

8

Tacitus (cos. 97 A.D.)

A speech of the Emperor Claudius
Original and literary recasting

The Texts:

Senatus consultum Claudianum (oratio Claudii)
de iure honorum Gallis dando, 48 A.D.¹

... | mae rerum no[strarum] sit u.....|

Equidem primam omnium illam cogitationem hominum quam |
maxime primam occurruram mihi provideo, deprecor, ne | quasi novam
istam rem introduci exhorrescatis, sed illa | potius cogitetis, quam
multa in hac civitate novata sint, et | quidem statim ab origine urbis
nostrae in quod formas | statusque res p[ublica] nostra diducta sit. |

Quondam réges hanc tenuére urbem, nec tamen domesticis suc-
ces[soribus] eam tradere contigit. Supervenere alieni et quidam exter[ni],
ut Numa Romulo successerit ex Sabinis veniens, vicinus qui|dem, sed
tunc externus; ut Ancó Márcio Príscus Tarquinius. [Is] | propter
temeratum sanguinem, quod patre Demaratho C[orinthio] natus erat
et Tarquiniensi mátre generosá sed inopi, | ut quae tali marito necesse
habuerit succumbere, cum domi re|pelleretur á gerendis honoribus,
postquam Romam migravit, | regnum adeptus est. Huic quoque et filio
nepotivae eius (nam et | hoc inter auctores discrepat) insertus Servius
Tullius, si nostros | sequimur, captiva natus Ocesia, si Tuscos, Caeli
quondam Vi|vennae sodalis fidelissimus omnisque eius casus comes,
post | quam variá fortuna exactus cum omnibus reliquis Caeliani |
exercitus Etruria excessit, montem Caelium occupavit et a duce suo |
Caelio ita appellat[us],² mutatoque nomine (nam Tusce Mastarna | ei
nomen erat) ita appellatus est, ut dixi, et regnum summá cum rei |
p[ublicae] utilitate optinuit. Deinde postquam Tarquini Superbi mores

¹ Text in *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae* (ed. H. Dessau) vol. I (Berlin 1902) no. 212; P. Fabia *La Table Claudienne de Lyon* (Lyon 1929) pp. 62ff.

² The inscription has *appellatus*; this is accepted by P. Sage 'La table claudienne et le style de l'empereur Claude. Essai de réhabilitation' *REL* 58 (1980) pp. 274-312 (esp. 276 and 279; however Sage also interprets *duce suo* as a solecism). *Appellatum* is proposed by J. Carcopino *Points de vue sur l'impérialisme romain* (Paris 1934) pp. 159-199, esp. 169 and 184 (= 1959², pp. 174-208, esp. 195); cf. L. Pareti *Studi Etruschi* 5 (1931) p. 156 and A. Momigliano *L'opera dell'imperatore Claudio* (Florence 1932) p. 31.

in|visi civitati nostrae esse coeperunt, qua ipsius qua filiorum ei[us], |
nempe pertaesum est mentés régni et ad consules, annuós magis|trátus,
administratio rei p[ublicae] tráslata est. |

Quid nunc commemorem dictaturae hóc ipso consulári impe|rium
valentius repertum apud maiores nostros, quo in a[s]|perioribus bellis
aut in civili motú difficilior uterentur? | aut in auxilium plebis creatós
tribunos plébei? quid á consu|libus ad decemviros tráslátum imperium,
solutoque postea | decemvirali régno ad consules rúsus reditum? quid in
[p]u|ris distributum consulare imperium tribunosque mil[itu]m | con-
sulari imperio appellatós, qui séni et saepe octoni crearen|tur? quid
communicátos postrémo cum plebe honóres, non imperi | solum sed
sacerdotiorum quoque? Iam si nárrrem bella, á quibus | coeperint
maiores nostri, et quo processerimus, vereor né nimió | insolentior esse
videar et quaesisse iactatiónem glóriæ pro|lati imperi ultrá óceanum.
Sed illoc potius revertar. Civitat[em] | ... [lacuna]

...[po]test. Sane | novo m[ore] et dívus Aug[ustus] av[on]c[ulus] m[eu]s
et patruus Ti. | Caesar omnem flórem ubique coloniárum ac munici-
piorum, bo|nórum scilicet virorum et locupletium, in hac cúria esse
voluit. | Quid ergo? non Italicus senator provinciali potior est? Iam |
vobis, cum hanc partem censurae meae adprobáre coepero, quid | de eá
ré sentiam, rebus ostendam. Sed ne provinciales quidem, | si modo
ornare curiam poterint, reiciendos puto. |

Ornatissima ecce colonia valentissimaque Viennensium, quam |
longo iam tempore senatores huic curiae confert! Ex qua colo|nia inter
paucos equestris órdis órnaméntum L. Vestinum fa|miliarissime
díligo et hodieque in rebus meis detineo, cuius libe|ri fruuntur quae-
só primo sacerdotiorum gradú, post modo cum | annis promoturi digni-
tatis suae incrementa; ut dírum nomen la|tronis taceam, et odi illud
palaesticum pródigium, quod ante in do|num consulatum intulit,
quam colonia sua solidum civitatis Roma|nae beneficium cónsecuta est.
Idem dé fratre eius possum dícere, | miserabili quidem indignissimoque
hóc casú, ut vobis utilis | senator esse non possit. |—

Tempus est iam, Ti. Caesar Germanice, detegere té patribus
conscriptis, quo tendat oratio tua; iam enim ad extremos fines Galliae
Nar|bonensis venistí. |—

Tot ecce insignes iuvenes, quot intueor, non magis sunt paenitendi |
senatores, quam paenitet Persicum, nobilissimum virum, ami|cum
meum, inter imagines maiorum suorum Allobrogici no|men legere.
Quod si haec ita esse consentitis, quid ultrá desidera|tis, quam ut vobis
digito demonstrem, solum ipsum ultra fines | provinciae Narbonensis

iam vobis senatores mittere, quando | ex Luguduno habere nos nostri ordinis viros non paenitet. | Timide quidem, p(atres) c(onscripti), egressus adsuetos familiaresque vobis pro|vinciarum terminos sum, sed dextricate iam Comatae Galliae | causa agenda est, in qua si quis hoc intuetur, quod bello per de|cem annos exercuerunt divom Iulium, idem opponat centum | annorum immobilem fidem obsequiumque multis trepidis re|bus nostris plus quam expertum. Illi patri meo Druso Germaniam | subigenti tutam quiete sua securamque á tergo pácem praes|titerunt, et quidem cum [a] census novo tum opere et inadsue|to Gallis ad bellum advocatus esset; quod opus quam ar|duum sit nobis, nunc cum maxime, quamvis nihil ultra, quam | ut publice notae sint facultates nostrae, exquiratur, nimis | magno experimento cognoscimus.

I at least foresee that I shall be confronted first of all by what is usually men's very first thought, and I ask you not to be outraged, as if it were an innovation that was being introduced here, but rather to reflect how much novelty there has been already in this commonwealth and how many constitutional forms our state has adopted, right from the foundation of our city onwards in fact.

Kings once possessed this city, and yet they were unable to pass it on to indigenous successors. Strangers intervened, and even some foreigners; thus Numa, Romulus' successor, came from the Sabines, a neighbour it is true, but at that time still a foreigner; thus Ancus Marcius was followed by Priscus Tarquinius. Because he was a bastard (his father was the Corinthian Demaratos, and his mother an aristocratic but impoverished Tarquin; so she had no choice but to take such a husband), he was excluded from state office in his own country; when for this reason he then emigrated to Rome, he attained the kingship. Similarly between him and his son or grandson (for writers disagree on this point too) came Servius Tullius, who according to our historians was the son of a prisoner called Oeresia, but according to the Etruscans was once the faithful companion of Caelius (Caelus) Vivenna and shared his every adversity. After the caprice of fortune had expelled him and all survivors of the Caelian army from Etruria, he occupied the Caelian Hill and gave it this name after his general Caelius. He changed his own name (for in Etruscan he was called Mastarna), was given the name I used above, and attained the kingship to the great benefit of the state. Then after the behaviour of both Tarquinius Superbus and his sons had roused the hostility of our citizens, they of course grew tired of the monarchy, and administration of the state was transferred to annually elected consuls.

What is the point now of mentioning the introduction of the dictatorship among our ancestors, a stronger form of government than that of consuls for more difficult times of war and for more serious civil strife? Or the creation of tribunes of the people to help the plebeians? The transfer of government from the consuls to the decemvirs, and after abolition of the unlimited power of the decemvirs, the return to a consular constitution? The division of consular authority, and the creation of six to eight military tribunes with

consular imperium? Finally the admission of the plebs to positions of honour, not only to government offices, but also to priesthoods? If I were to give an account of the wars with which our forefathers began, and of how far we have come, then I fear it could look as if I were too presumptuous and had sought an opportunity to boast of my extension of the empire beyond the ocean. But I prefer to return to my subject ... [*lacuna*]

It was certainly in a 'new' spirit that both my great uncle, the divine Augustus, and my uncle Tiberius Caesar wanted to see represented in this curia the whole élite of all the colonies and municipia, naturally the good and well-to-do. Well now! Does not an Italic senator take precedence over a provincial one? I shall demonstrate to you my opinion on this by my actual practice, when I start to make clear to you this part of my activity as censor. But I think that even the provincials should not be turned down, as long as they are the sort of people that would do credit to the curia.

Look at the respected and flourishing colony of Vienna. How long it has been sending senators into our curia! From it comes L. Vestinus, an ornament of the equestrian order, to whom I feel the closest attachment, such as I do to few others, and whom I still to this day entrust with my business; may his children, I pray, come to enjoy the first grade of the priesthoods and later as the years go by rise to ever higher rank; however I shall pass over in silence the baneful name of the brigand,³ and I hate that monster from the wrestling school, that brought home the rank of consul before his colony was granted full Roman citizenship. I can say the same about his brother, who is however to be pitied and does not deserve the misfortune of not being allowed to serve you as senator.

It is now time, Tiberius Caesar Germanicus, to reveal to the senators what your speech is getting at; for you have already reached the extreme edge of Gallia Narbonensis. We shall not be sorry about admitting to the Senate the many admirable men I see before me, any more than my friend, the excellent Persicus, is sorry to read the name Allobrogicus on the images of his ancestors. But if you agree with this, what else are you asking than for me to point with my finger for you: the ground beyond the frontiers of the province of Narbo does indeed send senators to you already, for to our joy there are men of our rank from Lugudunum among us. It is only with timidity, senators, that I have overstepped the province boundaries you know so well, but the cause of Gallia Comata must now be resolutely pressed; if in this connection anyone takes into account the fact that for ten years the Gauls caused trouble to the god Julius in war, then he should also set against this their immutable loyalty for over a hundred years and their obedience that has been more than tested in many critical situations. While my father Drusus was subjugating Germany, their quiet behaviour gave him the cover of a safe and carefree peace, and this was at a time when he had been called away to the war from the business of the census which was then something new and unaccustomed for the Gauls; we are learning at this very moment from all too abundant experience how difficult this business is for us, although no more is being asked than that our resources should be officially known.

³ Valerius Asiaticus.

Tac. ann. 11,24⁴

Maiores mei, quorum antiquissimus Clausus origine Sabina simul in civitatem Romanam et in familias patriciorum adscitus est, hortantur uti paribus consiliis in re publica capessenda, transferendo huc quod usquam egregium fuerit. neque enim ignoro Iulios Alba, Coruncanios Camerio, Porcios Tusculo, et ne vetera scrutemur, Etruria Lucaniaque et omni Italia in senatum accitos, postremo ipsam ad Alpes promotam, ut non modo singuli viritim, sed terrae, gentes in nomen nostrum coalescerent. tunc solida domi quies; et adversus externa floruumus, cum Transpadani in civitatem recepti, cum specie deductarum per orbem terrae legionum additis provincialium validissimis fesso imperio subventum est. num paenitet Balbos ex Hispania nec minus insignes viros e Gallia Narbonensi transivisse? manent posteri eorum nec amore in hanc patriam nobis concedunt. quid aliud exitio Lacedaemoniis et Atheniensibus fuit, quamquam armis pollerent, nisi quod victos pro alienigenis arcebant? at conditor nostri Romulus tantum sapientia valuit, ut plerosque populos eodem die hostes, dein cives habuerit. advenae in nos regnaverunt; libertinorum filiis magistratus mandare non, ut plerique falluntur, repens, sed priori populo factitatum est. at cum Senonibus pugnavimus: scilicet Vulsci et Aequi numquam adversam nobis aciem instruxere. capti a Gallis sumus: sed et Tuscis obsides dedimus et Samnitium iugum subiimus. ac tamen, si cuncta bella recenseas nullum brevioris spatio quam adversus Gallos confectum: continua inde ac fida pax. iam moribus artibus adfinitatibus nostris mixti aurum et opes suas inferant potius quam separati habeant. omnia, patres conscripti, quae nunc vetustissima creduntur, nova fuere: plebei magistratus post patricos, Latini post plebeios, ceterarum Italiae gentium post Latinos. inveterascet hoc quoque et quod hodie exemplis tuemur, inter exempla erit.

My forefathers, of whom the eldest, Clausus, came from the Sabines and was raised to patrician rank at the same time as he obtained Roman citizenship, urge me, on taking over state affairs, to decide in the same spirit, by transferring here all that has anywhere achieved distinction. For I am well aware that the Julians were called to the Senate from Alba, the Coruncanians from Camerium, the Porcians from Tusculum and, so as not to pursue stories from the past any further, that people were called to it from Etruria, Lucania and the whole of Italy, and that in the end Italy itself was extended

⁴ Text of H. Heubner (Stuttgart 1983). Commentary by E. Koestermann, vol. III (Heidelberg 1967). Review of the most recent scholarship in F. Römer *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft* (hrsg. v. d. Humanistischen Gesellschaft) 37 (1984) pp.154-208 and 38 (1985) pp.129-204 (for 1973-1982).

as far as the Alps, so that not only single individuals, but countries and even races merged with our name. At that time internal peace was guaranteed; and against outside dangers we were at the height of our power, when the Transpadanes obtained citizenship, when all over the world the most powerful provincials were admitted to our ranks under the pretence of settling legions and thus help came to the exhausted empire. Or are you sorry that the Balbi came over from Spain and that equally distinguished people came from Gallia Narbonensis? Their descendants are still among us and feel no less love for our country than we do. What else destroyed the Spartans or Athenians, for all their military achievements, save the fact that they kept the defeated apart from themselves as aliens? Yet Romulus, the founder of our state, possessed such great wisdom that he regarded most races on one and the same day first as enemies and then as citizens. Among us, foreigners had the rank of kings. Entrusting state office to sons of freedmen is no sudden innovation, as most people wrongly believe, but an ancient custom in our nation. 'But we did after all fight with the Senones!' So the Volsci and Aequi have never deployed their forces against us? 'The Gauls captured our city'. But we also had to give hostages to the Etruscans and go under the yoke of the Samnites. Yet, if one runs through every war, none was ended in less time than the one against the Gauls; from then on, without interruption, there was profound peace. Now that they are permeated by our character and our ways and are connected with us by marriage, they should rather bring their gold and treasures to us than keep them for themselves. Everything, senators, that is now considered very old, was once new: plebeians as officials after the patricians, Latins after the plebeians, representatives of the other races of Italy after the Latins. This too will one day be old, and what today we defend with precedents, will rank among the precedents.

A. Overall structure and sequence of ideas

1. Claudius

After a lacuna our text starts with the *praemunitio* that one should not reject Claudius' proposal as an innovation but reflect that the whole of Roman constitutional history has been one long process of renewal. (The two occurrences of *primam* seem to indicate that this objection, which receives such strong emphasis as 'the first', cannot have been preceded by very much more than the main announcement of the theme).

Next come examples. The first is that, as long as kings ruled, there were foreigners among them (here Claudius frequently strays into biographical details). Secondly, the Roman constitution has often changed. The second section does not quite form a strict conceptual whole. It is true that everything in the enumeration fits the theme of 'changes in the Roman constitution', but only part of it fits the point

at issue, 'extension of the class of people entitled to participate in government'.

In the form of an appendix Claudius speaks of the Roman empire's military conquests and its outward expansion; this is something that really deserved full treatment as a separate item, because it is linked ultimately with the need to give the incorporated peoples a share in government. However Claudius oddly describes this approach as a digression; for after it he explains that he is now returning to the subject. Yet at this point he deals with the extension of Roman citizenship to the defeated peoples, which follows naturally from the aspect he has just mentioned. After the ensuing lacuna the further point is made that the right of actual representation in the Senate was granted by Augustus and Julius Caesar to the leading men in colonies and municipia. Without encroaching on the pre-eminence of Italic senators, Claudius then stresses that the provincials should not be ignored.

Claudius mentions a specific community and particular individuals on whose behalf he applies for privileges or whom he abuses. After telling himself to come to the point, Claudius finally draws attention to the many distinguished men who deserve to be senators. By mentioning Persicus⁵ the emperor shows that he is not just an innovator, but also a respecter of tradition. In the next sentence he recalls that men from Lugudunum are already in the Senate.

It is true that Caesar waged war against the Gauls for ten years; since then however they have been loyal to Rome for a hundred years. When Drusus fought the Germans, the Gauls remained quiet, though at that particular time the census was being carried out among them. Claudius now knows from experience how many problems are involved in a census even in Rome.

Vittinghoff⁶ assumes that Tacitus' hard-headed argument to the effect that the Gallic senators should bring their money to Rome was immortalized in Gaul itself on the bronze tablet in Lyon: this absurd view needs no refutation.⁷ It is therefore impossible to see why he

⁵ Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus had at one time triumphed over the Allobroges. Hence Paullus Fabius Persicus might well have taken the strongest exception to the admission of Allobroges into the Senate (F. Vittinghoff 'Zur Rede des Kaisers Claudius ...' *Hermes* 82 [1954] pp.348-371, esp. 360). Koestermann, comm. p.79, grotesquely calls Persicus an 'Allobrogian'.

⁶ Loc. cit. (n.5) pp.361f.

⁷ Nor does Vittinghoff's assumption carry conviction (pp.364f.) that at the end Claudius needs to mention his real purpose once again and prepare the way for the Senate's decree. There is no proof that straight after the speech the decree itself was

postulates any continuation at all, especially as the archaeological data offer no support for it.

2. Tacitus

The best men in the provinces should be attracted to Rome: this had always been the case. The ancestor of the Claudians came from Sabine territory; the same is true of many famous families. Italy itself was extended as far as the Alps; so it was not just individuals, but whole nations that were granted the citizenship. Examples are given. The Transpadanes added new strength to the exhausted empire. Roman patriotism is shown by descendants of Spanish citizens and men of Gallic origin. Then comes an example to the contrary: Sparta and Athens were ruined by their racial exclusiveness. Romulus by contrast accepted enemies as citizens; foreigners became kings and even in the early days sons of freedmen became officers of state. The imaginary objection that the Senones waged war against Rome is refuted by the observation that so did Vulsci and Aequi. The second objection is that the Gauls conquered Rome; it is refuted by the fact that Rome was also humiliated by the Etruscans and Samnites. Moreover the Gallic war was brought to an end with particular speed, and since then the Gauls have been unwaveringly loyal. They are already Romanized and should make the benefits of their wealth available also in Rome. In the course of Roman history the *ius honorum* was extended to an ever wider class of people. The present step too is only part of a broader development.

3. Comparison

a) What does Tacitus omit?

Tacitus' speech is considerably shorter than the original. He passes over the complicated discourse on the period of the kings (one of Claudius' fields of study⁸), the sketch of Roman constitutional history, the reference to Claudius' wars and successes in Britain, the

written on a supposed third tablet. A far more natural assumption is that the decree was mentioned in the lost opening of the tablet and explicitly identified with the emperor's words as subsequently quoted. If we assume that the general heading extended in somewhat larger letters over the whole double tablet, it is clear that the lacunae at the start and in the middle of the speech do not need to be very big. Hence the conclusions we have drawn from the content are also in line with the external data. A brief senatorial decree at the start of the tablet is also posited by E. Schoenbauer *Jura* 6 (1955) p.169. On the interpretation of the last part of the inscription cf. now Sage pp.305-312.

⁸ *Inter alia* Claudius wrote twenty books of Etruscan history in Greek (Suet. *Claud.* 42,5).

allusions to measures of Augustus and Tiberius,⁹ and the mentions of Claudius' personal friends and the application for privileges on their behalf.

Tacitus deliberately restricts himself to the immediate question at issue and keeps it more sharply in mind than the emperor, who thinks more in terms of the general development of the Roman constitution and also adduces more details. To a degree these two elements in Claudius are interdependent. Since he proposes admission to priestly office for certain persons, he is also justified in not restricting himself to political magistracies in his historical survey. By contrast the limitation in Tacitus is characteristic: *plebei magistratus post patricios, Latini post plebeios, exterarum Italiae gentium post Latinos*. Tacitus thus omits what has only limited historical reference and does not belong to the subject. On the other hand there is no trace of Claudius' humour.

b) What does Tacitus add?

Since Claudius' original speech is not preserved in its entirety, there cannot be complete certainty on this point.¹⁰ Given the state of the texts, we can make the following observations.

Firstly, Tacitus brings out more clearly the principle behind Claudius' action: *ut non modo singuli viritum, sed terrae, gentes in nomen nostrum coalescerent*. He thus encapsulates the basic idea,¹¹ which in Claudius is there in the background while he is speaking of the Romans' wars and the expansion of the empire even beyond the Ocean.

Secondly, Tacitus also emphasizes the reliability of the Gauls,¹² but he goes beyond this and stresses the truly Roman patriotism of those senators that come from the provinces. Among these he significantly gives prominence to the Spaniards, who in his day were

⁹ However *deductarum ... legionum* presumably refers principally to colonies founded by Augustus.

¹⁰ Vittinghoff loc. cit. emphasizes the fragmentary state of the original speech and the possibility of an intermediate (historical) source for Tacitus. For direct use of the *acta Senatus* cf. F.A. Marx 'Untersuchungen zu Tacitus' *Annales Hermes* 60 (1925) pp.74-93, esp. 82-90. Direct use of the original speech is also assumed by Carcopino (1934 p.168; 1959 p.183).

¹¹ The same basic concept is already found in Sallust *epist.* 2,5,7. According to Vretska C. *Sallustius Crispus, Invektive und Episteln, hrsg., übers. und komm.* (Heidelberg 1961) vol. II pp.115f., Sallust is thinking here of the enfranchisement of the very Transpadanes mentioned in our Tacitus text as already a historical precedent.

¹² Both authors therefore pass over in silence the revolt of Sacrovir under Tiberius (Fabia p.6).

especially important.¹³

Thirdly, Tacitus draws attention to what is typical about the case by means of a historical example illustrating the opposite: Athens and Sparta brought political ruin on themselves because of their inability to overcome the prejudices of blood. This is certainly a striking example, but one that is more likely in a rhetorically trained man of letters than in a politician. Here Tacitus seems exceptionally to show a wider historical range than Claudius; however his purpose is to give the basic idea of the speech all the more prominence through an example to the contrary. He thus offers an interpretation of the emperor's action in setting it against a different type of behaviour. This is in essence an interpretation concerned with morals and with patterns of history, which does not deal primarily with the historical event but presents 'anthropological' generalizations. In Claudius the frame of reference is the whole development of the Roman constitution; in Tacitus it is the potentialities of human behaviour.¹⁴

Fourthly, in contrast to Athens and Sparta Tacitus then introduces Romulus, who made full citizens out of people that on the same day had been enemies. This accords, both overall and in detail, with his technique of bringing together opposites.

Fifthly, the Gauls were not just enemies of Rome; they actually conquered it. Tacitus makes a stronger appeal to the imagination. The refutation is hardly less vivid (*iugum subiimus*). This is evidence for his method of striking illustration in the form of 'mental pictures'.¹⁵

Sixthly, the historian uses two arguments that would have been out of place on an inscription published in Gaul: the military strength and the finances of the province should now benefit Rome. In line

¹³ The emperor Trajan was a Spaniard. The subject of 'new citizens in the Senate' also had importance for Tacitus in view of his own career and that of his admired father-in-law Agricola. E. Paratore *Tacito* (Rome 1962³) pp.498ff. is of course right to stress that subjectively an extension of the *ius honorum* need not necessarily have been welcomed by Tacitus.

¹⁴ K. Wellesley 'Can You Trust Tacitus?' *Greece and Rome* 2nd ser. 1 (1954) pp. 14-33 fails to see this when he says: 'a statesmanlike utterance is turned into a school exercise' (p.31). Value judgments like this depend on whether an observer is more interested in 'how it really was' or 'how it always will be given human nature' or in both. Ultimately they say more about the observer than about the thing observed.

¹⁵ Cf. H. Hommel *Die Bildkunst des Tacitus* Würzburger Studien 9 (Stuttgart 1936) pp.116-148, esp. 119 n.12: Tacitus' 'mind's eye' style (after P. Friedländer in *Norden Einl. in die Altertumswissenschaft*³ I 4 [1923] p.81); now in *Symbola* I (Hildesheim/New York 1976) pp.365-392, esp. 367 n.12.

with the practice of speeches in classical historians, no further significance is attached to such short-term factors.

Seventhly, Tacitus asserts the foreign origin of the most important patrician houses, including the Claudians; however this point may also have occurred in the lost opening of the original speech. What the historian has undoubtedly added, as we saw, is the mention of the new Spanish senators: if the purpose is to supply evidence for the speech's objective, Tacitus himself can use examples freely. On the other hand it is significant that as a senator he passes over Claudius' characteristic reference to his 'great-uncle' Augustus and his 'uncle' Tiberius; he thus eliminates the dynastic frame of reference, but not the traditional Roman clan-consciousness in the appeal to the *maiores*. This is an important shift of emphasis.

Eighthly, Tacitus objectifies the immediate event by setting it within the historical process (*inveterascet hoc quoque*). He also stresses the exemplary character of the step for the future. Both these points are in line with his tendency to think in terms of the 'exemplum'. It is however true that this general aspect does not appear until the end of the speech.

The writer's approach has thus freed the speech from its limited historical reference and in Tacitean fashion invested it with paradigmatic significance as an instance of universal human nature.

c) Arrangement

Claudius states at the beginning that the proposed step is new. Tacitus saves this idea to the end and allows it to suggest itself through the series of examples. At the end he skilfully combines it with a short recapitulation of the extension of the *ius honorum*.

Tacitus begins very abruptly with an example and it is not until the end of the first sentence in a kind of supplementary ablatival gerund that he introduces the basic concept. He thus allows the general point to develop out of the particular in a matter of detail as well as overall.

His procedure here is of course very far from being indiscriminate; this is shown by the structure. In the original speech the emperor strings the historical events together chronologically without always distinguishing the different aspects clearly from each other. In Tacitus on the other hand the grouping of the exempla is determined by their role within the argument: foreigners became kings in Rome. Placed impressively in the middle of the speech, the sentence has a more powerful effect than the many names and details at the opening of the emperor's real speech. However Claudius' wide-ranging

historical panorama is replaced in Tacitus by just a functional excerpt at the end.¹⁶

Suetonius said of Claudius' style: *scripsit magis inepte quam ineleganter*.¹⁷ Here *inepte* means neither 'crack-brained' nor 'clumsy', but denotes a certain 'inappropriateness', the opposite of *aptum*. Whereas Tacitus adapts every detail of his thought to subject, type of situation, and personal status, Claudius likes to indulge in digressions and sometimes shows his humour without too much regard for *dignitas*.

So much then for *ineptia* of content in Claudius and for Tacitus' feeling for *aptum*.¹⁸ The following section will show how far the emperor may after all have found the tone that suited his situation; it will also clarify what we are to make of Claudius' stylistic *elegantia* and what the contrasting characteristics are that occur in Tacitus.

B. Language and style

1. Claudius

A characterization of Claudius' speech in terms of language and style has to move between two extremes.¹⁹

a) Conventional style

In the vocabulary of the speech one is struck by certain political catchwords of the imperial era, for example *quies* and *pax* (2,36f.) as important civic values, and *boni et locupletes* as a qualification for admission to the Senate (2,5). Another characteristic feature are the stereotyped superlatives (elatives) used to designate the persons and

¹⁶ On the apparent widening of the historical perspective in Tacitus see above pp.145 and 146.

¹⁷ Suet. *Claud.* 41. On Claudius' *elegantia* cf. also Tac. *ann.* 13,3,6. A subtle interpretation of Tacitus' estimate is given by Sage p.297: Claudius possessed *elegantia*, but only when he *meditata dissereret*. The Lyon inscription preserves (in Sage's view) an *improvised* speech (on this cf. below p.152).

¹⁸ When N.P. Miller *RhM* 99 (1956) p.314 interprets the 'antiquarian arguments' of the speech in Tacitus as an attempt to characterize Claudius as a pedant, she fails to see that here Tacitus is replacing antiquarianism with anthropology, and is thus 'Tacitean' in the choice of arguments as well. Miller herself recognizes that the *style* of the speech is Tacitean. On the different criteria with regard to *aptum* in language cf. H. Lausberg *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich 1960) pp.507-511.

¹⁹ An excellent survey of all 'particularités grammaticales et stylistiques de la Table claudienne' is given by Sage pp.276-285.

communities on which the emperor bestows his favour: *ornatissima*²⁰ *ecce colonia valentissimaque* (2,10); *L. Vestinum familiarissime diligo*²¹ (2,12); *de fratre ... miserabili quidem indignissimoque hoc casu* (2,17f.); *nobilissimum virum* (2,25); to the same class belong terms that are only apparent expressions of feeling: *insignes iuvenes* (2,24); *amicum meum* (2,25). Abuse of a political opponent as 'brigand' and 'monster from the wrestling school' is also conventional (2,15). Here it is wrong to detect the unbridled temperament of the tyrant;²² rather we should realize that language like this, which is also familiar from Cicero, is not an outburst of passion but a cliché.

However political speeches are also characterized by a certain caution and restraint. One example of this is the choice of verbs. The subjective *puto* (2,9) and the imploring *quaeso* (2,13) are formulae of modesty; such empty phrases are also part of the stock-in-trade of speeches and motions in the Senate.²³ A similar tendency is found in *vereor ne ... videar* (1,39f.) and *timide quidem* (2,30). Caution is also indicated by the indirect form of polemic and debate: *si quis hoc intuetur ... idem opponat* (2,32-34). On the other hand the repeated use of *non paenitet* in the sense of 'we are glad' is a piece of diplomatic understatement.

The tone of the speech has a decisive effect also on syntax and style. This explains elements that are only apparently 'pleonastic', e.g. *equidem primam omnium illam cogitationem hominum quam maxime primam occurruram mihi provideo*: 'that I shall be confronted first by what men always think first of all'. Here the repetition has a generalizing function that weakens the objection from the start.

Duplications are also part of the traditional Curial style:²⁴ *formas statusque* (1,7); *coloniarum ac municipiorum* (2,3); *bonorum ... et locupletium* (2,4); *ornatissima ... valentissimaque* (2,9); *familiarissime diligo et hodieque in rebus meis detineo* (2,11f.); *miserabili quidem*

indignissimoque hoc casu (2,18); *fidem obsequiumque* (2,34).

Certain forms of *traductio* (*plokē*) also belong to the traditional style of the Curia. We are reminded of the ancient type *diem, quo die* when Claudius says: *non magis sunt paenitendi senatores, quam paenitet* (2,23f.; cf. also 2,29 *non paenitet*).

b) Choice expression and historiographical style

There is more to the speech than just the conventional traits of the Curial style. Thus where duplication is used we find a tendency to invest it with fresh brilliance by means of additional devices. The collocation *fidem obsequiumque* has a more vivid impact because the marginal position of the elements modifying each word gives rise to a chiasmus. The *traductio* mentioned above achieves pointedness thanks to antithesis. Synonymous adjectives often have other words inserted between them (above 2,4 and 2,9); alternatively the second element is expanded (above 2,11f.; 2,18).

While most features of the Curial style are found in the second column and in the opening lines of the first, the main part of this first column is rather different. With *quondam reges hanc tenuere urbem* Claudius enters the sphere of historiography in regard both to content and style.²⁵ We can compare the opening of Tacitus' *Annals*: *urbem Romam a principio reges habuere*. The same 'distinguished'-sounding termination *-ere* occurs in Claudius, where it is also retained in the following sentence (*supervenere* 1,9).²⁶ The explanatory parentheses with *nam* (1,16 and 22) are likewise typical of the historiographical style. The intensive *appellito*²⁷ also fits the archaic

²⁰ In our text the use of *ornare* and related expressions is entirely stereotyped: cf. also *ornare curiam* 2,9; *equestris ordinis ornamentum* 2,11. The term *ornamentum* also occurs Sen. *ad Polyb.* 14,3 (on the 'typically Claudian' style of this speech cf. H. Dahlmann *Hermes* 71 [1936] pp.374f.; D.M. Last and R.M. Ogilvie 'Claudius and Livy' *Latomus* 17 [1958] pp.476-487, esp. 485).

²¹ *Diligo* is fairly rare in Tacitus, cf. R. Syme *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) p.345.

²² Vittinghoff p.362: 'The furious attack on Valerius Asiaticus, without any basis in fact, is sufficient indication of the character of an impulsive man who lacks self-control.'

²³ Cf. e.g. the use of *arbitror* in Cato's speech for the Rhodians (above p.18).

²⁴ Here it is not a question of synonyms, but of the stylistic co-ordination of related concepts. On the frequent occurrence of duplications in col. 2,3f. cf. Sage p.284. Claudius may actually have intended the sequence of heavy genitive plurals.

²⁵ It is no surprise to find in our text many phrases from Livy, Claudius' admired teacher (this is fully treated by Last and Ogilvie loc. cit.; although they definitely go too far in classing expressions like *primam omnium* or *qua - qua* among the reminiscences, this still leaves such characteristic echoes as *supervenere*; *discrepat inter*; *invisi civitati*; *trepidus rebus*; *securam ... pacem praestiterunt*; *bello per ... annos exercuerunt* and various others). For a comparison with the speech of Canuleius (Liv. 4,3f.) see A. Momigliano (cited above p.136 n.2) p.38 (with older lit.). The emperor presents himself as a tribune of the people.

²⁶ On the other hand the 'normal' ending *coeperunt* is used with great sensitivity in a non-narrative section concerned with appraisal (1,25).

²⁷ In the archaizer Gellius the verb occurs often with a frequentative sense. On one occasion in Tacitus it is also used intensively; oddly enough this too is in connection with the *mons Caelius* (*ann.* 4,65). The semantically striking use of this very rare verb in the same material context suggests that it occurred in an early historian, on whom Tacitus and Claudius are ultimately dependent. It is unlikely that here too Tacitus is drawing on Claudius, since the matter presented in Tacitus is different. The passage from Claudius' speech is strangely absent from the *Thesaurus*, although it is the oldest direct evidence for the word. However Claudius cannot have been the first to use the word in the sense of *appellare* (i.e. as an intensive, not a frequentative), for Paul. Fest.

colouring of the historical part of the speech.

The way important concepts are assigned to less important parts of the sentence at times indicates a striving after asymmetry. Participial constructions²⁸ that can show considerable refinement play a particular role: these are still relatively rare in Cicero. However this practice, which is also to be found in Tacitus, is not put into effect by Claudius at all strictly; what gives Claudius' speech its distinctive character is neither the studied asymmetry nor the preciousness, but a very objective style that is characterized by Suetonius without particular commendation as '*non ineleganter*'.²⁹

c) Unconstrained style

Other elements seem to point to an oral quality about the style that on occasion almost suggests improvisation. We can cite cases of repetitiveness like *ornare – ornatissima – ornamentum* (close together at 2,9-11 and without any recognizable stylistic purpose, especially as there is no close conceptual link between the sentences); cf. also *ita appellavit – ita appellatus est* (1,22f.).

At times it seems possible to identify traces of oral improvisation³⁰ in the sentence structure as well. We should note how in the following sentence the construction develops gradually and undergoes a certain shift (1,5-7) ... *cogitetis, quam multa in hac civitate novata sint, et | quidem statim ab origine urbis nostrae in quod formas statusque res (publica) nostra diducta sit*. Initially *et quidem* adds a supplementary adverbial phrase which could mark the end of the sentence (*urbis nostrae*); however this addition develops into an independent new

27 M. (= 24 L.) presumably goes back via Festus to Verrius Flaccus (Augustan period), who in turn must have taken the word, which he thought needed explaining, from the common early tradition that is used by Claudius and Tacitus. There is an interesting piece of evidence to support this. In Paulus, Müller reads: *appellitavisse: <saepe> appellasse*. The added word is a modern supplement and is out of place in Claudius and Tacitus and the tradition they depend on. It should be rejected, since frequentative *appellitare = saepe appellare* was well-known and needed no explanation for a Roman; on the other hand *appellitare = appellare* (for giving names) was unusual, and Verrius recorded it.

²⁸ E.g. the future participle *promoturi*; this is presumably not dependent on *quaeso* with ellipse of *sint* (on the sequence of tenses in final object-clauses see Kühner-Stegmann II p.180), but is a loosely attached predicative participle. Cf. also *patri ... subigenti*, even though this second construction is known to Cicero.

²⁹ The pleasure Claudius takes in the 'right' term will become even clearer in comparison with Tacitus.

³⁰ The form *poterint*, for which there are occasional parallels (Sommer *Hdb.* p.531: *erint* [auct. Her. 1,10; 2,10] is 'scarcely old'; *aderint* in inscriptions from the 1st cent. A.D.), may be due to the workman who inscribed the tablet. Cf. Sage p.277: 'Si Claude a réellement dit *poterint*, il a commis un quasi-barbarisme.'

statement with its own subject and predicate.

The historical part of the speech is also marked by the same unconstrained style that allows the idea to unfold gradually with the sentence. The result is a very singular blend of both historiographical solemnity and a style that adds things on in a manner close to ordinary speech. Here one idea engenders the next as clarification. The statement *propter temeratum sanguinem* is put in concrete terms in a supplementary *quod*-clause; we here have a reference to the mother's poverty, which is in turn explained more fully in a further subordinate clause. However Claudius has not lost sight of his goal in the meantime, for in two further subordinate clauses he now heads resolutely for the close that contains the main idea: *cum domi re|pelleretur á gerendis honoribus, postquam Romam migravit, | regnum adeptus est*. Though at first the emperor indulged his taste for relating a few details in conversational tone from his abundant historical knowledge, he is in no danger of losing the thread; on the contrary he follows the seemingly chaotic *diastole* with a definite and systematic *systemole*. The same thing can also be observed in the following sentence. First the basic idea 'between him and his son came Servius Tullius' is expanded by an annotation to the word *filio*: 'or his grandson'. This explanatory remark is then followed by another involving a reference to the sources: 'for writers disagree on this point too'. All these annotations are put, not at the end of the sentence, but in its centre; the important final position is reserved for the grammatical subject Servius Tullius. (It is noteworthy that here the verb forfeits its traditional place,³¹ in order to give greater emphasis to the proper name.) This name is followed by two observations. Firstly, according to Roman tradition Servius is the son of a prisoner (*captiva natus Oeresiá*: the important words are on the outside). Secondly, in the Etruscan version he is the comrade-in-arms of Caelius (Caeles) Vivenna. If the sentence finished here, nothing would be missing; *insertus* would then be an elliptical main verb. However Claudius now expands his review of the Etruscan version and at the same time moves gradually towards the real goal of the sentence: *postquam ... Etruria excessit* has a similar function to *cum domi re|pelleretur á gerendis honoribus* in the previous sentence. It is true that before he attains the kingship we also have a report of his occupation of the Caelian Hill and of how both were given new names. This involves use of parenthesis and rather long-winded

³¹ It is true that with predicative participles this is often the case.

repetition and periphrasis. On the whole however the sentence we have just examined reveals the same principle of construction as the previous one, only in extended form: beginning, annotations, main point, annotations, gradual return in the temporal clause, annotations, main point. In the following sentence we again notice a tendency for the annotation to move into the centre (*qua ipsius qua filiorum eius*). Again the crucial political change comes at the end.³²

Thus the section considered so far does indeed exhibit elements of a looseness of structure that is close to oral expression. However this is no reason to regard Claudius' style as associative and erratic, or even as symptomatic of a weak personality. It would after all be strange if from the middle of the sentence onwards Claudius' personality consistently changed back to being a strong one, aiming resolutely for the thematically relevant end.

This approach is therefore deliberately chosen and has two components: the first is artistic and the second practical and psychological. The artistic component is the attempt to achieve greater colour and movement by breaking up the surface. This is the same approach that leaves the walls and columns of the contemporary Porta Maggiore in Rome in a state of half-finished rustication³³ and thereby makes the light that shines in softer. The psychological component is barely separable from the artistic one. There is so much less rigidity to a style of argument which does not aim straight for its goal without regard for the audience, but takes them first on a pleasant trip along the seeming byways of early Roman history. The cosy oral manner and the scholarly absent-mindedness of 'dear old Emperor Claudius' are also a device he uses to influence the audience diplomatically.

2. Tacitus

Our discussion follows the text. Each heading indicates a stylistic device that is especially prominent in the sentence under consideration. However mention is also made of the other recurrent stylistic features so as to present a complete picture of the text.

a) Main idea in subordinate position

The very first sentence contains an unusual feature. The main idea does not in fact occur in the main clause, but in an ablative addition:

³² A detailed analysis of the two periods just discussed is to be found in Sage pp.281-284 and 296, with reference to sentence structure and improvisation.

³³ L. Curtius-A. Nawrath *Das antike Rom*⁴, ed. E. Nash (Vienna and Munich 1963) pp.209f.

*transferendo*³⁴ *huc quod usquam egregium fuerit*. The effect of this stylistic device is not to devalue or modify the idea, for this is given sufficient weight by the final position itself. However the ablative form adds an impersonal and self-contained element that belongs to the monumentality of Tacitus' style.

The second sentence shows twofold ellipse of *esse*: this again is a typical piece of compression. At the same time Tacitus demonstrates his feeling for climax. We twice have a sequence of increasing magnitude: then in *non modo ... sed* a further climax is achieved. This sentence too has an ending that is important in its content and form. The main idea of the first sentence is developed and surpassed, as transplanting the best foreigners to Rome is replaced by the more comprehensive idea of general Romanization. The important concluding idea again comes in a subordinate position. This will often be the case in the following sentences. In Tacitus the 'exception' almost becomes the rule.

b) Two concepts superimposed

The form in which the process of Romanization finds expression is typically Tacitean: *in nomen nostrum coalescerent*. The peculiar appeal of this collocation is due to the fact that preposition and prefix are not identical: *in* signifies a 'growing into' the Roman name, whereas *co-* on the other hand indicates a 'growing together'. The translator or commentator is obliged to undo the 'yoke' with which the writer has combined two not wholly congruent ideas; this is a difficulty constantly facing anyone who is concerned with Tacitus' style. A similar phenomenon recurs in our text later on (see p.155 under 'f').

In virtually no other writer is zeugma so marked a pattern of thought as in Tacitus.³⁵ The slight clash here between preposition and prefix will also have been felt by a Roman. The phrase owes its particular density to the intentional creation of two different levels. We could say that Tacitus places one musical note on top of another, instead of letting us hear them one by one.

³⁴ On 'ablative of the gerund with accusative' cf. A. Draeger *Ueber Syntax und Stil des Tacitus* (Leipzig 1882³) p.81, with further examples; on additions to the sentence see especially F. Klingner 'Beobachtungen über Sprache und Stil des Tacitus am Anfang des 13. Annalenbuches' in: V. Pöschl (ed.) *Tacitus Wege der Forschung* 97 (Darmstadt 1986²) pp.557-574; K. Seitz *Studien zur Stilentwicklung und zur Satzstruktur innerhalb der Annalen des Tacitus* (Diss. Marburg 1958); for a specific treatment of the abl. abs. as the additional element cf. R. Enghofer *Der Ablativus absolutus bei Tacitus* (Diss. Würzburg 1961) pp.39-46 and 130-138.

³⁵ On zeugma in Tacitus cf. Draeger p.107. For related expressions cf. pp.105f.

c) Asymmetry

The third sentence again contains two ellipses. Here again the main idea, coming as it does at the end, is not in the main clause. However the most typical feature of the sentence in question is its asymmetry. *Solida domi quies* is expressed impersonally. The personal *adversus externa floruimus* is co-ordinated with this construction by means of simple *et*. The constructions of the following *cum*-clauses are in reverse sequence: the first is personal, the second impersonal.

Owing to its elliptical character the fourth sentence is very nearly ambiguous. That *num paenitet* means the same as *num vos paenitet* has to be guessed from the context; otherwise we have to consult Claudius' original speech to make sure.³⁶ The idea of naturalization and of moving to Rome for good again comes emphatically at the end of the sentence, and again it is not a main verb that expresses it.

d) Compactness

The constructive half of the speech is rounded off by a sentence whose corner-stones are two finite verbs (*manent ... concedunt*) and whose centre stresses the Roman patriotism of the new citizens (*amore* is in the middle of the sentence).

e) Overstatement³⁷ and contrast

With *quid aliud* Tacitus now puts forward an example to the contrary that carries immediate conviction. The main idea, which this time is the rejection of foreign assimilation, is once again moved to the end, and again stands in a subordinate clause. The contrasting positive example of Romulus likewise puts the emphasis on the end: this time it is in a consecutive clause. The following sentence, the shortest so far, overstates the general idea: in Rome even the kingship was open to foreigners. And then comes another extreme case: sons of freedmen obtained state office. Tacitus had already paved the way for this kind of overstatement earlier, when he made the transformation from enemy to citizen take place within a single day. Cases like these are meant to serve as a contrast to set off the innocuousness of the present step. Now for the first time there is an idea at the end of the sentence that differs from what has gone before: the extension of the *ius honorum* accords with ancient custom. The importance of this fact is underlined by the choice of vocabulary: *factitatum est* is a

frequentative.³⁸ To this we should add the striking rhythm (double trochee).

f) Conciseness

An imaginary objection follows: the Senones were our enemies. This is countered by the argument that so were the Volsci and Aequi. Then comes a second objection: the Gauls conquered our city. The counter-argument here is that the Etruscans and Samnites have already humiliated us as well.

In these four sentences the style is very concise: the facts are simply set one against the other. Initially *at* serves to indicate the logical relationship; in the fourth sentence *sed* does this. The third sentence is put in asyndetically; the second contains an ironic *scilicet*.

This is followed by two arguments in the Gauls' favour. Quickly subjugated, they have been staunchly loyal to the Romans ever since. Besides, they should now invest their wealth also in Rome. Here again typically Tacitean ellipses occur, such as we have often encountered throughout our text (*nullum ... confectum: continua inde ... pax*). In addition we have a collocation that is close to Zeugma: *moribus artibus adfinitatibus nostris mixti*.

At the end the perspective broadens. All that is now old was once new. The *ius honorum* was constantly extended to cover a wider class of people. Today's decision will also be among the precedents in future. The final section has been given greater animation than those preceding it. This is due in part to the technique of introducing an objection and rebutting it with counter-arguments, as well as to the exceptional conciseness of the wording.

g) Position of the main verb and sentence connection

In Tacitus the position of the main verb is more flexible than in Claudius' speech. We find not only the traditional final position, but also the 'logical' centre position (*hortantur uti ...*) and the animated initial position: this last occurs in an interrogative clause (*num paenitet ...*) as well as in a statement clause (*manent posteri eorum*; similarly *inveterascet hoc quoque*).³⁹ The significant part of the predicate stands emphatically at the beginning in the following hyperbaton: *capti a Gallis sumus*.

If the significant verb comes to the front, the result is a lively

³⁸ This verb is often used to refer to ancient customs. Tacitus employs it with somewhat greater variety than Cicero (see *ThLL* 6,1 [1913] 139f.).

³⁹ In both cases the inverted word order is supported by chiasmus (marginal position of the verbs).

³⁶ Col. 2,23; 24; 29.

³⁷ On the subject in general cf. B.-R. Voss *Der pointierte Stil des Tacitus* (Münster 1980²).

staccato. In fact the sentences are often not connected to each other by logical particles, but juxtaposed asyndetically as in poetry.⁴⁰ The only sentence-connecting particles that occur rather more frequently are adversative.⁴¹ This too is characteristic of Tacitus' concise style with its love of contrast and pointed expression.

h) Irony

It is typical that irony should play a role in Tacitus: *scilicet Vulsci et Aequi numquam adversam nobis aciem instruxere*. We shall come back to this when we compare Claudius.

3. Stylistic comparison

We have mentioned already that comparison of content involves a number of uncertainties; when it comes to language and style we can however be more definite. Claudius' language is not uniform. On one side there is the normal language of senatorial speeches with its conventionality in praise as well as blame and a diction that is restrained and circumspect to the point of imprecision; in contrast to this we have elements of the historiographical style and certain participial constructions that appear elegant and even affected. However these differences are not arbitrary: they are the result of accommodation to the particular subject-matter and situation.

In Tacitus linguistic usage is more homogeneous. This is clear from details like the ending *-ere* (3rd person, perf. ind.). Tacitus uses it not only in referring to historical facts (*instruxere*) but, unlike Claudius, in the actual discussion as well: *omnia ..., quae nunc vetustissima creduntur, nova fuere*. Likewise the Sallustian *fessus* (significantly avoided altogether by Caesar) stands in a clause of appraisal. This participle normally refers to persons and its association with *imperium* produces a poetic effect.⁴²

The process of Romanization is twice given eloquent expression in the form of zeugma. Avoidance of conventional phrases is everywhere discernible (Claudius on the other hand consistently uses the technical terms of political life,⁴³ e.g. 1,34f. *distributum consulare*

*imperium tribunosque militum consulari imperio appellatos*⁴⁴). The *coloniae* and *municipia* (Claudius 2,3) are also missing here in Tacitus; instead he expresses the point in an enigmatic paraphrase: *specie deductarum per orbem terrae legionum* (there is a hint here of *deductarum coloniarum*, but no use of the technical term).⁴⁵ Tacitus observes similar restraint in his use of elatives, insofar as conventional formulae of commendation are involved (cf. just the positive *insignes viros*).⁴⁶

In Claudius' style we kept noting cases of pleonasm; in Tacitus it was cases of ellipsis. Before making inferences from this as to the personalities of the two writers, we need to take into account the social context. Claudius is speaking in front of the Senate, which he has to convince tactfully. A certain long-windedness is often a requirement of diplomacy and can be part of the oratorical style.⁴⁷

Tacitus on the other hand has no need to adjust to an audience that is often indifferent and only half attentive. He can expect a receptive readership that is able to look forward eagerly to all the sophistications of his style and to enjoy them in peace.⁴⁸ In practice a speech like this one of Tacitus would have sounded much the same as Brutus' speech in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*: clever and concentrated, but somewhat aloof and too subtle to be effective.

Ultimately therefore the differences in literary genre here are determined by the differing audiences. If Tacitus' stylistic approach to the speeches in his work does differ somewhat from his treatment

⁴⁴ The 'tribuni militum consulari potestate' were a permanent institution of the early Republic (Liv. 4,6,8 and often); on the consular tribunate cf. T. Mommsen *Römisches Staatsrecht* II,1 (Leipzig 1887³) pp.181-192. Tacitus does not mention the *latus clavus* here, although it is the real point (cf. 11,23,1; on this cf. Syme p.344).

⁴⁵ A tendency to avoid technical terms can be observed throughout Tacitus (cf. Syme pp.343f.; F. Kuntz *Die Sprache des Tacitus* [Diss. Heidelberg 1962] p.148; Norden I p.331; Koestermann on 11,23,1). On adoption and avoidance of terminology from Claudius' speech cf. J.N. Adams 'The Vocabulary of the Speeches in Tacitus' *Historical Works' BICS* 20 (1973) pp.124-144 (esp. 127f.): 'Tacitus has borrowed a few words or expressions deliberately, but only if they fit easily into his own style' etc.; ib. pp.138f. (n.) a bibliography on the style of Tacitus' speeches.

⁴⁶ Claudius also uses this form (2,23 *insignes iuvenes*), but with him it is not the only one (see above).

⁴⁷ Pliny (*epist.* 1,20) tries to convince Tacitus that in some sense a speech's quality increases with its length. This is of course a one-sided view, but in principle it is based on a correct psychological observation: the audience want to get the feeling that the orator is interested in them and deserves their trust.

⁴⁸ Quintilian has in mind the difference of audience when he praises Sallust's style but at the same time describes it as unsuitable for practical oratory (10,1,32).

⁴⁰ On Tacitus and Vergil (with reference to content) cf. W. Edelmaier *Tacitus und die Gegner Roms* (Diss. Heidelberg 1964) pp.134-139. On the stylistic aspect cf. Syme pp.357f. Passages are assembled in Draeger pp.127-129. In our text *regnare in* is unusual (by analogy with *dominari*).

⁴¹ *At* in an imaginary objection is rhetorical, cf. Draeger p.122.

⁴² Cf. *ThLL* 6,3 (1916) 611,22ff.; 612,3ff.

⁴³ *Dignitatis incrementa* also occurs in Val. Max. 4,7,5 and is attested in inscriptions (*ThLL* 7,1,7 [1941] 1047,40ff. [Bulhart]). The phrase is less artificial than it first appears. Claudius positively delights in the 'right' expression.

of the historical narrative itself,⁴⁹ our discussion has shown that the gap separating this speech from one that could actually be delivered is still far greater than any such inbuilt divergence. Tacitus' style in the imaginary speech under consideration is marked by brachylogy, ellipse, zeugma and the search for elevated language; the same features are also present elsewhere.

Claudius' original speech is altogether more communicative. Irony is a dangerous weapon in the orator's hand: since it arouses hostility, it can very easily turn against the speaker. Tacitus can use it without danger, as we have seen. Claudius on the other hand fills his speech with humour⁵⁰ and thereby wins the senators' good-will. He dwells happily on the situation of the impoverished noblewoman who has no choice but to marry a foreigner. He praises the loyalty of the Gauls, who did not revolt during the German War although the census was being carried out just then, and he points out that this is still a problem even today and in Rome. The way he touches on his conquest of Britain is also far from straightforward, being varied by a streak of innocent self-irony⁵¹ and given a slightly humorous tone. Thus in real life majesty and humour go together better than in a work of history.

We have noted a whole series of linguistic devices whereby Claudius endeavours to take the edge off his remarks. We see the opposite in Tacitus: *eodem die hostes, dein cives; advenae in nos regnaverunt*. The trend towards epigrammatic overstatement can be observed in almost every sentence. The reverse tendency is exhibited in Claudius' 'supplementary' style (his supplements depart from the subject, whereas in Tacitus⁵² they are strictly relevant).

To what extent can we move beyond generic boundaries to the writers' stylistic individuality? We know that Claudius too was a historian, though not a follower of Sallust but a student of Livy.⁵³

⁴⁹ In Tacitus *inveterascere* occurs only in the present speech, though it is familiar to Caesar and Cicero. Words that Tacitus uses only in speeches are collected by Syme II pp.719f.

⁵⁰ This is not the only place where Claudius shows a sense of humour, cf. V.M. Scramuzza *The Emperor Claudius* (Cambridge 1940) p.111; C.G. Bruns *Fontes Juris Romani* (Tübingen 1909⁷) pp.199f. (no. 53).

⁵¹ Self-irony is much closer to humour than to irony proper, see A. Haury *L'ironie et l'humour chez Cicéron* (Leiden 1955). Cf. also the present writer 'Ovids Humor' *Der altsprachliche Unterricht* 6,2 (1963) pp.47-72; now in: M. v. Albrecht and E. Zinn (edd.) *Ovid Wege der Forschung* 92 (Darmstadt 1968) pp.405-437, esp. 408.

⁵² On 'supplements' in Tacitus cf. Klingner (cited above p.153 n.34).

⁵³ The fact that Tacitus also in part follows Livy is stressed by Syme II pp.733f.; however he also recognizes that Sallust's influence is more important. Kuntz talks

The diametrical opposition to Livy's serene *lactea ubertas*⁵⁴ is an indication that the style of the Tacitus passage is not merely due to generic tradition, but to the independent creativity of a highly disciplined newcomer to the Senate. If on the other hand we recall the sober and straightforward diction of normal senatorial decrees and imperial edicts, we can detect a personal note in the scholarly long-windedness and the relaxed humour of the aristocratic and unpretentious emperor.

Despite occasional preciousness the language of Claudius' speech is on the whole conventional; however the train of thought is Claudius' own. With Tacitus the reverse is in a sense the case. As regards the thought, he looks for what is typical; but as to the wording he underlines the distinctiveness of the historiographical style by looking for what is unusual. Here avoidance of normality and repetition of unfamiliar structures in fact produce a new norm of linguistic detachment.⁵⁵

Hence the occurrence of what is factually *ineptum* and stylistically *proprium* in Claudius and of the factually *aptum* and stylistically *improprium* in Tacitus is more than just a mechanical consequence of the difference of genre. In its particular configuration it is characteristic of the distinctive quality and stylistic approach of both authors.⁵⁶

about 'historiographical language' throughout. Yet the real issue starts where he stops: every historian has his own different style.

⁵⁴ Quint. 10,1,32, cf. also 10,1,101: *adfectus quidem praecipue eos, qui sunt dulciores, ut parcissime dicam, nemo historicorum commendavit magis.*

⁵⁵ For example in the way the main concepts are transferred to subordinate parts of the sentence.

⁵⁶ Tacitus' deliberate elaboration of his language and style is shown by the major studies of his stylistic development, of which we need mention only those by E. Wölfflin (*Philologus* 25 [1867] pp.92ff.) and E. Löfstedt (most recently in: V. Pöschl [ed.] *Tacitus* [Darmstadt 1986²] pp.70-84). For literary assessments of Claudius (besides the works already cited) the following deserve particular mention: E. Huzar 'Claudius - The Erudite Emperor' *ANRW* II 32, 1 pp.611-650 (on the Lyon tablet 627-632; for an estimate of the emperor as orator cf. also esp. 635); M.T. Griffin 'The Lyons Tablet and Tacitean Hindsight' *CQ* 32 (1982) pp.404-418.

ARCA

Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs

23

**MASTERS OF
ROMAN PROSE
FROM CATO TO APULEIUS**

Interpretative Studies

MICHAEL VON ALBRECHT

Translated by **NEIL ADKIN**

1989

General Editors: Francis Cairns, Robin Seager, Frederick Williams

Assistant Editors: Neil Adkin, Sandra Cairns

ISSN 0309-5541

X FRANCIS CAIRNS