

5-1974

# Direct and indirect speeches in Tacitus' *Historiae*

Francess Butt Slaughter

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses>



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Slaughter, Francess Butt, "Direct and indirect speeches in Tacitus' *Historiae*" (1974). *Master's Theses*. Paper 1016.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu](mailto:scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu).

DIRECT AND INDIRECT SPEECHES IN TACITUS' HISTORIAE

BY

FRANCES BUTT SLAUGHTER

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND  
IN CANDIDACY  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN LATIN

MAY 1974

DIRECT AND INDIRECT SPEECHES IN TACITUS' HISTORIAE

BY

FRANCES BUTT SLAUGHTER

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND  
IN CANDIDACY  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN LATIN

MAY 1974

Approval Sheet

Joseph L. White

Thesis Director,  
Chairman of Department

Julius R. Beebe

Second Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter</b>		
I.	HISTORY AND RHETORIC . . . . .	1
II.	THE SPEECHES: AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE <u>HISTORIAE</u> . .	6
III.	THE SPEECHES: REFLECTIONS OF TACITUS' SPECIAL INTERESTS . . . . .	35
IV.	THE SPEECHES: A REFLECTION IN STYLE OF THE INDIVIDUALITY OF THE SPEAKER . . . . .	53
<b>Appendices</b>		
I.	DIRECT SPEECHES CATEGORIZED BY INTRODUCTORY WORDS .	60
II.	RHETORICAL DEVICES EMPLOYED IN THE DIRECT SPEECHES .	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .		92

## PREFACE

The topic of this thesis will be a study of the Roman historian Publius Cornelius Tacitus' use of dramatic speech, both direct and indirect, in his Historiae. In the initial chapter of this study, a consideration of the relationship between history and rhetoric so far as some of Tacitus' predecessors were concerned, and an investigation of the historian's own feelings on this matter as stated in his works will show that the historian was very much aware of the need for truth in relating history and that he was, by composing speeches for historical personages to utter, following a well established literary tradition.

The second chapter will deal with a question much debated by scholars, that is, whether or not Tacitus was unduly influenced by his early rhetorical training and career as an orator and too much swayed from the path of veracity in his invention and treatment of speeches. An analysis of selected speeches regarding purpose and style will prove that the utterances are indeed an integral part of the historical work as a whole and not merely showpieces in which the author exercised his wit and displayed his oratorical talent.

In the third chapter the idea will be espoused that the speeches reveal matters of special import to the historian. Again, an analysis of certain speeches will make clear the favored topics, namely, the antithesis of freedom and slavery as it appears in the relationship of emperor to subjects and Roman citizens to provincials

and the importance of the personality and quality of the individual ruler as well as the increasing role of the army in government.

A final chapter will dwell on the style of the direct speeches as a reflection of the individuality of the speakers, and it will be shown that the words prefacing the speeches have been employed deliberately by the author to indicate varying degrees of veracity. Lastly, an appendix will list for the reader the various rhetorical devices which the writer has used to embellish the direct speeches. Thus, the reader will be able quite readily to see the manner in which the historian has colored his speeches, a technique to which this study will often refer.

The text from which all the quotations are taken is: *Cornelii Taciti, Historiarum Libri*, ed. by C. D. Fisher (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910).

## I. HISTORY AND RHETORIC

"When an historian who is also an orator equips his narration with choice specimens of eloquence, and when, moreover, it is more than doubtful whether any such words were ever spoken, a suspicion arises, with the grave charge that he is employing the arts of the rhetorician." So writes Ronald Syme of Tacitus as he initiates a discussion of that ancient Roman author's use of speeches in his Historiae.<sup>1</sup> It would seem that before any statement can be made about rhetoric in history with regard to Tacitus the relationship of rhetoric to history, so far as some of his predecessors were concerned, must be revealed. With this end in mind, let us turn to the works of several literary figures who were important to Tacitus, as well as to the writings of the historian himself.

History and oratory were always closely associated by the Romans; as proof of this Walker quotes Cicero, opus oratorium maxime.<sup>2</sup> This remark, however, has been interpreted in a slightly different manner to indicate that ". . . writing history was essentially an orator's work. . . ." <sup>3</sup> Yet, if additional evidence is sought from other writings of Cicero, his De Oratore which in part treats of this very subject cannot be overlooked. There he states, Nam quis nescit primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere



audeat? Deinde ne quid veri non audeat?<sup>4</sup> Walker has concluded:

Cicero uses 'eloquence' in the narrow sense of the advocate's skill, in which persuasiveness is the whole aim, and the wider sense of 'accomplished prose (sometimes even verse) composition.' In this sense history is a department of oratory; but it has its own strict laws.<sup>5</sup>

The views of other Romans substantiate this opinion. Sallust, who has been generally accepted by scholars as one of Tacitus' models,<sup>6</sup> proclaims that he is well suited to the task of writing history, eo magis, quod mihi a spe, metu, partibus rei publicae animus liber erat.<sup>7</sup> Clearly, he recognizes the necessity for impartiality when dealing with events of the past. Similarly, Pliny the Younger, whose thoughts are important because he was not only a contemporary of Tacitus but also a writer himself, remarks in a letter:

Habet quidem oratio et historia multa communia, sed plura diversa in his ipsis, quae communia videntur. . . . [he then elaborates upon the differences and concludes by saying] His ex causis non adducor ut duo dissimilia et hoc ipso diversa, quo maxima, confundam misceamque, ne tanta quasi colluvione turbatus ibi faciam quod hic debeo.

For Pliny, too, there existed two very different genres. Quintilian, who may have served as teacher to Tacitus,<sup>9</sup> notes a basic difference in the purpose of history and oratory as he says of history, scribitur ad narrandum, non ad probandum.<sup>10</sup> Our evidence does not consider the writing of history and of oratory to be the same. Let us see if Tacitus subscribed to the dicta of an earlier age and of his own.

In Tacitus' work on orators one of the participants in the dialogue, Vipstanus Messalla, discourses at length upon the rhetorical schools of the day and castigates them for their ineptness.<sup>11</sup>

Moreover, it is not Messalla alone who is critical. As Walker points out, "Every speaker condemns them [the declamation schools] as artificial and narrow, producing superficiality. . . ." <sup>12</sup> She then concludes, "He [Tacitus] valued very highly the power of language developed in him through the power of the rhetoric-school. But he was far from being a docile pupil, blind to the defects of that form of education. He valued rhetoric not in itself, but as an instrument." <sup>13</sup> It seems highly unlikely, therefore, that Tacitus who was about to apply himself to the task of writing history would, in so doing, knowingly indulge himself in practices which he, through the speakers in the *Dialogus*, had lately eschewed. In an even earlier work Tacitus declares, ita quae priores nondum comperta eloquentia percoluere, rerum fide tradentur <sup>14</sup> thus pointing out that factual accuracy is a necessity for history. Finally, as he begins the labor to which he has aspired, Tacitus states that he is doing so, neque amore . . . et sine odio <sup>15</sup> and again at the outset of his second great endeavor, sine ira et studio. <sup>16</sup> Certainly Tacitus was aware of the need for unbiased and truthful recording in the relating of history. Whether he successfully meets the standards which he has set for himself is a matter for later debate.

Yet, as Walker observes,

In one respect the ancient theory of history did sacrifice facts to rhetoric; the writer was expected to compose speeches for his characters which might bear very little relation to any speech actually delivered. These free compositions were not merely permitted, but really preferred to a verbatim report, quotation, or summary of an historical speech. <sup>17</sup>

Speeches had become, since Thucydides first employed them, an accepted literary device, <sup>18</sup> ". . . the principal contrivance that enable [d]

the historian, cutting loose from the trammels of fact and chronology, to assert full independence, with a full commentary upon men and events."<sup>19</sup> Nothing could have been more in keeping with Tacitus' own predilections. Although not a great deal is known with certainty about his life, it is a fact that his oratorical abilities were considerable<sup>20</sup> and that he, together with Pliny the Younger, in 100 A.D. undertook the successful prosecution of Marius Priscus who had governed Africa in a disgraceful and rapacious fashion.<sup>21</sup> Thus, Tacitus, in his earlier years practiced the art of oratory with no mean achievement; that the subject was one of particular interest for him is evident from his composition of the Dialogus De Oratoribus and the points discussed therein. It comes as no surprise, then, to find in his Historiae numerous examples of speeches which Tacitus has his characters utter. If the declaimers speak in the style of Tacitus, that also is to be expected, for the author's ". . . task was to 'adapt' (invertere, Tac. Ann. XV 63) what had been said so that its expression would harmonise with the main narrative, displaying those qualities of character and situation which would be appropriate for emphasis at that particular point."<sup>22</sup> How much freedom was allowed to the historian at work can be shown by a comparison of the original speech of the emperor Claudius with Tacitus' version in the Annales XI 24. Although several such studies have been made, with opinions of Tacitus' treatment varying,<sup>23</sup> it is more widely held that the author ". . . has included all Claudius' main points and expressed faithfully the speaker's general intention."<sup>24</sup> As Leeman has remarked the license of ancient historians had to be extreme,

because an historical work as a whole was in the first place an artistic achievement, and depended on the author's ability to shape his story in composition and style. There was only narrow scope for the expression of personal stylistic features of the speakers, because they endangered the stylistic unity of the whole.<sup>25</sup>

Thus, Tacitus, following a literary tradition as well as his own inclinations, with honesty of intentions, composed speeches throughout his Historiae. Whether his delight with rhetoric swayed him too far from the path of veracity must yet be examined.

II. THE SPEECHES: AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE HISTORIAE

If the speeches of the Historiae are not, as it has been suggested,<sup>1</sup> merely rhetorical exercises designed to exhibit the author's talent in that art, it must be assumed that they are a functional part of the whole and that they serve a definite purpose. In fact, "To discredit the author it would have to be proved that the speeches are set compositions shoved in for effect, or superfluous."<sup>2</sup> An examination, then, of a selected number of speeches with a view of their purpose and their concordance with the entire work is in order.

There is general agreement among scholars as to the ends which a speech may serve. "It can portray a character or illustrate a situation; . . ."<sup>3</sup> With these aims in mind let us turn to several of the speeches about which there exists some controversy, and let us attempt an analysis.

One direct speech recommends itself for scrutiny immediately because of its early placement (I 15-16) and the generosity of treatment.<sup>4</sup> That is the homily of the elderly emperor Galba as he announces his adoption of Piso, his intended heir and successor. In a discourse of some length Galba surveys the political scene, past, present, and future, and speaks loftily and with firmness of purpose about the best method of choosing a successor as well as what type of government best suits the Roman people. Since neither Suetonius

nor Plutarch mentions such a speech, it is to be assumed that it is, to a great extent, Tacitus' invention.<sup>5</sup> Critics have been quick to note that Galba, as he has been portrayed by the author up to the moment of his speech, is a far different man from the moral and political philosopher who emerges. "Dans cette parole calme et grave, qui s'épanche avec noblesse, nous refusons de reconnaître ou le prince affaibli par l'age, ou le soldat redevenu brusque et cassant, . . . , l'homme enfin qui n'avait jamais cessé, quand il parlait, de le faire avec la brièveté (imperatoria brevitare, I 18) du commandement."<sup>6</sup>

Suetonius and Plutarch concur with Tacitus' sketch of the emperor as being old and enfeebled, and neither makes any mention of his speaking ability. What, then, is to be concluded? Courbaud has decided that the author, ". . . ne s'occupe point de maintenir l'unité de son caractère, il s'est substitué à lui."<sup>7</sup> In other words, Tacitus wished to voice certain ideas in an eloquent manner and did not fail to take advantage of an opportunity to do so, to the detriment of his consistency of character portrayal.

Daitz has also noted the incongruity of Galba's words with the preceding narrative and is at pains to provide an explanation for it.

It may be possible that Galba was one of the many men in power whose words far outshone his deeds. . . . The explanation most favorable to Tacitus' consistency as a literary artist would be that the excellent ideas expressed in the speech were Galba's revealing a political insight in the speaker which unfortunately was rarely manifested in his actions.

Ullmann believes that Tacitus was trying to give Galba ". . . the weight wished of age and experience."<sup>9</sup> He does not really deal with the problem of the harmony of the whole. Walker, in a discussion

of distortions of facts in the Annales, asks, "When Tacitus admits facts which conflict with his own interpretation of a character or event, why must we conclude 'this is rhetorical dissimulation' and not 'this is honesty'?"<sup>10</sup> If her reasoning is applied to the problem at hand, explanations such as those of Daitz will be arrived at, and although these ideas certainly may be true, they seem rather unlikely and a bit contrived.

What is the solution to this perplexing problem? Syme offers a different approach. Rather than assume that Tacitus himself was either unaware of the discrepancy or that he simply chose to ignore it because of an interest in voicing certain ideas, Syme feels that the author has purposefully employed this device. "He adopts by predilection a superior procedure that brings out, not the contrast between speech and speech, but the conflict between words and facts."<sup>11</sup> Syme elaborates: "The orators are often made to betray their predicament or falsity by equivocal argumentation, conventional phraseology—or by simple discordance with the facts."<sup>12</sup> This is the case with the elderly Galba, who, on the brink of disaster, attempts to hide his plight and to display a confidence which he cannot really feel. The alert reader is only too aware of the true situation, and so there is a terrible irony at work. An examination of the emperor's very words confirms the interpretation. "The phraseology allotted to Galba is conventional, resembling the legends on coinage, and to be assessed accordingly. Galba alleges that he has been summoned to rule deorum hominumque consensu (I 15). In fact, his elevation was due to force and accident, and his regime was now collapsing."<sup>13</sup> With regard to

the adoption itself, Galba announces that he is establishing a precedent, sub Tiberio et Gaio et Claudio unius familiae quasi hereditas fuimus: loco libertatis erit quod eligi coepimus; et finita Iuliorum Claudiorumque domo optimum quemque adoptio inveniet (I 16). And yet, as Syme points out, Galba had no other recourse since he had no son or close relatives whom he deemed worthy. For him to have been the founder of a dynasty of his own blood was impossible.<sup>14</sup> The weakness of that claim is further underscored by an ambiguity in the diction. Moore comments, "fuimus: Galba speaks as a citizen, but in eligi coepimus as emperor (not coepti sumus, the classical usage; . . ."<sup>15</sup>

Other assertions deserve notice. Galba states, et audita adoptione desinam videri senex, quod nunc unum obicitur (I 16). In truth, however, the fact that Galba is old is not the only charge upon which he can be indicted; he is also, as Plutarch<sup>16</sup> and Suetonius<sup>17</sup> affirm, miserly and excessively severe and old-fashioned.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, he rapidly glosses over the fact that two legions have revolted, dismissing it as nothing extraordinary and prescribing the adoption as a cure.<sup>19</sup> In reality, this was the beginning of the rebellion which culminated in Otho's suicide and Vitellius' elevation just two short months after Galba's own downfall. That Galba was in actuality distressed by the rumors from Germany, Tacitus has earlier affirmed: Sed Galba post nuntios Germanicae seditionis, quamquam nihil adhuc de Vitellio certum, anxius quoniam exercituum vis erumperet, ne urbano quidem militi confisus (I 14). There can be no doubt that these bold words were meant to conceal a growing insecurity. Again, the statement,



sed neque ipse imperium ambitione accepi (I 15) has the ring of conventionality while the philosophical assessment of the corruption which success brings (I 15) is oddly perceptive for a man dominated by those close to him, Potentia principatus divisa in Titum Vinium consulem Cornelium Laconem praetorii praefectum; nec minor gratia Icelo Galbae liberto, (I 13). Once more, the emperor's words do not correspond to the facts. Lastly, his judgment of what brought about Nero's ruin (I 16) is quite discerning for a man in his predicament, and how ironic it is that in avoiding Nero's luxuria, he falls prey to parsimonia and fails to do the one thing, namely, bestowing upon the troops a donative, which might have saved him. The insight which is revealed by his words is lacking in the conduct of his life and serves to betray his equivocal position.

In this light the emperor's speech serves a vital purpose by revealing both his character and the situation in a most penetrating and poignant way. What technique could be more appropriate for the author who ". . . introduced man's personality into history,"<sup>20</sup> than to allow the facts to give the lie to a character's words? "And the obituary notice on Galba seals the condemnatory verdict on an Emperor's incapacity,"<sup>21</sup> lest there be any doubts lingering in the reader's mind. Galba's elevated words have sprung from his fear of the future and represent his attempt to conceal the truth. Michel remarks in his commentary upon the Dialogus:

--Malignitas: attitude très conforme à l'idéologie de Tacite, qui attribue un grand rôle historique à la mauvaise foi, nourrie par les passions. Un grand nombre des discours, que prononcent les héros des Histoires et des Annales, dissimulent sous des 'prétextes' généraux leurs 'raisons' véritables, qui résident dans la haine, l'ambition, la crainte.<sup>22</sup>

One more point remains to be made about the inclusion of this speech. For Tacitus and for his readers as well, the enervated Galba of 69 A.D. presented a striking parallel to the elderly Nerva of 97. It may even have been that Tacitus as consul-designate in that year was a member of the council which persuaded Nerva to adopt a successor,<sup>23</sup> and, therefore, had first-hand knowledge of a similar situation. Leeman speaks of the importance of allusion in Latin literature;<sup>24</sup> here, then, was too remarkable an opportunity for Tacitus not to treat the episode in a memorable fashion with a speech.

Another direct speech which has as its primary purpose character delineation is that of Piso Licinianus (I 29-30) addressing the troops just outside the palace in an attempt to retain their loyalty after news of Otho's traitorous actions has been reported. As Courbaud observes, "Or ses actes, dans le court intervalle de quatre jours qui sépare son adoption de sa mort, que sent-ils? que peuvent-ils être? Presque rien. C'est son discours qui met en lumière sa physionomie et la générosité de ses sentiments, et qui nous donne de lui une opinion aussi favorable."<sup>25</sup> From the speech the reader gains a favorable impression of Piso as a man; he appears concerned for Galba and for the welfare of his country, anxious for peace and an avoidance of bloodshed, yet, having experienced adversity, prepared for whatever may come. But, as both Courbaud and Syme note, even Piso does not in his speech adhere exactly to the facts.<sup>26</sup> It is hardly true that Galba's elevation was untainted by bloodshed<sup>27</sup> or that the urban troops are about to set a dangerous example for the provincial armies<sup>28</sup> when it was the latter who first proclaimed Galba as emperor. Furthermore, when Piso, as a seeming last resort,

ends his address with a promise of a donative for loyalty,<sup>29</sup> who would not be wary? If this promise was as long in coming as the earlier gift pledged in Galba's name, there would be a long wait indeed.<sup>30</sup> After all, there was the famous remark of Galba, legi a se militem, non emi (I 5). What is the reason for these lies? Courbaud once again sees the answer in rhetoric, "Dans le discours même de Pison, discours à intentions psychologiques, la rhétorique se reconnaît au dédain de l'exactitude matérielle."<sup>31</sup> Syme, however, sees Tacitus as rendering an unfavorable verdict upon Piso as a ruler.<sup>32</sup> And this really is the issue at hand. Piso may have possessed many admirable qualities as a person, but there was nothing to recommend him as an emperor. Let us turn to the language of Tacitus, keeping in mind what Miller has to say with regard to his treatment of Augustus in the Annales,

But the historian is, by definition, not only a recorder, but an interpreter. He may present his analysis of Augustus as a case for and a case against, but he will also have an opinion about the verdict. Since the presentation is rhetorical, we should not be surprised that the verdict is implied and not argued, or that the implication is produced by stylistic means.<sup>33</sup>

As Tacitus relates the characteristics of Piso which led Galba to select him, and they are notably few,<sup>34</sup> it is interesting to observe that he uses the same adjectives to describe him, moris antiqui et . . . severus (I 14) which he later applies to his adopted father.<sup>35</sup> Tacitus has already clearly revealed that Galba was not a fit ruler. Thus, the same judgment must fall upon Piso just as the same doom awaited them. Tacitus has here employed a speech not only to portray character but also to make the point that what constitutes a good man and is praiseworthy in him is not necessarily what is suf-

ficient to produce the best emperor.

A third purpose for the utterances of Piso cannot be overlooked, and that is the opposition of this speech to that of Otho (I 37-38) and the vivid contrast subsequently brought out between the two men.<sup>36</sup> The two speeches have some elements in common as well as some telling differences.

Both men speak to segments of the urban soldiery, and both men employ the flattering, commilitones. Although Piso can make a positive statement about his position and refer to himself as Caesar, he weakens this point in his favor by adding, et sive optandum hoc nomen sive timendum erat (I 29) making it appear at the outset that he is really not altogether eager to retain his new title. Otho, on the other hand, although admitting that he is not quite a citizen nor yet a princeps, leaves no doubt by the tenor of his remarks and the subsequent arming of the troops that he would prefer to be the latter. Both men admit that the fate of the city rests in the hands of the troops, but Piso, in moralizing tones that are somewhat inappropriate in light of Galba's bloody accession, attempts an ill-timed appeal to the men's finer feelings, patris et senatus et ipsius imperii vicem doleo, si nobis aut perire hodie necesse est aut, quod aequè apud bonos miserum est, occidere (I 29) while Otho employs flattery and compliments, vestra virtus expectatur, apud quos omne honestis consiliis robur et sine quibus quamvis egregia invalida sunt (I 38). Further, while Piso says, si res publica et senatus et populus vacua nomina sunt (I 30) implying that the soldiers are like aliens, standing apart from the state and its other members, Otho more cleverly associates them,

idem senatus, idem populi Romani animus est (I 38) realizing that people are more likely to act when they believe themselves in the majority.

Each indulges in maligning his rival. Yet, Otho, in a more protracted diatribe, succeeds in blackening Galba while Piso manages merely to tarnish Otho. This vilifying of Galba, Otho achieves not only by the devices he uses such as sarcasm, rhetorical questions, and pathos, but also by the details upon which he dwells. He censures Galba for the bloodiness that marked his rise to power and his entry into Rome, mentioning, tot milia innocentissimorum militum trucidaverit (I 37). The alliteration and use of the superlative, as well as the vague number suggesting the enormity of the slaughter, and the savageness associated with the verb all contribute to the effect. He continues, horror animum subit quotiens recordor (I 37) and the Vergilean echo<sup>37</sup> will not be missed. He mentions the decimation of troops who had surrendered, cum in oculis urbis decimari deditos iuberet, quos deprecantis in fidem acceperat (I 37), and in so doing makes the most of a frightening episode which the praetorians no doubt could easily take to heart. He fills in the picture of carnage by a detailed list of Galba's victims, thus lending credence to his words. A series of antitheses completes the indictment:

quae usquam provincia, quae castra sunt nisi cruenta et maculata aut, ut ipse praedicat, emendata et correcta? nam quae alii scelera, hic remedia vocat, dum falsis nominibus severitatem pro saevitia, parsimoniam pro avaritia, supplicia et contumelias vestras disciplinam appellat. (I 37)

Having thus summed up those charges, he hits at another sore spot, Galba's miserliness and the long-promised but never-received donative. It does not matter that there is little with which he can reproach

Piso, quem tristitia et avaritia sui simillimum iudicabat (I 38).

He does not need to, for he can produce much more damning evidence, vidistis, commilitones, notabili tempestate etiam deos infaustam adoptionem aversantis (I 38). What more is there to say? It remains only to exhort the troops to action, which he promptly does.

Piso, too, rebukes Otho but with not nearly so much force and vigor. The vices which he enumerates, stupra nunc et commissationes et feminarum coetus volvit animo: . . . libido ac voluptas (I 30) are faults which probably disturbed the soldiers very little, for Tacitus himself has said, atque ita quattuordecim annis a Nerone adsuefactos ut haud minus vitia principum amarent quam olim virtutes verebantur (I 5). And extravagance, falluntur quibus luxuria specie liberalitatis imponit (I 30) would no doubt be welcomed.

So it is that the two men reveal themselves and at the same time their fates, for there can be no doubt, thanks to Tacitus' treatment of the speeches, that Piso's sober remarks, though they are to his personal credit, will not be effective while Otho's ambitious, daring and clever harangue has better judged the temper of the troops. The fact that Otho's address is second and that it is slightly longer are two small points which help to create the total impression. Even subtleties of language can be noted. Piso refers to himself as Caesar (I 30); immediately Julius Caesar comes to mind, with or without the stigma of absolute ruler, but certainly with the memory of his assassination still vivid. Otho uses the word principem (I 37) which milder title Augustus, who lived to a ripe old age, originated.

This pair of speeches, therefore, contributes greatly to the

drama of the first book of the Historiae not only by revealing character but also by passing judgment on an ill-fated adoption. The fact that according to Suetonius, Otho appeared before the praetorians with a humble attitude should be of no real concern.<sup>38</sup> Ullmann, too, notices this but believes that Tacitus has here simply taken advantage of a fine opportunity for the above-mentioned purposes.<sup>39</sup> Yet, Courbaud persists; because the author, just prior to the speech, says of Otho, nec deerat Otho pretendens manus adorare vulgum, iacere oscula et omnia serviliter pre dominatione (I 36), Courbaud concludes that by depicting an audacious Otho, "Tacite a oublié son personnage, oublié la situation, . . ."40 I would judge just the opposite. If Otho were clever enough to ingratiate himself with the soldiers by a fawning manner, he surely would have recognized just the right moment for a change of posture and a daring address. Courbaud overlooks the fact that Tacitus introduces the speech by remarking, postquam universa classicorum legio sacramentum eius accepit, fidens viribus (I 36), thus indicating a confidence on Otho's part. And in the speech itself, Otho's craftiness and ability to rouse the soldiers is revealed to the fullest. Tacitus has been entirely consistent in portraying an ambitious schemer who would do or say whatever was necessary in order to achieve his own ends and who was quite adroit in the process.

Later in Book I, Tacitus does not neglect a second opportunity to add color to his portrait of Otho (I 83-84). The occasion is the day after some of the urban troops, believing a plot of nobles against the emperor to be afoot, have burst in upon Otho's dinner party, uttering threats and curses. The emperor, having ventured to address

the troops only after money has been doled out, begins with the flattery which we have come to recognize as a mark of his style, neque ut adfectus vestros in amorem mei accenderem, commilitones, neque ut animum ad virtutem cohortarer (utraque enim egregie supersunt (I 83). Soon, however, he waxes eloquent upon the proper roles of the various parts of the military and finishes by extolling the Roman senate with the highest praise. Plutarch's account of the episode is similar, but the speech, as Ullmann points out,<sup>41</sup> is briefer and contains fewer details. In this case, however, Tacitus' elaboration seems to bother his critics less. Courbaud remarks, "Tacite aura voulu encore embellir sa matière; mais ces hautes considerations qu'il aime ne sont pas, après tout, inadmissables en la circonstance: et nous savons qu'il ne'en faut pas demander davantage aux historiens de l'antiquité."<sup>42</sup> Ullmann, taking the speech at face value says, "And so the orator is characterized also by this loyalty to the old institutions of Rome, that which must extol the at least apparent zeal of Otho for reestablishing liberty."<sup>43</sup> And yet, if this is so, what can be farther from the previous sketch of the clever self-seeker? A closing statement comes closer to what is perhaps one of Tacitus' aims, "It is in this way also that he gives a stamp of legitimacy to his ingratiating and ambitious proceedings."<sup>44</sup> Syme discusses the problem more fully:

Taken in isolation, or taken literally, the oration seems to disclose a new and exemplary Otho--not the corrupt and ambitious wastrel, but a ruler sagacious in discourse on the duties of military, noble and eloquent when he invokes the majesty of Rome, the destiny of the Empire, the prestige of the Senate.  
The facts are enough.



pressing reason for Otho's suicide was the fact that he was nervous, incapable of dealing with discouragement and wished to resolve the tension,<sup>50</sup> rather than because of any great nobility of spirit. Indeed, Tacitus himself was aware of this, for he says, Otho increpita ducum segnitia rem in discrimen mitti iubebat, aeger mora et spei impatiens (II 40) and in the council chamber, Otho pronus ad decertandum (II 33). Here, however, was an opportunity for Tacitus to present the final act of the emperor in a dramatic way and in sharp contrast to the earlier hideous act of assassination by expanding words of self-sacrifice which, as confirmed by the other sources, Otho did utter. Tacitus did not conceal other motives; he simply elected to dwell on the theme of magnanimity since, regardless of what prompted Otho, his suicide did result in a cessation of hostilities and the saving of lives. Courbaud is critical. He feels that here again Tacitus' primary interest was rhetoric and that the Stoical Otho is more like the characters in Seneca's tragedies than a representation of historical truth.<sup>51</sup> Pichon believes that statement to be a contradiction, for he says:

Les fanfarennades paradoxales de Sénèque sont, dans une certaine mesure, des témoignages de la façon de sentir et de penser de ses contemporains; il a bien pu dire devant ses amis, ou se dire à lui-même, des choses qui ressemblaient un peu aux tirades des tragédies de Sénèque. Et ainsi ce qui paraît à M. Courbaud une construction toute dramatique ou romanesque, peut être interprété comme un trait de caractère ou de mœurs très intéressant.<sup>52</sup>

One point remains to be made. It has been shown how Tacitus employs earlier speeches not only for characterization, but also, in an attempt to interpret history to his readers, for passing judgment on either a person or an act. Certainly, Tacitus, by his elaborate

treatment of Otho's remarks, has affixed his seal of approval upon the emperor's final act. Harris points out that Tacitus has given him a more favorable account than that of Galba and Vitellius because he believed that his death accomplished something, even more than the deaths of noted Stoics such as Thræsea and Seneca.<sup>53</sup> To be sure, Otho's obituary stands as proof. Tacitus passes over his boyhood and youth, which would entail listing faults and vices, as having been described earlier, pueritia ac iuventa, qualem monstravimus (II 50). The next pointed sentence tells the tale, duobus facinoribus, altero flagitiosissimo, altero egregio, tantundem apud posteros meruit bonae famae quantum malae (II 50). Otho's suicide was as praiseworthy as the murder of Galba was despicable. Tacitus has shown his readers that suicide can be useful provided that it gains the proper results.

Thus far, this study has concerned itself with illustrating how the speeches in the Historiae are an integral part of the work by dwelling on the manner in which they reveal character and sometimes pass judgment on some aspect of that person. However, these are not the only functions which they serve. "An oration can be used to expound some theme that is much in his [Tacitus] mind—a theory of Roman political life, . . ." <sup>54</sup> Let us turn again to the address of Galba, but now with a different end in sight, that of viewing the old emperor as a spokesman for Tacitus himself.

It has been mentioned that Galba announces that he is establishing a precedent with regard to choosing a successor, that of adoption of the best person rather than of a relative. Courbaud, in an attempt to show Tacitus' inconsistency of character portrayal

when presented with the opportunity to display his rhetorical skills, argues that Galba could not have spoken with such confidence about his policy, and because Tacitus lived to see the example of Nerva and Trajan, it is he who is really speaking.<sup>55</sup> The latter point is well taken, for the similarity of 69 A.D. to 97 A.D. has already been established,<sup>56</sup> but, as has been noted previously, Courbaud has failed to see another reason that Tacitus has Galba speak as he does--namely, to attempt unsuccessfully to conceal his tenuous position by lofty assertions. Courbaud has assumed, as others have done,<sup>57</sup> that because he sets it forth, Tacitus himself is a partisan of the adoption policy.<sup>58</sup> He has failed to distinguish between the presentation of an idea and the sanctioning of it. Syme makes clear the difference, "It should seem that the historian Tacitus, so far from ingenuously commending a political doctrine, is employing the same demolitionary technique that presents Otho with a magnificent peroration on the Roman Senate and the 'aeternitas' of Rome and the Empire."<sup>59</sup> In other words, Tacitus has given voice to an issue which doubtless concerned him and his contemporaries and at the same time he has revealed character and made a pronouncement about an act destined to failure. If additional evidence is sought to strengthen the idea that Tacitus did not necessarily sanction adoption as the best method, it will be well to mention that which was a special concern of the author, the personalities of his characters. Indeed, Löfstedt remarks, ". . . and it can truly be said that it is Tacitus who set personality, the representative of the individual, in the centre of history."<sup>60</sup> As Syme observes, "The quality of rulers mattered more than any theory or programme."<sup>61</sup> Tacitus found an occasion for

bringing up a matter of much import and concern, and he did so. To infer that he approved it, especially in light of Galba's predicament of childlessness is to assume too much.

In a similar fashion, Galba's remarks about the best sort of government for the Romans have provoked many comments from scholars; however, a discussion of these pronouncements will be reserved for a later chapter in which very special interests of the author will be examined.

Yet another reason for the inclusion of speeches in an ancient historical work is the presentation of certain policies or thinking and often ideas which are contrasting.<sup>62</sup> It is in these speeches that Courbaud finds the most fertile ground for his criticism of Tacitus, for he prefaces his examples by saying:

Tantôt enfin ils [les discours] servent à exposer une situation sous forme pathétique et brillante, à plaider d'une question le pour et le contre, à développer une idée générale: ils deviennent des exercices presque purement littéraires, ou un disciple des rhéteurs trouve l'occasion de verser sa rhétorique.<sup>63</sup>

And again, he makes his point:

Mais le plus souvent il arrive que le discours est pour Tacite un sujet simplement littéraire, un morceau d'art qu'il traite en lui-même et uniquement pour lui-même, ou un sujet d'école qu'il développe comme il l'eût fait dans une salle de déclamation, avec tous les procédés de l'école. Alors la rhétorique domine en maîtresse.<sup>64</sup>

If Courbaud is to be proved wrong, it will be necessary to take an example of each sort of speech which he recognizes as having originated in the schools of rhetoric and show that it has a definite function and is, therefore, an integral part of the work. Let us begin with what Courbaud refers to as ". . . les monologues dramatiques,

issus des suasoriae, . . ." in which the character, finding himself in a difficult situation, debates a course of action.<sup>65</sup>

Such a suasoria is that of Otho (I 21) as he considers the assassination of Galba. It cannot be denied that Tacitus has imbued these reflections with rhetorical coloring; balance and antithesis abound: cui compositis rebus nulla spes, omne in turbide consilium, multa simul extimulabant, luxuria etiam principi onerosa, inopia vix private toleranda, in Galbam ira, in Pisonem invidia (I 21). Generalities or maxims dominate Otho's ideas, suspectum semper invisumque dominantibus qui proximus destinaretur (I 21), and:

opportunos magnis conatibus transitus rerum, nec cunctatione opus, ubi perniciosior sit quies quam temeritas. mortem omnibus ex natura aequalem oblivione apud posteros vel gloria distingui; ac si nocentem innocentemque idem exitus maneat, acrioris viri esse merito perire.(I 21).

In each case the thought is underscored by sound effects, alliteration ("s" sounds) in the first sentence and a play on words (nocentem innocentemque idem) as well as alliteration ("s", "t" and "q" sounds) in the second. The sentence in which he resolves to act has a striking example of word play also (agendum audendumque). But does the use of rhetorical devices mean that the speech is superfluous? On the contrary, these devices serve merely to heighten the rationalizations of the would-be emperor and thus enable the reader to understand him and his subsequent actions better. Indeed, Daitz has said that Tacitus ". . . explained events in terms of personal forces, i.e., the traits of human personality, . . ."<sup>66</sup> and, similarly, Auerbach has observed that the ancients did ". . . not see forces . . . [but] vices and virtues, successes and mistakes."<sup>67</sup> What, then, could be

more central to Tacitus' task than the illumination of character and what better tool than that of allowing the reader to penetrate into the mind of a character? Tacitus has done just that in this passage; he even states, fingebat et metum quo magis concupisceret (I 21).

By placing such a monologue early in his narrative, Tacitus permits the rash and wily Otho to reveal himself, and the reader will scarcely be taken aback by the foul deed which follows. Courbaud has failed to realize that simply because a speech bears the stamp of the rhetorical schools, a rhetorical display is not necessarily the reason for its inclusion.

A second type of speech which Courbaud attributes to the schools of rhetoric is the controversia<sup>68</sup> in which two arguments are set forth, one for and one against, whether the declaimers appear together or somewhat separated. One such example is the debate which occurs in the senate between Helvidius Priscus and Eprius Marcellus, an infamous informer whose prosecution under Nero succeeded in the downfall of Helvidius' father-in-law Thrasea Paetus, a noted Stoic; the issue at hand about which the two adversaries take opposing views is in what manner a senatorial delegation shall be chosen for the purpose of paying respect to Vespasian. Helvidius demands a vote of the senators under oath (IV 7). Eprius adheres to the long-established custom of choosing by lot (IV 8).

Courbaud insists that speeches such as these derive from a common principle: the wish of Tacitus to exercise his rhetorical talents and to produce, as he had done in school, the best possible

orations.<sup>69</sup> However, Walker remarks, "He [Tacitus] has not tried to fit the narrative to a rhetorical preconception; he has tried, continually, to fit rhetoric to his narrative, . . ." <sup>70</sup> and Miller says of the controversia:

. . . the device is an accepted literary convention, which enabled the ancient historian to present his analysis in a way which is more personal, vivid, dramatic, and therefore more memorable than straight narrative prose could be. Both the historian and his readers had an education based on rhetoric, and were trained in the production of speeches for and against the same point. When faced with an assessment of this kind, therefore, they naturally saw it in terms of prosecution and defence, and expected to have the case presented with full rhetorical treatment.<sup>71</sup>

In other words, it was perfectly natural for Tacitus to employ this device as well as to use rhetorical coloring. The controversia itself should be a functional part of the work, though, and it is on these grounds that Courbaud finds fault with the passage under study. He thinks it inconsistent with Eprius' character that he preach moderation and give useful political advice--he who caused the ruin of so many people during Nero's reign.<sup>72</sup> Let us see if there is some explanation for this seeming contradiction.

Pichon offers an immediate solution to the dilemma, ". . .--encore que le véritable Eprius ait pu tenir un langage analogue à celui que lui prête Tacite, car après tout, dans sa situation, son habileté de delateur lui commandait d'affecter des dehors de sagesse et de bon sens."<sup>73</sup> Pichon, then, sees this as possibly another example of the dissembling politician. And, indeed, if Eprius were clever enough to have survived Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius in spite of all his activities, he must have been sufficiently shrewd to answer Helvidius as he does. Pichon has one more point to add, "Il me semble qu'il

y a ici autre chose que de la coquetterie ou de la virtuosité littéraire. La harangue fictive pourrait bien être pour Tacite un moyen de faire connaître ses propres opinions sur les affaires de l'Etat."<sup>74</sup>

That statement leads us in quite a different direction and bears further investigation in a subsequent chapter devoted to special concerns of the author. However, at this point, it can be assumed that the controversia of Helvidius and Eprius serves the important purpose of illustrating the relationship of the senate to the princes as well as allowing the author to make known his own assessment of the situation. It is hardly a mere rhetorical display. Indeed, with regard to Tacitus' use of the controversia and suasoria, Michel in his commentary says:

Ce paragraphe [4.4] est important. Messalla compare la déclamation, pratiquée par Aper, et l'histoire, pratiquée par Secundus. Effectivement, Tacite, dans ses écrits historiques, applique souvent aux discours les méthodes de la 'suasoria' et de la 'controverse'. Notons d'ailleurs que Messalla, historien et ami des anciens, préfère sans aucun doute la méthode de Secundus.

A third type of speech which Courbaud attributes to the schools of rhetoric is that of "verisimilitude" which he describes in the following manner:

Ceux-ci du moins, s'ils n'ont pas été tenus, auraient pu l'être, parce que les idées ou les sentiments exprimés, les arguments développés sont ceux qu'il est vraisemblable de supposer, d'après la logique des choses et des caractères, que le personnage historique, s'il avait pris la parole, aurait exprimés ou développés pour son compte; discours souvent anonymes d'ailleurs, qui sont la voix d'une collectivité et par lesquels un groupe, une foule plus ou moins nombreuse analyse, à la place de l'auteur, la situation présente ou définit son état d'âme.<sup>76</sup>

Rather than criticizing Tacitus' use of this kind of speech, Courbaud believes that it makes for a more vivid and dramatic study;<sup>77</sup>



therefore, one example shall serve as an illustration, that of Vitellius' followers exhorting their emperor to make a firm stand against Vespasian rather than to abdicate and quit his reign in a cowardly fashion (III 66). Every conceivable argument is employed in an effort to pluck up the emperor's courage: Vespasian is depicted as capricious in order to nullify his offers of clemency, and the execution of Fabius Valens is mentioned in an attempt to frighten some spirit into Vitellius. There is an appeal to the emperor's pride by relating the previous offices and honors of his family and a pathetic reminder of the duty he has to his own son. Finally, there is the enunciation of ruin no matter what and an entreaty to die in a dignified manner. But the pleas fall on deaf ears, and the reader will not be surprised by the abdication which begins in the very next chapter. Thus, by clever juxtaposition Tacitus dramatizes the entire episode and makes Vitellius' incompetence all the more pointed. Furthermore, he provides one explanation for the terrible carnage that results after Vespasian's forces enter Rome, for he remarks, Quod si tam facile suorum mentis flexisset Vitellius, quam ipse cesserat, incruentam urbem Vespasiani exercitus intrasset (III 66).

If those reasons are not enough to justify the inclusion of this speech, one more purpose can be cited. In subtle ways Tacitus makes known his feelings on the subject of Vitellius' continuing the struggle, and he is decidedly against it. The prefacing remark previously mentioned about the subsequent bloodshed is sufficient to put the reader on guard, and the arguments allotted to the partisans of the emperor are just that—rationalizations which do not always

have the ring of truth. For example, there is no point in comparing Vitellius' anticipated treatment at the hands of Vespasian with that of Valens, for the latter had been captured as a prisoner of war and had been promised nothing in contrast to the enticements offered the emperor for his voluntary resignation. Nor is it strictly true, when precedents are cited for the harsh treatment of a defeated rival, that Caesar put Pompey to death and Augustus, Antony; for Pompey was murdered in Egypt by an agent of King Ptolemy, and Antony, after his defeat, committed suicide. The claim that the soldiers are loyal, per stare militem (III 66) is greatly exaggerated, for Tacitus has just observed, Abrupta undique spe Vitellianus miles transiturus in partis (III 66) as is the mention of the zeal of the people, superesse studia populi (III 66). Surely, Vitellius did have followers, loyal almost to the point of fanaticism as their reckless defense of the city shows,<sup>78</sup> but later Tacitus remarks, Aderat pugnantibus spectator populus, utque in ludicre certamine, hos, rursus illos clamore et plausu fovebat (III 83). And again, velut festis diebus id quoque gaudium accederet, exultabant, fruebantur, nulla partium cura, malis publicis laeti (III 83). Finally, the tenor of the remarks, calculated to make Vitellius ashamed of what he is about to do and to arouse his pride, misjudges the emperor's personality as well as his state of mind and is ultimately doomed to failure. Tacitus has just remarked of him, tanta torpede invaserat animum ut, si principem eum fuisse ceteri non meminissent, ipse oblivisceretur (III 63). Surely, this is not a man ready for bold actions, and the first words after the entreaties leave no doubt of that, Surdæ ad fortia consilia Vitellie aures (III 67). The verdict is in then; Tacitus believed further re-

sistance on the part of Vitellius futile. If only his followers had been so disposed; after all, rei publicae haud dubie intererat Vitellium vinci (III 86).

There is yet another method which Courbaud employs for classifying the speeches in the Historiae, namely ". . . discours, non plus contradictoires, mais symétriques et parallèles encore, ou Tacite se plaît à prendre et reprendre un même thème, . . ." and, as previously, he attributes these harangues to the schools of rhetoric and believes Tacitus' motivations for composing them to be, ". . . pour montrer la fécondité de ses ressources et la souplesse de son talent."<sup>79</sup> Let us examine the instances in which Antonius Primus, involved with military operations, is the declaimer (III 2; 10; 20; 24), and let us keep in mind Wellesley's remarks, "What are the qualities necessary to successful generalship? In offering these answers, as he does again and again in the Agricola, Histories and Annals, the historian no longer merely records or diverts: he fulfils his proper didactic role of teaching by examples."<sup>80</sup>

Before Antonius is himself introduced into the narrative, Tacitus imparts some information to the reader as to his character and earlier life. The description is not at all complimentary with the exception of qualities, strenuus manu, sermone promptus (II 86) which will serve him well in war, belle non spernendus (II 86). Thus, the reader is at once alerted to the possibility that Antonius will be a major contender for the forces of Vespasian. Early in Book III, Tacitus sets out to establish just that fact, for we meet

Antonius as he delivers a bold speech in a council-of-war and advocates that the war efforts be launched with all haste (III 2). Tacitus describes him at the outset, is acerrimus belli concitator (III 2), and his demeanor bears this out, flagrans oculis, truci voce (III 3). It is no surprise, then, that the desired effect is achieved, ita effudit ut cautos quoque ac providos permoveret, vulgus et ceteri unum virum ducentem, spreta aliorum segnitia, laudibus ferrent (III 3). Furthermore, his standing with the rank and file soldiers is made clear, aperte descendisse in causam videbatur, eoque gravior militibus (III 3). Wellesley has compiled what he believes ". . . to be Tacitus' philosophy of military leadership."<sup>81</sup> Let us compare this to Tacitus' presentation of Antonius in an effort to determine whether or not the author is indeed employing him as a model for successful generals.

We have already learned that the subject in question is very energetic and bold, an effective orator, who by his looks and frank words, carries weight with his men. Wellesley says, "The man should preferably be tall, impressive in appearance and able to dominate a meeting or parade; and if possible a good speaker. . . . But whether in the council-of-war, on parade, or before contact with the enemy, a well-judged and well-expressed speech by the commander can be a tremendous boost to morale."<sup>82</sup> Obviously, Antonius fulfills these first requisites nicely as he does the necessities of councils-of-war, ". . . good intelligence, frank expression of views, a firm and not too-long-delayed decision by the general--and once the decision is made, no vacillation."<sup>83</sup> Chapter 10 reinforces the reader's first impressions

as Antonius skillfully avoids a mutiny by making a dramatic appeal with drawn sword to the better natures of the men. There is little doubt that he will meet with success, for Tacitus remarks at the outset, uni Antonio apertae militum aures; namque et facundia aderat mulcendique vulgum artes et auctoritas (III 10). These attributes having been properly demonstrated, fatisceret seditio et extremo iam die sua quisque in tentoria dilaberentur (III 10).

Although they contain no speech, chapters 16 and 17 reveal Antonius' capabilities in the press of battle amidst panic and possible disaster. Again, he proves himself admirably, Nullum in illa trepidatione Antonius constantis ducis aut fortis militis officium omisit (III 17). His tour de force consists of piercing with his spear a deserting standard bearer and himself seizing the standard and turning it towards the enemy. This act provokes some equites to resist, motivated by, quo pudore (III 17) and is ultimately the turning point of the conflict. Wellesley states, "Since Romans form the leading nation on earth, appeals can often be made to their sense of shame and honour; . . ." <sup>84</sup> Can the point be better demonstrated?

Chapter 20 finds Antonius again in the forefront, this time persuading the men in a lengthy discourse to refrain from a rash and potentially calamitous attack upon Cremona. He begins with the delineation of the roles proper for soldiers and for officers,

sed divisa inter exercitum ducesque munia: militibus cupidinem pugnandi convenire, duces providendo, consultantando, cunctatione saepius quam temeritate prodesse. ut pro virili portione armis ac manu victoriam iuverit, ratione et consilio, propriis ducis artibus, profuturum (III 20);

Wellesley comments, "The chain of command is usually clear and if not it must be clarified; commander, officer and soldier has each his different role, and efficiency depends on a clear demarcation between them."<sup>85</sup> And again, ". . . but the troops may often have to be restrained from impetuous and foolhardy ventures."<sup>86</sup> Once more Antonius meets the test.

Finally, Antonius must exhibit his mettle during the decisive encounter and draw forth from his men their best efforts. In chapter 24, he, doing battle in the ranks, applies just the proper goad to each man, alios pudere et probris, multos laude et hortatu, omnis spe promissisque accendens (III 24), and the victory is almost a matter of course. Wellesley writes, "If a danger-point develops, the general should be present at it; in a really tight corner he should fight alongside his men, and his courage and cool-headedness have sometimes retrieved an apparently impossible situation."<sup>87</sup>

The defense rests its case. In the face of the evidence presented, it must be admitted that the speeches of Antonius Primus have a far more important purpose than serving as rhetorical show-pieces. On the contrary, they enable the historian to paint a portrait of the successful general by depicting him in various situations. As Miller says, "The great ancient historians use dramatic speech before battle as one of their great tools of interpretation, and not simply for rhetorical display."<sup>88</sup>

One point remains to be discussed with regard to Tacitus' composition of his speeches, and that is whether or not the historian, by his use of rhetorical color, since the content of the speeches has

been shown to be essential, has sacrificed a semblance of truth to a desire to please his readers with the pointed style which was so much in vogue at that time. Courbaud recognizes the stamp of the schools of rhetoric upon certain devices which Tacitus employs constantly, for he remarks:

De l'école toujours, les pensées générales qui visent à la profondeur, les maximes aiguës en pointes et réservées pour le trait de la fin, les oppositions d'idées et de mots, les cliquetis, les sententiae, cette forme nouvelle sous laquelle, sans avoir renoncé à l'ancienne, la rhétorique se présentait au temps de l'Empire: . . .

Later, after relating a portion of the outcries of Caecina's men against the treason of their general (III 13), he asks, "Est-ce ainsi que des soldats ont du parler? avec ces antitheses? sur ce ton? Je ne reconnais plus l'historien soucieux d'être vraisemblable, sinon vrai? J'y vois l'homme d'école ou le lecteur des recitations occupé à flatter le faible de son public."<sup>90</sup> And yet, although Tacitus does vary his language to some degree in order to suit his speakers,<sup>91</sup> isn't this pointed style just what was expected of him as an historian who at the same time was a literary artist? Auerbach also notes that the soldier Percennius in the Annales ". . . speaks Tacitean, . . ."<sup>92</sup> Rather than viewing this as something for which Tacitus can be reproached, however, he asserts, "And this is the second distinctive characteristic of antique historiography: it is rhetorical. The combination of ethical and rhetorical preoccupations gives it a high degree of order, clarity, and dramatic impact."<sup>93</sup> In short, rhetorical treatment was not only expected but desired.

Similarly, Martin makes the point that most writers, after Livy, sought to surpass their predecessors in literary skill,<sup>94</sup>

which would entail a unity throughout, and Goodyear states, "Tacitus, like other ancient stylists, seeks to maintain consistency of style. To do so he must largely accommodate speeches to the stylistic texture of his writing as a whole, and refrain from citing original documents or ipsissima verba at any length."<sup>95</sup> Tacitus, therefore, employs rhetorical color in the manner expected of a literary artist of his time.

In summary, it can only be concluded that the speeches in the Historiae are indeed an integral part of the work as a whole. Far from being superfluous pieces added merely to display the author's talent, they exhibit a purpose central to the author's task by revealing character, illustrating a situation, expounding policies or reasoning, and even sometimes by expressing the views of the writer himself. Very often subtleties of style and language indicate the historian's approval or disapproval of a character or some aspect of his conduct. In this fashion does Tacitus interpret history for his readers and serve a proper didactic function.

A number of scholars noted for their work on Tacitus concur. Ullmann has stated, "Whether the speeches are borrowed or invented, they are inserted only when the importance of the situation or the character imposes that necessity upon them."<sup>96</sup> Miller, who has done a statistical study of Books I and IV of the Historiae proves that dramatic speech accounts for a relatively small percentage of the whole,<sup>97</sup> and adds, "The speeches are part of the whole cloth, and not a series of purple patches."<sup>98</sup> Finally, Syme states, ". . . their [the speeches] function is structural, or rather organic."<sup>99</sup> No more need be said.



### III. THE SPEECHES: REFLECTIONS OF TACITUS' SPECIAL INTERESTS

A writer's genuine predilections cannot always be disguised. Tacitus revels in the speeches. Whether he adapts or has recourse to free composition, he displays vigour, confidence, even gaiety. He might elect for an oration any subject that captured his fancy; and the speeches, like the digressions, are often a clue to the writer's closest preoccupations.<sup>1</sup>

It is to be expected that the speeches in the Historiae will betray some issue or matter which was of special concern to the author. In fact, an examination of the speeches with regard to content does reveal just such a subject, that is, the antithesis between slavery and freedom. The opposition of these two concepts appears in a number of the speeches in various forms and is worth investigation.

The contrast first shows itself in the words of Galba (I 16) as he brings to an end the oration in which he discloses the adoption of Piso. His counsel to his would-be-successor ends with the statement, neque enim hic, ut gentibus quae regnantur, certa dominorum domus et ceteri servi, sed imperaturus es hominibus qui nec totam servitutem pati possunt nec totam libertatem (I 16). This remark has proved to be somewhat of an enigma for scholars who have interpreted it in different ways. Goodyear points out that ". . . some [scholars] consider it to represent Tacitus' most considered thinking on the principate."<sup>2</sup> Such a critic is Courbaud who discusses the passage at length. He believes that the total freedom which the Romans cannot endure is a reference to the ease with which Augustus established his

regime. In other words, the people, unable or unwilling to assume the responsibility for governing themselves, were only too happy to transfer the burden to Augustus. Total slavery he understands as an allusion to the reigns of such tyrants as Caligula and Nero who were comparable to oriental despots. The tempered monarchy of which Galba speaks must refer, according to Courbaud, to the rule of Nerva, and he substantiates this claim by citing the often-quoted passage from the Agricola, Nerva Caesar res olim dissociabilis miscuerit, principatum ac libertatem.<sup>3</sup>

Assuming that it is indeed Tacitus speaking, he closes his argument, "Ici encore l'historien était éclairé par une expérience qui n'était vrai que de son époque, prêtant à son orateur d'occasion une belle théorie libérale, à laquelle le vieux soldat autoritaire n'avait sans doute jamais pensé."<sup>4</sup> Courbaud, then, considers Tacitus, in this speech, to be giving his approval to a principate such as that of Nerva.

Since the antithesis between slavery and freedom is inherent in the relationship of the emperor to his subjects, let us attempt to discover if Courbaud's theory concerning the historian's attitude toward the principate can be substantiated by examining other interpretations of the passage in the Agricola as well as what Tacitus himself has to say elsewhere in the Historiae.

Benario, in an effort to understand Tacitus' opinion of the government, has made a study of the words in the Historiae which the author employs in reference to the principate; on the basis of that endeavor, he concludes that the historian's, ". . . view of the principate is still a sanguine one."<sup>5</sup> In a sense, he concurs with Courbaud. And yet, with regard to the brief rule of Nerva and its

claim to have restored liberty, Syme injects a warning note, "In truth, if the label seemed promising, the mixture was dangerous and likely to cause convulsions. Thoughtful men, who knew the phraseology, watched and waited, devising their plans for the event of trouble."<sup>6</sup> He later observes, "The antithesis is obvious between legitimate authority and despotic power. It had been formulated long ago, and published often since--and it was suspect to any man of understanding."<sup>7</sup> Thus, Syme, rather than believing Tacitus to be setting forth his own opinions in Galba's speech, thinks that he is allotting grandiloquent phrases to the old emperor, to whom nothing else, no viable plan, remained, as he made his final unsuccessful attempt to salvage the wreck of his reign. If Galba's speech does not necessarily reveal Tacitus' thoughts, and if Tacitus despite his optimistic declaration after Domitian's death did have some misgivings with regard to Nerva, the answer, perhaps, is to be found in the precise meaning of libertas as Tacitus employed it. Martin offers some insight:

Individual emperors might be good or bad, but the basis of power remained the same. Under such a regime libertas, in its Republican sense of political freedom, was impossible; yet the emperor had need of senators to assist in governing the empire, and a new 'special relationship' was possible between princeps and senatus, if each admitted the need of the other. But it would be essentially a relationship of master and servant, terminable at the will of the former. As long as the princeps allowed senators to seek a share in government and express their views on it, it was possible in a new, though limited, sense to talk of libertas senatoria.<sup>8</sup>

Surely, this must be the sort of libertas which Tacitus had in mind as will be borne out by further inquiry.

Syme, looking upon the Agricola as a whole, has understood it to be a defense of Agricola's subservience to Domitian, a defense called for in the climate of vengeance that arose after the tyrant's death when clamors were loud from friends and relatives of those who had

suffered under that emperor.<sup>9</sup> If he is defending Agricola, Tacitus must surely be defending his own conduct, his acquiescence, and criticizing both those who opposed a tyrant and gained nothing by doing so and those who failed to see the need for moderation when the tyrant's death opened the door for retribution. Syme elaborates: "Tacitus speaks not only for Agricola or for himself. The Agricola expounds the moral and political ideals of the new aristocracy, . . ."<sup>10</sup>

These ideals were moderation and the subordination of liberty to obedience,<sup>11</sup> for "It was not a foreign enemy that endangered the Empire, but internal weakness—a wicked ruler, an irresponsible opposition. Patience and sagacity held the structure together."<sup>12</sup>

Derey concurs with Syme's proposed purpose of the Agricola as Tacitus' defense of his father-in-law's conduct, but notes certain distortions in the work which he attributes to Tacitus' attempt, in order to answer criticism, to portray Agricola as an enduring victim of Domitian rather than, as he believes, someone who had enjoyed his favor.<sup>13</sup>

Goodyear, after listing the supposed purposes of the Agricola, adds, "This view is reinforced by what Tacitus says in his major works about statesmen who compromised, notably Lepidus, whose moderation and good influence make Tacitus wonder (Ann. 4.20.3) whether one may not inter abruptam contumaciam et deforme obsequium pergere iter ambitione ac periculis vacuum."<sup>14</sup> Surely, then, in Eprius' speech in the Historiae, Tacitus must be sounding the same theme<sup>15</sup> when he gives voice to such sentiments as:

. . . sufficere omnis obsequio. id magis vitandum ne pervicacia querundam iritatur animus . . . se meminisse temporum quibus natus sit, quam civitatis formam patres avique instituerint;

ulteriora mirari, praesentia sequi; bonos imperatores voto expetere, qualiscumque tolerare. non magis sua oratione Thraseam quam iudicio senatus adflictum; . . . denique constantia fortitudine Catonibus et Brutis aequaretur Helvidius: se unum esse ex illo senatu, qui simul servierit (IV 8).

Let us see, since opposing views are presented, if there is any stylistic evidence to indicate Tacitus' approval of Eprius' position as stated.

Three obvious facts stand out. The speech of Eprius is longer, and it is apt to be remembered more because it is the latter of the two arguments. Also, because Eprius' method of choosing the senators is approved, it can be inferred that the tenor of his entire reply should be viewed more favorably. Helvidius' statements, occurrere illi quos innocentissimos senatus habeat, qui honestis sermonibus auris imperator imbuant (IV 7) and, Hoc senatus iudicio velut admoneri principem quos probet, quos reformidet (IV 7) suggest that, in spite of Thrasea's death and his own exile, he still does not understand the nature of the government and of an absolute ruler. To believe that the senate could influence an emperor to any great extent is naïve and unrealistic. Furthermore, remarks such as, sorte et urna mores non discerni: suffragia et existimationem senatus reperta ut in cuiusque vitam famamque penetrarent (IV 7) and Vespasianum melioribus relinqueret (IV 7) are prime examples of the moralizing tone which pervades the whole speech and seems vaguely reminiscent of Pise. And hasn't the author made clear that this attitude is old-fashioned and no longer to be tolerated?

Eprius, on the other hand, by admonishing Helvidius not to preach to Vespasian<sup>16</sup> far better interprets the relationship of senator to princeps. In addition, he sizes up the nature of an absolute ruler with more insight by observing, quo modo pessimis imperatoribus sine fine dominationem, ita quamvis egregiis modum libertatis placere (IV 8).

Even under a good emperor freedom can exist only in a restricted fashion. A subtlety of terminology supports the two men's attitudes. Helvidius refers to the government as rei publicae (IV 7), a designation not altogether out of place but more often associated with the democratic state and unrestrained liberty, while Eprius alludes to the principatu (IV 8) which seems more accurate. Here, Tacitus is underscoring Helvidius' old-fashioned misconceptions and Eprius' political savvy.

If additional proof be sought as an indication of the senate's servitude, a subsequent episode will suffice. That is the behaviour of the senators on the day following the speech of Curtius Montanus in which he bitterly assails Eprius Marcellus for his prosecutions.<sup>17</sup> In the ensuing debate a heated quarrel arises, and strife and discord rule the curia. At the next meeting, however, Domitian and Mucianus make a plea for restraint and the necessity of forgetting the past and Mucianus even speaks on behalf of the accusers.<sup>18</sup> The reaction of the senators is illuminating, patres coeptatem libertatem, postquam obviam itum, omisere (IV 44). Immediately they toss their new-found freedom to the winds in the face of opposition. Far from being capable of influencing an emperor, as Helvidius proclaims, in all matters they must take their lead from him and those close to him.

Martin has analyzed the speech of Curtius Montanus and found it to be the only one in the Historiae with ". . . a sustained attempt at Ciceronian rhythm."<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, he has concluded that it reveals Tacitus' own thoughts that sufficient time had elapsed after Domitian's downfall for a recovery, but the best time had past; there was peace and security, ". . . great eloquence and political freedom,

no."<sup>20</sup> Elsewhere, he writes:

For a brief moment it might seem that there was room for a revival of the contentious eloquence of the Republic; a Ciceronian speech could therefore be most appropriate. More important, all the Ciceronian phrases came to nothing. Domitian and Mucianus advised the senate not to resume their private feuds. The brave visions of unrestricted freedom crumpled.<sup>21</sup>

One additional point can be made in corroboration of Tacitus' view of the principate and the restrained freedom which could be exercised under it, and that is the pattern of the author's own life and what he had to say in the Dialogus. It is known that Tacitus as a young man was quite an eloquent orator<sup>22</sup> but that he later turned his back on a career at the bar in order to pursue the writing of history.<sup>23</sup> His reasons for doing so, it is widely thought,<sup>24</sup> are set forth by Maternus, one of the speakers in the Dialogus. Costa has summarized the argument well, ". . . the cause of the decay of eloquence at Rome is the change in political conditions, the contrast between the turbulent times of the Republic and the more settled state of the empire under one man's control."<sup>25</sup> And Syme remarks, "The rewards belonged to the past, like the danger or the splendour, and it [oratory] was not needed any more."<sup>26</sup> Here, then, is to be found a clear statement about the position of free speech in the empire; it simply did not exist. Doubtless, Tacitus accepted the principate, but in so doing he also accepted libertas in a very limited sense; no other course was open to a man of insight.

In addition to the tension between a ruler and his subjects, Tacitus also saw and sounded the theme of freedom and slavery with regard to the Roman provinces. The attitude of the provincials toward

Roman domination and the Romans' assessment of the same situation is explored a number of times by the author in Book IV. As Syme says, "The author of the Historiae is not content with an odd detail or the picturesque incident that will fill space. He has a general interest, and a deep understanding of the relations between Rome and the natives. The speeches help."<sup>27</sup> Indeed, Tacitus devotes a generous amount of attention to the development of both viewpoints; with the art and skill characteristic of him, he does, however, in the final analysis make known his own feelings on the vital issue of Roman imperialism. Let us examine the author's treatment of this topic in order to understand the arguments of each side as well as to arrive at the historian's own judgments.

The principal proponent of the natives' point of view and the chief antagonist of the Romans is the Batavian noble, Julius Civilis, who raises the standard of revolt, at first cunningly under guise of fighting for Vespasian, and later overtly for his own causes. He is introduced into the narrative in chapter 13 of Book IV, and immediately his craft, ambitious aims and bitter feelings are revealed in a stirring plea to his kinsmen (IV 14). The author's introductory remarks serve as a key to an early understanding not only of Civilis' appeal but also to the provincials' response to it, a laude gloriaque gentis orsus iniurias et raptus et cetera servitii mala enumerat (IV 14). Civilis will employ the pride and honor of his people as a tribe to goad them into action. Time and time again, as he does here, he will dwell on the evils of Roman domination, which is no more than slavery, while enumerating the strengths of his side. His virtuosity in speaking



43

is at once established: he picks just the proper moment for his harangue, ubi nocte ac laetitia incaluisse videt (IV 14) and then begins a horrifying picture of the Batavians' treatment at the hands of Romans whose only concerns are, spoliis et sanguine (IV 14). With a peremptory dismissal of the empire as, adfectam rem Romanam (IV 14), he scorns the Roman soldiers in the vicinity as senes (IV 14). Their own position, on the other hand, is all firmness, with allies just waiting to join in the fray, at sibi rebur peditum equitumque consanguineos Germanos, Gallias idem cupientis (IV 14). Small wonder that, Magne cum adsensu auditus (IV 15) and the fight is on. But what of Civilis' arguments? Are they the clever mouthings of a demagogue or do they admit of some substance? That the provincials have justifiable grievances Tacitus does not deny, for he states, iussu Vitelli Batavorum iuventus ad dilectum vocabatur, quam suapte natura gravem onerabant ministri avaritia ac luxu, senes aut invalides conquirende, quos pretie dimitterent; rursus impubes et forma conspicui (et est plerisque precera pueritia) ad stuprum trahebantur (IV 14). Whether or not the wrongs suffered provide a sufficient excuse for war is yet another question.

The next time that Civilis has occasion for oratory he occupies even a stronger position. After a victory over the Romans which is largely due to treachery, he and his men have been hailed as, libertatis auctores (IV 17), and he is fervently pressing his case upon the Gauls. The tenor of his remarks is the same; the emphasis on slavery as opposed to hoped-for freedom is even more telling: miseram servitutem false

pacem vocarent. . . . Bataves, . . . arma contra communis dominos cepisse; . . . servirent Syria Asiaque et suetus regibus Oriens: . . . nuper certe caese Quintilio Vare pulsam e Germania servitutem, . . . libertatem natura etiam mutis animalibus datam (IV 17). Tacitus allows Civilis one further opportunity to vent his wrath in his remarks (IV 32) to Montanus, a soldier sent from the Romans to dissuade him from hostilities. A master of sarcasm, the audacious Batavian once more harps on his theme and complains loudly, vos autem Treviri ceteraque servientium animae, quod praemium effusi totiens sanguinis expectatis nisi ingratham militiam, immortalia tributa, virgas, securis et dominorum ingenia (IV 32)? He concludes with the enticing and magic word, aut libertas sequetur aut victi idem erimus (IV 32).

At this point, before the case for the Romans has been presented, let us see whether Tacitus, while admitting wrongs toward the provincials, has been alerting the reader to the fact that other motives may have set Civilis and the Batavians into motion. That he certainly has done, for early in his narrative he has said, Germani, laeta belle gens (IV 16) and a little later of Civilis' intentions, sic in Gallias Germaniasque intentus, si destinata provenissent, validissimarum ditissimarumque nationum regne imminebat (IV 18). Shortly thereafter, when Civilis has attempted to make two legions which he has defeated swear allegiance to Vespasian, and he has been sternly rebuffed and reprovved with the words, prediteris . . . hostium . . . perfuga Batavus . . . sceleris (IV 21) his reaction is quite revealing, incensus ira universam Batavorum gentem in arma rapit (IV 21). For what lofty reasons do the

other tribes heed the call? iunguntur Bructeri Tencterique et excita nuntiis Germania ad praedam famamque (IV 21). If these words are not enough to cast some aspersions on the nobility of the provincials' efforts, Tacitus strengthens his case by adding, mox valescentibus Germanis pleraeque civitates adversum nos arma sumpsere spe libertatis et, si exuissent servitium, cupidine imperitandi (IV 25). As the narrative progresses, the desires which have impelled the natives to wage war remain constant. When Civilis and his Gallic confederate Classicus debate whether they should permit their armies to plunder Cologne, Tacitus observes, saevitia ingenii et cupidine praedae ad excidium civitatis trahebantur (IV 63). Later, on the verge of a victory over the Romans as the result of a surprise attack, the natives are eventually driven off; they have one explanation, the historian another, sed obstitit vincentibus pravum inter ipsos certamen omisso hoste spolia consecrandi (IV 78). So it is that the provincials gradually reveal themselves. Let us turn now to the cause of the Romans.

The first spokesman to offer the opposing viewpoint is Dillius Vercula, a Roman general. Finding himself in a most precarious position since his Gallic allies have just joined themselves to the enemy and his own troops are on the brink of committing a monstrous treason, he voices his contempt for the provincials and attributes their hostility to the leniency of Galba; they will have a change of heart, he continues, when they have been despoiled.<sup>28</sup> Harsh words, to be sure, and an acknowledgment of provincial servitium at the hands of the Romans, but also an unshakable confidence in the necessity of

that domination. There follows an oration of some length as the courageous general employs every artifice<sup>29</sup> in an attempt to prevent his men from transferring their allegiance (IV 58) and committing what the historian calls, flagitium incognitum (IV 57). Alas, Vocula's pleas go unheeded and he is the victim of a foul murder, but as Martin says, ". . . the speech carries a note of conviction." and is reminiscent of Livy's treatment of similar episodes.<sup>30</sup> Let us see, then, in subsequent chapters how the author makes it clear that Vocula's position has been the right one.

Indeed, vindication is not long in coming in the notable lack of any speech in contrast to that of Vocula on the part of Classicus, the Gaul to whom the Romans have submitted; the assumption of the trappings of a Roman general, which in itself is significant in revealing Classicus' desire for power and glory, is not enough, for words fail him, dein sumptis Romani imperii insignibus in castra venit. nec illi, quamquam ad omne facinus durato, verba ultra supeditavere quam ut sacramentum recitaret (IV 59). Moreover, the attitude of the Roman turncoats very shortly bears out Vocula's very words. Everywhere there is an almost unrelieved picture of shame and revulsion at the thought of the hideous act, rubore et infamia: . . . deformitas . . . ignominiam . . . silens agmen et velut longae exequiae; . . . flagitium (IV 62). The evidence continues to mount; an incident which weighs very heavily in favor of the Romans is the controversia which involves the people of Cologne (IV 64-65). Syme summarizes the episode well:

He [Tacitus] brings in the citizens of Colonia Claudia (mixed colonial and native stock) to speak in their own person. The town had neither resisted nor actively helped the insurgents. After a time a German tribe across the river, the Tencteri, made an appeal, based on liberty, honesty, mutual confidence, and a common origin: the Agrippinenses should pull down their walls, liberate the traffic between the two banks, and kill all Romans in their territory. The arguments were patently spurious. The Agrippinenses in a diplomatic answer, while admitting kinship with the Germans, and not averse to certain concessions, deny that there are any aliens among them: native or veteran, they constitute a single and indivisible community.<sup>31</sup>

And in a like vein are Dudley's remarks, "Here is a signal tribute to Romanisation; even in this hour of stress, the Ubii felt themselves a single patria with the Roman colony."<sup>32</sup> What could better represent the good and beneficial aspects of Roman domination and the Roman civilizing influence than for the provincials themselves to appear as the happy and prosperous product of that rule?

But the author has scarcely begun; a squadron of cavalry flees its Gallic masters, cuts down the assassin of Vocula and, initium exolvernae in posterum culpa fecere (IV 62). Not much later the Lingones are routed by the Sequani who have remained loyal, and the historian remarks, fortuna melioribus adfuit (IV 67). A choice of words is interesting when some of the states again begin to honor their treaties which are equated with, fas (IV 67), and they are said to have "... recovered their senses."<sup>33</sup> Tacitus very cleverly once more allows the natives themselves to prove his point for him in the next two incidents. In the first, at an assemblage of Gallic states, two leaders address an audience, Julius Valentinus as an advocate of war (IV 68) and Julius Auspex as the extoller of conditions of peace (IV 69). The verdict is rendered even before the plea for peace is

heard; Valentinus' eloquence is described as, vaecordi (IV 68), and the outcome is scarcely a surprise, et Valentini animum laudabant, consilium Auspiciis se uebantur (IV 69). The second episode in the chapter provides an even more striking illustration of the temper of the Gauls and a reason for the strong hand of the Romans. A quarrel arises among the states regarding leadership and policies (IV 69) proving the provincials' inability to achieve concord even when united by the presumably strong cause of overthrowing foreign domination.

The scene is now set for the entrance of the Roman general Petilius Cerialis who will in words defend eloquently his country's imperialism and in deeds prove the truth of Vecula's attitudes. The personification of confidence, he sends home the Gauls' young men and deals most firmly with them, and they behave as Vecula predicted, auxit ea res Gallorum obsequium: nam recepta iuventute facilius tributa toleravere, priores ad officia quod spernebantur (IV 71).

One more description of the terrible shame which the turncoats experienced<sup>34</sup> and everything is in readiness for Cerialis' enunciation and justification of Roman policy in the provinces (IV 73-74). Syme analyzes it:

The argument is powerful--without Rome there would be no defence from the Germans; Gaul in the past had always been the scene of regna bellaque; protection cannot be had without arms, or arms without taxation; the only alternative to the Roman dominion is anarchy.

At the same time the orator, as might be expected, adduces pleas of dubious validity. Affirming that there is no barrier between the Romans and the Gauls, he alleges that Gauls command Roman legions (which cannot have been normal).<sup>35</sup>

Similarly Martin observes, "The Sallustian allusion at the outset warns us not to take at its face value Cerialis' claim to be speaking simple, unvarnished truth."<sup>36</sup> There is the other side of the picture, then, clearly a servitium and that not without its faults, but certainly preferable to the chaos of a Gallic empire or the domination of the Germans. And what about libertas? Alas, it is merely an attractive word used by the Germans to disguise the servitium at which they were aiming.<sup>37</sup>

So it is that Tacitus understands and presents both viewpoints on this vital issue, each with its truths and its fallacies, quite well; but there can be no doubt that he believes Roman rule to be for the best. Wellesley analyzes the author's attitude:

Despite his fundamental pride in all things Roman, Tacitus is a caustic critic of the shortcomings of his nation; and it is probable that the Agricola and Germania have contributed greatly to fostering the popular conception of Rome as an oppressive military government battering upon down-trodden provincials. Lapidary phrases like ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant are readily trotted out by those who do not realize that Tacitus delights, with the virtuosity of the skilled barrister that he was, to play the Devil's Advocate, indeed to plead on both sides by contrasting speeches put into the mouths of opposing generals and politicians. As a corrective it may be useful to quote part of a speech of reconciliation to Gauls, now defeated, who had joined with Germans in the Rebellion of Civilis: . . . (The speech is then quoted.) Here at last speaks Tacitus himself, in carefully pondered words, both just and prophetic.<sup>38</sup>

Nor is the author content to drop his argument with the general's words. Perhaps the most telling evidence is the change of heart that the Batavians themselves undergo when faced with defeat. Tacitus skillfully permits them to plead the Romans' case (V 25), and now the servitium, because no tribute is paid, but men merely furnished, is, proximum id libertati (V 25), and the opposition of the words has

come full-circle. Moreover, Civilis is denounced as his fellows reflect upon his motives, Civilis rabie semet in arma trusus; illum domesticis malis excidium gentis opposuisse (V 25). A few other instances of Tacitus' remarks which show a decided favoritism for the Romans or reveal the inferiority of Civilis and his men are worth noting. Very early in the narrative the historian describes the Batavian leader, sed Civilis ultra quam barbaris solitum ingenio sollers (IV 13) thus exhibiting a belief that usually natives are less intelligent than Romans. Chapter 23 reveals the Batavians' ineptitude at building war machines as the author dismisses their seige engine as, informe opus (IV 23). Soon (IV 29) the German war effort, which in this particular attack is ruled by, inconsulta ira (IV 29) is contrasted, to the natives' detriment, with the efficiency and organization of the Romans. Finally, the primitive quality of Civilis is emphasized as Tacitus relates his vow of letting his hair, which he has dyed red, grow long until he should meet with success; also, it is said that he gave prisoners to his small son to serve as targets for his weapons (IV 61). Far better it is, then, for people such as these to be subjected to Roman rule.

So it is that Tacitus sets forth in the speeches in the Historiae his interest in the opposition of freedom and slavery, whether it be that between an emperor and the Roman senate or the Roman Empire and the provincials. Reinke states, "Convinced of the eternal sameness of human nature, Tacitus viewed the tension between power and freedom as the fundamental theme of history."<sup>39</sup> Nor does



the author fail to make known his own assessment of a given condition.

As Goodyear remarks, "For Tacitus, as for Sallust and Livy, history has a moral and exemplary purpose, as he affirms expressly at Ann.

3.55.1: praecipium munus annalium reor, ne virtutes sileantur utque pravis dictis factisque ex posteritate et infamia motus sit."<sup>40</sup> Surely,

Tacitus takes advantage of the speeches not only to sound forth on issues important to him but also to provide useful lessons for posterity.

Two other of the historian's interests which come to light often in the speeches and which have been discussed before in a different manner are those he evinces in the emperors and the troops. Naturally, under an autocratic government the quality of the emperor was of supreme importance. Small wonder, then, that "Tacitus put emphasis upon the personality of the successive rulers."<sup>41</sup> And, as has been pointed out, the speeches aid greatly in conveying to the reader an understanding of each sovereign. Every speech in Book I, whether direct or indirect, deals in some way with an emperor, and the four direct speeches are delivered by emperors;<sup>42</sup> interesting, too, is the fact that all of these, save Galba's address, are delivered before the troops. And why the concern for them? evulgate imperii arcane posse principem alibi quam Romae fieri (I 4). Galba's rise and fall confirmed the power which the army could wield and the increasing role it was to play in affairs of state.

Similarly, in Book II the two direct speeches are concerned with emperors, the voluntary death of one (II 47) and the making of another (II 76-77) while the indirect remarks have as their subject

matter some aspect of an emperor or his troops. In Book III, the emphasis is mainly on the fight between the Flavians and Vitellians with the three direct speeches of any length uttered by Antonius Primus. As has been shown, Tacitus is here concentrating on providing a model for a successful general for, "Without a guiding intelligence an army is simply a mob. . . . and it must not be forgotten that whatever the strength of the Roman tradition of discipline and loyalty troops are capable of behaving no more sensibly than the urban riff-raff of Rome."<sup>43</sup> Given their great potential for creating havoc and chaos how best to control them was certainly a subject worthy of consideration.

Syme writes:

The crisis of the year 69 was wider: it concerned the whole governing class, and the system of rule. Is Tacitus adequate in his diagnosis of the events he describes?

The causes were various, and the crisis took many shapes. Tacitus, it appears, does full justice. So far as known, his Historiae demonstrate for the first time the full impact of provinces and armies on the Roman government.<sup>44</sup>

And the speeches provide an excellent vehicle for the author's purposes, whether they be structural with some specific aim in mind or didactic with the goal of providing moral lessons, or simply a source of concern for the writer. Most often, as has been indicated, they serve all three functions.

#### IV. THE SPEECHES: A REFLECTION IN STYLE OF THE INDIVIDUALITY OF THE SPEAKER

The speeches in the Historiae having now been discussed with regard to purpose and content, it remains for a few remarks to be made with regard to style.

As it has been observed,<sup>1</sup> Tacitus was interested in achieving a kind of style throughout his writing. However, maintaining a stylistic unity did not preclude treating the ideas which different characters uttered in various ways in order to reflect the individuality of a particular speaker. A stylistic analysis of the direct speeches in the Historiae, since they are generally longer, reveals just such a variation of speaking styles,<sup>2</sup> and two declaimers, one, because he appears three times as an orator (III 2; 20; 24) and the other, because his remarks are so lengthy (II 76-77) recommend themselves for particular examination.

The first speaker, the Flavian general Antonius Primus, upon the first occasion of his voicing his thoughts (III 2) does not fail to fulfill what the author has already said of him, sermone promptus (II 86), for his words are bold and frank as he logically and practically sets forth his own opinions and invalidates the case of the opposition. Vigor and speed mark his style as a series of rhetorical questions<sup>3</sup> allows him to drive home his points and leads to his advice or sententia which begins, quin potius (III 2). Thus

after weakening the arguments of his adversaries, he replaces that faulty advice with his own positive counsel. Having wasted no words, he ends with a confident declaration emphasized by antithesis and alliteration, and the use of the imperative further contributes to a picture of self-assurance.

When next the reader meets him speaking (III 20) there can be no doubt as to his identity, for the same fierceness and energy which characterized him before are present again. Once more, his first phrases, neatly balanced, demand attention, and once more the cogency of the opposite viewpoint is shattered by a barrage of logic in the form of rhetorical questions. Only then is his sententia allowed to emerge, once more introduced by quin potius (III 20). Alliteration is even more marked, and there is even an example of anaphora as well as a simile as Tacitus adds to his portrait of a skillful demagogue.

A third occasion for oratory (III 24) and the picture is complete. Again, the speaker cannot be mistaken. Balance and rhetorical questions are employed to goad the men into action in an emotional appeal to their shame and pride. Stylistically consistent, the speeches of Antonius Primus are a great aid to the reader's understanding of him and his abilities as a general.

A very different manner of speaking is allotted to Licinius Mucianus who was also a general but a different sort of man. Of his eloquence Tacitus says, satis decorus etiam Graeca facundia, omniumque quae diceret atque ageret arte quadam ostentator (II 80).

A character description very early in the narrative (I 10) makes it plain that Mucianus is adroit in the art of influencing others, a man of duplicity whose words will be deliberately and carefully chosen-- everything considered and nothing said or done rashly. His speech to Vespasian contradicts this image not one bit. It is elaborately treated, second in length only to Galba's address, and, abounding in sententiae, smacks of the self-styled philosopher. Balance and antithesis flourish as well as litotes, chiasmus, and alliteration. There are opposing triads and the collocation of certain words is deliberate; in short, all the artifices of the trained orator are present as well as the smoothness of the crafty diplomat whose chief aim is persuasion.

A perusal of the style of other speakers confirms the evidence which has been established by our two examples. Of course, all the orators speak the language of Tacitus, even the Batavian leader, Julius Civilis; therefore, all the speeches are rhetorically treated with devices favored by the author, particularly balance and antithesis, the use of sententiae, alliteration, and opposing triads. However, the effect which these devices bring about is quite different in each case: Galba's majestic homily with all its elaboration actually serves to betray the weakness of the old emperor and the precariousness of his position; Piso's moralizing proves untimely; Otho's eloquence is consistently ingratiating as he employs pathos and sarcasm and many other devices with which his speechwriter no doubt supplied him; Civilis, in all of his appearances, works on the emotions of

his listeners as he employs sarcasm, exaggeration and climax to heap abuse upon his enemies. Audacity and temerity color both his words and deeds. Syme summarizes the situation:

To render speakers in their diversity Tacitus plays upon the variations of language and movement. Piso is sober, dignified, and melancholy, while Otho's harangue blends flattering appeal with the feverish violence of the temporary desperado. Licinius Mucianus, that guileful diplomat, manages an elaborate orchestration, punctuated by telling epigrams. Antonius Primus is fierce and direct, with a run of rhetorical questions. Eprius Marcellus (it is known) was a truculent speaker: the historian tones down his discourse (for so the occasion demanded), producing the plain man's plea in a sequence of straightforward asseverations.<sup>4</sup>

So it is that while all the speeches have some elements in common, a feature which creates a unity of the whole, they are also quite individual.

An additional point can be made with regard to using a particular style for a particular speech, and that is the historian's desire in certain instances to allude to his predecessors. Syme remarks:

The Licinius Mucianus of the historian Tacitus is not only a Sallustian character suitably depicted in Sallustian language. His speech of counsel to Vespasian is also in the manner. As Mucianus develops his theme--war is safer than peace and empire the only refuge--he confirms the argument with a series of epigrams: subtle and sinister paradox conveyed by a daring and deadly simplicity of words.

Echoes and hints of Sallust will not be interpreted merely as proper homage to the archetypal historian whom Tacitus honored as rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor. [Ann. III 30 I] The resemblances go much deeper. The Sallustian manner corresponds to an organic necessity in Roman historiography, as Tacitus understood the matter, and not Tacitus only.<sup>5</sup>

Nor is Sallust the only earlier historian of whom there are echoes, ". . . the manner and diction of Livy can often be detected. . . .

the surrender of a Roman army on the Rhine is portrayed with devices that evoke, by direct reminiscence, the legions at the Caudine Forks; and the Roman general Dillius Vocula duly comes out with a Livian speech."<sup>6</sup> Finally, as has been mentioned,<sup>7</sup> the speech of Curtius Montanus is very much in a Ciceronian vein since, for a brief moment after Vitellius' death, freedom of speech was revived in the senate. Stylistic subtleties, then, often are accounted for by allusions to earlier writers.

One more matter remains for discussion as far as style is concerned, and that deals with the various formulae which the author employs to introduce the speeches. Since the remarks prefacing oratio obliqua are so different, no pattern seems to be present, but it has been thought that with regard to the speeches in the Agricola different words ". . . indicate different degrees of veracity."<sup>8</sup> If that is true, with regard to the speeches in oratio recta we shall attempt first to categorize the formulae and then to understand any design which may emerge.

The introductory remarks separate themselves into three groups: (1) those which begin with the words in hunc modum followed by a verb of speaking; (2) those beginning with ita followed by a verb of speaking; and (3) those which merely have inquit. A glance at the chart<sup>9</sup> reveals that some form of loquer is the preferred verb of speaking since it occurs four times out of nine while dissero is next, being used twice. The speeches in the first group have in common that they are probably the invention of Tacitus himself. Only one speech, that of Piso, is

even mentioned by another source<sup>10</sup> as having taken place, and then the gist of the speech or conference is not reported, leaving Tacitus wide scope for his own treatment of the event. Similarly, in the second group, the remarks of Mucianus and Cerialis are more than likely the compositions of the historian. The first remarks of Otho (I 37-38) Suetonius mentions<sup>11</sup> but reports them to be rather different from Tacitus' account, while no such harangue takes place in Plutarch, and the second speech (I 83-84) Plutarch recounts<sup>12</sup> but his version also is different from that of Tacitus. It is to be concluded, then, that speeches introduced either by in hunc modum or ita are the free compositions of Tacitus himself. Even if such a speech were made, Tacitus altered it substantially for his own purposes.

The speeches beginning with inquit can be further broken down into two divisions: those which were indicated in another source and the others all uttered by a general in the heat of battle or in some military context. For example, Otho's suicide speech (II 47) is also related by Plutarch<sup>13</sup> and Suetonius;<sup>14</sup> Galba's pithy remark (I 35) by Plutarch;<sup>15</sup> and the tenor of Julius Agrestis' words to Vitellius, Tacitus himself affirms have been elsewhere documented (III 54). It must be assumed that the speech of Curtius Montanus (IV 42) and possibly the remark of Eprius Marcellus (IV 43) were to be found in the acta of the senate as Syme points out: "Though the speeches of senators may not have been consigned to the official record, but only perhaps a summary along with the sententia, some orations had no doubt been



published."<sup>16</sup> And again: "The account of these debates [IV 40-47] goes back to the official register of the Senate. Tacitus looked for himself. To deny it could only be ignorance or bigotry. The report carries impeccable precision and detail."<sup>17</sup>

The five other speeches introduced by inquit all are involved with military affairs and are appropriate and faithful reproductions of that type of address. In these instances inquit does not indicate the exact words spoken in a given situation but merely what is reasonable to assume was said. Tacitus may here be following a tradition in the reporting of military events, since the direct speeches in Caesar's two works all are begun with inquit.

Thus, it would seem that the introductory words which Tacitus employs are not scattered about the narrative haphazardly but do indeed follow a pattern which the historian established.

APPENDIX I  
DIRECT SPEECHES CATEGORIZED BY INTRODUCTORY WORDS

in hunc modum

- 1. Galba (I 15-16) locutus fertur
- 2. Piso (I 29-30) adlocutus est
- 3. Vecula (IV 58) disseruit
- 4. Tencteri (IV 64) protulit
- 5. Agrippenenses (IV 65) respondent

ita

- 1. Otho (I 37-38) coepit
- 2. Otho (I 83-84) disseruit
- 3. Mucianus (II 76-77) locutus
- 4. Cerialis (IV 73) adlocquitur

inquit

- 1. Galba (I 35)
- 2. Otho (II 47)
- 3. Antonius Primus (III 20)
- 4. Antonius Primus (III 24)
- 5. Julius Agrestis (III 54)
- 6. Civilis (IV 32)
- 7. Curtius Montanus (IV 42)
- 8. Eprius Marcellus (IV 43)
- 9. Civilis (IV 66)
- 10. Cerialis (IV 77)

APPENDIX II  
RHETORICAL DEVICES EMPLOYED IN THE DIRECT SPEECHES

Speech: I 15-16

Content: Galba's announcement of his adoption of Piso Licinianus  
as his heir and successor

Introductory words: in hunc modum locutus fertur

Length: 69 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

et mihi egregium . . . et tibi insigne

bello . . . quiescenti

sed Augustus in domo . . . ego in republica,

ea aetas tua quae . . . ea vita in qua

imperii . . . res publica

nec mea senectus . . . quam bonum successerem

nec tua . . . iuventa quam bonum principem

non Vindex cum . . . aut ego cum

a pessimo . . . desiderabitur: . . . a bonis desideretur.

nec totam servitutem . . . nec totam libertatem.

Alliteration

fortunam adnuc tantum adversam tulisti:

secundae res acrioribus stimulis animos

totam servitutem pati possunt nec totam libertatem

Sententiae

secundae res acrioribus stimulis animos explorant, quia miseriae  
tolerantur, felicitate corrumpimur.

Sententiae (continued)

sed imperaturus es nominibus qui nec totam servitutem pati possunt nec totam libertatem.

Anaphora

ea . . . ea

ne . . . ne

Chiasmus

natu maior, dignus hac fortuna

Metaphor

inrumpet adulatio, . . .

Opposing Triads

fidem, libertatem, amicitiam . . . adulatio, blanditiae et . . . utilitas

Personification

Si immensum imperii corpus stare ac librari sine rectore posset,

Speech: I 29-30

Content: Piso's attempt to retain the fidelity of the urban troops  
when faced with Otho's insurrection

Introductory words: in hunc modum adlocutus est

Length: 44 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

sive optandum hoc nomen sive timendum erat,  
adversas res expertus . . . ne secundas quidem  
libido ac voluptas penes ipsum sit, rubor ac dedecus penes omnis;  
a nobis donativum ob fidem quam ab aliis pro facinore accipietis.  
perire . . . occidere.  
legionum seditio . . . vestra fides famaue inlaesa

Alliteration

haec principatus praemia putat,

Sententia

nemo enim unquam imperium flagitio quaesitum bonis artibus exercuit.

Chiasmus

et Nero quoque vos destituit, non vos Neronem.  
et ad nos scelerum exitus, bellorum ad vos pertinebunt.  
admittis exemplum et . . . crimen facitis?

Triads

habitune et incessu an ille muliebri ornatu  
stupra nunc et comissiones et feminarum coetus  
res publica et senatus et populus

Play on Words (Paronomasia)

perdere iste sciet, donare nesciet.

Speech: I 37-38

Content: Otho's appeal to the urban troops to overthrow Galba

Introductory words: ita coepit.

Length: 39 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

nec privatum . . . nec principem

imperatorem populi Romani in castris an hostem habeatis.

cruenta et maculata aut, ut ipse praedicat, emendata et correctata? nam quae alii scelera, hic remedia vocat, dum falsis nominibus severitatem pro saevitia, parsimoniam pro avaritia, supplicia et contumelias vestras disciplinam appellat.

apud quos . . . et sine quibus

Alliteration

donec dubitabitur

decimari deditos iuberet, quos deprecantis

sui simillimum

Anaphora

cum vos aspexerit, cum signum meum acceperit,

idem senatus, idem populi Romani animus est:

Sarcasm

et cuius lenitatis est Galba,

Play on Words

nec una cohors togata defendit nunc Galbam sed detinet:

Pathos

ut qui nullo exposcente tot milia innocentissimorum militum trucidaverit.

et hanc solam Galbae victoriam, cum in oculis urbis decimari deditos iuberet, quos deprecantis in fidem acceperat.

Climax

his auspiciis urbem ingressus, . . . emendata et correctata?

Speech: I 83-84

Content: Otho's address to the urban troops after a near mutiny in which he attempts to soothe them and preclude any more such occurrences; also, a glorification of the senate

Introductory words: ita disseruit

Length: 50 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

tam nescire quaedam milites quam scire oportet:

parendo potius, commilitones, quam imperia ducum sciscitando

vobis arma et animus sit: mihi consilium et virtutis vestrae regimen relinquit.

illi, quos cum maxime Vitellius in nos ciuit, Germani . . .  
ulline Italiae alumni et Romana vere iuventus

cuius splendore et gloria serdis et obscuritatem Vitellianarum partium praestringimus

hinc res publica, inde hostes rei publicae constiterint.

nam ut ex vobis senatores, ita ex senatoribus principes nascuntur.

pro me . . . adversus me

Sententiae

nam saepe honestas rerum causas, ni iudicium adhibeas, perniciosi exitus consequuntur.

parendo potius, commilitones, quam imperia ducum sciscitando res militares continentur, et fortissimus in ipso discrimine exercitus est qui ante discrimen quietissimus.

Anaphora

neque ut . . . neque ut

ne miles centurioni, ne centurio tribuno

Collocation

alus incolumitate,

Collocation (continued)

ullus usquam

num omnis nuntios palam audiri, omnia consilia cunctis praesentibus

Chiasmus

ratio rerum aut occasionum velocitas

Triads

in discursu ac tenebris et rerum omnium confusione

quem nobis animum, quas mentis imprecentur, quid aliud



Speech: II 76-77

Content: Mucianus' appeal to Vespasian to challenge Vitellius and to seize the principate

Introductory words: ita locutus

Length: 51 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

rei publicae utile, ipsis gloriosum

quam salutare rei publicae, quam tibi magnificum

si quid ardoris ac ferociae miles habuit, popinis et commissationibus et principis imitatione deteritur:

tibi e Iudaea et Syria et Aegypto novem legiones integrae, nulla acie exhaustae, non discordia corruptae, sed firmatus usu miles et belli domitor externi: classium alarum cohortium robera et fidissimi reges et tua ante omnis experientia.

ne Vitellie antepone, te mihi.

non adversus divi Augusti acerrimam mentem  
nec adversus cautissimam Tiberii senectutem,

tu tuos exercitus rege, mihi bellum et proeliorum incerta trade.

Alliteration

terpere ultra et polluendam perdendamque rem publicam relinquere sopor  
et ignavia videretur, etiam si tibi quam inhonesta, tam tuta servitus esset.

et Nere nobilitate natalium Vitellium anteibat.

aperiet et recludet contacta et tumescentia victricium partium vulnera  
bellum ipsum

Sententiae

confugiendum est ad imperium.

satis clarus est apud timentem quisque timetur.

sed meliorem in bello causam quam in pace habemus; nam qui deliberant,  
desciverunt.

Collocation

Ego te

nullis stipendiis, nulla militari fama,

Chiasmus

spargit legiones, exarmat cohortis, neva . . . semina ministrat.

Opposing Triads

nec mihi maior in tua vigilantia parsimonia sapientia fiducia est quam  
in Vitellii terrore inscitia saevitia.

Litotes

non arduum

Speech: III 2

Content: Antonius Primus' urging of the other officers to take the offensive against Vitellius

Introductory word:	Indirect speech disseruit	Direct speech (none)
--------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

Length:	19 lines	8 lines
---------	----------	---------

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

festinationem ipsis utilem, Vitellio exitiosam

quanto ferocius ante se egerint, tanto cupidius insolitas voluptates hausisse.

vos, quibus fortuna in integro est, legiones continete: mihi expeditae cohortes sufficient.

Alliteration

vestigis vincentis

Sententia (Antonii Primi)

quin potius . . .

Metaphor

hausisse

Rhetorical Questions

quid tum claustra montium profutura? quid tractum in aestatem aliam bellum? unde interim pecuniam et comaeatus?

Speech: III 20

Content: Antonius Primus' persuasion of his troops to delay their attack upon Cremona

Introductory words:	Indirect Speech adfirmabat	Direct Speech inquit
---------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------

Length:	13 lines	6 lines
---------	----------	---------

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

militibus cupidinem pugnandi convenire, duces providendo, consultando, cunctatione saepius quam temeritate prodesse.

ut pro virili portione armis ac manu victoriam iuverit, ratione et consilio, propriis ducis artibus, profuturum;

Alliteration

pateant portae,

quanta altitudo moenium, tormentisne et telis

et pilis perfringere

altitudinem turrium et aliena munimenta mirantes?

vim victoriamque

Sententia (Antonii Primi)

quin potius mora noctis . . .

Anaphora

nisi explorato, nisi die intrandum.

Rhetorical Questions.

an obpugnationem inchoaturos adempto omni prospectu, quis aequus locus, quanta altitudo moenium, tormentisne et telis an operibus et vineis adgredienda urbs foret?

gladiisne . . . et pilis perfringere ac subruere muros ullae manus possunt?

si aggerem-struere, si pluteis cratibusve protegi necesse fuerit, ut vulgus improvidum inriti stabimus, altitudinem turrium et aliena munimenta mirantes?

Simile

ut vulgus improvidum

Speech: III 24

Content: Antonius Primus' urging of his men at the battle of Cremona

Introductory words:	Indirect Speech interrogabat	Direct Speech inquit
---------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------

Length:	8 lines	3 lines
---------	---------	---------

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

alios pudere et probris, multos laude et hortatu, omnis spe promissis-  
que accendens,

minis et verbis . . . manus eorum scutesque

sub M. Antonio Parthes, sub Corbulone Armenios, nuper Sarmatas

in quibus abolere labem prioris ignominiae, ubi recipere gloriam possent.

Rhetorical Questions

nisi vincitis, pagani, quis alius imperator, quae castra alia excipient?

Speech: IV 32

Content: Julius Civilis' reply to Montanus when asked to cease hostilities; an indictment of the Romans

Introductory word: inquit

Length: 10 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

en ego praefectus unum cohortis et Canninefates Batavique, exigua  
Galliarum portio, . . . vana illa castrorum spatia

Alliteration

a questu periculisque quae per quinque

ferre fameque

Sarcasm

egregium . . . pretium . . .

Metaphor

exhausisset

Climax and Exaggeration

quod praemium effusi totiens sanguinis expectatis nisi ingratham militiam,  
inmortalia tributa, virgas, securis et dominorum ingenia?

Synchysis

saevisissimas huius exercitus voces

Speech: IV 42

Content: Curtius Montanus' attack in the senate upon Aquilius Regulus

Introductory word: inquit

Length: 26 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Alliteration

hoc certe . . . Nere non coegit

cum ex funere rei publicae raptis consularibus spoliis, septuagens  
sestertio saginatus et sacerdotio fulgens innoxios pueros, illustris  
senes, conspicuas feminas

diutius durant

ministros more maiorum

Sententiae

optimus est post malum principem dies primus.

Anaphora

nihil quod . . . nihil quod

qui Tiberio, qui Gaio

ea principis aetas, ea moderatio:

Sarcasm

retinete, patres conscripti, et reservate hominem tam expediti consilii . . .

N.B. R. H. Martin's article for Ciceronian style



Speech: IV 42

Content: Curtius Montanus' attack in the senate upon Aquilius Regulus

Introductory word: inquit

Length: 26 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Alliteration

hoc certe . . . Nero non coegit

cum ex funere rei publicae raptis consularibus spoliis, septuagens  
sestertio saginatus et sacerdotio fulgens innoxios pueros, illustres  
senes, conspicuas feminas

diutius durant

ministros more maiorum

Sententiae

optimus est post malum principem dies primus.

Anaphora

nihil quod . . . nihil quod

qui Tiberio, qui Gaius

ea principis aetas, ea moderatio:

Sarcasm

retinete, patres conscripti, et reservate hominem tam expediti consilii . . .

N.B. R. H. Martin's article for Ciceronian style

Speech: IV 58

Content: Dillius Vocula's attempt to retain the loyalty of his troops

Introductory words: in hunc modum disseruit

Length: 38 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

aut pro vobis sollicitior aut pro me securior.

tolerant cum maxime inopiam obsidiumque apud Vetera legiones nec  
terrore aut promissis demoveantur:  
nobis super arma et viros et egregia castrorum munimenta frumentum  
et comaeatus quamvis longo bello pares.

Alliteration

meritemque in tot malis hostium ut finem miseriarum expecto:

perire praeoptaveritne loco pellerentur?

socii saepe nostri excindi urbis suas seque . . .

toto terrarum orbe vulgetur, vobis

octingentes viginti annos tot triumphis

Collocation

vestris se manibus

transfugae e transfugis et proditores e proditoribus

vestri me pudet miseretque,

Vergilean Echo

horret animus tanti flagitii imagine.

Combination of Synonyms (Ciceronian)

precor venerorque

incorrupta et intemerata

pollui foedarique

Prayer (Ciceronian)

te, Iuppiter optime maxime, . . . te, (Anaphora)

Speech: IV 73-74

Content: Cerialis' explanation of Roman imperialism

Introductory words: ita adloquitur

Length: 46 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

quae . . . utilius sit vobis audisse quam nobis dixisse.

ne contumaciam cum pernicie quam obsequium cum securitate malitis.

Alliteration

apud vos verba plurimum valent

sed verbis seditiosorum aestimantur, statui

victi victoresque

Sententiae

ceterum libertas et speciosa nomina praetexuntur; nec quisquam alienum servitium et dominationem sibi concupivit ut non eadem ista vocabula usurparet.

et laudatorum principum usus ex aequo quamvis procul agentibus: saevi proximis ingruunt.

vitia erunt, donec homines, sed neque haec continua et meliorum interventu pensantur:

Anaphora

neque quies gentium sine armis neque arma sine stipendiis neque stipendia sine tributis haberi queunt:

ipsi plerumque legionibus nostris praesidetis, ipsi has aliasque provincias regitis;

Sarcasm

an vos cariores . . . fuerunt?

nisi forte . . . arceantur.

Collocation

quae convelli sine exitio convellentium non potest:

Synchysis

quantis exercituum nostrorum laboribus

Speech: IV 77

Content: Cerialis' urging his men in the heat of battle

Introductory word: inquit

Length: 8 lines

Rhetorical Devices:

Balance and Antithesis

neque me inultum neque vos impunitos

Alliteration

militum manibus

ite, nuntiate Vespasiano vel, quod propius est, Civili et Classico,

Anaphora

non Flaccum . . . non Voculam

<u>Rhetorical Devices</u>	<u>Number of Speeches in which each occurs</u>	<u>Total number of times each occurs</u>
1. Balance and Antithesis	12	47
2. Alliteration	11	31
3. Sententiae	8	14
4. Anaphora	7	16
5. Collocation	5	9
6. Sarcasm	4	5
7. Chiasmus	4	6
8. Metaphor	3	3
9. Rhetorical Questions	3	7
10. Opposing Triads	2	2
11. Triads	2	6
12. Play on Words	2	2
13. Synchysis	2	2
14. Simile	1	1
15. Personification	1	1
16. Pathos	1	1
17. Litotes	1	1
18. Climax	1	1
19. Vergilean Echo	1	1

## FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER I

1 Ronald Syme, Tacitus (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), I, p. 191.

2 Bessie Walker, The "Annals" of Tacitus (2d ed.; Manchester: University Press, 1960), p. 145, quoting Cic. de Leg. I 5.

3 H. W. L. Freudenthal, "Sine ira et studio," CJ, XXXIX (1943-44), p. 298.

4 Cic. de Or. II 62.

5 Walker, The "Annals," pp. 145-46.

6 See the discussion in Syme, Tac., pp. 146 ff. and A. D. Leeman, Orationis Ratio (2 vols.; Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1963), I, pp. 337-61.

7 Sall. Cat. 4,ii.

8 Plin. Ep. V 8.

9 Leeman, Orat., p. 322, and Clarence W. Mendell, Tacitus (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), p. 73.

10 Quint. Inst. X 1 31.

11 Tac. Dial. 35. It is generally accepted now by scholars that this work is Tacitus'. See C. D. N. Costa, "The 'Dialogus,'" in Tacitus, ed. by T. A. Dorey (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 19.

12 Walker, The "Annals," p. 151.

13 Ibid.

14 Tac. Agr. 10 1.

15 Tac. Hist. I 1.

16 Tac. Ann. I 1.

17 Walker, The "Annals," pp. 146-47.



18 Moses Hadas, A History of Latin Literature (New York: University Press, 1960), p. 329.

19 Syme, Tac., p. 317.

20 Ibid., p. 64.

21 Plin. Ep. II 11 2ff.

22 Walker, The "Annals," p. 147.

23 See Kenneth Wellesley, "Can you trust Tacitus," G & R, N.S. 1 (1954), pp. 13-35, and N. P. Miller, "The Claudian Tablet and Tacitus: A Reconsideration," RhM, 99 (1956), pp. 304-15. The full text of the original speech is to be found in C.I.L. 13, 1668; it is also printed in Furneaux' edition of the Annales, II p. 56 ff.

24 Walker, The "Annals," p. 147.

25 Leeman, Orat., p. 355.

## FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER II

- 1 Edmond Courbaud, Le procédés d'art de Tacite dans les "Histoires" (Paris, 1918), p. 217.
- 2 Syme, Tac., p. 192.
- 3 Idem.
- 4 Containing 69 lines in the Oxford Text, it is the longest direct speech in Book I.
- 5 Ragnar Ullmann, La technique des discours dans Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite (Oslo, 1927), p. 203.
- 6 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 210.
- 7 Ibid., p. 211.
- 8 S. G. Daitz, "Tacitus' Technique of Character Portrayal," AJPh, LXXXI (1960), p. 45.
- 9 Ullmann, La tech., p. 202.
- 10 Walker, The "Annals," p. 152.
- 11 Syme, Tac., p. 192.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Ibid., p. 207.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 F. G. Moore, The Histories of Tacitus, Books I and II (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910), p. 124.
- 16 Plut. Galba 3 16 29.
- 17 Suet. Galba 14 2 12.
- 18 Tac. Hist. I 18: constat potuisse conciliari animos quantula-cumque parci senis liberalitate: nocuit antiquus rigor et nimia severitas, cui iam pares non sumus.

19 Tac. Hist. I 16: tamen territus fueris si duae legiones in hoc concussi orbis metu nondum quiescunt: . . .

20 Daitz, "Tac. Tech.," p. 30.

21 Syme, Tac., p. 182.

22 Alain Michel, Tacite: Dialogus de Oratoribus (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962), p. 82.

23 Syme, Tac., pp. 129-30.

24 Leeman, Orat., p. 346.

25 Courbaud, Le proc., pp. 207-08.

26 Ibid., pp. 216-17; Syme, Tac., p. 207.

27 Tac. Hist. I 29: solacium proximi metus habebamus incruentam urbem et res sine discordia translatas: . . .

28 Tac. Hist. I 30: admittitis exemplum et quiescendo commune crimen facitis? transcendet haec licentia in provincias, . . .

29 Tac. Hist. I 30: nec est plus quod pro caede principis quam quod innocentibus datur, sed proinde a nobis donativum ob fidem quam ab aliis pro facinore accipietis.

30 Tac. Hist. I 5: Miles urbanus . . . postquam neque dari donativum sub nomine Galbae promissum . . .

31 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 216.

32 Syme, Tac., p. 207.

33 Norma P. Miller, "Style and Content in Tacitus," in Tacitus, ed. by T. A. Dorey (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 102.

34 Tac. Hist. I 14: Piso M. Crasso et Scribonia genitus, nobilis utrimque, vultu habituque moris antiqui et aestimatione recta severus, . . . if the latter can be considered a recommendation

35 Supra, n. 18.

36 Ullmann, La tech., p. 205.

37 Compare the following lines of Vergil: quamquam animus meminisse horret luctuque refugit (Verg. Aen. II 12); at me tum primum saevus circumstetit horror (Verg. Aen. II 559).

38 See Courbaud, Le proc., p. 225.

39 Ullmann, La tech., p. 205.

40 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 226.

41 Ullmann, La tech., p. 206.

42 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 227.

43 Ullmann, La tech., p. 207.

44 Ibid.

45 Syme, Tac., p. 183. His argument is summarized as follows: Otho's eloquence regarding the military is not to be taken at face value in light of his own accession through intrigue; he was not another Galba, nor did he have his standards. The Guard, except for the officers, did not furnish candidates for the senate and hardly deserved the complimentary epithets lavished upon it when bribery alone produced good behavior. The senators' cowardly flight and subsequent behavior (Tac. Hist. I 85) gives a twist of irony to Otho's laudatory assertions.

46 Supra, p. 65, for the abundance of rhetorical devices employed.

47 Syme, Tac., p. 192.

48 Ullmann, La tech., pp. 208-210.

49 Ibid., p. 210. For an analysis of the pointed style of this speech, see B. F. Harris, "Tacitus on the death of Otho," CJ, LVIII (1962), pp. 76-77.

50 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 227.

51 Ibid., pp. 227-28.

52 René Pichon, "Les 'Histoires' de Tacite," Journal des Savants (1919), p. 187.

53 Harris, "Tac. on the death," p. 74.

54 Syme, Tac., p. 192.

55 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 213.

56 Supra, n. 23, chapter II.

57 See n. 2, p. 207 of Syme, Tac., for specific references.

58 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 213.

59 Syme, Tac., pp. 207-208.

- 60 Einar Löfstedt, Roman Literary Portraits (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), p. 150.
- 61 Syme, Tac., p. 208.
- 62 Ibid., p. 192.
- 63 Courbaud, Le proc., pp. 206-07.
- 64 Ibid., p. 217.
- 65 Ibid., p. 218.
- 66 Daitz, "Tac.' Tech.," p. 32.
- 67 Erich Auerbach, Mimesis (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), p. 38.
- 68 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 217.
- 69 Ibid., pp. 224-25.
- 70 Walker, The "Annals," pp. 152-53.
- 71 Miller, "Style," p. 102.
- 72 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 225.
- 73 Pichon, "Les 'Hist.,'" p. 188.
- 74 Ibid.
- 75 Michel, Tacite, p. 53.
- 76 Courbaud, Le proc., pp. 218-19.
- 77 Ibid., p. 219.
- 78 Tac. Hist. III 82: Vitelliani desperatione sola ruebant, et quamquam pulsi, rursus in urbe congregabantur.
- 79 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 218.
- 80 Kenneth Wellesley, "Tacitus as a Military Historian," in Tacitus, ed. by T. A. Dorey (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 88.
- 81 Ibid., p. 89.
- 82 Ibid., p. 90.

- 83 Ibid.
- 84 Ibid., p. 89.
- 85 Ibid.
- 86 Ibid., p. 91.
- 87 Ibid., p. 90.
- 88 Miller, "Style," p. 110.
- 89 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 218.
- 90 Ibid., p. 224.
- 91 Syme, Tac., p. 192.
- 92 Auerbach, Mim., p. 39.
- 93 Ibid., p. 40.
- 94 R. H. Martin, "Tacitus and His Predecessors," in Tacitus, ed. by T. A. Dorey (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 121.
- 95 F. R. D. Goodyear, "Tacitus," G & R, N.S. 4 (1970), p. 40.
- 96 Ullmann, La tech., p. 21.
- 97 15.1% in Book I and 18.5% in Book IV. Norma P. Miller, "Dramatic Speech in Tacitus," AJPh, LXXXV (1964), p. 292.
- 98 Ibid., p. 288.
- 99 Syme, Tac., p. 192.

## FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER III

- 1 Syme, Tac., p. 320.
- 2 Goodyear, "Tac.," p. 40.
- 3 Tac., Agr. 3.1.
- 4 Courbaud, Le proc., p. 215; for the summarized discussion, pp. 214-15.
- 5 H. W. Benario, "Tacitus and the Principate," CJ, LX (1964), p. 102.
- 6 Syme, Tac., p. 7.
- 7 Ibid., p. 207.
- 8 Martin, "Tacitus and His," pp. 140-41.
- 9 See the discussion in Syme, Tac., pp. 24-29.
- 10 Syme, Tac., p. 26.
- 11 Ibid., p. 27.
- 12 Ibid., p. 28.
- 13 T. A. Dorey, "'Agricola' and 'Germania,'" in Tacitus, ed. by T. A. Dorey (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 6-8.
- 14 Goodyear, "Tac.," pp. 6-7.
- 15 Syme, Tac., pp. 25-26.
- 16 Tac. Hist. IV 8: suadere etiam Prisco ne supra principem scanderet, ne Vespasianum senem triumphalem, iuvenum liberorum patrem, praeceptis coerceret.
- 17 Tac. Hist. IV 42-45. The speech is IV 42.
- 18 Tac. Hist. IV 44: Proximo senatu, inchoante Caesare de abolendo dolore iraque et priorum temporum necessitatibus, censuit Mucianus prolixè pro accusatoribus; . . .

19 R. H. Martin, "The Speech of Curtius Montanus," JRS, LVII (1967), p. 109.

20 Ibid., p. 114.

21 Martin, "Tacitus and His," p. 131.

22 Syme, Tac., p. 64.

23 Ibid., p. 71.

24 See n. 3 in Syme, Tac., p. 111, and Leeman, Orat., p. 346.

25 Costa, "'The Dial.," p. 27.

26 Syme, Tac., p. 111.

27 Ibid., pp. 452-53.

28 Tac. Hist. IV 57: Galbam et infracta tributa hostilis spiritus induisse. Nunc hostis, quia molle servitium; cum spoliati exutique fuerint, amicos fore.

29 Supra, p. 75 for a list of the rhetorical devices employed.

30 Martin, "Tacitus and His," p. 130.

31 Syme, Tac., p. 453.

32 Donald R. Dudley, The World of Tacitus (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968), p. 186.

33 Tac. Hist. IV 67: The word is repiscere.

34 Tac. Hist. IV 72: pudor ac dedecus obstupescerat, . . .

35 Syme, Tac., p. 453.

36 Martin, "Tacitus and His," p. 130.

37 Tac. Hist. IV 73: ceterum libertas et speciosa nomina praetexuntur; nec quisquam alienum servitium et dominationem sibi concupivit ut non eadem ista vocabula usurparet.

38 Wellesley, "Tac. as a," pp. 79-80.

39 E. C. Reinke, "A review of Tacitus und das historische Bewusstsein," (Heidelberg, 1965), by Reinhard Haussler in CJ, LXIII (1967-68), p. 276.



40 Goodyear, "Tac.," p. 29.

41 Syme, Tac., p. 208.

42 Supra, pp. 61-65.

43 Wellesley, "Tac. as a," p. 89.

44 Syme, Tac., p. 208.

## FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER IV

1 Supra, p. 4.

2 For an analysis of the structure of individual speeches, refer to Ullmann, La Tech. This study will concern itself with the use of rhetorical devices only.

3 When reference is made to particular rhetorical devices, they will be found listed in Appendix II under the appropriate speech.

4 Syme, Tac., p. 192.

5 Ibid., pp. 196-97.

6 Ibid., pp. 200-01.

7 Supra, p. 40.

8 Dudley, World, p. 51.

9 Supra, p. 60.

10 Plut. Galba 25.

11 Suet. Otho 6.

12 Plut. Otho 3.

13 Plut. Otho 15.

14 Suet. Otho 10.

15 Plut. Galba 26.

16 Syme, Tac., p. 188.

17 Ibid.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY  
PRIMARY SOURCES

- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. Rhetorica. Vol. I. Libros De Oratore Tres.. Edited by A. S. Wilkins. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.
- Plinius Caecilius Secundus, C. Epistularum Libri Decem. Edited by R. A. B. Mynors. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Plutarchus. Vitae. Vol. XI. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. London: William Heinemann, 1926.
- Quintilianus, M. Fabius. Institutiones Oratoriae Liber X. Edited by W. Peterson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Sallustius Crispus, Caius. Catilina Iugurtha Fragmenta Ampliora. Edited by Alphonsus Kurfess. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1957.
- Suetonius. The Lives of the Caesars. Vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930.
- Tacitus, P. Cornelius. Annalium Libri I - IV. 2d ed. Edited by H. Furneaux. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tacite: Dialogus de Oratoribus. Edited by Alain Michel. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Historiarum Libri. Edited by C. D. Fisher. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Opera Minora Agricola Germania. Edited by Henry Furneaux and J. G. C. Anderson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis. Princeton: University Press, 1953.
- Benario, H. W. "Tacitus and the Principate." Classical Journal, LX (1964), 97-106.
- Costa, C. D. N. "The 'Dialogus.'" Tacitus. Edited by T. A. Dorey. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Courbaud, Edmond. Le Procèdes d'art de Tacite dans les "Histoires." Paris: 1918.
- Daitz, S. G. "Tacitus' Technique of Character Portrayal." American Journal of Philology, LXXXI (1960), 30-52.
- D'Alton, J. F. Roman Literary Theory and Criticism. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1962.
- Dorey, T. A. "'Agricola' and 'Germania.'" Tacitus. Edited by T. A. Dorey. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tacitus' Treatment of Antonius Primus." Classical Philology, LIII (1958), 244.
- Dudley, Donald R. The World of Tacitus. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968.
- Freudenthal, H. W. L. "Sine ira et studio." Classical Journal, XXXIX (1943-44), 298.
- Goodyear, F. R. D. "Tacitus." Greece & Rome, N.S. 4 (1970), 1-44.
- Hadas, Moses. A History of Latin Literature. New York: University Press, 1960.
- Harris, B. F. "Tacitus on the death of Otho." Classical Journal, LVIII (1962), 73-77.
- Jerome, T. S. "The Tacitean Tiberius." Classical Philology, VII, No. 3 (July 1912), 265-92.
- Leeman, A. D. Orationis Ratio. Vol. I. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1963.

- Löfstedt, Einar. Roman Literary Portraits. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Martin, R. H. "Tacitus and His Predecessors." Tacitus. Edited by T. A. Dorey. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Speech of Curtius Montanus." Journal of Roman Studies, LVII (1967), 109-14.
- Mendell, Clarence W. Tacitus. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957..
- Miller, Norma P. "Dramatic Speech in Tacitus." American Journal of Philology, LXXXV (1964), 279-96.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Style and Content in Tacitus." Tacitus. Edited by T. A. Dorey. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Claudian Tablet and Tacitus: A Reconsideration." Rheinisches Museum, XCIX (1956), 304-15.
- Pichon, René. "Les 'Histoires' de Tacite." Journal des Savants, 1919, 183-93.
- Keinke, E. C. "A Review of Tacitus und das historische Bewusstsein" by Reinhard Haussler. Classical Journal, LXIII (1967-68), 274, 276, 278.
- Syme, Ronald. Tacitus. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ten Studies in Tacitus. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Ullmann, Ragnar, La Technique des Discours Dans Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite. Oslo: 1927.
- Walker, Bessie. The "Annals" of Tacitus. 2d ed. Manchester: University Press, 1960.
- Wellesley, Kenneth. "Can you trust Tacitus?" Greece & Rome, N.S. 1 (1954), 13-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tacitus as a Military Historian." Tacitus. Edited by T. A. Dorey. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Three Historical Puzzles in Histories III." Classical Quarterly, L (1956), 207-14.

## VITA

Frances Wilcox Butt, the daughter of Bruce Wilcox Butt and the former Frances Godwin Bell, was born September 13, 1944, in Suffolk, Virginia. Educated in Virginia public schools, she was graduated from Lexington High School in 1962 as valedictorian of her class; in addition, in 1960 and 1961 she was a state winner in the Latin Tournament sponsored by the Classical Association of Virginia. From 1962 to 1966 she attended Sweet Briar College on a scholarship where she was consistently on the Dean's List. She was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and graduated magna cum laude.

On July 9, 1966, she married David Howard Slaughter of Lynchburg, Virginia, the son of Samuel Garland Slaughter, Jr. and the former Rhoda Howard. She taught Latin for one year in Lynchburg. She and her husband then moved to Richmond where she has subsequently taught Latin at St. Catherine's School and is presently the Department Chairman. Her husband is employed by Wheat, First Securities in its Data Processing Division. They have one daughter, Frances Garland, born September 11, 1972.