of unrestrained speech, species libertatis, that draws Tacitus' scorn. In his eagerness to underscore the conflict of appearance and reality and to create a sparkling sententia Tacitus conflates the two meanings of species. We might translate, "That form of adulation, false though it was in its appearance of free speech, was the only one remaining to be tried."

To sum up, the stated purpose with which we began our discussion was to establish the connection of the conflict between appearance and reality with species. Species is, of course, a natural choice for an author seeking to express a divergence of appearance and reality. The word may be used to express the appearance behind which a true motive lies hidden, as at 1.3, 34,
and 44, or it may signify the deceptive appearance by which adulation seems to be free speech (1.8), exile retirement (1.4), treachery friendship (1.10), and infringement of liberty mere extension of law (1.72). It helps to describe Tiberius' oratory when his style seems too ornate to inspire trust (1.52). All these uses could be paralleled from other books of the Annales; note, for example, the similar uses of species in 1.3, "[Augustus Gaium et Lucium] destinari consules specie recusantissime cupiverat," and in 3.35, "respondit Blaesus specie recusantis, sed neque eadem adseveratione, et consensu adulantium adiutus est"; in 1.8, "ea sola species adulandi supererat," and in 2.35, "Gallus, quia speciem libertatis Piso praecipserat . . . dicebat"; in 1.52, "[Tiberius] rettulit tamen ad senatum de rebus gestis multaque de virtute eius memoravit, magis in speciem verbis adornata quam ut penitus sentire crederetur," and 2.36, "[Tiberius] favorabili in speciem oratione vim imperii tenuit"; finally, in 1.4, "[Tiberium] ne iis quidem annis, quibus Rhodi specie secessus exulem egerit, aliquid quam iram et simulationem et secretas libidines meditatum," and 4.44, "[L. Antonium] admodum adulescentulum, sororis nepotem, seposuit Augustus in civitatem Massiliensem, ubi specie studiorum nomen exilii tegeretur." In the first pair of passages the same phrase, specie recusantis, described similar situations, Augustus' feigned reluctance to see his grandsons prematurely designated consuls,
and the seeming modesty of Blaesus, Sejanus' uncle, on being nominated proconsul of Africa. In 1.8 and 2.35 *species* was applied to a senator's motion which presented a false appearance of unrestrained speech. In the third pair of passages the phrase *in speciem* denoted the conflict between form and intention in two orations of Tiberius. In the fourth pair of passages, *specie* and a genitive described the pretexts which veiled the exiles of Augustus' stepson and grand-nephew. These passages reveal that the choice of *species* to express the conflict between appearance and reality in the Annales is not confined to the first book, nor to the *dissimulatio* of Tiberius.

The parallel between 1.4 and 4.44, in fact, points up an aspect of the use of *species* that is especially important in the first book of the Annales. We have already demonstrated that four of the eight occurrences of *species* in Book 1 apply to Augustus (1.3, 4, 10, and 72), and further that of the eight occurrences, four (1.3, 4, 8, and 10) appear in the first ten chapters, which deal largely with the reign of Augustus, his death, and the arrangements for the succession and his funeral. Tacitus employs *species* thus of and in association with the first *princeps* in order to support a fundamental tenet of his history: that the system of government which could produce Nero as its ultimate product must have been corrupt in its origins. Whatever libertarian sentiments or Republican institutions manifested themselves
under the early Emperors must accordingly have been the mere facades of authoritarian rule or adulatory subservience. This early, concentrated use of species to convey the conflict of Republican appearance and Imperial reality conditions the reader to interpret the word as a reference to that conflict even when its lexicographical meaning may not seem to justify such an interpretation.

For example: at 3.60 Tacitus records a session of the Senate held to consider the partial curtailment of the right of asylum in certain Greek cities. He ends his account with this summation:

magnaque eius diei species fuit, quo senatus maiorum beneficia, sociorum pacta, regum etiam, qui ante vim Romanam valuerant, decreta ipsorumque numinum religiones introspexit, libero, ut quondam, quid firmaret mutaretve.

"Magnaque eius diei species fuit" need mean no more than "Great that day was the sight . . . etc.," but previous appearances of species cause us to feel that it means "Great that day—but deceptive—was the sight . . . etc." Tacitus does not, however, rely only upon species to convey his meaning here. The account begins, "Sed Tiberius, vim principatus sibi firmans, imaginem antiquitatis senatui praebat, postulata provinciarum ad disquisitionem patrum mittendo." We have seen vis opposed to species, as it is here to imago, at 2.36. Tacitus further reminds us by the parenthetical ut quondam that the Senate is not in fact the free and Republican body that it seems to be.
Species, in short, serves as one device for indicating the conflict between appearance and reality, and its use for that purpose extends throughout the first hexad of the Annales. Species is not applied entirely, or even predominately, to Tiberian dissimulatio; it is used of the Senate and military as well as the Imperial house, and it helps to convey the theme of false friendship which plays such a large part in the account of Sejanus' rise to power. In the first book in particular species reinforces Tacitus' presentation of the rule of Augustus as fundamentally an autocratic regime in which the reality of one man's control lay concealed beneath the appearance of Republican government.

We now turn to the second major purpose of our analysis of species: to see if any change in the use of species between the first hexad and the later books reflects Tacitus' different conceptions of the Tiberian and later Julio-Claudian Principates. Since the nature of the Principate did in fact change from the years of Tiberius to the time of Nero, becoming progressively more absolutist and monarchic, we might expect that Tacitus would need to devote less attention to the conflict of appearance and reality in the latter books, and that his use of species, which we have seen to be one instrument for conveying that conflict in the first hexad, would show a corresponding alteration. The frequency of species does not, in fact, diminish significantly between 1-6, in which the word occurs 37 times, and 11-16,
in which it occurs 34 times. The number of passages in which *species* signifies merely the form or outward appearance of something (Gerber-Greef's meanings A and B) does, however, increase in 11-16; Table I shows that these senses of *species* occur 14 times in 11-16, but only nine times in 1-6. As examples of these senses we may note 11.21, in which *species* refers to a prophetic vision which appeared to Curtius Rufus, and 13.27, in which the two forms of manumission are called "manumittendi duas species."

The decreasing frequency with which *species* means 'false appearance, pretense, pretext' in 11-16 perhaps indicates a corresponding decrease in the emphasis placed on the conflict between appearance and reality. One further difference in the use of *species* between 1-6 and 11-16 tends to support this conclusion. Whereas *species* in 1-6, as we have seen, was used frequently of the Emperor, Augustus or Tiberius, in 11-16 it is used only four times in connection with the ruler's actions. At 13.5 Tacitus relates how Nero, with Seneca's prompt coaching, avoided the impropriety which would have occurred had Agrippina been able, as she intended, to sit beside the Emperor and receive foreign ambassadors:

\[\text{quin et legatis Armeniorum causam gentis apud Neronem orantibus conscendere suggestum imperatoris et praesidere simul parabat, nisi ceteris pave defixis Seneca admonuisset, venienti matri occurrere. ita specie pietatis obviam itum dedecori.}\]
The phrase *specie pietatis* itself might stand as a summary and foreshadowing of Nero's relations with Agrippina. The word *pietas*, despite its importance in Roman private and political thought, occurs only nine times in the Annales, and only six times in the sense of 'filial duty.' We are likely, therefore, to take special note of it at 14.3, the only other passage in which it refers to Nero. The situations, moreover, are similar, for at 13.5 and at 14.3 Nero attends to the advice of his ministers about eliminating the influence of Agrippina—-or Agrippina herself. The freedman Anicetus advises him at 14.3:

```
obtulit ingenium Anicetus libertus, classi apud Misenum praefectus et pueritiae Neronis educator ac mutuis odiis Agrippinae invisus. ergo navem posse componi docet, cuius pars ipso in mari per artem soluta effunderet ignaram: nihil tam capax fortuitorum quam mare; et si naufragio intercepta sit, quem adeo iniquum, ut sceleri adsignet, quod venti et fluctus deliquerint? additurum principem defunctae templum et aras et cetera ostentandae pietati.
```

Both times Nero is advised by his tutor (note that Anicetus is called "pueritiae Neronis educator"), and both times the advice includes attention to the preservation of an appearance of filial duty.

Tacitus uses *species* again in connection with Nero at 14.60, in which he describes Nero's removal of Octavia by what seemed at first to be an ordinary divorce: "movetur tamen [sc. Octavia] primo civilis discidii specie domumque Burri, praedia Plauti infausta
dona accipit; mox in Campaniam pulsa est addita militari custodia." Likewise species is used in connection with Nero's attack on the consul Vestinus:

\[\text{Igitur non orlmine* non accusatore existente, quia speciem iudicis induere non poterat, ad vim dominationis conversus Gerellanum tribunum cum cohorte militum immittit iubetque prae-venire conatus consulis, occupare velut arcem eius, opprimere delectam iiuentutem, quia Vestinus imminentes foro aedes decoraque seruitia et pari aestate habebat. (15.69)}\]

By the year 65 the true, monarchic nature of the Principate was completely revealed, and Nero need not bother with even the appearance of judicial procedure (speciem iudicis) as he sends troops to arrest the Republic's highest magistrate. Walker (pp. 62-3) has shown how commonly the metaphor of putting on or taking off clothing, seen here in induere, is used of Tiberius, Sejanus, and other hypocritical or dissimulating characters.

The fourth instance of species used in connection with Nero occurs at 14.16, in which Tacitus describes the verses which Nero passed off as his own:

\[\text{hi}\text{\ae}nati considere simul, et adlatos vel ibidem repertos versus conectere atque ipsius verba ququo modo prolata supplere, quod species ipsa carminum docet, non impetu et instinctu nec ore uno fluens.}\]

Although species here denotes merely the form of the poems, what we should call their lack of unity, it bears the familiar connotation, 'false or fraudulent.
appearance.' Suetonius, we may note, takes pains to correct Tacitus' criticism on the basis of a manuscript in Nero's hand (Ner. 52).35

Of the four instances from 11-16 of species used in connection with an Emperor, only one, 14.60, conforms to the type familiar from 1-6, where species often expressed the apparent motive or pretext veiling Augustus' or Tiberius' real intentions. Species elsewhere reinforces the theme of false pietas (13.5) or helps to confirm the fraudulent nature of Nero's talent (14.16). At 15.69, in fact, the contrast between the concealed tyranny of the earlier Principate and Nero's open exercise of the supreme power is clarified through the use of species, for in that passage Tacitus states that Nero could dispense with the pretense that the Emperor was a judge, not an autocrat: "non crimine, non accusatore existente, quia speciem iudicis induere non poterat, ad vim dominationis conversus."

Species in 11-16, then, applies more often to mere physical appearance and far less often to an Emperor's dissimulatio than in the first hexad. But how is species distributed otherwise, and what is its use in those passages from 11-16 in which it does not signify physical appearance or explain an Emperor's actions? Species, apart from the two uses already discussed, appears most often in 11-16 in contexts of foreign affairs. A catalogue will present the eight occurrences most economically:
11.24 (the speech of Claudius on admitting Gauls to the Senate): tunc solida domi quies; et adversus externa floruimus, cum Transpadani in civitatem recepti, cum specie deductarum per orbem terrae legionum additis provincialium validissimis fesso imperio subventum est.

12.44: ita Radamistus simulata adversus patrem discordia tamquam novercae odiis impar pergit ad patrum, multaque ab eo comitide in speciem liberum cultus primores Armeniorum ad res novas illicit, ignaro et orant ante insuper Mithridate.

12.45: Reconciliationis specie adsumpta regressusque ad patrem, quae fraude confici potuerint, prompta nuntiat, cetera armis exsequenda.

12.48 (Ummidius Quadratus, governor of Syria, counsels on how to deal with the overthrow of Mithridates by Radamistus): paucis decus publicum curae, plures tuta disserunt: omne scelus externum cum laetitia habendum; semina etiam odorum iacienda, ut saepe principes Romani eadem Armeniam specie largitionis turbandis barbarorum animis praebuerint; poteretur Radamistus male partis, dum invisus infamis, quando id magis ex usu, quam si cum gloria adeptus foret.

12.54: sane praeberant Iudaei speciem motus orta seditione, postquam *** cognita caede eius haud obtemperatum esset, manebat metus, ne quis principum eadem imperitaret.

13.40: adsultare ex diverso Tiridates, non usque ad luctum teli, sed tum mimitans, tum specie trepidantis, si laxare ordines et diversos consectetur posset.

14.31: ad hoc templum divo Claudio constitutum quasi arx aeternae dominationis adspiciebatur, delectique sacerdotes specie religionis omnis fortunas effundebant.

15.15: Interim flumini Arsaniae (is castra praefluuebat) pontem imposuit, specie sibi illud iter expedientis, sed Parthi quasi documentum victoriae iuuerant; namque iis usui fuit, nostri per diversum iere.

As we noticed earlier in our analysis of species amicitiae
(above, p. 33), no useful pattern or consistent attitude can be extracted from Tacitus' accounts of Rome's foreign affairs. *Species* is used in the foreign sphere to express both Rome's subtle domination of the provinces and bordering nations (11.24; 12.48; 14.31; 15.15) and Parthian or Judaean wiles (12.44, 45, 54; 13.40).

*Species* is also used to express the intrigues and machinations of the potent imperial women, Messalina and Agrippina. At 11.1 Messalina, plotting against Valerius Asiaticus, implants suspicion of him in the mind of Claudius: "adiungitur Sosibius Britannici educator, qui per speciem benivolentiae moneret Claudium cavere vim atque opes principibus infensas." A similar situation, the intrigues of Sejanus against the elder Agrippina, has been described in similar language: "Ceterum Seianus maerentem et improvidam altius perculit, inmissis qui per speciem amicitiae monerent paratum ei venenum, vitandas soceri epulas" (4.54). *Species* also describes Agrippina the younger's seduction of her uncle Claudius, and her plots against Britannicus. At 12.3 she inveigles her uncle on the pretext of a niece's affection: "Praevaluere haec adiuta Agrippinae inlecebris, quae ad eum per speciem necessitudinis crebro ventitando pellicit patrum, ut praelata ceteris et nondum uxor potentia uxoria iam uteretur." Later in the same book Tacitus relates the elevation of Nero at Britannicus' expense: "simul qui centurionum tribunorum-que sortem Britannici miserabantur, remoti fictis causis
et alii per speciem honoris; etiam libertorum si quis incorrupta fide, depellitur tali occasione" (11.41).

The verb remoti gives no direct indication of who transferred the sympathetic officers, but by recording the complaints of Agrippina that Britannicus had insulted Nero, and by opening the next section of the narrative with "Nondum tamen summa moliri Agrippina audebat," Tacitus leaves no room to doubt her responsibility.

Elsewhere in 11-16 species appears in a variety of situations. It serves to characterize figures who are not what they seem to be; for example, the ineffectual plotter Calpurnius Piso (15.48), whose noble birth increased the reputation which had arisen from his virtue—or resemblance to virtue; or the voluptuary Petronius (16.18), whose loose words and deeds passed for elegant unaffectedness; or finally the fraudulent philosopher P. Egnatius Celer (16.32). Species may also express the false appearance of freedom produced by the removal of a troop of soldiers stationed at the games (13.24), the apparent rather than effective reduction of a tax (13.31), the veiling of effete, Hellenized pastimes with Roman names (14.20), or the legal subterfuge which led to the exile of Valerius Ponticus (14.41).

Species, then, even though it occurs almost as frequently in 11-16 as in 1-6, is diffused through a greater variety of contexts in the later books and is less directed toward the coherent presentation of a conflict between appearance and reality than in the
first hexad. What had been a pervasive conflict between fact and appearance under Tiberius, emanating from the Emperor by way of his dissimulatio, and extending thence to all elements of the state, has become less organized under Claudius and Nero as the emergence of the fact of despotism eliminates the need to maintain the appearance of the free Republic. *Species* in 11-16, therefore, reflects through changes in its use and distribution Tacitus' changed presentation of the later Julio-Claudian Principate.
2. Species in Other Authors

Since species helps, as we have shown, to convey the conflict of appearance and reality in the *Annales*; since, indeed, the word is so closely linked to the conflict that a change in the use of the one from 1-6 to 11-16 parallels a change in the presentation of the other, it behooves us to ask whether Tacitus' treatment of species originates with him or stems from tradition or from the habit of some particular author. Further, can the influence of Tacitus' handling of species be traced in any subsequent author? These questions go beyond the mere resolution of a point of literary originality, for if Tacitus' use of species is found to be common, even ordinary, in Latin, then our conclusions about its importance and its connection with one major theme of the *Annales* will be somewhat vitiated; if, on the other hand, Tacitus can be shown to have used species in a fashion not only original, but capable of influencing another author, then we may conclude not only that our perception of the function of species in the *Annales* has been correct, but also that Tacitus' use of species is sufficiently conspicuous to have attracted the attention and emulation of another Roman author.36

Let us begin with the poets, whose influence on
the language of Tacitus has attracted much attention. Lucretius uses *species* 32 times (see Appendix B), most notably in the line, "discutiant, sed naturae species ratioque," which occurs four times (1.148; 2.61; 3.93; 6.41). But *species* in Lucretius always signifies, as in the line just quoted, the outward form or appearance of things. There is no trace of the meaning 'false appearance, pretense, pretext,' which is so important in the *Annales*. Vergil, whose influence can be detected in much of Tacitus' style and attitude, uses *species* six times (G. 1.420; 2.103; 4.406; *Aen.* 2.407; 4.170; 6.208); in addition, *species* appears four times in the Appendix Vergiliana (Culex 140; *Ciris* 70, 487; *Moretum* 118). In all ten cases *species* signifies the outward form or appearance of something, whether the changing manifestations of the spirits of birds before a storm (G. 1.420), or the infinite forms of plant life (2.103), or the changing shapes of the Old Man of the Sea (4.406). In the *Aeneid*, *species* designates the spectacle of Cassandra in the hands of the Greeks (2.407), the appearance to the world of Dido's love for Aeneas (4.170), or the appearance of the golden bough (6.208). One might perhaps argue that Vergil's use of *species* in the *Georgics* has some connection with the theme of variety, and Tacitus was certainly capable of noticing this aspect and others of Vergil's art, but there is no indication that Vergil's rare and inconspicuous use of *species* directly influenced Tacitus' frequent and meaningful handling of that word.
Lucan, who resembles Tacitus more than Vergil in political sentiment and subject matter, uses species only twice: 6.254, "et vivam magnae speciem Virtutis adorant," and 9.612, "vana specie conterrite leti." In neither case does species mean 'false appearance, pretense, pretext,' as it does so often in Tacitus. 38

What, finally, of Ovid? Although his subject matter and attitudes might be supposed alien to the fancied σεμνότης of Tacitus, his influence can be detected in more than one passage. 39 Ovid uses species 35 times (see Appendix C), but the meaning 'false appearance, pretense, pretext' is present in only five cases: Met. 12.473, "quaque viri falsam speciem mercede parasti"; Fasti 6.685, "ut posset specie numeroque senatum fallere"; Am. 2.19,14, "a: quotiens finxit culpam, quantumque licebat / insonti, speciem præbuit esse nocens"; 3.7,15, "truncus iners iacui, species et inutile pondus"; and Ars. Am. 3.441, "sunt, qui mendaci specie grassentur amoris." In three of these passages species is accompanied by some word that clarifies its meaning: "falsam speciem" in Met. 12.473, "specie . . . fallere" in Fasti 6.685, and "mendaci specie" in Ars. Am. 3.441. This clarification of the connotation of species is un-Tacitean. Tacitus qualifies species with an adjective or demonstrative pronoun 36 times, but falsa is so used only twice, and only in the Historiae (I.1 and III.58). In the Annales species is modified for the most part by relatively colorless adjectives or demonstratives: maior, ipsa,
duas, magna, ea, sola, or sua. More significant adjectives like falsa, mira, honesta, egregia, invisitata, divinam, or ignavi appear with species only in the Historiae and minor works (see Appendix D), and mostly in passages where species refers to the actual appearance of something. We may conclude, then, that in his handling of species Tacitus was not influenced by any usage of the poets.

In the historians, on the other hand, certain foreshadowings of Tacitus' use of species can be discovered. Sallust uses species 13 times, once in the Bellum Catilinae, three times in the Bellum Iugurthinum, and nine times in the extant fragments of his Historiae (see Appendix E). In the greater part of these occurrences species means simply 'outward form, appearance,' as at Iug. 79.3: "ager in medio harenosus, una specie; neque flumen neque mons erat, qui finis eorum discernet."

In four instances, however, Sallust uses species to mean 'false appearance, pretense, pretext.' At Cat. 38.2 he discusses the efforts of the nobility to oppose the newly restored tribunate: "contra eos [sc. tribunos plebis] summa ope nitebantur pleraque nobilitas senatus specie pro sua magnitudine." The contrast with asyndeton between specie governing a genitive and a prepositional phrase with pro is unexampled in Tacitus' works, and specie meaning 'ostensibly on behalf (of)' does not occur in the Annales or minor works. In fact, only one example, which happens also to govern senatus, can be cited from the Historiae, I.74: "Otho, revocatis
quos Galba miserat legatis, rursus ad utrumque Germanicum exercitum et ad legionem Italicam easque, quae Lugduni agebant, copias specie senatus misit." At Iug. 29.4

Sallust also uses *species* in the sense of 'false appearance':

*ceterum interea fidei causa mittitur a consule Sextius quaestor in oppidum Iugurthae Vagam. quois rei species erat acceptio frumenti, quod Calpurnius palam legatis imperaverat, quoniam deditionis mora indutiae agitabantur.*

In his *Historiae* Sallust twice makes *species* mean 'false appearance,' both times in orations. The first occurs in the speech of the consul Lepidus against Sulla:

*Quare igitur tanto agmine atque animis incedit? Quia secundae res mire sunt vitii obtentui, quibus labefactis quam formidatus est, tam contemnetur: nisi forte specie cordiae et pacis, quae sceleri et parricidio suo nomina indidit.* (1.55, 24)

*Specie* (or *per speciem*) frequently governs an abstract noun in Tacitus (cf. the discussion of *specie amicitiae* above, and *specie religionis*, 3.63 and 14.31; *specie honoris*, 2.42, 2.67, and 12.41), and the contrast which Lepidus invokes between the name and the fact is also Tacitean. Sallust again uses *species* in the speech of the *popularis* tribune Macer: "Neque me praeterit, quantas opes nobilitatis solus impotens inani specie magistratus pellere dominatione incipiam quantoque tutius factio noxiorum agat quam soli innocentes" (H. 3.48, 3).
Tacitus nowhere uses *inanis* with *species* (above, p. 59 and Appendix D) or *species* with *magistratus*, but the sentiment of "*inani specie magistratus*" is certainly familiar to any reader of the first chapters of the *Annales*: "*domi res tranquillae, eadem magistratum vocabula; iuniores post Actiacam victoriam, etiam senes plerique inter bella civium nati: quotus quisque reliquus, qui rem publicam vidisset*" (1.3). Two indirect parallels, moreover, for Sallust's phrase "*inani specie magistratus*" can be found in Tacitus' *Historiae*: "*inani nomine ducum,*" II.39, and "*inania legionum nomina*" from the speech of Civilis, IV.14.

One might just possibly argue that Sallust's four uses of *species* to mean 'false appearance, pretense, pretext' all serve to point up a theme, or at least an attitude: criticism of the nobility for its duplicity. At *Cat.* 38.2 the nobility concealed self-aggrandizement with constitutional fictions; at *Iug.* 29.4 the noble Calpurnius, who has been bribed by Jugurtha (his only fault was avarice, 28.5), sends his quaestor away on a pretext so that he may arrange for the king to surrender on terms unfavorable to the Romans; Lepidus' oration attacks the reactionary Cornelius Sulla and his noble henchmen (cf. esp. *H.* 1.55,2) while Macer's oration (in, be it admitted, a passage coming somewhat after the occurrence of *species*) assails the nobility for tyrannizing over the state under the pretext of waging a war: "*Itaque omnes concessere iam in paucorum*
dominationem, qui per militare nomen aerarium, exercitus, regna, provincias occupavere . . ." (H. 3.48,6). Yet even if the argument were conceded—and note against it the favorable opinion of Calpurnius in Iug. 28.5 f. and that species in Macer's speech does not refer to any noble's duplicity, but to the weakness of the Sullan tribunate—it would still be impossible to conclude that Sallust's rare and incidental use of species in the sense 'false appearance, pretense, pretext,' or indeed in any sense at all, influenced Tacitus' frequent employment and meaningful treatment of the word. Criticism of the nobility pervades Sallust's writings (cf. e.g., Iug. 5.1; Cat. 13), and species, occurring only 13 times in all Sallust's works and only four times, and those far apart, in the sense 'false appearance, pretense, pretext,' plays no great part in announcing or developing this criticism. In Tacitus' works, by contrast, species occurs four times in the first ten chapters of the Annales, and its use there and elsewhere aids significantly in the development of a fundamental theme set forth in the prologue of the Annales: the conflict between appearance and reality, Republic and Empire. Furthermore, in seeking exact parallels in Tacitus for a Sallustian use of species, we often found that the Historiae, not the Annales, produced what few parallels we could cite. Although Sallust's language and style did, as is generally agreed, influence Tacitus, his use of species in particular does not
derive from Sallustian practice.\textsuperscript{41}

Livy uses \textit{species} 190 times, and this high frequency of occurrence might seem to suggest that his practice influenced Tacitus'. Cicero, in contrast, uses \textit{species} only 30 times in his orations, which almost equal in bulk the first five pentads of Livy. Table II presents the distribution of \textit{species} in Livy by type and by pentad. I have chosen to distinguish four uses of \textit{species} in Livy. Type A is the simple use of \textit{species} to mean 'appearance, shape, form'; for example, "nec hominis quicquam est, patres conscripti, praeter figuram et speciem neque Romani civis praeter habitum vestitumque et sonum Latinae linguae" (Livy 29.17,11). Type B is the use of \textit{species} to express the resemblance of one thing to another; for example, "pro cornibus ante Punicam aciem elephanti castellorum procul speciem praebebant" (28.14,5). Type C is the use, to which we have already devoted so much attention, of \textit{species} to mean 'false appearance, pretense, pretext'; for example, "nocte per speciem venandi urbe egressi ad eum proficiscuntur" (25.8,5). Type D is the use of \textit{species} to mean 'sight' or 'spectacle'; for example, "Volscorum animis nihil terribilius erat quam ipsius Camilli forte oblata species; ita quocumque se intulisset victoriam secum haud dubiam trahebat" (6.8,6). The absence of an analytical lexicon to Livy and the difficulty of deciding into which of the four categories certain doubtful instances belong make some errors in
Table II inevitable; nevertheless, separate compilations of the table showed almost no differences, and I believe that it can serve as a rough indicator of the distribution of *species* in Livy.

This distribution is remarkably uniform. We have noted (above, pp. 22 ff.) that in Tacitus one meaning of *species*, Gerber-Greef's D ('false appearance, pretense, pretext'), predominates; indeed, in Tacitus this meaning accounts for 69 of the 126 instances of *species*, or approximately 55 per cent. In Livy, on the other hand, no single meaning of *species* is so predominant, although the meaning 'false appearance, pretense, pretext' is the most common by a slight margin. Furthermore, *species* in Livy is uniformly distributed from pentad to pentad and comprises in every case from .03 to .05 per cent of the total number of words in the pentad. These statistics, interesting in themselves as evidence for what has been called the constancy of Livy's latinity, indicate as well that, unlike Tacitus, Livy did not associate *species* with any special theme or matter which would have caused him to concentrate on one nuance of the word, or to use it more frequently in one section of his work than in another.

More important than the un-Tacitean uniformity of Livy's use of *species* is the presence in Livy of certain usages that do not occur, or occur very rarely, in Tacitus. The phrase *prima species*, for example, appears eight times in Livy, usually in an ablative sense
almost exactly equivalent to our 'at first glance'.
Tacitus uses *prima* with *species* only once (IV.3). Livy
also favors the phrase *vana species*, which occurs five
times in his writings, but not at all in Tacitus'.
Indeed, although *species* is qualified by an adjective
or demonstrative pronoun about as often in Livy as in
Tacitus, the two authors have in common very few adjectives
modifying *species*. Besides *prima*, discussed just above,
only the relatively colorless modifiers *magna* (three
times in Tacitus, once in Livy), *alia* (once in Tacitus,
three times in Livy), *mira*, *honesta*, *divina*, and *ulla*
(once in each author) appear in both historians. Livy,
furthermore, is fond of clarifying the nuance of *species*
by opposing it to *res*, as at 39.35.4: "interim per
speciem auxilii Byzantiis ferendi, re ipsa ad terriorem
regulis Thracum iniciendum profectus, perculsis iis uno
proelio et Amadoco duce capto in Macedoniam redit."
This same collocation of *species* and *res* occurs also
at 5.40,3; 35.31,12; 36.8,4; and 39.37,13. Tacitus
nowhere opposes *species* to *res*. He prefers instead to
contrast *species* with *vis*, as at Annales 13.31: "vectigal
quoque quintae et vicesimae venalium mancipiorum remissum,
specie magis quam vi, quia, cum venditor pendere iubetur,
in partem pretii emptoribus adcrescebat." Tacitus
opposes *species* to *vis* in five other passages: IV.82;
V.7; 2.36; 3.30; and 15.69. Livy, on the other hand,
joins *species* and *vis* only twice, and in one of those
passages, *vis* is plural, as it never is when used with
species in Tacitus' works: "nihil eae deductae ex insula legiones minuerunt nec viribus nec specie eius provinciae prae sidium" (27.8,15). In this passage, moreover, vis refers to the literal strength of the legions and has not the metaphorical sense which it bears in the passage from Annales 13.31 just quoted. In the second passage opposing species to vis Livy's handling of the words resembles that of Tacitus: "alia sententia, asperior in speciem, vim minorem aliquanto habuit, quae patricios coire ad prodendum interregem iubebat" (3.40,7).

It may well be significant that Tacitus prefers to contrast species and vis, while Livy prefers to contrast species and res. One should be cautious when making generalizations on the basis of one particular; nevertheless, Tacitus, to a greater extent than Livy, concerned himself with the contrast between pomp and power, and I may suggest that his preference for the contrast of species with vis and the more frequent appearance of species contrasted with vis in the Annales than in the Historiae stem from his concern with political appearance and the reality of power.

One could point out further differences between Livy's handling of species and Tacitus'; for example, the phrase sub specie equivalent to per speciem appears three times in Livy (9.45,5; 44.24,4; 36.7,12) but not at all in Tacitus. The uniform distribution of species in Livy, however, and the particular usages discussed above prove adequately that although Livy's frequent
use of *species* in the sense 'false appearance, pretense, pretext' may have suggested the possibilities of that nuance to Tacitus, the later historian's careful disposition of *species* and his use of that word to reinforce an essential theme of his work do not derive from Livy's practice.⁴³

Valleius Paterculus has his virtues as a historian, but style is not generally conceded to be among them.⁴⁴ His influence on the great and careful stylist Tacitus may thus be doubted a priori; furthermore, Velleius' attitude toward Tiberius and Sejanus would certainly have placed him among those historians condemned for fear or adulation at 1.1. We should not therefore be surprised to find that the seven instances of *species* in Velleius show no sign of having influenced Tacitus' use of the word:⁴⁵

I.9: *cuius tantum priores excessit vel magnitudine regis Persei vel specie simulacrorum vel modo pecuniae, ut bis miliens centiens sestertium aerario contulerit et omnium ante actorum comparationem amplitudine vicerit.*

1.10: *ex iis duos natu maiores, unum P. Scipioni P. Africani filio, nihil ex paterna maiestate praeter speciem nominis vigoremque eloquentiae retinti, in adoptionem dederat, alterum Fabio Maximo.*

1.14: *Cum facilius cuiusque rei in unam contracta species quam divisa temporibus oculis animisque inhaereat, statui priorem huius voluminis posteriorumque partem non inutili rerum notitia in artum contracta distinguere atque huic loco inserere, quae quoque tempore post Romam a Gallis captam deducta sit colonia iussu senatus.*
Tacitus' treatment of *species* is thus both unique and original; so unique and original, in fact, that its influence can be felt in the writings of Tacitus' younger contemporary Suetonius. The biographer uses *species* 26 times (see Appendix F), nine times to mean 'false appearance, pretense, pretext.' Six of these nine instances occur in the life of Tiberius. This concentration of a Tacitean sense of *species* in the life of an emperor who is perhaps the most memorable prince in Tacitus would in itself indicate Tacitus' influence on Suetonius' handling of *species*, but we can point as well to more specific echoes of Tacitus' practice. Let us first consider the three examples of Suetonius' use of *species* meaning 'false appearance, pretense,'
pretext' in lives other than that of Tiberius.

At *Iul.* 82 Suetonius describes the positioning of the conspirators around the Dictator: "assidentem [sc. Caesarem] conspirati specie officii circumsteterunt." Although Tacitus did not treat the life of Julius Caesar and any direct Tacitean influence on this passage is thus unlikely, we may nonetheless note a parallel from Tacitus' description of the death of another head of the state: "is [sc. medicus nomine Charicles] velut propria ad negotia digrediens et per speciem officii manum complexus pulsum venarum attigit" (6.50). Perhaps more significant in indicating Tacitus' influence on Suetonius' use of *species* is a sentence from the *Caligula*: "nec multum afuit quin statim diadema sumeret speciem principatus in regni formam converteret."

(Calig. 22). Again no direct Tacitean influence can be established, for the historian's account of Gaius' rule has been lost; nevertheless, the contrast between *speciem principatus* and *regni formam* reminds us of Tacitus' contrast between Republican appearance and Imperial reality. More solid evidence for Tacitus' influence on Suetonius appears in *Otho* 3:

item Poppaeam Sabinam tunc adhuc amicam eius, abductam marito demandatamque interim sibi, nuptiarum specie recept nunc corrupisse contentus adeo dilexit, ut ne rivalem quidem Neronem aequo tulerit animo creditur certe non modo missos ad arcessendam non recepisse, sed ipsum etiam exclusisse quondam pro foribus astantem miscentemque frustra minas et preces ac depositum reposcentem.
Tacitus gives two versions of the relationship of Poppaea, Otho, and Nero. The version at I.13 resembles Suetonius' account: "eoque Poppaeam Sabinam, principale scortum, ut apud conscium libidinum deposuerat, donec Octaviam uxorem amoliretur. mox suspicium in eadem Poppaeae in provinciam Lusitaniam specie legationis seposuit." At 13.45, however, Tacitus amends his earlier version and states that Nero became attracted to Poppaea only after her marriage to Otho, and that Otho, far from not accepting Nero as a rival, even encouraged Poppaea's adultery with the Emperor in order to further his own designs. Suetonius probably knew the Historiae (certainly, if Syme's suggestion that Otho 6.3 answers I.37 f. proves correct), and he may simply be confirming Tacitus' earlier version and echoing Tacitus' specie legationis in specie nuptiarum. Another possibility, however, presents itself. In several passages Suetonius appears to refute statements made by Tacitus in the Annales; for example, Tacitus' assertion that Caligula was born in the camp (1.41) is corrected by Suetonius with documentation, a letter of Augustus, at Calig. 8. Perhaps at Otho 3 Suetonius is refuting the version of the relations of Poppaea, Otho, and Nero given in the Annales and at the same time using a characteristically Tacitean sense of species. Note, also, the Tacitean phrase secretorum particeps used of Otho in Otho 3 and of Sallustius Crispus at Annales 1.6.

Every instance save one of species in Suetonius'
biography of Tiberius bears the Tacitean sense 'false appearance, pretense, pretext.' These six instances furnish confirmation of Tacitus' influence on Suetonius' treatment of species. At Tib. 30 Suetonius reports the favorable aspects of Tiberius' rule: "Quin etiam speciem libertatis quandam induxit conservatis senatui ac magistratibus et maiestate pristina et potestate."

Sentiment and expression are Tacitean; compare "quippe adulationi foedum crimen servitutis, malignitati falsa species libertatis inest" (I.1); also "speciem libertatis Piso praeceperat" (2.35), and "statio cohortis adsidere ludis solita demovetur, quo maior species libertatis esset" (13.24). At Tib. 24 Suetonius relates Tiberius' reluctance to undertake the burden of Empire: "Principatum, quamvis neque occupare confestim neque agere dubitasset, et statione militum, hoc est vi et specie dominationis assumpta, diu tamen recusavit." In this passage species means 'external appearance' rather than 'false appearance, pretense, pretext,' but the influence of Tacitus is nonetheless certain. We have already noted Tacitus' fondness for contrasting species with vis (above, pp. 66 f.), and since Tacitus' analysis of the same events at 1.7 similarly emphasizes Tiberius' seeming reluctance to accept the Principate ("Tiberius cuncta per consules incipiebat, tamquam vetere re publica et ambiguus imperandi") and his simultaneous exercise of the military command ("sed defuncto Augusto signum praetoriis cohortibus ut imperator dederat; excubiae arma, cetera aulae;"
miles in forum, miles in curiam comitabatur"), the conjunction of Tacitean language and Tacitean sentiment attests the historian's influence on the biographer. At *Tib.* 59 Suetonius introduces certain popular verses complaining about Tiberius' strict attitude toward luxury and wantonness:

*Multa praeterea specie gravitatis ac morum corrigendorum, sed et magis naturae obtemperans, ita saeve et atrociter factitavit, ut nonnulli versiculis quoque et praesentia exprobrarent et futura denuntiarent mala.*

Tacitus does not happen to use the phrase *specie gravitatis,* but the use of *species* to express Tiberius' *dissimulatio* and the veiling of the actual whims of a despot behind apparently Republican virtues (*gravitas*) and motives (*ad mores corrigendos*) is thoroughly Tacitean.

Suetonius uses the phrase *per speciem* three times, all of them in the *Tiberius.* In each case *per speciem* means 'under the pretext (of),' a sense which we have seen to be common in Tacitus' works (above, p. 24). At *Tib.* 36 we hear of Tiberius' expulsion of the Jewish youth from Rome:

*Iudaorum iuventum per speciem sacramenti in provincias gravioris caeli distribuit, reliquos gentis eiusdem vel similia sectantes urbe summovit, sub poena perpetuae servitutis nisi obtemperassent.*

At *Tib.* 50 Suetonius, under the rubric 'familial relationships,' tells of Tiberius' attitude toward his wife Julia:
Iuliae uxori tantum afuit ut relegatae, quod minimum est, offici aut humanitatis aliquid impertiret, ut ex constitutione patris uno oppido clausam domo quoque egressi et commercio hominum frui vetuerit; sed et peculio concesso a patre praebitisque annuis fraudavit, per speciem publici iuris, quod nihil de his Augustus testamento cavisset.

At Tib. 65 Suetonius relates Tiberius' crafty overthrow of Sejanus: "nam primo, ut a se per speciem honoris dimiteret, collegam sibi assumpsit in quinto consulatu, quem longo intervallo absens ob id ipsum susceperat."

All three occurrences of *per speciem* in Suetonius refer to the dissimulatio of Tiberius. The phrase *per speciem* occurs twelve times in Tacitus' works, four times in I-V, three times in 11-16, and five times in 1-6. Only once, however, does it refer directly to Tiberius (4.8): "consules sede vulgari per speciem maestitiae sedentis honoris locique admonuit." Nevertheless, the constant use of *per speciem* in Tacitus to express pretexts (e.g., 1.34, the pretext whereby the rebellious legionaries revealed their poor physical condition to Germanicus; 4.54, the pretext whereby suspicion of Tiberius was aroused in Agrippina; 5.8, the pretext whereby Vitellius obtained a means of suicide; also 6.50; 11.1; 12.3 and 41; I.24 and 71; IV.57; V.12) must have suggested Suetonius' concentration of the phrase on the pretexts of Tiberius, for unlike Tacitus, who saw the conflict between appearance and reality and hence the need for pretext and dissimulation in
every aspect of the Principate, Suetonius confines his attention to the personality of the Princeps.

In short: species in the Annales serves to reinforce the thematic contrast between appearance and reality. That theme and the use of species in connection with it are especially prominent in the first hexad, in which Tacitus needed to reveal the reality of absolutism lurking behind the Republican forms, which yet remained in seeming force. Tacitus' use of species to help convey a major theme of his work cannot be paralleled in previous authors, whether poets or historians; rather it originated with him and arose from his analysis of the nature of the Principate. His treatment of species, furthermore, attracted by its prominence the attention and emulation of Suetonius, whose imitations of Tacitean phrases and sentiments with species furnish independent testimony for the importance of species in the Annales.
17 Cf. Cic. Top. 7.30:

in divisione formae, quas Graeci ζηη vocant, nostri, si qui haec forte tractant, species appellant, non pessime id quidem sed inutiliter ad mutandos casus in dicendo. Nolim enim, ne si Latine quidem dici possit, specierum et speciebus dicere; et saepe his casibus utendum est; at formis et formarum velim. Cum autem utroque verbo idem significetur, commoditatem in dicendo non arbitror neglegendum.

18 On the Republican character of Tiberius' reign, see also Dio 57.7-9; E. Kornemann, "Der Prinzipat des Tiberius und der 'Genius Senatus,'" SBAW 1947, Heft 1; R. Seager, Tiberius (Berkeley, 1972), 123 ff.

19 Use of the term 'hexad' opens up a controversy which lies outside the scope of this dissertation. Suffice it to say that I believe the 30 books mentioned by Hieron., Comm. in Zach. 3.14 ("Cornelius Tacitus, qui post Augustum usque ad mortem Domitiani vitas Caesarum triginta voluminibus exaravit") were divided into twelve books of Historiae and eighteen books of Annales. Syme (Appendix 35), 686 ff., summarizes the arguments and bibliography.

20 Klingner, SBAW 1953, Heft 7, compares the accounts

21 J. A. Weller, "Tacitus and Tiberius' Rhodian Exile," *Phoenix* 12 (1958), 30 f., takes *specie secessus* to refer to Tiberius' *dissimulatio*, as though Tiberius, while pretending to be in retirement, had in his heart of hearts exiled himself: This interpretation ignores the role of Augustus as reported by Suetonius, *Tib.* 12, and the portrayal of Augustus in *Annales* 1.1-10. The parallels given by Weller, p. 31, are hardly relevant, since they do little more than establish that *specie* can mean 'under the pretext (of).’ A more apt parallel would have been 4.44, discussed below, p. 45.

22 Scholars have extensively treated Tacitus' presentation of the trials for *maiestas* under Tiberius; see especially R. S. Rogers, *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius* (Middletown, 1935); Walker, 82-109 and Appendix II; E. Koestermann, "Die Majestätsprozesse unter Tiberius," *Historia* 4 (1955), 72 ff.


25 We might almost render "sed non Tiberius omisit incepta" as "But he did not leave off what he had begun--no, not Tiberius." On the position of 'non,' see R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 4th ed. (1962; rpt. Darmstadt, 1966), II.1, #149.3a (p. 818).


29 Not "In these same arts he was surpassed," as D. Wiesen, "Isdem artibus victus est: Tacitus Annales
IV.1.3," *Mnemosyne* 23 (1970), 402 ff. contends, but "By these same arts he was overcome." See R. Renehan, "A Proverbial Expression in Tacitus," *CPh* 68 (1973), 114 f.

30 D. Timpe, *Der Triumph des Germanicus* (Bonn, 1968), 30-40, stresses the connection of the campaign conducted during the autumn of A.D. 14 with Tiberius' previous campaigns in that area and emphasizes Tiberius' role in directing Germanicus' strategy (38 ff.).

31 E.g., 2.32 and 87; 3.57, 65, and 69; 4.1, 9, and 42, etc. Note also that the word *adulatio* occurs 25 times in 1-6 but only 13 times in 11-16 (20 times in I-V, four times in the minor works).

32 On *vis* opposed to *species* see below, p. 66.


35 On the relationship of Suetonius to Tacitus, see below, 69 ff.

36 The editions, indices, concordances, and lexica
used in compiling the section on species in authors other than Tacitus are listed at the beginning of the Select Bibliography (below, pp. 175 ff.).


38 On other manifestations of Lucan's influence on Tacitus, see L. Robbert, De Tacito Lucani Imitatore (Gottingen, 1917).


41 Syme, pp. 144-148, treats Sallust's influence on the structure of Tacitus' works. Some specific echoes of Sallust in Tacitus are collected by G. B. A. Fletcher, "Some Certain or Possible Examples of Literary Reminiscence in Tacitus," CR 59 (1945), 45 ff.; W.

42 See K. Gries, Constancy in Livy's Latinity (New York, 1949).

43 This conclusion should not be interpreted as a denial of Livy's great influence on Tacitus, established by Wölfllin, Philologus 26 (1897), 129 ff.; C. Andresen, "Tacitus in Livius," Wochenschr. für cl. Phil. 1916, 210-214, 401-406, 688-694. Further parallels between Tacitus and Livy can be found in G. B. A. Fletcher, CR 59 (1945), 45 ff., and Annotations on Tacitus (Bruxelles-Berchem, 1964).

44 A recent, positive assessment of Velleius is G. Sumner, "The Truth about Velleius Paterculus: Prolegomena," HSCPPh 74 (1970), 257 ff. Some have argued, or suggested, Velleius' influence on specific passages of Tacitus; see E. Klebs, "Entlehnungen aus Velleius," Philologus 49 (1890), 302 ff.; Fletcher, CR 59 (1945), 47. The majority of scholars has ignored any possible Velleian influence, and some have taken the trouble to deny it (E. Norden, Antike Kunstprosa [Leipzig, 1898], p. 338). Perhaps the similarities are due to a common predecessor; see now A. J. Woodman,

45 No index or concordance to Velleius has been published, and I may have overlooked one or two instances of *species* in my reading of him.

46 On Tacitus' sources for these events, see Otto Schönberger, "Ein Quellenproblem bei Tacitus und Lucans Deklamation über Octavius Sagitta," *Historia* 12 (1963), 500 ff.

47 *Tacitus*, p. 781.

3. Imago, Effigies, Simulacrum

The second part of this dissertation will consider three words whose use in the *Annales* resembles that of *species*: *imago*, *effigies*, and *simulacrum*. *Imago* and *effigies*, like *species*, are natural synonyms of *forma* (Charisius, Gramm. p. 425.25 Barwick); indeed, Tacitus employs them in several places as synonyms for one another. For example, in 15.29 *effigiem* and *imagini* clearly refer to the same statue: "medio tribunal sedem curulem et sedes effigiem Neronis sustinebat. ad quam progressus Tiridates, caesis ex more victimis, sublatum capiti diadema imagini subiecit"; as do *imagines* and *effigiem* at 16.7: "obiectavitque Cassio, quod inter imagines maiorum etiam C. Cassi effigiem coluisset, ita inscriptam 'duci partium.'" Likewise *imago* is perhaps synonymous with *simulacrum* at 14.12: "aureum Minervae simulacrum in curia et iuxta principis imago statuerentur," although *imago* here may mean simply 'statue' in contrast to *simulacrum*, a cult-image. Yet even though *imago*, *effigies*, and *simulacrum* may mean the same thing, they are not always synonymous, and their uses in connection with the conflict of appearance and reality differ. I shall therefore consider each of them in turn.
The ancients understood *imago* to derive from the root meaning 'imitation.' Whatever the derivation, *imago* has two basic meanings. It can signify literally a picture, statue, or mask, as at Plaut. *Ps.* 1097, "epistula atque imago me certum facit," where Ballio refers to the picture on the letter's seal. *Imago* is the technical term for the ancestral images which decorated the *atria* of Roman nobles' mansions, and this literal sense of *imago* can also be extended to signify a ghost or phantom, as at Verg. *Aen.* 4.653 f.: "vixi et quem dederat sursum fortuna peregi, / et nunc magna mei sub terras ibit imago." The second, metaphorical meaning of *imago* can refer to a mental image, conception, thought, or idea, as at Livy 5.2, 9, "quidnam illi consules dictatoresve facturi essent, qui proconsularem imaginem tam saevam ac trucem fecerint," or to an appearance, semblance, or shadow, as when Velleius describes the tribunate after Sulla's reforms as "imaginem sine re" (2.30,4). *Imago* can also signify an echo (Verg. *G.* 4.50) and in rhetorical theory a figurative representation or comparison (Cic. *Inv.* Rhet. 1.30,49).

*Imago* occurs sixty-eight times in Tacitus' works, once in the *Agricola*, three times in the *Dialogus*, twenty-eight times in the *Historiae*, twenty-four times in *Annales* 1-6, and twelve times in 11-16. Tacitus employs the word rather frequently; Livy, in contrast, uses *imago* only twenty-five times in all his bulky
history. Gerber-Greef distinguish thirteen separate nuances of *imago* in Tacitus' works (see Table III), but we need only demarcate three; first, *imago* used literally of a statue, and especially of an ancestral image, as for example at 3.5, where Tacitus reports the public’s comparison of Germanicus’ funeral with that of his father Drusus: "circumfusas lecto [sc. Drusi] Claudiorum Iuliorumque imagines." This first type corresponds to Gerber-Greef’s I.A.a. Second, the metaphorical use of *imago* to signify an idea, reminiscence, or resemblance, as at 3.34: "mox Valerius cui parens Messala ineratque imago paternae facundiae." This type corresponds to Gerber-Greef’s I.A.b., I.A.c., and I.B.a. Third, the metaphorical use of *imago* in a sense equivalent to species meaning 'false appearance, pretense, pretext,' as at 1.10, "sed Pompeium imagine pacis, sed Lepidum specie amicitiae deceptos." This type corresponds to Gerber-Greef’s I.B.b.

This third use of *imago* is most obviously connected to the conflict of appearance and reality, and with it this discussion of Tacitus’ handling of *imago* in its three senses will begin. *Imago* with the meaning 'false appearance' occurs five times in 1-6; in each case *species* might be substituted without altering the sense of the passage. In 1.10, quoted just above, Tacitus uses *imagine* to avoid repetition of *specie* and to express the same idea as *species; the dissimulatio of the first *princeps*. At 1.81 Tacitus, having previously
(1.14-15) told how the elections were transferred from the people to the Senate, describes Tiberius' methods of commending candidates for the consulate:

modo subtractis candidatorum nominibus originem cuiusque et vitam et stipendia descripsit, ut qui forent intellegentur; aliquando ea quaeque significacione subtracta candidatos hortatus, ne ambitu comitia turbarent, suam ad id curam pollicitus est; plerumque eos tantum apud se professos disseruit, quorum nomina consulibus edidisset, --posse et alios profiteri, si gratiae aut meritis confiderent; speciosa verba re inania aut subdola, quantaque maiore libertatis imagine tegebantur, tanto eruptura ad infensius servitium.

Libertatis imagine, with which may be compared speciem libertatis at 2.35 and maior species libertatis at 13.24, expresses the conflict between the apparent freedom implied by Tiberius' statement that candidates other than those he nominated could present their names for the consulate and the actual servitude which these fair words veiled. The metaphors in tegebantur and eruptura are frequently applied to Tiberian anger and dissimulation; note, for example,

obturbabant quidem patres specie detestandi. sed penetrabat pavor et admiratio callidum olim [sc. Tiberium] et tegendis sceleribus obscurum huc confidentiae venisse, ut tamquam dimotis parietibus ostenderet nepotem sub verbere centurionis, inter servorum ictus, extrema vitae alimenta frustra orantem. (6.24)

and "sed mitigavit Seianus [sc. iram Tiberii], non Galli amore, verum ut cunctationes principis o<periretur, gnarus lentum in meditando, ubi prorupisset, tristibus
dictis atrocia facta coniungere" (4.71), as well as Walker, pp. 62 ff.

At 3.17 Tacitus reports the sham trial of Plancina, whose acquittal had already been secured: "biduum super hac imagine cognitionis absumptum urgente Tiberio liberos Pisonis matrem uti tuerentur." At 3.60, in a passage which I have already considered in my discussion of species (above, p. 47), Tacitus describes the Senate's debate on the petitions of several Greek cities: "Sed Tiberius, vim principatus sibi firmans, imaginem antiquitatis senatui praebebat, postulata provinciarum ad disquisitionem mittendo." Finally, at 6.27 Tacitus records the death of Aelius Lamia, who had been appointed governor of Syria and, like L. Arruntius, detained in the city while his province was governed through legates: "Extremo anni mors Aelii Lamiae funere censorio celebrata, qui administrandae Suriæ imagine tandem exsolutus urbi praefuerat." In all three passages imago helps to express the conflict between appearance and reality and to convey the dissimulatio of Tiberius. Imago in this sense thus does not differ in use or significance from species meaning 'false appearance, pretense, pretext.'

But imago has another function in 1-6. It is used with the meaning 'statue' or specifically 'ancestral image' to convey one aspect of the conflict between appearance and reality, the contrast between the appearance of a Republic and the reality of Empire. In 1-6 imago
again and again underscores the decline of the Republic and of the ancient Republican families; indeed, with one certain and one possible exception, imagō meaning 'statue' never refers to that of a living person in 1-6, although it is frequently so used in 11-16 (e.g., 14.12 and 61; 15.29 and 72). Twelve passages claim our attention.

At 2.27 Tacitus begins a lengthy account (six chapters) of the indictment of M. Scribonius Libo Drusus and gives his reason for treating the affair so extensively: "eius negotii initium ordinem finem curatius disseram, quia tum primum reperta sunt quae per tot annos rem publicam exedere." Here begins to flourish the evil of delation which plays so large a part in Tacitus' account of the reign of Tiberius. Delation itself had already begun (1.73), but this was the first time that the delators had instigated the crime to be denounced, secured the death of the victim, and been rewarded for their services. Libo is presented as a representative of the Republican nobility; the style of his introduction, not "Scribonius Libo Drusus" but "e familia Scriboniorum Libo Drusus," stresses his ancestry, and that ancestry is catalogued in phrases reminiscent of sepulchral inscriptions and redolent of the Republic: "proavum Pompeium, amitam Scriboniam, quae quondam Augusti coniux fuerat, consobrinos Caesares, plenam imaginibus domum." Alliteration (proavum Pompeium, quae quondam, consobrinos Caesares) perhaps contributes to the antique
effect. Against this representative of the Republic stand the delators and Tiberius, "callidus et novi iuris repertor." The images, which represented Scribonius' Republican ancestry at the beginning of Tacitus' account of his indictment, figure also at the end, when Tacitus records the sycophantic motions put forward in the Senate after Libo's suicide: "tunc Cotta Messalinus, ne imago Libonis exsequias posterorum comitaretur, censuit, Cn. Lentulus, ne quis Scribonius cognomentum Drusi adsumeret" (2.32). Imago used in the specific sense 'ancestral image' at the beginning and end of Tacitus' account of Libo's indictment emphasizes the unfortunate young noble's Republican ancestry, which is set in contrast to the delators and sycophants of the Principate.

Another noble youth finds himself opposed to Tiberius at 2.37 ff. M. Hortensius Hortalus, the grandson of the orator Hortensius, appeals to Tiberius in the Senate for a subsidy to maintain his senatorial rank. The princeps, in a scathing and eloquent speech, refuses his request. As in Tacitus' account of Libo's indictment, a few chapters before, the victim's Republican ancestry receives emphasis both in Tacitus' introduction of him ("Marci Hortali, nobilis iuvenis . . . nepos erat oratoris Hortensii") and in the speech which Tacitus devises for him ("en stirps et progenies tot consulum, tot dictatorum"). At the conclusion of the passage Hortensius' ancestry is again stressed and the decline of his noble family is explicitly stated: "siluit
Hortalus, pavore an avitae nobilitatis etiam inter angustias fortunae retinens. neque miseratus est Tiberius, quamvis domus Hortensii pudendam ad inopiam delaberetur" (2.38,5). The Hortensius affair, which has little significance in terms of the larger materials of history, foreign policy and domestic politics, serves nonetheless to illustrate the opposition of Tiberius and the Principate to the Republic and the Republican noble houses. One detail reinforcing this purpose concerns us here: Tacitus has Hortalus begin his appeal by looking to the image of his grandfather, which was placed among the likenesses of distinguished men of letters in Augustus' libraries on the Palatine. The portrait of Hortensius is described as an **imago**:

igitur quattuor filiis ante limen curiae adstantibus, loco sententiae, cum in Palatio senatus haberetur, modo Hortensii inter oratores sitam imaginem, modo Augusti intuens, ad hunc modum coepit. (2.37)

**Imago** does not, of course, mean 'ancestral image' in a strict sense here, as its application also to the portrait of Augustus indicates; nevertheless, in the context of the continual emphasis placed on the ancestry of Hortalus, the word retains an overtone of its technical meaning, which figured in Tacitus' presentation of the downfall of another young noble, Scribonius Libo.

A similar use of **imago** to emphasize the noble, Republican ancestry of a victim of the Principate appears at 3.23. Tacitus reports the trial of Aemilia Lepida
on a variety of charges (adultery, poisoning, illicit astrology, and the inevitable *maiestas*) and her eventual banishment. As in the passages dealing with Scribonius and Hortensius, the ancestry of the victim is emphasized at her introduction: "At Romae Lepida, cui super Aemiliorum decus L. Sulla et Cn. Pompeius proavi erant, defertur simulavisse partum ex P. Quirinio divite atque orbo" (3.22). Lepida is opposed by the anger and dissimulation of Tiberius: "haud facile quis dispexerit illa in cognitione mentem principis: adeo vertit ac miscuit irae et clementiae signa." Like Hortensius, Lepida employs the *imagines* of a noble ancestor in her appeal to the people; Tacitus states, moreover, that the people were especially moved and angered by the contrast of Lepida's nobility with the obscurity of her accuser:

*Lepida ludorum diebus, qui cognitionem intervenerant, theatrum cum claris feminis ingressa, lamentatione flebili maiores suos sciens ipsumque Pompeium, cuius ea monimenta et adstantes imagines visebantur, tantum misericordia(s) permovit, ut effusi in lacrimas saeva et detestanda Quirinio clamitarent, cuius senectae atque orbitati et obscurissimae domui destinata quondam uxor L. Caesari ac divo Augusto nurus dederetur.* (3.23)

Tacitus stresses the decline of the Republican noble houses in his transition to the next episode, the restoration of D. Iunius Silanus: "Inlustrium domum adversa (et enim haud multitum distantii tempore Calpurnii Pisonem, Aemilii Lepidam amiserant) solacio adfecit
D. Silanus Iuniae familiae redditus" (3.24). But Silanus' return was a solacium and no more: "fuit posthac in urbe neque honores adeptus est." Imago in 3.23 helps to reinforce the theme of Republican ancestry prominent in the passage; as in 2.37, it does not strictly mean 'ancestral image' but does preserve an overtone of that sense. The appeals to the imagines maiorum in 2.37 and 3.23 evoke in Latin powerful associations not only of antiquity, but also of death and decline; in 3.23, moreover, Tacitus singles out Sulla and Pompey among the ancestors of Lepida, and his comments elsewhere on these two figures (II.38; 4.27-28; above, pp. 13 f.) compel us to see Lepida as an example of the contrast between the Republic's last days in particular and the Empire.

At 4.35 another victim of the delators and the lex maiestatis refers in a speech on his own behalf to the imagines not of his ancestors, but of the last Republican heroes. The historian Cremutius Cordus has been charged by two creatures of Sejanus with a novel offense: writing annals in which he had called Brutus and Cassius the last of the Romans (4.34). Tacitus gives his fellow-annalist an oration covering the greater part of two chapters and then records his suicide and the subsequent suppression and survival of his works. In the oration Cremutius first cites numerous examples of previous historians whose praises of Pompey, Brutus,
Cassius, and others went unchecked by Caesar the dictator or Augustus. He insists on the distinction between words and deeds; no harm can come of writing about the last days of the Republic:

sed maxime solutum et sine obtrectatore fuit prodere de iis, quos mors odio aut gratiae examisset. num enim armatis Cassio et Bruto ac Philippenses campos obtinentibus belli civilis causa populum per contiones incendo? an illi quidem septuagesimum ante annum perempti, quo modo imaginibus suis noscuntur, quas ne victor quidem abolevit, sic partem memoriae apud scriptores retinet? (4.35)

As Syme points out (p. 337), Tacitus has placed Cremutius' oration immediately after his own assessment of the historian's task. In 4.32 and 33 Tacitus compares his task to that of the historians of the Republic: "Pleraque eorum quae rettuli quaeque referam parva forsitan et levia memoratu videri non nescius sum; set nemo annales hostros cum scriptura eorum contenderit, qui veteres populi Romani res composuere" (4.32). Similarly, the comparison between Republican libertas and Imperial suppression of free speech forms the burden of Cremutius' oration, and he closes with an assertion of immortality ("non modo Cassii et Bruti, sed etiam mei meminerint") which is confirmed by Tacitus' comment:

quo magis socordia(m) eorum inridere liber, qui praeenti potentia credunt extinguiri posse etiam sequentis sevi memoria. nam contra punitis ingeniiis gliscit auctoritas, neque aliud externi reges aut qui eadem saevitia usi sunt nisi dedecus sibi atque illis gloriam peperere. (4.35)
These hopeful remarks are balanced by the feeling, expressed both in Tacitus' own remarks at 4.32-33 and in the speech he gives Cremutius, that the Republic is gone. Tacitus believes (for it would be foolish to contend that Cremutius' words, which agree so well with Tacitus' preceding remarks, do not reflect Tacitus' opinion) that the Republic, like Brutus and Cassius, survives only as a memory and an *imago*.

Tacitus' use of *imago* to emphasize the decline of the Republican nobility in his account of the actions against Scribonius Libo and Aemilia Lepida and to underscore the contrast between the shadowy, though glorious, memory of a Republic and the oppressive reality of Empire in his account of the trial of Cremutius Cordus enables us to understand the significance of his use of the word in his report of the funeral of Junia:

Et Iunia sexagesimo quarto post Philippensem aciem anno supremum diem explavit, Catone avunculo genita, C. Cassii uxor, M. Bruti soror. testamentum eius multo apud vulgum rumore fuit, quia in magnis opibus, cum ferme cunctos proceres cum honore nominavisset, Caesarem omisit. quod civiliter acceptum, neque prohibuit quo minus laudatione pro rostris ceterisque sollemnibus funus cohonestaretur. viginti clarissimarum familiarum imagines antelatae sunt, Manlii, Quinctii aliaeque eiusdem nobilitatis nomina. sed praefulgebant Cassius atque Brutus, eo ipso quod effigies eorum non visebantur. (3.76)

As with the trial of Cremutius Cordus, context is important here. Junia's funeral is the last entry in Book 3 and thus terminates Tacitus' account of the
first nine years of Tiberius' reign and the first half of his treatment of that ruler. The year 23 initiated disorder and a progress toward open despotism:

C. Asinio C. Antistio consulibus nonus
Tiberio annus erat compositae rei publicae,
florentis domus (nam Germanici mortem inter prospera ducebat), cum repente turbare
fortuna coepit, saevire ipse aut saevientibus
vires praebere. initium et causa penes
Aelium Seianum . . . (4.1)

Junia's funeral marks the passing of the Republic and answers the question posed in 1.3, "quotus quisque reliquus, qui rem publicam vidisset," with a clear nemo. Instead of giving her age (she was surely over ninety, for her son had been old enough to assume the toga virilis in 44 B.C., according to Plutarch, Brutus 14.3), Tacitus dates her decease from the battle of Philippi, thus emphasizing her connection with the last days of the Republic. He stresses her kinship with Cato, Brutus, and Cassius and with the noble families of the old Republic, the Manlii, Quinctii, and eighteen other noble houses, but carefully omits to call her the sister-in-law of the triumvir Lepidus (Vell. Pat. 2.88; Cic. ad Att. 6.1,25). The imagines of her ancestors are more than the mere apparatus of a funeral; they represent the Republic, now only a fading image, and the declining Republican houses. The imago is confounded with what it represents, for Tacitus does not say that the imagines of Cassius and Brutus were conspicuous by their absence; rather, Cassius and Brutus themselves
are the subject of praefulgebant.⁶⁰ (Effigies is, of course, a synonym for imago here as at 15.29 and 16.7.) In his handling of Junia's funeral Tacitus has made a traditional element of annalistic history, the inclusion of obituary notices at the end of each year,⁶¹ into an effective means of indicating a major division of his history and of reinforcing an essential theme of his work: the contrast between Republican appearance and Imperial reality.

The use of imago in connection with the Republic and its survivors extends also to its use in connection with Germanicus and his family. Tacitus continually opposes the virtuous figure of Germanicus to the wily Tiberius.⁶² This opposition is more than the contrast of two aspects of Empire, one good and the other bad, for at his first detailed mention of Germanicus⁶³ Tacitus informs us of the reasons for Tiberius' hostility to Germanicus: Drusus, Germanicus' father, would, it was believed, have restored the Republic had he lived, and the same intention was credited to Germanicus. Tacitus then explicitly contrasts Germanicus and Tiberius:

ipse [sc. Germanicus] Druso fratre Tiberii genitus, Augustae nepos, sed anxius occultis in se patrui aviaeque odis, quorum causae aciores quia iniquae. quippe Drusi magna apud populum Romanum memoria, credebaturque, si rerum potissimus foret, libertatem redditurus; unde in Germanicum favor et spes eadem. nam iuveni civile ingenium, mira comitas et diversa a Tiberii sermone vultu, adrogantibus et obscuris. (1.33)
On four occasions Tacitus employs *imago* to emphasize the ancestry of Germanicus or his adoptive brother Drusus. At 2.43 Tacitus reports the division of the court into partisans of Drusus or of Germanicus and indicates that those who favored Germanicus did so in part because of his ancestry and held against Drusus his descent from an illustrious, but not noble, Roman of the last days of the Republic: "contra Druso proavus eques Romanus Pomponius Atticus dedecere Claudiorum imagines videbantur." At 2.73 Tacitus briefly comments on the funeral held for Germanicus at Antioch. The unelaborate ceremony afforded few materials for description, and Tacitus emphasizes its simplicity by recording the absence of the usual elements of a Roman funeral: "Funus, sine imaginibus et pompa, per laudes ac memoriam virtutum eius celebre fuit." Tacitus implies that the laudation and commemoration of Germanicus' virtues gave his funeral distinction even though the *imagines*, which are themselves memorials of past excellence, were absent. I shall return to this idea that a virtuous person sums up in himself his ancestral *imagines* in the discussion of 4.52 below.

At 3.5 the funeral rites held for Germanicus at Rome are compared to those which had been held for his father Drusus:

*Puere qui publici funeris pompam requirerent compararentque quae in Drusum, patrem Germanici, honora et magnifica Augustus fecisset. ipsum*
quippe asperrimo hiemis Ticinum usque progressum neque abscedentem a corpore simul urbem intravisse; circumfusas lecto Claudiorum Iuliorumque imagines; defletum in foro, laudatum pro rostris; cuncta a maioribus reperta aut quas posteri in-venerint cumulata; at Germanico ne solitos quidem et cuicumque nobili debitos honores contigisse.

The chief purpose of this passage is to furnish evidence (through rumor, as so often in Tacitus) for Tiberius' meanness and hostility toward Germanicus, as is shown by Tacitus' report of Tiberius' reaction to the rumors: "Gnarum id Tiberio fuit; utque premeret vulgi sermones, monuit edicto . . ." (3.6). The Emperor's neglect of ancestral custom receives emphasis throughout the passage, not only in the mention of the Julian and Claudian imagines, in "cuncta a maioribus reperta" and in "solitos . . . honores," but in the rhetorical question with which Tacitus concludes the passage: "ubi illa veterum instituta, propositam toro effigiem, meditata ad memoriam virtutis carmina et laudationes et lacrimas vel doloris imitamenta?" It does not occur to Tacitus, as he opposes Tiberius to Germanicus and emphasizes Tiberius' jealous neglect of the ceremonials due to a man of Germanicus' ancestry, that Tiberius himself was descended from as illustrious a group of Republican noble families as Germanicus. Tacitus does not stress Tiberius' Republican antecedents because to do so would be to obscure the contrast between Germanicus, a virtuous descendant of the Republic and its potential
restorer, and Tiberius, an Imperial despot, hostile to the ancient Republican houses. Tiberius in Tacitus' eyes keeps nothing of his ancestry but the ingrained Claudian arrogance (1.3).

At 4.9 Tacitus depreciates an offer by Tiberius to restore the Republic and reports the funeral of Drusus, during which the images of the most ancient days of Rome were paraded:

Magno ea fletu et mox precationibus faustis audita; ac si modum orationi posuisset [sc. Tiberius], misericordia sui gloriaeque animos audentium impleverat: ad vana et totiens inrisa revolutus, de reddenda re publica utque consules seu quis alius regimen susciperent, vero quoque et honesto fidem dempsit. memoriae Drusi eadem quae in Germanicum decernuntur, plerisque additis, ut ferme amat posterior adulatio. funus imaginum pompa maxime inlustre fuit, cum origo Iuliae gentis Aeneas omnesque Albanorum reges et conditor urbis Romulus, post Sabina nobilitas, Attus Clausus ceteraque Claudiorum effigies, longo ordine spectarentur.

The juxtaposition of the Emperor, falsely offering to restore the Republic, and the past glories of Rome, now images at a funeral, epitomizes the thematic contrast between the Republic, which is dead but glorious (cf. 4.32 ff.), and the Empire, which although it presents the appearance of a restored Republic is but present despotism. Drusus, however, is an ambiguous figure, a prince of the Imperial house as well as the adoptive brother of Germanicus, and his ancestry includes regal figures with the Republican.

Thus in the four passages where imago refers to
the ancestry of Germanicus or Drusus the word assists in developing the contrast between Republic and Empire, just as it emphasizes that contrast by underscoring the Republican ancestry of prominent victims of the Principate. For the sake of completeness I note here two passages in which *imago* meaning 'statue' or 'image' refers to Germanicus or his family but not to their ancestry. At 2.83 the catalogue of honors voted to Germanicus after his death includes a portrait standard to be carried before the squadrons of knights: "instituitque uti turmae idibus Iuliiis imaginem eius sequerentur." At 5.4, after telling how a mob carrying representations of Agrippina and Nero had surrounded the Senate house, Tacitus reports the insinuations of Sejanus to his master: "quid reliquum nisi ut caperent ferrum et quorum imagines pro vexillis secuti forent, duces imperatoresque deligerent?" We have now seen how *imago* in the sense 'false appearance, pretense, pretext' helps to convey the conflict between appearance and reality and how one aspect of that conflict, the contrast between Republican appearance and Imperial reality, is related to *imago* meaning 'statue' and particularly 'ancestral image.'

*Imago* in Tacitus can also signify an idea, reminiscence, or resemblance, and this sense, which occurs five times in 1-6, now claims our attention, for it too is related to the conflict between Republican appearance and Imperial reality. In three cases, in fact, *imago* in
this sense refers to Germanicus, his ancestry, or his
group and functions in much the same way as in the four
passages (2.43 and 73; 3.5; 4.9) discussed above. At
1.43, in the peroration of the speech by which he
persuades the mutinous Rhine legions to return to duty,
Germanicus appeals to the memory of his father Drusus:

tua, dive Auguste, caelo recepta mens, tua,
pater Druse, imago, tui memoria, isdem istis
cum militibus, quos iam pudor et gloria intrat,
eluant hanc maculam irasque civiles in exitium
hostibus vertant.

It is difficult to assign a precise value to imago in
this passage. Nipperdey ad loc., followed by Furneaux,
Koestermann, and Goodyear, explains imago as "die
ihrer Phantasie vorschwebende Person, gesteigert durch
das umfassendere tui memoria." The metaphorical use
of imago to indicate the memory of a departed person
appears also in Tacitus' account of the death of Seneca:

Ille interritus poscit tabulas; ac denegante
centurione conversus ad amicos, quando meritis
eorum referre gratiam prohibetur, quod unum
iam et tamen pulcherrimum habeat, imaginem
vitae suae relinquere testatur, cuius si
memores essent, bonorum artium famam tam
constantis amicitiae laturos. (15.62)

In 1.43 imago certainly means, as Nipperdey perceived,
'memory' and is amplified by tui memoria, but this meaning
arises naturally from the literal meaning 'ancestral
image.' The metaphorical and literal meanings cannot
be separated. Germanicus appeals to the imago of
Drusus much as Hortalus turns to Hortensius' imago
at 2.37, but Germanicus' hearers must imagine the ancestral mask and in so doing feel the implications of tradition and Republican lineage called up by the reference. *Imago* in 1.43 is more than a synonym for *memoria*; it evokes, as *memoria* does not, Germanicus' ancestry and family.65

Tacitus, indeed, has Germanicus begin his speech with a reference to his family: "Non mihi uxor aut filius patre et re publica cariores sunt, sed illum quidem sua maiestas, imperium Romanum ceteri exercitus defendent" (1.42). Although Germanicus confirms his loyalty not only to the commonwealth, but to its leader, his adoptive father Tiberius ("patre et re publica"), Tacitus carefully undermines the reference to Tiberius with a phrase which, though complimentary in its immediate context, leads the reader ineluctably to think of one of the most unpleasant aspects of Tiberius' reign: the Emperor, Tacitus has Germanicus say, will be defended by his maiestas. Germanicus' loyalty to Tiberius is essential to establish the injustice of Tiberius' suspicions of the prince as reported in 1.47, but this loyalty must be shown at once to be unfounded. Tacitus keeps the opposition of Germanicus and Tiberius always before the reader, and in 1.43 as elsewhere *imago*, with its connotations of Republican lineage, is used of Germanicus' ancestry in order to heighten the contrast between the descendant of Drusus, a potential restorer of the Republic, and the jealous and tyrannical
Emperor.

Tacitus begins his treatment of the events of A.D. 18 by recording Germanicus' assumption of his second consulate at Nicopolis, the city founded by Augustus to commemorate the victory at Actium. An excursion to the site of the great sea battle evokes mixed emotions in the prince:

```
simul sinus Actiaca victoria inclutos et sacratas ab Augusto manubias castraque Antonii cum recordatione maiorum suorum adiit. namque ei, ut memoravi, avunculus Augustus, avus Antonius erant, magnaque illic imago tristium laetorumque. (2.53)
```

*Imago* here means 'mental picture' or 'reminiscence' and amplifies *recordatione* as it amplified *memoria* in 1.43. As at 1.43, moreover, the literal meaning 'ancestral image' makes itself felt underneath the metaphorical sense. Tacitus again stresses Germanicus' lineage and even inserts a cross-reference (*ut memoravi*) to the passage ten chapters before (2.43) in which he also used *imago* in connection with the ancestry of Germanicus and his brother Drusus. The *imago* which haunts Germanicus as he gazes over the bay of Actium and visits the monuments established there takes the form of the images of his uncle and grandfather who met there in the last battle of the Republic and the first of the Empire. Tacitus does not specify which ancestral image provokes sorrowful reminiscence and which joyful; the two emotions are intertwined in Germanicus' feelings (*tristium laetorumque*). This contradictory experience
accords perfectly with Tacitus' presentation of Germanicus as a person at once loyal to the Roman state in its immediate form, the Principate, and to the person of his adoptive father, the princeps, and at the same time responsive to the ideal of the Republic and to the family traditions connecting him to it. In the exordium to Germanicus' oration at 1.42 ff. the same elements, "patre et re publica," were present, and in the peroration imago likewise served to point up Germanicus' mixed lineage as he invoked the divina mens of his uncle Augustus and the imago of his father Drusus.

After Germanicus' death the conflict between him and Tiberius is maintained through the opposition of Tiberius and Agrippina. Again Tacitus ignores Tiberius' claim to distinguished ancestry and has Agrippina emphasize her ancestry in a confrontation with the Emperor. Agrippina has been angered by the indictment of her cousin, Claudia Pulchra, on charges of adultery as well as attempted poisoning and magic directed against the princeps:

Agrippina semper atrox, tum et periculo propinquiæ accensa, pergit ad Tiberium ac forte sacrificantem patri reperit. quo initio invidiae non eiusdem alt mactare divo Augusto victimas et posteros eius insectari. non in effigies mutas divinum spiritum transfusum: se imaginem veram, caelesti sanguine ortam, intellegere discrimen, suscipere sordes. (4.52)

Imaginem forms a bold metaphor, and as in the passage discussed immediately above the metaphorical meaning
'reminiscence, mental image' gains much of its force from the literal meaning 'ancestral image.' Agrippina asserts that she, and not the statue before which (we may suppose) Tiberius sacrifices, represents the spirit of the consecrated Augustus, her ancestor. She, like Germanicus at his funeral in Antioch (2.73; above, p. 97), sums up the virtues of her ancestors in herself and thus represents her own imagines. One should not, however, suppose that the conflict between Agrippina and Tiberius can be seen as a mere extension of the conflict between Germanicus and Tiberius. Unlike Germanicus, whose imagines included both the founder of the Empire and illustrious men of the Republic, whose real father, Drusus, might have restored the Republic and whose adoptive father, Tiberius, fixed the despotism begun by Augustus, Agrippina could claim in Tacitus' eyes descent only from Augustus and from Augustus' adjutant Agrippa. No one could hope that Agrippina would restore the Republic, and when Tacitus comes to record her death he sums up her character: not one to suffer a rival, and eager to rule ("sed Agrippina aequi impatiens, dominandi avida, virilibus curis feminarum vitia exuerat," 6.25).

Imago, then, is applied to Germanicus and his family on nine occasions. I have demonstrated that in seven of those passages (1.43; 2.43,53, and 73; 3.5; 4.9 and 52) imago serves to emphasize the lineage of Germanicus or his family, and I have shown how the
literal meaning 'ancestral image' is present even when the metaphorical meaning 'reminiscence, idea, resemblance' predominates. Further I have indicated that the references to Germanicus' ancestry are related to a basic theme of the Annales, the conflict between Republic and Empire, and that this conflict is made manifest in Germanicus himself, whom Tacitus presents as torn between the claims of Republican ideals and Imperial reality. This dilemma was all too familiar to the men of Tacitus' day, and many figures in Tacitus' works can best be understood as responses to the problem posed in the Agricola: can there be good men under bad Emperors (Agr. 42)? Germanicus, whose forebears included figures of Republic and Empire, provided for Tacitus an ideal figure in which to mingle the claims of "res olim dissociabiles . . . principatum ac libertatem" (Agr. 3).

In two other passages the use of imago in the metaphorical sense 'reminiscence, resemblance' arises naturally from the literal meaning 'ancestral image.' At 3.34 Tacitus remarks on the resemblance of Valerius Messalinus' oratorical talent to that of his father, M. Valerius Messala Corvinus (cf. Appendix A): "mox Valerius Messalinus, cui parens Messala ineratque imago paternae facundiae, respondit multa duritiae veterum <in> melius et laetius mutata." Imago exactly conveys the resemblance of the son's oratory to the father's; as a person's physical appearance is preserved, though
in a stiff and lifeless fashion, by his \textit{imago}, so
Messala's ability could be seen in his son, though the
father's independent cooperation with Augustus had become
the eloquent servility of Messalinus toward Tiberius.
At 6.1 Tacitus reports (as fact, one may note, not
rumor) Tiberius' debaucheries on Capri. The Emperor's
diversions included the seduction of noble youths:
"nec formam tantum et decora corpora, sed in his
modestam pueritiam, in aliis imagines maiorum incitamentum
cupidinis habebat." Tiberius was incited to lust not
only by the physical charms of his victims, but by
their resemblance to their ancestors. The phrase
\textit{imagines maiorum} has not attracted the attention of the
commentators except to point out the parallel with
Curtius Rufus 4.10,24, "eximiamque pulchritudinem formae
eius non libidinis habuerat invitamentum, sed gloriae."
Yet interpretation of the phrase poses difficulties.
Does Tacitus imply that Tiberius lusted after the sons
because he had earlier lusted after their fathers,
perhaps while on Rhodes (cf. 1.4, "iram et simulationem
et secretas libidines meditatum," and 4.57, "et Rhodi
secreto vitare coetus, recondere voluptates insuerat.")?
Such an interpretation would be consistent with Tacitus' idea that Tiberius' character was unchanging and that
vices which had been concealed burst into the open on
Capri. A slightly different interpretation, however,
better accounts for the choice of the specific word
\textit{imago} by seeing this episode in the light of the
conflict between Republic and Empire. Tiberius corrupts and degrades the noble youths because of his hostility toward their Republican ancestry. We have earlier seen how *imago* in the sense 'ancestral image' forms a recurring motif in Tacitus' treatment of the conflict between the Emperor and the declining noble houses of the Republic (above, pp. 88 ff.). *Imago* in 6.1 as it expresses the resemblance of sons to fathers preserves the literal meaning 'ancestral image' and connects the personal lusts of the despot Tiberius to the political conflict between Republic and Empire. I have indicated in the introduction to this dissertation that Tiberius' importance for Tacitus goes beyond his political significance as the successor of Augustus and ruler of the Empire for twenty-three years. Tacitus perceived that Tiberius' personality coincided with the character of the Principate: as Tiberius concealed his tyrannical desires and physical vices behind a Republican, respectable facade, so the Principate concealed its despotic nature with preserved, though lifeless, Republican institutions. The *dissimulatio* of the Emperor supported and reflected the conflict between appearance and reality essential to the Imperial form of government, and the lusts of Tiberius in 6.1 are directed as much toward the political aspect of his victims as toward their personal charms. *Cupido*, we note, is a regular word in Tacitus' works for the lust for power (e.g., II.38; 4.60 and 68; 12.42 and 44; 13.2);
its use of specifically sexual desire is rare. In their two-column article on *cupido* Gerber-Greef report only 6.1 and seven other instances of the word used in a strictly physical sense.

In the interests of completeness I note here the one instance of *imago* in 1-6 remaining to be discussed. At 1.62 Tacitus reports Tiberius' criticism of Germanicus' handling of the last rites for the remains of Varus' three legions:

> quod Tiberio haud probatum, seu cuncta Germanici in deterius trahenti, sive exercitum imagine caesorum insepultorumque tardatum ad proelia et formidolosiem hostium credebat; neque imperatorem auguratu et vetustissimis caerimonii praeditum adtrectare feralia debuisse.

Only here in the *Annales* does Tacitus use *imago* to mean 'sight' or 'spectacle.' We can nevertheless detect the overtones of the literal meaning 'ancestral image.' The picture of a funeral is not far from Tacitus' mind, and he specifically states that the soldiers, in burying their comrades, felt as though they were performing the last rites for kinsmen:

> Igitur Romanus qui aderat exercitus sextum post cladis annum trium legionum ossa, nullo noscente alienas reliquias an suorum humo tegeret, omnes ut coniunctos, ut consanguineos aucta in hostem ira maesti simul et infensi condebant. (1.62)

*Imago* is thus the proper word, rich in funereal nuance, to express the sight of the remains of Varus' army as seen by those who came afterwards.
The preceding investigations of *imago* in 1-6 leads to these conclusions: *imago*, like *species*, can be used to express a false appearance, pretense, or pretext (1.10 and 81; 3.17, 36, and 60; 6.27). In this sense it helps to convey the conflict between appearance and reality, and the *dissimulatio* of Tiberius. *Imago* can also signify a literal, physical representation, a statue, image, or likeness. In 1-6 the literal sense of *imago* refers either to an ancestral image, a ceremonial deathmask (2.27, 32, 43, and 73; 3.5 and 76; 4.9 and 35) or to a statue of someone's ancestors (2.37; 3.23). These ancestral likenesses stand for the Republican connections either of prominent victims of Tiberius (2.27, 32, and 37; 3.23; 4.35) or of Germanicus and his family (2.43, 73, and 83; 3.5; 4.9) and thus highlight the thematic contrast between Republic and Empire. The *imaginex* at the funeral of Junia mark the transition from specious Republicanism to open despotism in Tiberius' reign (3.76). Finally, the metaphorical use of *imago* to express a mental image, reminiscence, or resemblance (1.43; 2.53; 3.34; 4.53; 6.1) always preserves overtones of the literal meaning 'ancestral image,' whether it appears in connection with Germanicus and his family (1.43; 2.53; 4.52) or with other Republican figures (3.34; 6.1). In only three cases did *imago* appear in a context not directly related to the conflict between Republic and Empire; 2.83 and 5.4, where it was nonetheless used in connection
with Germanicus or his family, and 1.62, where the immediate context demanded a word with funereal associations. In short, imago in 1-6 serves to convey one aspect of the conflict between appearance and reality; the contrast between the apparent Republic and the real Empire.

Tacitus' handling of imago in 1-6 shows coherency and careful attention to the demands of explicating a single theme. By contrast, imago in 11-16 appears in a variety of situations and does not convey any one theme. I have pointed out (above, pp. 48 ff.) that species in the Annales becomes more loosely connected to the conflict of appearance and reality as we move from the first hexad to the later books, in which that theme is less important; likewise imago in 11-16 becomes diffused through a greater variety of contexts as the need to express the conflict between an apparent Republic and the real Empire diminishes. In 1-6, for example, imago when used in the literal sense 'statue' or 'image' almost always signified an actual ancestral image, a ceremonial deathmask, or bore overtones of that meaning, and the word was never used to describe a likeness of Tiberius. (It might have been so employed at 4.64, but Tacitus chooses the less resonant word effigies: "adduntur sententiae, ut mons Caelius in posterum Augustus appellaretur, quando cunctis circum flagrantibus sola Tiberii effigies, sita in domo Iunii senatoris, inviolata mansisset.") In 11-16, on the other hand,
of the five instances of *imago* signifying an actual statue or image only one refers to an ancestral image: "obiectavitque Cassio, quod inter imagines maiorum etiam C. Cassi effigiem coluisset, ita inscriptam 'duci partium'" (16.7). *Imago*, moreover, is twice used to describe a statue of Nero: "aureum Minervae simulacrum in curia et iuxta principis imago statuerentur" (14.12), and "medio tribunal sedem curulem et sedes effigiem Neronis sustinebat. ad quam progressus Tiridates, caesis ex more victimis, sublatum capiti diadema imagini subiecit" (15.29). *Imago* also describes portraits of Octavia at 14.61, "effigies Poppaeae prorunt, Octaviae imagines gestant umeris," and representations of Nerva and Tigellinus at 15.72, "Tigellinum et Nervam ita extollens, ut super triumphales in foro imagines apud Palatium quoque effigies eorum sisteret." In four of these five cases *imago* appears with *effigies*, and although one might argue that a distinction is being made between the two words at 14.61 and 15.72, they are clearly synonymous at 15.29 and 16.7. This use of *imago* in conjunction with *effigies* is in keeping with Tacitus' well-known aversion to repetition or symmetry and suggests that in 11-16 Tacitus' deployment of *imago* was dictated more by immediate considerations of style than by the need to convey any theme.

In 11-16 Tacitus also uses *imago* to signify a dream or vision. *Imago* in this sense did not appear in 1-6, and the two instances in 11-16 show no trace
of the nuance 'ancestral image' or of any thematic connection. At 11.4 the vision which appeared to the knight Petra is called an imago, and Tacitus' choice of that term is clearly governed by a desire to avoid repetition of species: "verum nocturnae quietis species alteri objecta, tamquam vidisset Claudium spicis evinctum spicas retro conversis, eaque imagine gravitatem annonae (praesedixisset." At 16.1 imago designates the illusory dream which appeared to Caesellius Bassus:

Inlusi dehinc Neroni fortuna per vanitatem ipsius et promissa Caeselli Bassi, qui origine Poenus, mente turbida, nocturnae quietis imaginem ad spem hau dubia re\(i\) traxit, vectusque Romam, principis aditum emergetus, expromit repertum in agro suo spectum altitudine immensa, quo magna vis auri continetur, non in formam pecuniæ, sed rudi et antiquo pondere.

The use of the same phrase, nocturnae quietis, with imago at 16.1 and with species in 11.4 shows that imagine in the latter passage is employed merely as a substitute for species.

Imago appears once in Tacitus with its basic meaning 'imitation' (Gerber-Greef I.B.b.a.). At 15.70 Tacitus describes how the dying Lucan recited a poem which contained a literary imitation of his own death:

is profluent sanguine ubi frigescere pedes manusque et paulatim ab extremis cedere spiritum fervido adhuc et compote mentis pectore intellegit, recordatus carmen a se compositum, quo volneratum militem per eius modi mortis imaginem obisse tradiderat, versus ipsos rettulit, eaque illi suprema vox fuit.
In 11-16 *imago* is also used in the sense 'false appearance, pretense, pretext' which appeared in 1-6 at 1.10 and 81; 3.17, 36, and 60; and 6.27. In the later books, however, *imago* in this sense is not consistently applied to an Emperor's *dissimulatio* or to a conflict between Republican appearance and Imperial reality, as it was in 1-6. At 15.14 *imago* expresses the contrast between Roman claims to control Armenia and Parthian power to do so:

tum Paetus Lucullus, Pompeios et si qua Caesar obserant, Vasaces imaginem retinendi largimentum dive penes nos, vim penes Parthos memorat.

At 15.31 *imago* helps to express quite a different notion: the oriental's concern for the trappings of power contrasted with the Roman's attention to its actuality:

Et digressus Pacorum apud Medos, Vologaesen Ecbatanis repperit, non incuriosum fratris; quippe et propriis nuntiis a Corbulone petierat, ne quam imaginem servitii Tiridates perferret neu ferrum traderet aut complexu provincias obtinentium arceretur foribus eorum adsisteret, tantusque ei Romae quantus consulibus honor esset. scilicet externae superbiae sueto non inerat nostris, apud quos vis imperii valet, inania tramittuntur.

At 16.32 *imago* and *species* express the fraudulent methods by which Egnatius Celer preserved the appearance of a philosopher's virtue:

cliens hic [sc. Celer] Sorani, et tunc emptus ad opprimendum amicum, auctoritatem Stoicae sectae praeferebat, habitu et ore ad exprimendam
imaginem honesti avaritiam ac libidinem occultans; quae postquam pecunia reclusa sunt, dedit exemplum praecavendi, quo modo fraudibus involutos aut flagitiis commaculatos, sic specie bonarum artium falsos et amicitiae fallaces.

Although *imago* in 11-16 does not serve to convey the conflict between apparent Republic and real Empire as consistently as in 1-6, it does appear twice in conjunction with that idea. I have already quoted 16.7, in which two nobles of Republican houses, C. Cassius Longinus and L. Iunius Silanus, were charged with revolutionary designs on the grounds that Cassius had kept among his ancestral images a bust of the conspirator inscribed *duci partium*. The second instance requires no comment: "manebat nihilo minus quaedam imago rei publicae" (13.28). Yet these two occurrences do not constitute a theme, a conception unifying Tacitus' narration of events in the way that *imago* in 1-6 through the implications of the meaning 'ancestral image' unifies Tacitus' accounts of the prosecutions and deaths of the nobility, of the conflict between Germanicus and Tiberius, and of Tiberius' personal *dissimulatio* and lust into a coherent picture of the manifold conflict between the appearance of a Republic and the reality of an Empire. *Imago*, like *species*, had served its thematic purpose by the time Tacitus came to narrate the revealed tyranny of the later Julio-Claudian Principate.

*Imago*, because of its connotations founded in
Roman tradition and ritual, means more than 'likeness, image, statue.' Effigies, on the other hand, serves whenever Tacitus requires a word devoid of wider associations to mean simply 'statue.' Two observations confirm the neutral character of effigies in the Annales: first, although effigies is used forty-five times in the Annales, it nowhere appears with the nuance 'false appearance' which is so familiar from our examination of species and imago. Tacitus might have used the word to express a contrast between appearance and reality, for Seneca so uses it at Ep. 103.2: "Erras si istorum tibi qui occurrunt vultibus credis: hominum effigies habent, animos ferarum, nisi quod illarum perniciosus est primus incursus: quos transire non quaerunt." Second, Tacitus usually chooses effigies when he wishes to refer to statues of Augustus or Tiberius in 1-6 (e.g., 1.11 and 73; 2.41 and 64; 3.57, 64, and 70; 4.67). I have already noted (above, p.111) how Tacitus avoids using imago for an Emperor's statue in 1-6, although he does use the word for that purpose in 11-16. In 1-6 the neutral term effigies, not imago which was charged with associations and reserved to express the conflict between apparent Republic and real Empire, signifies 'statue' without evoking Republican associations.

Comparison of two passages, 4.52 and 12.68, will clarify the difference between effigies and imago.

At 4.52 (cf. above, pp.104 f.) Tacitus reports Agrippina's
angry assertion of her lineage before Tiberius: the
divine spirit of Augustus did not, she said, pass after
his death into silent statues (in effigies mutas);
rather she was the true image (imaginem veram) of her
ancestor, descended from celestial stock. Imago is
is used with the full force of its meaning 'ancestral
image,' but effigies signifies a mere statue and bears
no wider connotations. The two words could be inter­
changed without altering the basic, lexical meaning of
the passage, but not without sacrificing the association
of imago with Germanicus and his family and with the
meaning 'ancestral image.' In contrast, Agrippina the
Younger employs effigies to describe the resemblance
of a child to its parent, an idea which was expressed
by imago in 4.52: "iam primum Agrippina, velut dolore
victa et solacia conquirens, tenere amplexu Britannicum,
veram paterni oris effigiem appellare ac variis artibus
demorari, ne cubiculo egrederetur" (12.68). In the
later passage the neutral term effigies has replaced
imago in the same context.

Although effigies does not have the same consistent
relation to the conflict of appearance and reality as
species and imago, it is used in one series of four
passages to underscore the rise of Sejanus to power.
In this series the statues of Sejanus, a creature of
the Principate, are contrasted with the monuments of
the old Republic. Tacitus sets the tone for his use
of effigies in connection with Sejanus by recording
the restoration of the Basilica Aemilia by a descendant of its builder:

Isdem diebus Lepidus ab senatu petivit ut basilicam Pauli, Aemilia monimenta, propria pecunia firmaret ornaretque. erat etiam tum in more publica munificentia; nec Augustus arcuerat Taurum, Philippum, Balbum hostiles exuvias aut exundantis opes ornatum ad urbis et posterum gloriam conferre. quo tum exemplo Lepidus, quamquam pecuniae modicus, avitum decus recoluit. (3.72)

The laudable initiative of Lepidus, which recalls the example of the Republic and does credit to his noble ancestors, is shown to be a relic, not a precedent, by etiam tum. An adversative conjunction, at, opposes the remainder of the passage to the account of Lepidus' project. Lepidus, though of modest means, could reflect his Republican ancestors' glory by petitioning the Senate to allow him to restore the Basilica Aemilia, but the family of Pompey had fallen into poverty, and Caesar, not the Senate or any noble house, promises to restore the theater of Pompey. The Senate then decrees that the theater be adorned with statues of Caesar's creature:

at Pompei theatrum igne fortuito haustum
Caesar exstructurum pollicitus est, eo quod nemo e familia restaurando sufficeret, manente tamen nomine Pompei. simul laudibus Seianum extulit, tamquam labore vigilantiaque eius tanta vis unum intra damnun stetisset. et censuere patres effigiem Seiano, quae apud theatrum Pompei locaretur. (3.72)

The concessive tamen in "manente tamen nomine Pompei"
indicates that the phrase is to be taken closely with "nemo . . . sufficeret" as a reference to the remaining member of the Pompeian gens 69 and not, as Nipperdey, ad loc., implies, as a reference to the name of Pompey inscribed on the restored theater. Nomen signifies a noble family in a nearby passage: "Manlii, Quinctii aliaque eiusdem nobilitatis nomina" (3.76). Tacitus' juxtaposition of accounts of the rebuilding of two Republican monuments, the Basilica Aemilia and the theater of Pompey, allows him to present two aspects of the conflict between Republic and Empire. Lepidus' project was only a vestige of the glorious activities of Republican builders, and Tiberius' placing of a statue of Sejanus in Pompey's theater showed the decline of the Republican nobility and the hostility of the Emperor to Republican institutions. Tacitus is not interested in details of building projects except insofar as they relate to the themes of his history:

\[
\text{Nerone iterum L. Pisone consulibus pauc\-a mem\-oria digna evenere, nisi cui libeat laudandis fundamentis et trabibus, quis molem amphitheatri apud campum Martis Caesar exstruxerat, volumina implere, cum ex dignitate populi Romani repertum sit res inlustres analibus, talia diurnis urbis actis mandare. (12.31)}
\]

Tacitus' predecessor in history, Cremutius Cordus, had already recognized the importance of the statue of Sejanus in Pompey's theater; Seneca, in fact, records Cremutius' comment: "decernebatur illi statua in Pompei
teatro ponenda, quod exustum Caesar reficiebat.

exclamavit Cordus tunc vere theatrum perire" (cons. ad Marciam 22,4). The episode recorded in 3.76 marks the end of the first stage in Tacitus' portrayal of Sejanus (v. Koestermann, ad loc.) and comes only a little before the funeral of Junia (3.76; above, pp. 94 ff.) and the full-scale description of Sejanus' personality (4.1) which mark the division between the earlier, better part of Tiberius' reign and the later despotism.

In the course of this description of Sejanus and his consolidation of power Tacitus again mentions his statues:

neque senatorio ambitu abstinebat clientes suos honoribus aut provinciis ornandi, facili Tiberio atque ita prono, ut socium laborum non modo in sermonibus, sed apud patres et populum celebraret colique per theatra et fora effigies eius interque principia legionum sineret. (4.2)

Although the plurals theatra and fora are vague, Tacitus has previously mentioned only one statue of Sejanus, that in the theater of Pompey, and a reader cannot help but think of that statue as implied by theatra, since it was mentioned not six chapters before. Five chapters later Tacitus again mentions the statue of Sejanus in Pompey's theater, and here it clearly indicates the growing power of Sejanus:

et quantum superesse, ut collega dicatur? primas dominandi spes in arduo; ubi sis ingressus, adesse studia et ministros. exstructa iam sponte praefecti castra,
datos in manum milites; cerni effigiem eius in monimentis Cn. Pompei, communes illi cum familia Drusorum fore nepotes; precandam post haec modestiam, ut contentus esset. (4.7)

Three mentions of Sejanus' statue in twelve chapters emphasize its importance as an indicator of Sejanus' power, and the first passage, 3.72, establishes that the contrast between the statue of an Imperial creature and its location in a Republican monument is one manifestation of the contrast between Republic and Empire. Tacitus de-emphasizes the connections of Sejanus with the Republican nobility,\(^{70}\) just as he does not stress Tiberius' Claudian ancestry. In 4.7 the contrast between Sejanus and the nobility is implied not only by the mention of his statue, but by the wording of the subsequent clause: Sejanus' grandchildren would be members of the family of the Drusi—and thus grand-nieces or -nephews of Germanicus. "Communes illi cum familia Drusorum fore nepotes" refers to the proposed marriage of Sejanus' daughter to Drusus, the son of Claudius by Plautia Urgulanilla (3.29).

The statues of Sejanus herald his rise to power at the beginning of Book 5 and signal also his closer association with Tiberius and his growing influence over the Emperor at the end of that book. At 4.74 Tacitus reports that although Roman troops had been defeated by the Frisii, the Senate cared nothing for foreign affairs but feared only Sejanus and Tiberius.
and thought of no remedy but adulation:

neque senatus in eo cura, an imperii extrema dehonestarentur: pavor internus occupaverat animos, cui remedium adulatione quaerebatur. ita, quamquam diversis super rebus consulentrur, aram clementiae, aram amicitiae effigiesque circum Caesaris ac Seiani censuere; crebrisque precibus efflagitabant visendi sui copiam facerent.

The statues of both Tiberius and Sejanus indicate the increasingly close association of the Emperor and his minister, and Tacitus' description in the rest of the chapter of the embassy of senators, knights, and people to Sejanus vividly reveals that real power rested with the minister, who was less accessible than the Emperor (cuius durior congressus).

Like effigies, simulacrum, which occurs fourteen times in the Annales and seven times in the rest of Tacitus' works, can mean any statue, image, or representation. Simulacrum, however, frequently has the specific meaning 'statue of a god' (cf. Cic. Verr. II.5, 72; Caes. BG 6.16; BC 2.5; Lucr. 5.75 and 308; Verg. Aen. 2.172), and Tacitus uses it in this sense on eight occasions in the Annales (1.73; 3.63; 12.22; 14.12 and 32; 15.29, 44, and 45). With numen, however, Tacitus seems to prefer effigies, for he writes effigie numinum at 1.10 and 4.37, and numinum effigies at 3.71. Once simulacrum refers to the bronze bull which decorated the Forum Boarium (12.24), and once it signifies the models of battles and geographical features which were
displayed in the triumph of Germanicus (2.41). In all these passages simulacrum does not advance the theme of conflict between appearance and reality; rather it appears in a literal or technical sense. Once, however, simulacrum is used to convey the contrast between Republican appearance and Imperial reality. At 1.77 Tacitus reports an altercation in the Senate over a proposal that praetors be given the right to scourge actors:

actum de ea seditione apud patres, dicebanturque sententiae, ut praetoribus ius virgarum in histriones esset. intercessit Materius Agrippa tribunus plebei increpitusque est Asinii Galli oratione, silente Tiberio, qui ea simulacra libertatis senatui praebebat.

With the phrase simulacra libertatis may be compared species libertatis at 2.35 and 13.24 and libertatis imagine at 1.81. A similar disagreement between a senator and a tribune is called imago rei publicae at 13.28.

The one other occurrence of the metaphorical sense of simulacrum in 1-6 refers to the preservation of the urban prefecture during the Republic, even after the need for a viceroy had disappeared except for the days of the Feriae Latinae:

Namque antea, prefectis domo regibus ac mox magistratibus, ne urbs sine imperio foret, in tempus deligebatur qui ius redderet ac subitis mederetur; feruntque ab Romulo Dentrem Romulium, post ab Tullo Hostilio Numam Marcium et ab Tarquinio Superbo Spurium Lucretium impositos. dein consules mandabant;
duratque simulacrum, quotiens ob ferias
Latinas praeficitur qui consulare munus
usurpet (6.11).

Though the antiquarian digression was occasioned by
the obituary of L. Piso the pontifex (6.10), it serves
a further purpose: to display the similarity between
the ancient kings of Rome and the new Emperors. Only
under these sovereigns did the urban prefecture have
any real power, and three prefects of kings, Romulius
Denter, Marcius Numa, and Lucretius Spurius, are
balanced by three prefects of Emperors, Messala Corvinua,
Statilius Taurus, and L. Piso. Perhaps Tacitus was hard
put to find three urban prefects from the regal period.
Romulius Denter is known only from this passage, and
Livy, although he mentions Numa Marcius' pontificate
(1.10,5), says nothing of an urban prefecture. Livy
does, however, attest Lucretius' prefecture (1.59,12).
Maecenas held the post temporarily, during the transi­tional period when Octavian was consolidating his
power.72 The summary of Roman history in 1.1, "Urbem
Romam a principio reges habuere . . . [Augustus] cuncta
discordiis civilibus fessa nomine principis sub imperium
acceptit," makes the same point: despotism, open or
concealed, marks the beginning and the end of Roman
history. The Republic is an interlude characterized
by shifting forms of power ("ad tempus . . . neque
ultra biennium neque diu . . . non longa dominatio . . .
cito").73
No one should suppose, however, that *simulacrum* in 6.11 implies any conflict between appearance and reality under the Republic. The passage is concerned with the similarity of Empire to kingship, not with the contrast between Republic and Empire, and Tacitus' use of *simulacrum* elsewhere provides no inducement for a critic to discover thematic implications in every case. Except in 1.77, where the phrase *simulacra libertatis* left no doubt that the conflict between Republican appearance and Imperial reality was meant, *simulacrum* in the Annales means either 'statue' and specifically 'statue of a god' or 'imitation, similarity,' without reference to the conflict of Republican appearance and Imperial reality. This latter meaning appears at 6.11 and at 11.31, where *simulacrum* describes the masquerade of a vintage festival conducted by Messalina: "At Messalina non alias solutior luxu, adulto autumno simulacrum vindemiae per domum celebrabat." At 15.15 *simulacrum* refers to the Parthians' imitation of Roman practices: "addidit rumor sub iugum missas legiones et alia ex rebus infastis, quorum simulacrum ab Armeniis usurpatum est."

50 Cic. Pis. 1.1: "Obrepsisti ad honores errore hominum, commendatione fumosarum imaginum, quarum simile habes nihil praeter colorem."


52 Syme, 442 f.
The certain exception is 5.4 (below, p. 100). I call 3.34, "indecebat enim deterrimo cuique licentia impune probra et invidiam in bonos excitandi arrepta imagine Caesari," a possible exception only because Nipperdey, ad. loc., interpreted imagine as a reference not to an actual statue of the Emperor, but to a threatened charge of maiestas. Furneaux, followed by Koestermann, adequately refutes this notion.

Goodyear, Appendix 3, pp. 336 ff., issues a useful warning against overvaluing the effect and intention of alliteration.

Not, it seems, a very distinguished representative. Seneca, Ep. 70.10, fixes this young man on a very sharp pin: "Scribonia, gravis femina, amita Drusi Libonis fuit, adolescentis tam stolidi quam nobilis, maiora sperantis quam illo saeculo quisquam sperare poterat aut ipse ullo."

Tacitus errs, perhaps intentionally, in suggesting that Tiberius was the first to circumvent the laws that a man's slaves could not be tortured to testify against him by selling the slaves to the commonwealth. Dio, 55.5.4, reports a similar sale of slaves to the state in 8 B.C.

He was the son of an otherwise unknown M. Hortensius,

58 The location is confirmed by a clause of the Tabula Hebana; see S. Weinstock, "The Image and the Chair of Germanicus," JRS 47 (1957), p. 145. The images, W. shows, were probably imagines clipeatae.

59 On Tacitus' sources for this account, see G. B. Townend, "The Trial of Aemilia Lepida," Latomus 21 (1962), 484 ff.

60 Cf. 1.65, "nam Quintilium Varum [not, e.g., 'Quintilii Vari speciem'] . . . cernere et audire visus est velut vocantem."

61 Of the twelve obituary notices in the Annales, four (3.30; 4.61; 6.27 and 39) are explicitly stated to be the last items in a year, three (13.30; 14.19 and 47) are in fact the last items, and three (3.48 and 75; 4.44) occupy the last place but one. Only two occur in midyear (4.15; 6.10), and both the men thus commemorated, Lucilius Longus and L. Piso, had public funerals. See R. Syme, "Obituaries in Tacitus," AJPh 79 (1958), 18 ff.

62 As, for example, at 1.33 and 52; 2.26. See also S. Borzsak, "Das Germanicusbild des Tacitus," Latomus

Germanicus has been mentioned briefly and favorably at 1.3 and 7.


For more general remarks on the association of imago and memoria in Tacitus and other authors, see Hommel, Würzburger Studien 9 (1936), 141 ff.

Se imaginem is Muretus' certain restoration of the Medicean ms.' reading set imagine.

On this aversion see G. Sörbom, Variatio Sermonis
Tacitei (Upsala, 1935). Tacitus is not averse to meaningful repetition. His repetition of qui aderat exercitus from 1.61 at 1.62 underscores, as Furneaux, ad loc., says, the contrast of the living army with the dead.

68 The interpretation of "per eius modi mortis imaginem" followed above is not generally accepted. It stems from the comment of Nipperdey, ad loc., "weil er jenen Fall erdichtet hatte: 'durch einen erdichteten Tod dieser Art.'" Gerber-Greef follow Nipperdey, but Furneaux translated, "by a form of death similar to it," and adduces as parallels III.28, omni imagine mortium, Verg. Aen. 2.369, plurima mortis image, Thuc. 3.81, πᾶσα ἱδέα κατέστη Θανατοῦ, and Shakespeare, Macbeth I.iii.97, "strange images of death." Koestermann follows Furneaux and translates, "durch einen Tod, dem seinigen ähnlich war." Yet none of these parallels will reconcile the Latin with the translations of Furneaux or Koestermann. The difficulty lies in eius modi, for if mortis imaginem means 'a kind of death'--and the parallels do establish that the two words can mean that--then eius modi will be redundant. The phrase cannot mean 'a kind of death of that kind,' and Furneaux's translation of eius modi by "similar to it" strains the Latin, while Koestermann's is even vaguer. Neither commentator provides a parallel for eius modi meaning 'similar to' when used with a word meaning 'form,
species, variety.'

69 Sex. Pompeius, cos. 14, noted for his elegant conversation (Val. Max. II.6,8) and mentioned in Ovid's works (Pont. IV.1; 4,15 ff.). As Muretus noted, at Sen. Tranq. 11.10, numquid divitior Pompeio, Ptolemaeo must be read.


71 E.g., Cic. Arch. 12,30; Verr. II.2,65.

72 See Koestermann, ad loc., p. 266; Syme, p. 432.

73 See Klingner, SBAW 1953, 5 ff.
## TABLE I

**Species in Tacitus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Ager.</th>
<th>Germ.</th>
<th>Dial.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.a.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.b.1</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.b.2.a</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.b.2.b</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.α.</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.β.</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.γ-δ.</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.ε.</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.ε.α.</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.ε.β.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.ε.γ.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*I have chosen to keep the categories and classification of Gerber-Greef, s.v. species, not because I agree with them in every case, but because their grouping is on the whole more conservative than mine would be. Thus speciem in Agr. 39 (above, p. ) might more properly belong to D. than to B.l.a. if we consider the passage illustrative of Domitian's dissimulatio, and I would so consider it. Yet we have here a question of interpretation, and the general conservatism of Gerber-Greef is a kind of insurance for the correctness of any interpretation based on data drawn from their systems.

**Gerber-Greef's categories D.γ. and D.δ. duplicate material included under other categories.

KEY TO TABLE I

Gerber-Greef:

A: Anblick, Aussehen; e.g., "variae hinc bellantium species, cum Parthus sequi vel fugere pari arte suetus distraheret turmas, spatium ictus quaereret, Sarmatae omissa arcu, quo brevius valent, contis gladiisque ruerent" (6.35).

B.l.a.α: (Aussere) Gestalt, Erscheinung; e.g., "augebat intuentium visus eximia ipsius species currusque quinque liberis onustus" (2.41).

B.l.a.β: Erscheinungen, Formen; e.g., "[Piso] claro apud volgum rumore erat per virtutem aut species virtutibus similes" (15.48).

B.l.b.1: Gestalt, Erscheinung im Traume; e.g., "verum nocturnae quietis species alteri obiecta, tamquam vidisset Claudium spicea corona evictum" (11.4).

B.l.b.2.α: grossartige Erscheinung; e.g., "velis habiles, citae remis augetabantur alacritate militum in speciem ac terrorem" (2.6).

B.l.b.2.β: Glanz, Gepränge; e.g., "sua consulibus, sua praetoribus species; minorum quoque magistratum exercitum potestas; legesque, si malestatis quaestio eximeretur, bono in usu" (4.6).

B.2: Gestalt, Form, Art; e.g., "quin et manu mittendi duas species institutas, ut relinquaretur paenitentiae aut novo beneficio locus" (13.27).
G: **Ideal**, e.g., "scilicet sublime et erectum ingenium pulchritudinem ac **speciem** magnae excelsaeque gloriae vehementius quam caute appetebat" (Agr. 4).

D.α: **Schein, Anschein, Vorwand**; e.g., "vectigal quoque quintae et vicesimae venalium mancipiorum remissum, **specie** magis quam vi, quia, cum venditor pendere iuberetur, in partem pretii emptoribus adcrebecbat" (13.31).

D.β: **species** with the same meaning as D. α and governing a genitive, except those instances included under D. e; e.g., "Gallus, quia **speciem** libertatis Piso praeciperat, nihil satis inlustre aut ex dignitate populi Romani nisi coram et sub oculis Caesaris, eoque conventum Italiae et adflucentis provincias praeentiae eius servanda dicebat" (2.35).

D.ε.αα: **specie** as in D.; e.g., "convictique et puniti sunt qui **specie** amicitiae dolum parabant" (14.24).

D.ε.ββ: **per speciem** as in D.; e.g., "consulesque sede vulgari **per speciem** maestitiae sedentis honoris locique admonuit et effusum in lacrimas senatum victo gemitu, simul oratione continua erexit" (4.8).

D.ε.γγ: **in speciem** as in D.; e.g., "favorabili **in speciem** oratione vim imperii tenuit" (2.36).

E: **Art**, opp. genus; e.g., "nec refert quod inter se **specie** differunt, cum genere consentiant" (Dial. 25).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>number of instances</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of words in each pentad</th>
<th>88,400</th>
<th>70,800</th>
<th>76,000</th>
<th>76,700</th>
<th>62,600</th>
<th>74,300</th>
<th>56,200</th>
<th>505,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of total number of words made up by species</td>
<td>.03%</td>
<td>.04%</td>
<td>.05%</td>
<td>.03%</td>
<td>.03%</td>
<td>.03%</td>
<td>.04%</td>
<td>.038%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerber-Greef example</td>
<td>Agr.</td>
<td>Dial.</td>
<td>Germ.</td>
<td>I-V</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.a.α.</td>
<td>IV.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.a.β.1.</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.a.β.2.</td>
<td>II.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.a.β.3.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.a.γ.</td>
<td>V.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.b.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.c.</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.a.</td>
<td>IV.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.b.α.</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.b.β.</td>
<td>III.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.b.γ.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.a.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.b.</td>
<td>I.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY TO TABLE III

Gerber-Greef:

I.A.a.a: literal, of beasts; e.g., "hinc veteranarum cohortium signa, inde deprompta silvis lucisve ferrarum imagines" (IV.22).

I.A.a.β.1: literal, of men; e.g., "effigies Poppaeae proruunt, Octaviae imagines gestant humeris" (14.61).

I.A.a.β.2: literal, of emperors; e.g., "populus cum lauru ac floribus Galbae imagines circum templata tuit" (II.55).

I.A.a.β.3: literal, of ancestors; e.g., "circumfusas lecto Claudiorum Iuliorumque imagines" (3.5).

I.A.γ: literal, of the gods; e.g., "Aegyptii pleraque animalia effigiesque compositas venerantur, Judaei mente sola unumque numen intelligunt: profanos, qui deum imagines mortalibus materiis in species hominum effingant" (V.5).

I.A.b: Abbild, Ebenbild; e.g., "non in effigies mutas divinum spiritum transfusum: se imaginem veram, caelesti sanguine ortam, intellegere discrimen, suscipere sordes" (4.52).

I.A.c: Traumbild; e.g., "Inlusit dehinc Neroni fortuna per vanitatem ipsius et promissa Caeselli Bassi, qui origine Poenus, mente turbida, nocturnae quietis imaginem ad spem haud dubiae rei traxit" (16.1).

I.B.a: metaphorical; e.g., "Manlius Patruitus senator pulsatum se in colonia Seniens coetu multitudinis et iussu magistratum querebatur; nec finem iniuriae hic stetisse: planctum et lamenta et
Key to Table III (cont’d.)

supremorum imaginem praesenti sibi circumdata
cum contumeliiis ac probris, quae in senatum
universum iacerentur” (IV.45).

I.B.b.α: metaphorical, as opposite of truth or reality;
e.g., “recordatus carmen a se compositum, quo
volneratum militem per eius modi mortis imaginem
obisse tradiderat” (15.70).

I.B.b.β: metaphorical, with deception implied; e.g.,
“simulationem prorsus et imaginem deponendi
imperii fuisse ad decipiendos tot inlustres
viros” (III.70).

I.B.b.γ: metaphorical, with emptiness implied; e.g.,
“Tiberius, vim principatus sibi firmans, imaginem
antiquitatis senatui praebebat” (3.60).

II.a: sight; e.g., “exercitum imagine caesorum insepul-
torumque tardatum ad proelia et formidolosiorum
hostium credebat” (1.62).

II.b: thought; e.g., “recordatio maiestatis in Galba,
amicitiae in Tito Vinio quamvis immitem animum
imagine tristi confuderat” (1.44).
APPENDIX A

In the body of this dissertation I have twice referred to the relationship between Valerius Messala Corvinus and his son, Valerius Messalinus (above, pp. 42, 106 f.). In this appendix I shall set forth in greater detail that relationship and that of another father and son, Asinius Pollio and Asinius Gallus, and I shall show how the roles of these men and of two other orators in the Annales are connected with the conflict of Republican appearance and Imperial reality.

During Tacitus' account of the events of A.D. 47, the delators P. Suillius and Cossutianus Capito argue against a motion to enforce the lex Cincia, which forbade advocates to receive fees or gifts:

facile Asinium et Messalam, inter Antonium et Augustum bellorum praemii refertos, aut ditium familiarum heredes Aeserninos et Arruntios magnum animum induisse. prompta sibi exempla, quantis mercedibus P. Clodius aut C. Curio contionari soliti sint. (11.7)

The examples of honest orators put forth by Silius (11.6) and rejected by Suillius and Capito form an interesting group, not least because they recall the times of Tiberius or before. By 47, in fact, Asinius, Messala, and Arruntius were certainly dead and Aeserninus
probably so. In these four men meet several strands of Tacitus' interests: oratory and literature, genealogy and the ancestry of his contemporaries, the nature of the Principate and the methods and fate of good men under it.

C. Asinius Pollio (PIR² I.1241) and M. Valerius Messala Corvinus (PIR¹ III.90) were the principal orators of the Augustan age (Vell. Pat. 2.36; Quint. Inst. 1.113; Dial. 12.6). Pollio was an historian as well, noted for his resolute neutrality in the campaigns before Actium and his intractable, though passive, Republicanism thereafter. His history treated the last years of the Republic and placed the beginning of the end in 60 B.C., when Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus first contracted to destroy the free state.¹ Both he and Messala had consular descendants in Tacitus' time: L. Valerius Catullus Messalinus, who held a second consulate in 85 (Fasti Ostienses XIIIis = Inscriptiones Italiae 13.1, p. 193), Q. Asinius Marcellus, consul in an uncertain year (CIL XIV.4447; Degrassi, Fasti Cons. 113,154), and M. Asinius Marcellus, consul in 104 (Degrassi, Fasti Cons. 31). Asinius Pollio's grandson, M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus (PIR² II.928), is cited here as an orator worthy of his grandfather's example in style and morals.² Pollio's daughter Asinia, whose name is nowhere attested, married Marcellus Aeserninus, consul in 22 B.C. and father of the celebrated orator.³ The consul of 22 had for his colleague L. Arruntius (CIL I²
p. 28; VI.32323), one of Octavian's commanders at Actium (Vell. Pat. 2.85; Dio 50.14,1) and an historian. More cautious than Pollio, he chose to treat the Punic Wars (Sen. Ep. 114.17-19). His son, L. Arruntius (PIR² I.1130), is commended for eloquence and ethics at 11.6-7.⁴

Pollio, Messala, Aeserninus, and Arruntius, orators and historians, attract the attention and commendation of Tacitus. These men's literary activities do not, however, fully account for their prominence in this debate. The four exemplary orators, or their sons, form a group distinguished for opposition to the Principate or survival under it. These qualities were never far from Tacitus' thoughts.

---Valerius Messala Corvinus and Valerius Messalinus---

Messala Corvinus did not live to see Tiberius emperor, but his son Valerius Messalinus (PIR¹ III.93) could represent his father's oratorical distinction and service to the regime. It was the father Valerius Messala who proposed the title pater patriae for Augustus (Suet. Aug. 58). The son Valerius Messalinus, here called Messala Valerius, appears first in Tacitus at 1.8 as the sponsor of an extravagant motion: that the oath of allegiance to Tiberius should be renewed annually.
When Tiberius asked whether the motion came on Messalinus' own initiative, he responded that he had consulted no one but himself and would speak his mind even at the risk of causing offense. "Ea sola species adulandi supererat," Tacitus scornfully comments. Although Messalinus used the cognomen 'Messala' along with 'Messalinus' in his official titulature (CIL IV.2450), he is usually called 'Messalinus' in the literary sources (e.g., Tibull. II.5,17 and 115; Ovid Pont. I.7,1 and 67; II.2,3 and 87; Vell. Pat. 2.112; Dio 55.30) to distinguish him from his father. At 1.8 Tacitus reverses the usual order, nomen-cognomen, for emphasis and gives Messalinus his father's name as well as a shadow of his attributes.

Messalinus' proposal in 1.8 is associated with that of Arruntius, one of the men also commemorated at 11.6-7, and that of Gallus, the son of another. An important difference should, however, be noted between the proposals of Gallus and Arruntius and that of Messalinus. Their motions concern the past, the funeral of Augustus, while his pertains to Tiberius and forecasts further adulation to come. Tacitus will use Arruntius and Gallus as two different types of an opponent of Tiberius, but Messalinus serves as an example of the contrast between servants of the old and new regimes. He is not a person of consequence in the history of the early Principate, yet he receives early prominence in the Annales and in his only other appearance is
given a full-dress oration to deliver on a subject of little importance: should proconsuls' wives accompany them to their provinces (3.34)? On the latter occasion too his reflection of his father's talent is remarked. The two Valerii, father and son, typify the relationship in Tacitus between Republic and Empire. M. Valerius Messala Corvinus, patrician of a noble Republican house, could serve Augustus well while maintaining independence and dignity in life and eloquence.5 His son, on the other hand, did not approach his father's stature, and his eloquence, spent upon trivial subjects, resembled but did not equal his father's. The appearance of Messalinus called to mind his Republican and Augustan ancestry; the reality under Tiberius was changed and far different.

---Asinius Pollio and Asinius Gallus---

If Valerius Messalinus could illustrate the transition from cooperation to servility, C. Asinius Gallus (PIR2 I.1229), Pollio's son, could serve to exemplify the inevitable fate of his father's obdurate Republicanism under the new dispensation. After his first introduction into the Annales as sponsor of a motion concerning Augustus' funeral (1.8), Gallus next appears in the subsequent session of the Senate, which confirmed Tiberius
as Augustus' successor. His unexpected response to Tiberius' refusal to undertake the whole responsibility of Empire provoked the Imperial wrath. Tiberius said nothing, but Gallus inferred his anger from his countenance and withdrew into evasion and adulation, to no avail. His marriage to Vipsania, the wife whom Augustus had forced Tiberius to divorce, and his inherited intractability counted too heavily against him:

\[\text{nec ideo iram eius [sc. Tiberii] lenivit, pridem invisus, tamquam ducta in matrimonium Vipsania, M. Agrippae filia, quae quondam Tiberii uxor fuerat, plus quam civilia agitaret Pollionisque Asinii patris ferociam retineret.} \quad (1.12)\]

The characteristics of Gallus' first extended appearance, offense given to Tiberius who reacts with dissimulation, and the reasons for Tiberius' anger, Gallus' marriage to Vipsania, his ambition for more than civilian status, his retention of his father's ferocity, recur in Gallus' other appearances in the *Annales*. At 4.71 Gallus again follows up a guarded remark which Tiberius had made in a letter alluding to Nero and Agrippina with a demand for clarification and an assertion of the Senate's prerogatives. He suggests that Tiberius should confess his suspicions to the Senate and allow the Senate to dispel them: "petendum a principe ut metus suos senatui fateretur anoverique sineret." This time Tiberius' dissimulatio does not merely mask his anger; this cherished imperial virtue is directly exposed, and Sejanus must
intervene, not from any consideration for Gallus, but in the knowledge that Tiberius' anger is the more formidable in delay and concealment. Again Gallus' dynastic connections are underscored even as his motives for asking Tiberius to name Agrippina and Nero before the Emperor is ready to do so are revealed: "Gallus, cuius liberorum Agrippina matertera erat."

At 1.76 Gallus proposes that the Sibylline Books be consulted in connection with recent floods of the Tiber. Tiberius refuses, preferring to keep divine affairs as well as human obscure. At 1.77 Gallus censures the tribune Materius Agrippa. An attack on a tribune could be construed as an attack on one pillar of Empire, the tribunician power. Tiberius is silent; he liked to allow the Senate some show of free speech ("silente Tiberio, qui ea simulacra libertatis praebet."). At 2.36 Gallus again comes into conflict with Tiberius by proposing that Tiberius select candidates for the praetorship five years in advance. The proposal appears to increase the Emperor's power to dispose of the higher magistracies; in reality, it seeks to limit the Emperor's control. Tiberius' reply has the appearance of moderate deference to the interests of the Senate, but in truth it serves to keep the power of Empire: "favorabili in speciem oratione vim imperii tenuit."

In all these passages Gallus provokes Tiberius' wrath and dissimulation with some speech or question which seems innocuous or even flattering to the Emperor.
Tiberius is not the only one who can say one thing and mean another. In other passages Gallus presents a very different character, adulatory and sycophantic. We have already commented on 2.32 (above, p. 89). Immediately after his motion in the matter of Scribonius Libo, Gallus speaks in the Senate in support of Tiberius against the imposition of any further sumptuary legislation (2.33). This time it is Gallus who conceals shameful reality beneath an honorable appearance: "sub nominibus honestis confessio vitiorum et similitudo audentium." At 2.35 Gallus proposes that no senatorial business should be conducted unless Caesar is present. The proposal is couched in adulatory terms: "nihil satis inlustre aut ex dignitate populi Romani nisi coram et sub oculis Caesaris, eoque conventum Italiae et adfluentis provincias praesentiae eius servanda." Gallus is reacting to a proposal of L. Piso that seems free-spoken and assertive of Senatorial power. The reality is otherwise: "speciem libertatis Piso praecisperat." Tiberius listens in silence, and nothing happens.

The contradictions in the character of Gallus, at one time outspoken against the regime and at another proposing shamefully adulatory motions, correspond to contradictions seen by Tacitus in the nature of the Principate. The Republican intractability and fierce neutrality of Asinius Pollio could be reflected, but not reproduced, in his son. Likewise the oratorical talent of the Republican aristocrat Valerius Messala,
freely given to cooperation with Augustan policies, became enforced and eloquent servility in his son Messalinus. The conflict between appearance and reality characteristic of the Principate is characteristic of the actions of both younger men as recorded in the Annales. Messalinus tried to give his adulation the appearance of independent speech (1.8), while Gallus, who is developed at greater length, disguises opposition to the regime in speech that seems innocuous or favorable (1.12, 16, and 77; 2.36; 4.71). The dissimulatio of Tiberius always answers Gallus' attempts at opposition; when Gallus agrees with or praises Tiberius, appearance and reality still conflict (2.33 and 35).

---L. Arruntius---

Gallus was more than an ineffectual needler of the regime; he was eager to rule. But another of the orators mentioned at 11.6, L. Arruntius, showed capacity as well as eagerness for power:

quippe Augustus supremis sermonibus, cum tractaret, quinam adipisci principem locum suffecturi abnuerent aut impares vellent vel idem possent cuperentque, M. Lepidum dixerat capacem sed aspernantem, Gallum Asinium avidum et minorem, L. Arruntium non indignum et, si casus daretur, ausurum. (1.13)

Unlike Gallus, however, Arruntius successfully combined
in Tacitus' estimation service to the commonwealth with opposition to the regime. He first appears at 1.8 along with Gallus and Valerius Messalinus. Later we learn that Arruntius offended Tiberius by some sentiment similar to Gallus' in 1.12. Tiberius' deeper objection to Arruntius was not, however, based on marriage alliance or inherited truculence; rather, his character and accomplishments offended: "Tiberio nulla vetus in Arruntium ira: sed divitem, promptum, artibus egregiis et pari fama publice, suspectabat" (1.13). In Augustus' discussion of the capaces imperii which follows, Arruntius comes off best. At 1.76 Arruntius and the jurist Ateius Capito are given the task of finding a method for preventing any further floods like the one which has just devastated Rome. Tacitus has no favorable opinion of Capito (cf. 3.70); his association with Arruntius is not emphasized and produces no remedies. 9

Arruntius again turns up in association with Asinius Gallus and another of the men mentioned at 11.6, Aeserninus, when they and others are asked to stand by Cn. Piso at his trial:

Post quae reo L. Arruntium, P. Vinicium, Asinimum Gallum, Aeserninum Marcellum, Sex. Pompeium patronos petenti iisque diversa excusantibus M. Lepidus et L. Piso et Livineius Regulus adfuere, arrecta omni civitate, quanta fides amicis Germanici, quae fiducia reo; satín cohaberet ac premeret sensus suos Tiberius. (3.11)

According to one view 10 Arruntius, Gallus, and the
others refused to defend Piso because they judged it imprudent for members of the opposition to defend a man charged with treason. The contrary view, that refusing to defend Piso was an act of opposition, finds support in the text. Tacitus had opposed the virtuous Germanicus to the wily Tiberius (above, pp. 96 ff.). To stand by the memory of Germanicus, then, by refusing to aid his enemy would be to go against the sentiments of Tiberius, so far as they could be ascertained, and coincidentally to benefit the group whose interests were connected with the Emperor's son, Drusus. The attention of all the citizens is devoted to precisely this question: will the friends of Germanicus remain loyal to him? The citizenry have earlier remarked the meanness of Tiberius in connection with Germanicus' obsequies (3.5). Someone may object that Tacitus does not present Tiberius as actively supporting Piso. Rather the Emperor is merciless in his judgment of the rebel (3.14). Yet Tacitus does his best in the face of a dearth of evidence to imply that Tiberius supported Piso against Germanicus. Neutrality, or any actions unfavorable to Piso, could be attributed to Tiberian dissimulatio; this quality too occupies the people's thoughts: "satin cohiberet ac premeret sensus suos Tiberius." If rumor had held that Piso acted under secret instructions from Tiberius, according to Tacitus it lay beyond doubt that Augusta had incited Plancina against Germanicus' wife (2.43). Furthermore, according to another rumor Piso was prepared
to present written evidence that he had thwarted Germanicus on the Emperor's authority, and Piso's death was no suicide, but an execution. Men still living in Tacitus' youth thought as much (3.16). Tiberius' solicitous concern in the matter of Piso's death is a mask: "flexo in maestitiam ore."

Arruntius thus appears at 3.11 in a context of opposition to, or at least non-cooperation with, Tiberius. Another reason for the listing of those reluctant to defend Piso may be discovered in Tacitus' attention to the history of Roman oratory. Of the five men who refused to defend Piso, Arruntius and Aeserninus reappear in the group of good orators at 11.6; Asinius Gallus recalls his father Pollio, who also appears at 11.6; P. Vinicius, father of M. Vinicius the grandson-in-law of Tiberius, was an orator of distinction (Sen. Controv. I.4, 11) a fastidious critic (ibid. VII.5, 11), and a devotee of Ovid's works (ibid. X.4, 25); Sex. Pompeius, noted for his elegant conversation (Val. Max. II.6, 8), had earned mention in Ovid's works (Pont. IV.1; 4, 15 ff.); his oratorical prowess, though nowhere attested, may be safely assumed. Tacitus takes this opportunity to commend his predecessors in letters and to group together prominent opponents of the regime.11

At 3.31 Arruntius and Mamercus Scaurus defend their young kinsman L. Sulla against a complaint that he had not shown sufficient deference to Domitius Corbulo. The affair was trivial, and Arruntius' role in it is
not stressed; Scaurus' luxuriant oratory receives most of Tacitus' attention. Sulla himself was a harmless and stolid nonentity (13.47), but his name was potent, and his sloth might seem in another emperor's eyes to conceal ambition (14.57). Tiberius had recently retired to Campania for his health (3.31), but the defense of Sulla cannot have escaped his attention. Scaurus, accused but not condemned in the matter of Vistilius (6.9), was driven finally to a suicide worthy of the Aemilii (6.29). The ostensible cause was a tragedy containing seditious verses, but earlier manifestations of anti-Imperial sentiment may have weighed in Tiberius' mind. At 6.5 Arruntius and another of the capaces imperii, M. Lepidus, figure in an attack made by the leading senators on Cotta Messalinus. Cotta was charged with, among other things, referring to Tiberius in an overly familiar fashion: "querensque de potentia M. Lepidi ac M. Arruntii, cum quibus ob rem pecuniam disceps-tabant, addidisse: 'illos quidem senatus, me autem tuebitur Tiberiolus meus.'" Arruntius and Lepidus have little to do with the chief business of the chapter, the inability of the Senate to prosecute Cotta who enjoyed the Emperor's favor; nevertheless, Arruntius appears here too as a member of the senatorial opposition. He had, in fact, been accused of maiestas the year before (6.7; cf. Rogers, CPh 26, 37-39).

At 6.27 Arruntius again receives passing notice. Tiberius, upbraiding the Senate for its unwillingness
to undertake the responsibility of governing provinces, forgets Arruntius, who has been detained in Rome for a decade \(^{12}\) since his appointment to the governorship of Spain. Elsewhere (II.65) Tacitus says that fear led Tiberius to keep Arruntius in the capital, and Arruntius must have been viewed with at least suspicion by the Emperor. The events following the death of Nero would show how much potential lay at the disposal of a capable governor of Spain or Syria. Arruntius, *capax imperii* and an opponent of the regime, could not be trusted to govern his province in person.

Arruntius' last action in the *Annales* comes at 6.47 f. He had been no friend of Sejanus and was likewise no friend of Macro, and when he was named along with Cn. Domitius and Vibius Marsus as a paramour of Albucilla, the circumstances of the indictment gave grounds for suspicion that the charge had been divised to satisfy Macro's enmity toward Arruntius. Rather than continue a fruitless opposition to a regime which showed every sign of worsening, Arruntius chose to end his life. He is not given an obituary, but instead a noble and prophetic valedictory speech. From first to last, Tacitus portrays Arruntius in the *Annales* as a man capable of Empire (1.13; 6.27), consistent in prudent opposition to the Principate (3.11 and 31; 6.5), and faithful in practical service to the commonwealth (1.76 and 77; 6.27).

Less can be said about the fourth orator commended
at 11.6, M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus. There is no evidence that he held any magistracy higher than the praetorship in 19 (CIL I\textsuperscript{2}, p. 70), and in all probability he died before reaching the consulate,\textsuperscript{13} but not before establishing a reputation for eloquence. We may suppose that his political sentiments and activities accorded with those of the group with which he is associated at 3.11: Arruntius, Gallus, P. Vinicius, and Sex. Pompeius.

Rhetorical talent is not the only distinction uniting the four orators praised at 11.7, Asinius Pollio, Valerius Messala, Aeserninus Marcellus, and L. Arruntius. Each in his own way presents a different solution to a problem which occupied Tacitus' thoughts as early as the 	extit{Agricola}: how do good men fare under bad princes? Chronology excluded Pollio and Messala from the 	extit{Annales}, but their sons could represent by contrast with the fathers how intractability and voluntary cooperation alike would degenerate into ineffectual servility or meaningless and ostentatious opposition. Both Valerius Messalinus and Asinius Gallus fell victim to the contrast between appearance and reality characteristic of the Principate, and neither reproduced under Tiberius the successful accommodation of his father to Augustus. Aeserninus established his reputation for the highest eloquence and died young, thereby revealing another method of preserving reputation and talent uncorrupted. Arruntius managed to combine meaningful, effective,
and lengthy service to the state with prudent opposition to Tiberius. This solution to the problem first posed in the Agricola met Tacitus' favor, for he honors Arruntius with first place among the capaces imperii (Piso, whom some authorities substituted for Arruntius, is relegated to a parenthetical note) and with an extended death-scene. Arruntius' final speech and death confirmed the rightness of his mode of life; he understood the Principate and foretold its future course.
NOTES: APPENDIX A


2 See also Sen. Controv. II.5,9; VII.1.5; 2,10; Suas. II.9; VII.4,10.

3 There is no need to postulate, as Groag does in PIR², a third M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus.

4 Recentiorum is conclusive against the suggestion of von Rohden, PW II.1262, that the consuls of 22 are meant at 11.6.

5 Cf. 11.6, "ad summa proiectos incorrupta vita et facundia." Messala fought for Brutus and Cassius at Philippi and later joined the cause of Antony, and his literary circle never embraced Augustanism as heartily as did that of Maecenas.
One cannot help but apply "verum ut cunctationes . . . coniungere" to Sejanus. Tacitus foreshadows the minister's downfall as well as Gallus'.

Adultery with Gallus is part of the charges against Agrippina at 6.25.

Note the tense of "adiecerat"; Tiberius spoke first.

R. S. Rogers, "Lucius Arruntius," CPh 26 (1931), p. 33, suggests that Tiberius appointed Arruntius to the commission in order to win his support. Nothing in Tacitus, however, indicates that Arruntius and Capito were appointed by Tiberius. The cippi of the curatores riparum, the permanent board of five which replaced the two-man commission, describe the curatores as acting "ex s. c." (CIL VI.31541). Not until the time of Claudius do the curatores describe themselves as acting "ex auctoritate Caesaris" (CIL VI.31545). Dio (57.14), who is apt to be imprecise about constitutional details, implies that Tiberius chose the commissioners.

Rogers, op. cit., 35.

P. Vinicius' opposition to Sejanus is recorded by Sen. Controv. VII.5,11. Sex. Pompeius, of whom little is known (above, n. 69), has at least a Republican
name. All four *capaces imperii* appear at 3.11: Gallus and Arruntius against Piso, M. Lepidus and L. Piso for him. This polarization may reflect the confused political orientation of Piso's trial and the uncertainty over Tiberius' position.

12 "Decimum annum" is a round figure, for Arruntius' predecessor, Piso, had been assassinated in 25 (4.45).

13 Groag, *PIR²* II.928, following Borghesi, suggests that "ad summa" at 11.6 implies the consulship, probably a suffect post in an uncertain year under Tiberius. Degrassi, however, cannot find a place for him in the *Fasti Cons.*, and Tacitus would surely have said more about him had he lived. He is mentioned only at 3.11 and 11.6-7.
APPENDIX B
Species in Lucretius

Species:

1.10 ff: nam simul ac species patefactast verna diei
et reserata viget genitabilis aura favoni,
aeriae primum volucres te, diva, tuumque
significant initum perculsae corda tua vi.

1.146 ff: Hunc igitur terrorem animi tenebrasque necessest
non radii solis neque lucida tela diei
discutiant, sed naturae species raticque.
(The same three lines are repeated at 2.59 ff., 3.91 ff.,
and 6.39 ff.)

2.364 f; nec vitulorum aliae species per pabula laeta
derivare queunt animum curaque levare.

2.701 ff: . . . nam vulgo fieri portentia videres,
semiferas hominum species existere et altos
interdum ramos egigni corpore vivo.

2.1024 f: nam tibi vementer nova res molitur ad auris
accidere et nova se species ostendere rerum.

2.1036 f: aut minus ante quod auderent fore credere gentes?
nil, ut opinor: ita haec species miranda fuisset.

4.601 f: perscinduntur enim, nisi recta foramina tranant,
qualia sunt vitri, species qua transvolat omnis.

4.706 ff: Nec tamen hoc solis in odoribus atque saporum
in generest, sed item species rerum atque colores
non ita conveniunt ad sensus omnibus omnes,
ut non sint aliis quaedam magis acria visu.
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5.93 ff: quorum naturam triplicem, tria corpora, Memmi, 
tris species tam dissimilis, tria talaia texta, 
una dies dabit exitio, multosque per annos 
sustentata ruet moles et machina mundi.

5.1293 f: inde minutatim processit ferreus ensis 
versaque in opprobrium species est falcis aenae.

6.993 f: nam fluere hac species, illac calor ire videtur, 
atque aliis aliud citius transmittere eadem.

Perhaps we should add 6.83, ... est ratio caeli 
(species) que tenenda.

speciem:

1.124 ff: unde sibi exortam semper florentis Homeri 
commemorat speciem lacrimas effundere salsas 
coepisse et rerum naturam expandere dictis.

1.320 f: sed quae corpora decedant in tempore quoque, 
invida praeclusit speciem natura videndi.

2.489 f: omnimodis expertus eris, quam quisque det ordo 
formai speciem totius corporis eius.

3.213 ff: nil ibi libatum de toto corpore cernas 
ad speciem, nil ad pondus: mors omnia praestat 
vitalem praeter sensum calidumque vaporem.

4.46 ff: Dico igitur rerum effigias tenuisque figuras 
mittier ab rebus summo de corpore rerum, 
quae quasi membranae vel cortex nominitandast, 
quod speciem ac formam similem gerit eius imago 
cuiuscumque cluet de corpora fusa vagari.

4.78 ff: namque ibi consessum caveai subter et omnem 
scenaei speciem, patrum matrumque deorum 
inficiunt coguntque suo fluitare colore.
4.133 ff: quae multis formata modis sublime feruntur
nee speciem mutare suam liquentia cessant
et cuiusque modi formarum vertere in oras;
ut nubis facile interdum concrescere in alto
cernimus et mundi speciem violare serenam
aera mulcentis motu . . .

4.234 ff: nunc igitur si quadratum temptamus et id nos
commovet in tenebris, in luci quae poterit res
accedere ad speciem quadrata, nisi eius imago?

4.241 ff: verum nos oculis quis solis cernere quimus,
propterea fit uti, speciem quo vertimus, omnes
res ibi eam contra feriant forma atque colore.

5.568 ff: nil illa his intervallis de corpore libant
flammarum, nil ad speciem est contractior ignis.

5.581 ff: . . . quapropter luna necesse est,
quandoquidem claram speciem certamque figuram
praebet, ut est oris extremis cumque notata,
quantaque quantast, hinc nobis videatur in alto.

5.705 ff: Luna potest solis radiis percussa nitere
inque dies magis <id> lumen convertere nobis
ad speciem, quantum solis secedit ob orbi.

5.723 ff: donec eam partem, quaecumque est ignibus aucta,
ad speciem vertit nobis oculosque patentis.

specie:

2.418 ff: neve bonos rerum simili constare colores
semine constitutas, oculos qui pasccere possunt,
et qui compungunt aciem lacrimareque cogunt
aut foeda specie diri turpesque videntur.
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2.661 ff: Saepe itaque ex uno tondentes gramina campo lanigerae pecudes et equorum duellica proles buceriaque greges eodem sub tegmine caeli ex unoque sitim sedantes flumine aquai dissimili vivunt specie retinentque parentum naturam et mores generatim quaeque imitantur.

4.98 ff: postremo speculis in aqua splendoreque in omni quaecumque apparent nobis simulacra, necessest, quandoquidem simili specie sunt praedita rerum, ex (ea) imaginibus missis consistere rerum.

5.579 ff: nam prius omnia, quae longe semota tuemur aera per multum, specie confusa videntur quam minui filum.
APPENDIX C
Species in Ovid

in the Metamorphoses:

1.32 ff: Sic ubi dispositam, quisquis fuit ille deorum, congeriem secuit sectamque in membra redegit, principio terram, ne non aequalis ab omni parte foret, magni speciem glomeravit in orbis.

1.434 ff: Ergo ubi diluvio tellus lutulenta recenti solibus aetheriis altoque recanduit aestu, edidit innumeris species partimque figuras rettulit antiquas, partim nova monstra creavit.

1.612 ff: Bos quoque formosa est; speciem Saturnia vaccae, quamquam invita, probat nec non et cuius et unde, quove sit armento, veri quasi nescia, quaerit.

3.683 ff: Undique dant saltus multaque aspergine iterum redeuntque sub aequora rursus inque chori ludunt speciem lascivaque iactant corpora et acceptum patulis mare naribus efflant.

7.82 f: Sic iam lenis amor, iam quem languere putares, ut vidit iuvenem, specie praesentis inarsit.

7.125 ff: Utque hominis speciem materna sumit in alvo perque suos intus numeros componitur infans nec nisi maturus communes exit in auras; sic ubi visceribus gravidae telluris imago effecta est hominis, feto consurgit in arvo, quodque magis mirum est, simul edita concutit arma.

6.681 f: Excipit Actaeis e fratribus alter et: "Usum maiorem specie mirabere" dixit "in isto."
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8.179 ff: . . . Tenues volat illa per auras
dumque volat, gemmæ nitidos vertuntur in ignes
consistuntque loco, specie remanente coronae,
qui medius Nixique genu est Anguemque tenentis.

8.626 f: Iuppiter huc specie mortali cumque parente
venit Atlantiades positis caducifer alis.

9.472 f: Somnus abit; silet illa diu repetitque quietis
ipsa suae speciem dubiaque ita mente profatur.

10.527 f: Laesa manu natum dea reppulit; altius actum
vulnus erat specie primoque fefellerat ipsam.

11.678 ff: Voce sua specieque viri turbata soporem
excuit et primo, si sit, circumspicit illic,
qui modo visus erat; nam moti voce ministri
intulerant lumen . . .

12.470 ff: "Et te, Caeni, feram? nam tu mihi femina semper,
tu mihi Caenis eris. Nec te natalis origo
commonuit mentemque subit, quo praemia facto
quaque viri falsam speciem mercede parasti?"

13.694 f: "Quid tamen haec species, quid dis placuisse marinis,
quid iuvat esse deum, si tu non tangeris istis?"

15.199 f: Quid? non in species succedere quattuor annum
aspicis, aetatis peragentem imitamina nostrae?

15.252 f: Nec species sua cuique manet rerumque novatrix
ex aliis alias reddit natura figuras.

15.305 f: . . . tumor ille loci permansit et alti
collis habet speciem longoque induruit aevo.

15.419 ff: Desinet ante dies et in alto Phoebus anhelos
aequore tinget equos quam consequar omnia verbis
in species translata novas . . .
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15.506 ff: Pittheam profugo curru Troezena petebam
iamque Corinthiaci carpebam litora ponti,
cum mare surrexit cumulusque immanis aquarum
in montes speciem curvari et crescere visus
et dare mugitus summoque summoque cacumine findi.

15.742 ff: Huc se de Latia pinu Phoebelius anguis
contulit et finem, specie caeleste resumpta,
luctibus imposuit venitque salutifer urbi.

In the Fasti:

5.11 ff: "post chaos ut primum data sunt tria corpora mundo,
inque novas species omne recessit opus,
ponderem terrae suo subsedit et aequora traxit,
at Caerul summa in loca summa tuit."

5.351 ff: non est de tetricis, non est de magna professis,
volt suo plebeio sacra patere choro,
et monet aetatis specie, cum floreat, uti;
contemnire spinam, cum cecidere rosae.

5.357 f: an quia maturis albescit messis aristis,
et color et species floribus omnis inest?

6.685 ff: "Plautius, ut posset specie numeroque senatum
fallere, personis imperat ora tegi,
admiscetque alios et, ut hunc tibicina coetum
augeat, in longis vestibus esse iubet."

In the Amores:

1.4,45 f: me nova sollicitat, me tangit serior aetas:
haec melior specie, moribus illa placet.

2.19,13 f: a, quotiens finxit culpam, quantumque licebat
insonti, speciem praebuit esse nocens:

3.7,15 f: truncus iners iacui, species et inutile pondus,
et non exactum, corpus an umbra forem.
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in the *Ars Amatoria*:

2.233 f: militiae species amor est: discedite, segnes;
non sunt haec timidis signa tuenda viris.

3.441 f: sunt qui mendaci specie grassentur amoris
perque aditus talis lucra pudenda petant.

in the *Epistulae Heroidum*:

2.91 f: Illa meis oculis species abeuntis inhaeret,
cum premeret portus classis itura meos.

9.31 f: Non honor est sed onus species laesura ferentes:
siqua voles apte nubere, nube pari.

in the *Remedia Amoris*:

525 f: nam quoniam variant animi, variabimus artes;
mille mali species, mille salutis erunt.

in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*:

3.3,1 ff: Si vacat exiguum profugo dare tempus amico,
o sidus Fabiae, Maxime, gentis, ades,
dum tibi quae vidi refo, seu corporis umbra
seu veri species seu fuit ille sopor.

3.9,27 ff: atque ita di mites minuant mihi Caesaris iram,
ossaque pacata nostra tegantur humo,
ut mihi conanti nonnumquam intendere curas
fortunae species obstat acerba meae.

in the *Ibis*:

69 ff: ipsaque tu tellus, ipsum cum fluctibus aequor,
ipse meas aether accipe summe preces,
sideraque et radiis circumdata solis imago,
lunaque, quae numquam quo prius orbe micas,
noxque tenebrarum specie reverenda tuarum . . .
APPENDIX D
Modifiers of Species in Tacitus and Livy

In Tacitus:

** aliam:** Dial. 10

** divinam:** IV.82

* duas: 13.27

ea: 1.8; 2.19 and 52; IV.3; eam: 15.16.

** eadem:** IV.83

egregia: Agr. 25

* eximia: 2.41

** falsa:** I.1; III.58

** honesta:** III.4

ignavi: Agr. 25

** invisitata:** II.50

* ipsa: 14.16

* magna: 3.60; 15.9 and 29.

maior: 13.24; maiorem: i.86; maiore: III.32; IV.83.

** mira:** V.11

** omnem:** III.70

** prima:** IV.3

quae: Dial. 6

* sola: 1.8
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** solidam: V.7
* sua: 4.6 bis
  totidem: Germ. 26
  ullam: Germ. 26
* variae: 6.35
* venerabilis: 16.29

In Livy:
alia: 37.40,3; aliam: 25.38,9; 27.2,5.
alia: 22.54,6; aliquam: 9.11,7
amplam: 28.35,5
apertam: 2.59,6
divina: 21.22,6
ea: 4.33,8; 22.59,15.
falacia: 44.44,4; fallaci: 7.15,6.
hac: 34.4,14
honestas: 44.19,8
ingentem: 22.11,6
insueta: 7.17,3; 30.37,8.
iustam: 40.6,7
magnas: 1.11,8
maximam: 9.40,16
mira: 22.32,3
miserabilis: 5.40,3
oblata: 1.31,8; 6.8,6
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**prima**: 2.56,3; 4.60,3; 21.22,6; 22.28,5;
  25.37,17; 35.32,13; 44.6,6; 45.32,4.

**recentissima**: 40.29,6

**ulla**: 4.9,10

**universam**: 31.34,8

**vana**: 3.5,14; 10.39,12; 24.30,5; 33.31,2;
  33.32,7.

**veram**: 9.17,14

**visa**: 1.55,6; 8.6,9; 26.19,4; 42.2,4.

---

e.g., **magna**: words used with species by both Tacitus and Livy.

* : words used only in the Annales.

** : words used only in the Historiae.
APPENDIX E
Species in Sallust

in the Catilina:
38.2: contra eos summa ope nitebatur pleraque nobilitas senatus specie pro sua magnitudine.

in the Iugurtha:
16.5: in divisione, quae pars Numidiae Mauretaniam adtingit, agro virisque opulentior, Iugurthae traditus; illam alteram specie quam usu potiorem, quae portuosior et aedificiis magis exornata erat, Adherbal possedit.

29.4: ceterum interea fidei causa mittitur a consule Sextius quaestor in oppidum Iugurthae Vagam. quod Calpurnius palam legatis imperaverat, quoniam deditionis mora indutiae agitabantur.

79.3: ager in medio harenosus, una specie; neque flumen neque mons erat, qui finis eorum discerneret.

in the Historiae:
1.30: Speciem captae urbis efficere.

3.63: Speciem efficit Scythici arcus.

3.96A,3: (hastas igni torrere quibus praeter) speciem bello necessarium haud multo secus, quam ferro, noceri poterat.
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3.96B,13: et ad vigilium speciem procul visen|tibus palis ere|xerant fulta |ante portam| recentia cadaver et cre|bro|s ignis fecerant, ut for|midine f|ugarentur Varini |m|ilites.

4.27: Et monstruosam speciem fabulae illi dederunt, quasi formam hominis caninis succinctam capitibus, qui collisi ibi fluctus latratus videntur expressere.

4.66: Qui praegradiabantur, equites catafracti, ferrea omni specie.

5.21: Speciem et celebritatem nominis intellexi timentem.

1.55,24: Quare igitur tanto agmine atque animis incedit? Quia secundae res mire sunt vitis obtentui, quibus labefactis quam formidatus est, tam contemnetur: nisi forte specie concordiae et pacis, quae sceleri et parricidio suo nomina inedit.

3.48,3: Neque me praeterit, quantas opes nobilitatis solus impotens inani specie magistratus pellere dominatione incipiam quantoque tutius factio noxiorum agat quam soli innocentes.

(Species may well occur only 11 times in Sallust, and not 13 as stated on p. 60 above, for the reading "speciem" in both 3.96B,13 and 5.21 is a far from certain conjecture. See Maurenbrecher, ad locc.)
APPENDIX F
Species in Suetonius

in nominative:

Aug. 96: Philippo Thessalus quidam de futura victoria nuntiavit auctore Divo Caesare, cuius sibi species itinere avio occurisset.

Cl. 1: hostem etiam frequentem caesium ac penitus in intimas solitudines actum non prius destittit insequi quam species barbarae mulieris humana amplior victorem tendere ultra sermone Latino prohibuisset.

in accusative:

Iul. 67: nec milites eos pro contione, sed blandiore nomine commilitones appellabant habebatque tam cultos, ut argento et auro politis armis ornaret, simul et ad speciem et quo tenaciores eorum in proelio essent metu damni.

Aug. 95: Post necem Caesaris reverso ab Apollonia et ingrediens eo urbem repente liquido ac puro sereno circulus ad speciem caelestis arcus orbem solis ambiit ac subinde Iuliae Caesaris filiae monimentum fulmine ictum est.

Tib. 30: Quin etiam speciem libertatis quandam induxit conservatis senatu et magistratibus et maiestate pristina et potestate.

Cal. 22: nec multum auit quin statim diadema speciemque principatus in regni formam converteret.

Cal. 35: erat Aesius Proculus patre primipilari, ob egregiam corporis amplitudinem et speciem Colosseros dictus; hunc spectaculis detractum repente et in harenam deductum Thracei et mox
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hoplomacho comparavit bisque victorem constringi
sine mora iussit et pannis obsitum vicatim
circumduci ac mulieribus ostendi, deinde iugulari.

Cal. 50: incitabatur insomnio maxime; neque
enim plus quam tribus nocturnis horis quiescebat
ac ne iis quidem placida quiete, sed pavida miris
rerum imaginibus, ut qui inter ceteras pelagi
quondam speciem conloquentem secum videre visus
sit.

Cl. 37: pari modo oppressum ferunt Appium Silanum:
quem cum Messalina et Narcissus conspirassent
perdere, divisis partibus alter ante lucem similis
attonito patroni cubiculum inrupit, affirmans
somniaesse se vim ei ab Appio inlatam; altera
in admirationem formata sibi quoque eandem speciem
aliquot iam noctibus obversari rettulit.

Ner. 31: vestibulum eius fuit, in quo colossus
CXX pedum staret ipsius effigie; tanta laxitas,
ut porticus triplices miliarias haberet; item
stagnum maris instar, circumsaeptum aedificiis
ad urbium speciem; rura insuper arvis et
vinetis et pasquis silvisque varia, cum multitudine
omnis generis pecundum ac ferarum.

Ner. 41: leviterque modo in itinere frivolo
auspicio mente recreata, cum adnotasset insculptum
monumento militem Gallum ab equite R. oppressum
trahi crinis, ad eam speciem exiluit gaudio
caelumque adoravit.

Ner. 46: asturconem, quo maxime laetabatur,
posteriore corporis parte in simiae speciem
transfiguratun ac tantum capite integro
hinnitus edere canores.

Gal. 18: monile margaritis gemmisque consortum
ad ormandam Fortunam suam Tusculanam ex omni
gaza secrerat; id repente quasi augustiore
dignius loco Capitolinae Veneri dedicavit, ac
proxima nocte somniavit speciem Fortunae querentis
fraudatam se dono destinato, minantisque erepturam
et ipsam quae dedisset.
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**in ablative:**

**Iul. 77**: nec minoris inpotentiae voces propalam edebat, ut Titus Amp<sub>r</sub>i<sub>s</sub>ius scribit: nihil esse rem publicam, appelationem modo sine corpore ac specie.

**Iul. 82**: assidentem conspirati specie officii circumsteterunt, ilicoque Cimber Tullius, qui primas partes susceperat, quasi aliquid rogaturus propius accessit reventique et gestum in aliud tempus differenti ab utroque umero togam adprehendit.

**Aug. 94,6**: atque etiam sequenti statim nocte videre visus est filium mortali specie ampliorem, cum fulmine et sceptro exuviisque Iovis Optimi Maximi ac radiata corona, super laureatum currum, bis senis equis candore eximio trahentibus.

**Tib. 24**: Principatum, quamvis neque occupare confestim neque agere dubitasset, et statione militum, hoc est vi et specie dominationis assumpta, diu tamen recusavit.

**Tib. 59**: Multa praeterea specie gravitatis ac morum corrigendorum, sed et magis naturae optemperans, ita saeve et atrociter factitavit, ut nonnulli versiculis quoque et praesentia exprobrarent et futura denuntiarent mala.

**Cal. 45**: comites autem et participes victoriae novo genere ac nomine coronarum donavit, quas distinctas solis ac lunae siderumque specie exploratorias appellavit.

**Cl. 30**: Auctoritas dignitasque formae non defuit et veterum stanti vel sedenti ac praecepto quiescenti, nam et prolixo nec exili corpore erat et specie canitieque pulchra, opimus cervicibus.

**Ner. 34**: neque tamen conscientiam sceleris, quamquam et militum et senatus populusque gratulationibus confirmaretur, aut statim aut umquam
postea ferre potuit, saepe confessus exagitari se materna specie verberibusque Furiarum ac taedis ardentibus.

Otho 3: item Poppaeam Sabinam tunc adhuc amicam eius, abductam marito demandatamque interim sibi, nuptiarum specie recepti nec corrupisse contentus adeo dilexit, ut ne rivalem quidem Neronem aequo tulerit animo creditur certe non modo missos ad arcessendam non recepisse, sed ipsum etiam exclusisse quondam pro foribus astantem miscentemque frustra minas et preces ac depositum reposcentem.

in accusative plural:

Aug. 9: Proposita vitae eius velut summa parte<s> singillatim neque per tempora sed per species exequar, quo distinctius demonstrari cognoscique possint.

per speciem:

Tib. 36: Iudaeorum iuventutem per speciem sacramenti in provincias gravioris caeli distribuit, reliquos gentis eiusdem vel similia sectantes urbe summovit, sub poena perpetuae servitutis nisi obtemperassent.

Tib. 50: sed et peculio concesso a patre praebitisque annuis fraudavit, per speciem publici iuris, quod nihil de his Augustus testamento cavisset.

Tib. 65: nam primo, ut a se per speciem honoris dimiteret, collegam sibi assumpsit in quinto consulatu, quem longo intervallo absens ob id ipsum susceperat.
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