

# THE ANNALS OF TACITUS

BOOKS 1-6

EDITED WITH A COMMENTARY

*RANCIS*  
*Richard* BY  
F. R. D. GOODYEAR

VOLUME II: *ANNALS* 1.55-81  
AND *ANNALS* 2



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE

LONDON NEW YORK NEW ROCHELLE

MELBOURNE SYDNEY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE LIBRARY  
BRYN MAWR, PA. 19010



Rhescuporis inter metum et iram cunctatus maluit patrati  
quam incepti facinoris reus esse: occidi Cotyn iubet mor-  
temque sponte sumptam ementitur. nec tamen Caesar placi- 2  
tas semel artes mutauit, sed defuncto Pandusa, quem sibi  
5 infensum Rhescuporis arguebat, Pomponium Flaccum,  
ueterem stipendiis et arta cum rege amicitia eoque accommo-  
datiorem ad fallendum, ob id maxime Moesiae praefecit.

67. Flaccus in Thraciam transgressus per ingentia pro- 1  
missa quamuis ambiguum et scelera sua reputantem perpulit  
10 ut praesidia Romana intraret. circumdata hinc regi specie  
honoris ualida manus, tribunique et centuriones monendo  
suadendo, et quanto longius abscedebatur apertiore custodia,  
postremo gnarum necessitatis in urbem traxere. accusatus 2  
in senatu ab uxore Cotyis damnatur, ut procul regno tenere-  
15 tur. Thraecia in Rhoemetalcen filium, quem paternis consiliis  
aduersatum constabat, inque liberos Cotyis diuiditur; iisque  
nondum adultis Trebellenus Rufus praetura functus datur  
qui regnum interim tractaret, exemplo quo maiores M.  
Lepidum Ptolemaei liberis tutorem in Aegyptum miserant.  
20 Rhescuporis Alexandriam deuectus atque illic fugam temp- 3  
tans an ficto crimine interficitur.

68. Per idem tempus Vonones, quem amotum in Ciliciam 1  
memorauit, corruptis custodibus effugere ad Armenios, inde  
Albanos Heniochosque et consanguineum sibi regem Scy-  
25 tharum conatus est. specie uenandi omissis maritimis locis  
auia saltuum petiit, mox pernecitate equi ad amnem Pyra-  
mum contendit, cuius pontes accolae ruperant audita regis  
fuga; neque uado penetrari poterat. igitur in ripa fluminis a 2  
Vibio Frontone praefecto equitum uincitur; mox Remmius  
30 euocatus, priori custodiae regis adpositus, quasi per iram  
gladio eum transigit. unde maior fides conscientia sceleris et  
metu indicii mortem Vononi inlatam.

69. At Germanicus Aegypto remeans cuncta quae apud 1  
legiones aut urbes iusserat abolita uel in contrarium uersa

4 Pandusa *Nipperdey*: padusa *M*

23 inde *Wopkens*: inde in *M*



cognoscit. hinc graues in Pisonem contumeliae, nec minus  
acerba quae ab illo in Caesarem temptabantur. dein Piso  
2 abire Suria statuit. mox aduersa Germanici uoletudine  
detentus, ubi recreatum accepit uotaque pro incolumitate  
soluebantur, admotas hostias, sacrificalem apparatus, festam 5  
Antiochensium plebem per lictores proturbat. tum Seleuciam  
degreditur, opperiens aegritudinem quae rursum Germanico  
3 acciderat. saeuam uim morbi augebat persuasio ueneni a  
Pisone accepti; et reperiiebantur solo ac parietibus erutae  
humanorum corporum reliquiae, carmina et deuotiones et 10  
nomen Germanici plumbeis tabulis insculptum, semusti  
cineres ac tabe obliti aliaque malefica, quis creditur animas  
numinibus infernis sacrari. simul missi a Pisone incusabantur  
ut uoletudinis aduersa rimantes.

1 70. Ea Germanico haud minus ira quam per metum 15  
accepta. si limen obsideretur, si effundendus spiritus sub  
oculis inimicorum foret, quid deinde miserrimae coniugi,  
quid infantibus liberis euenturum? lenta uideri ueneficia:  
festinare et urgere, ut prouinciam, ut legiones solus habeat.  
sed non usque eo defectum Germanicum, neque praemia 20  
2 caedis apud interfectorem mansura. componit epistulas quis  
amicitiam ei renuntiabat; addunt plerique iussum prouincia  
decedere. nec Piso moratus ultra nauis soluit moderabaturque  
cursui quo propius regrederetur, si mors Germanici Suriam  
aperuisset. 25

1 71. Caesar paulisper ad spem erectus, dein fesso corpore,  
ubi finis aderat, adsistentes amicos in hunc modum adlo-  
quitur: 'si fato concederem, iustus mihi dolor etiam aduersus  
deos esset, quod me parentibus liberis patriae intra iuuentam  
praemature exitu raperent. nunc scelere Pisonis et Plancinae 30  
interceptus ultimas preces pectoribus uestris relinquo:  
referatis patri ac fratri, quibus acerbissimis dilaceratus,  
quibus insidiis circumuentus miserrimam uitam pessima

2 temptabantur] intentabantur Wurm

24 quo Lipsius: qui M

12 tabe] tabo Lipsius



si temeritas afuerit praepeditusque sit percussas tot uictoriis  
 3 Germanias seruitio premere. quod si solus arbiter rerum, si  
 iure et nomine regio fuisset, tanto promptius adsecuturum  
 gloriam militiae quantum clementia temperantia, ceteris bonis  
 4 artibus praestitisset. corpus antequam cremaretur nudatum 5  
 in foro Antiochensium, qui locus sepulturae destinabatur,  
 praetuleritne ueneficii signa parum constitit; nam ut quis  
 misericordia in Germanicum et praesumpta suspicione aut  
 fauore in Pisonem pronior, diuersi interpretabantur.

1 74. Consultatum inde inter legatos quique alii senatorum 10  
 aderant, quisnam Suriae praeficeretur. et ceteris modice nisis,  
 inter Vibium Marsum et Cn. Sentium diu quaesitum; dein  
 2 Marsus seniori et acrius tendenti Sentio concessit. isque  
 infamem ueneficiis ea in prouincia et Plancinae percaram  
 nomine Martinam in urbem misit, postulantibus Vitellio ac 15  
 Veranio ceterisque, qui crimina et accusationem tamquam  
 aduersus receptos iam reos instruebant.

1 75. At Agrippina, quamquam defessa luctu et corpore  
 aegro, omnium tamen quae ultionem morarentur intolerans,  
 ascendit classem cum cineribus Germanici et liberis, miseran- 20  
 tibus cunctis, quod femina nobilitate princeps, pulcherrimo  
 modo matrimonio, inter uenerantes gratantisque aspici  
 solita, tunc feralis reliquias sinu ferret, incerta ultionis, anxia  
 sui et infelici fecunditate fortunae totiens obnoxia.

2 Pisonem interim apud Coum insulam nuntius adsequitur 25  
 excessisse Germanicum. quo intemperanter accepto caedit  
 uictimas, adit templa, neque ipse gaudium moderans et magis  
 insolescente Plancina, quae luctum amissae sororis tum  
 1 primum laeto cultu mutauit. 76. adfluebant centuriones  
 monebantque prompta illi legionum studia: repeteret prouin- 30  
 ciam non iure ablatam et uacuam.

2 Igitur quid agendum consultanti M. Piso filius properan-  
 dum in urbem censebat: nihil adhuc inexpressibile admissum,  
 neque suspiciones imbecillas aut inania famae pertimescenda.

---

9 interpretabantur *Beroaldus*: interpretantur *M*



## COMMENTARY 2.69.1

440 *Aegypto aduenio domum* onwards, shows this ablative had long been quite regular: see Hofmann-Szantyr 102. Quintilian, to be sure, is wont to sponsor lost causes, but I doubt whether this ever was a cause to be lost in the first place. Perhaps some distinction, evident to him, eludes us, or perhaps his text is corrupt.<sup>1</sup>

**2.69.1 cuncta . . . uersa** Cf. Suet. *Gaius* 3.3. Germanicus' authority, even in his absence, ought to have sufficed to prevent Piso taking such action. Since it did not, his excursion, as has been said, seems irresponsible. Koestermann, 'Mission' 351, suspects Tiberius privately lent Piso encouragement. One cannot disprove it. But was Tiberius really indifferent to the damage to Roman prestige the quarrels between Piso and Germanicus must have entailed and which Koestermann, *ibid.* n.49, admits?

**2.69.1 temptabantur** Often changed to *intentabantur*, which would have apt analogy at, e.g., 3.36.1, 12.47.4. But there is equally good analogy for the paradosis at 4.14.3 *multa ab iis [sc. histrionibus] in publicum seditiose, foeda per domos temptari*. The actors did not merely attempt these disgraceful things: they actually did them, and tried to get away with them. In such contexts *temptare* can have the force 'impudently do/say/demand': cf. 1.19.3 *si tamen tenderent in pace temptare quae ne ciuiliū quidem bellorum uictores expostulauerint*.

**2.69.1 dein . . . statuit** At 70.2, after the *renuntiatio amicitiae*, T. says *addunt plerique iussum prouincia decedere*. Perhaps then he rejects that version of Piso's departure, and credits only what he reports here, that Piso himself resolved to go. But several considerations suggest 70.2 implies no more than is actually said, that most, but not all, T.'s sources mention the order: (i) it is doubtful whether Piso could relinquish his command without permission, (ii) what follows, *nec Piso moratus ultra*, referring back to *detentus* and *opperiens* here, links more naturally with a direct order to leave than with *renuntiatio amicitiae* alone, and therefore T. appears to assume the order was given (cf. 76.1 *prouinciam . . . ablatam*, 76.2 *ademptione . . . prouinciae*, 78.1 *seque pulsum*), (iii) the two passages are not contradictory, since, if Piso decided to leave, then put off going, Germanicus, in the state of mind T. describes, might well demand he should do so, whether that exceeded the scope of his *imperium maius* or not, and (iv), unless Germanicus issued an order in due form, the conduct of his friends after his death is unaccountable, for in barring from his province a *legatus*

---

<sup>1</sup> His other examples of solecism through *detractio*, viz. *ambulo uiam* and *ne hoc fecit*, are glaring enough. Did he in fact write *Aegyptios uenio*, solecistic for *ad A. u.*?



## COMMENTARY 2.69.1

legally appointed and not legally removed they would court prosecution under the *lex de ui publica*, if not the *lex maiestatis*. It may be claimed that Suet. *Gaius* 3.3 *ne tunc quidem ultra progressus quam ut amicitiam ei more maiorum renuntiaret* supports the present passage against 70.2, but, as everyone agrees, Suetonius closely follows an extremely partisan source: if the order's validity or wisdom was in any question, this source was likely to omit it. Further, since it may well be identical with the source known to T. at 70.2 as divergent from the majority, we cannot argue Suetonius provides an independent control by which to test T.'s information: a source does not acquire extra authority because two writers use it.

**2.69.1 abire Suria** Similarly 19.1 *abire sedibus*. The verb is found in Plautus with abl. of local separation (so *Merc.* 654 *hac urbe abis*) and in prose from Livy (so 21.19.11 *abire finibus*): cf. also Val. Max. 2.9.8 *abitueros se Italia iurauerant*, Just. 4.5.2 *ut abirent Sicilia*, and see Hofmann-Szantyr 102-3.

**2.69.2 aduersa . . . ualetudine** It is useless to debate its nature. To describe the symptoms of illness was not part of T.'s task, as he understood it.

**2.69.2 admotas . . . proturbat** Why? Mommsen, *Staatsr.* 2.825, argues that *uota* for male members of the imperial family other than the *princeps* were forbidden or frowned on, and cites *inter alia* Tiberius' sharp reaction to the association of Nero and Drusus with *uota pro incolumitate principis* (4.17.1-2). Even if that is generally true (Mommsen admits some exceptions), only regular, annual *uota* are clearly in question: this is not such a case. Marsh 94 n.1 contends that Piso considered Germanicus a traitor (cf. 78.1) and vows on his behalf treasonable. Blind rage is a likelier explanation. It is likeliest of all, however, that what happened has been distorted to Piso's disadvantage. Perhaps, as Professor Crook surmises, the crowd got out of hand and he merely intervened to restore order.

**2.69.2 admotas** The familiarity of *admouere arae/altaribus* allows the dative to be dispensed with: cf. Val. Max. 1.1.4 *propter exta parum curiose admota*, if Kempf repairs that passage correctly.

**2.69.2 sacrificalem apparatus** Cf. iii.56.1 *disiecto sacrificii apparatu*. The expression has no special colour and *sacrificalis* is scarcely a Tacitean coinage: cf. Agen. Agr. p. 33 T *terminos sacrificales . . . ponunt*, ibid. *adimi fides sacrificialibus palis*, Apul. Met. 9.1 *sacrificales epulas . . . cenitabat*, SHA Prob. 5.1 *donatus est . . . patera sacrificiali*.

**2.69.2 festam . . . plebem** Applied thus to persons, 'festive, making holiday', the adjective is distinctly poetical: cf. Hor. Carm. 3.18.11-12 *festus in pratis uacat otioso* | *cum boue pagus*, Sen. Ag. 311-12 *tibi festa caput* |



## COMMENTARY 2.69.2

*turba coronat*, 645 *festi patres adeunt aras*, but also Mela 2.9 *festu coetu familiarium*.

**2.69.2 Seleuciam** Seleucia Pieria, the port of Antioch.

**2.69.2 Seleuciam degreditur** Either 'goes down to S.' or 'sets off for S.': cf. *A.* 6.1 *in urbem degressus*, 11.21.2. Lipsius' *digreditur* is gratuitous.

**2.69.2 opperiens aegritudinem** Pregnant, 'awaiting the outcome of the illness': cf. 4.71.3 *ut cunctationes principis opperiretur* (Muretus: *aperirentur* M).

**2.69.3 saeuam ... accepti** By clear implication T. discounts poisoning: it exists only as a *persuasio* in Germanicus' mind (and his friends'), which serves, in his anguish, to intensify the violence of his illness. Had T. been concerned to foster the suspicion poison was indeed used, he would have avoided drawing attention to *saeuam uim morbi*. Here then he can be acquitted of culpable ambiguity. Perhaps he cannot entirely at 73.4, but he gives the matter prominence mainly because it was much discussed at the time and because it figured in Piso's trial, when the charge failed to stick (3.14.1).

**2.69.3 et reperiabantur** Cf. Dio 57.18.9. Reality, not fevered imaginings. By whom and at whose instigation these horrors were contrived naturally remains obscure, but we know enough about the darker sides of Roman life not to cast doubt on the story. Belief in the efficacy of black magic was very wide-spread (see on 27.2 *magorum sacra*) and the upper echelons of society were not immune from its contagion.

**2.69.3 solo ... erutae** The simple ablative with *eruo* is not confined to the poets, as Koestermann asserts: cf. Liv. 23.19.13, Plin. *N.H.* 20.113.

**2.69.3 humanorum ... reliquiae** Use of human remains for black magic has abundant attestation. Suffice it to adduce two devotees of the macabre, Lucan (6.533ff) and Apuleius (*Met.* 3.17).

**2.69.3 carmina ... insculptum** 'Incantations, curses, lead tablets inscribed with Germanicus' name' or 'versified curses on lead tablets' etc.: the three items variously specify one and the same thing.<sup>1</sup> The evidence which could be cited for *deuotio* and kindred practices is again substantial. I select from literature 4.52.1 *ueneficia in*

---

<sup>1</sup> *carmina* is unclear: verses may be meant, but not necessarily in this context. I am loth to accept that T. should be so verbose as he here appears, but see no alternative. If *deuotiones* could have a very concrete sense and = 'voodoo objects' or the like, we might obtain an apt distinction. But the material collected in *TLL* s.v. and said to be complete does not commend that possibility.



## COMMENTARY 2.69.3

*principem et deuotiones obiectabat*, Ov. *Am.* 3.7.27–30, *Her.* 6.89–92, Plin. *N.H.* 28.19 *defigi quidem diris deprecationibus nemo non metuit*, Paul. *Sent.* 5.23.15 *qui sacra impia nocturnaue, ut quem obcantarent defigerent obligarent, fecerint*, SHA *Gord.* 11.9 *Maximinum cum filio dis inferis deuouemus*, Macr. *Sat.* 3.9.10, 5.19.7 *ad . . . carmina et deuotiones confugientem*, Hieron. *Vita Hil.* 21 *subter limen domus puellae portenta quaedam uerborum et portentosas figuras sculptas in aeris Cyprii lamina defodit*,<sup>1</sup> from numerous curse-tablets, which are mainly of lead, Audollent 129 *hunc ego apud uostrum numen demando deuoueo desacrifico*, 190 *dii inferi, uobis commendo illius membra colorem figuram caput . . .* [another thirty particulars] . . . *dii inferi, si illam uidero tabescentem . . .*, 199 *hos homines omnes infereis deis deligo*,<sup>2</sup> and in addition that memorable inscription *ILS 3001 Ioui opt. max. . . . quod is sceleratissimi serui publici infando latrocinio defixa monumentis decurionum nomina numine suo eruit ac uindicauit*. Germanicus' fear, the normal reaction according to Pliny, should not be held against him. And, we may presume, a charge of sorcery, as distinct from poisoning,<sup>3</sup> might have been found proved at Piso's trial, had it been possible to pin responsibility upon him.

**2.69.3 semusti . . . obliti** T. expresses himself obscurely, but seems to mean partially burnt animal/human remains. While *tabes* turns into *cinis* in the course of burning, it is a mystery how *cinis* can be smeared with it. It is no less unclear how these remains differ from those mentioned above. Perhaps as resulting from cremation, if the others did not, perhaps as not being recognizably human.

**2.69.3 tabe** Lipsius' conjecture is very widely accepted, and wrongly. Furneaux argues for it thus: 'Tacitus appears to be elsewhere careful to distinguish the words and to use *tabes* only of disease and decay, *tabum* of putrefied animal matter'. That is misleading. Of T.'s seven examples of *tabes* only two, *iv.*81.1 and *i.*53.2, fall definitely within the semantic area 'decay/putrefaction', here in question.<sup>4</sup> *tabum* too he uses twice, *ii.*70.1 *infecta tabo humus*, *iii.*35.1 *noxia tabo humus*. In the former pair of examples *tabes* does indeed refer to the process of decay, while in the latter *tabum* denotes, as usual, putrescent matter. But four examples are insufficient to show T. observes a consistent distinction, particularly when three are found in the *Histories*,

<sup>1</sup> I owe this last reference to Audollent, *Defixionum tabellae* p. cxxi.

<sup>2</sup> These excerpts are much 'corrected' and restored.

<sup>3</sup> For the Romans the difference between poisoning and sorcery was, to be sure, much less apparent than it is to us, as their use of *ueneficium* for both sufficiently indicates. Similarly with *uenenum*.

<sup>4</sup> Of the other five two relate to pestilence, three are metaphorical.



## COMMENTARY 2.69.3

from which the *Annals* differ in many details of vocabulary. To determine whether the *paradosis* can stand we must ask whether *tabes* = *tabum* is well enough attested in earlier writing to have been freely available to T. if he cared to use it. And in fact it is well attested, especially in poetry: cf. Luc. 4.321-3 *saniem tabemque ferarum . . . infundas*, 7.791 *sidentis in tabem spectat aceruos*, 826-7 *tabemque cruentae | caedis odorati*, [Sen.] *H.O.* 1194 *hydram tabe pauissem mea*, Oct. 511-13 *flere nec licuit suos, | non gemere dira tabe polluto foro, | stillante sanie per putres uultus graui*, St. *Th.* 3.129 *hae pressant in tabe comas*, also Plin. *N.H.* 2.223 *quod ferarum occisa corpora in tabem uisu suo resoluat*, Suet. *Vit.* 10.3 *abhorrentis quosdam cadauerum tabem*. If, in face of such evidence, we deny T. admitted a mild and common poeticism in the *Annals* because he happened not to use it in two passages of the *Histories*, we should, to be consistent ourselves, adopt scores of textual changes Wölfflin and others propose in order to make T. consistent.

**2.69.3 malefica** 'Devices of black magic': ἄπαξ. Beroaldus wrote *malefica*, used of black magic at, e.g., Apul. *Ap.* 42, *Met.* 9.29 *quae deuotionibus et maleficiis quiduis efficere posse credebatur*. But T., I think, wanted to make the concrete sense quite distinct, and he is ready enough to substantivize adjectives elsewhere: cf. 1.62.2 *feralia*, also, it seems, unique, 2.57.1 *socialia*.

**2.69.3 missi a Pisone** Cf. v.5.2 *transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant*, 13.2 *fore ut ualesceret Oriens profectique Iudaea rerum potirentur*. Such substantivization of the perfect participle masculine is not common, though already found in republican Latin, e.g. Caes. *Bell. Ciu.* 1.18.6 *missi ad Pompeium reuertuntur*: see Hofmann-Szantyr 156.

**2.69.3 ut . . . rimantes** What T. suspects Domitian's emissaries were doing at Agricola's death-bed.

**2.70.1 si effundendus spiritus** Cf. iii.66.4, Cic. *Phil.* 14.32, Sen. *Ep.* 78.4.

**2.70.1 infantibus liberis** Gaius and Julia were probably with him (54.1, Suet. *Gaius* 10.1). 75.1 might suggest the others were too, but in P Oxy 2435 he complains of separation from his children.

**2.70.1 defectum** 'Enfeebled': cf. 4.29.1. A usage perhaps stemming from Augustan poetry, but soon accepted in prose, e.g. Colum. 1 *pr.* 12, Sen. *Ep.* 58.33, Plin. *N.H.* 23.53.

**2.70.2 componit epistulas** Cf. iii.63.2 and see Heubner *ad loc.*<sup>1</sup>

**2.70.2 amicitiam ei renuntiabat** Cf. Suet. *Gaius* 3.3 and see on 3.12.2 *odero . . . ulciscar*.

---

<sup>1</sup> On 1.30.4 *epistulis* I said T. and the younger Pliny were perhaps the first to use this plural for the singular. It seems already so to be used at Sen. *Contr.* 1.7.3, as Dr Winterbottom kindly points out.



## COMMENTARY 2.73.4

*ut tinctum ueneno igne confici nequeat.* And Plin. *N.H.* 11.187 records how the matter was debated at Piso's trial, Vitellius alleging the condition of the heart as proof of poison, the defence attributing it to cardiac disease. T. shows commendable caution here, even if he does not dispel suspicion of foul play. And caution was very wise. The ancients were largely helpless in face of allegations of poisoning. Since they did not in general dissect bodies or conduct any post-mortems,<sup>1</sup> and since they had no means to analyse egesta, they could not obtain reliable evidence from the supposed victim.

**2.73.4 ut quis . . . interpretabantur** Cf. 4.36.3 and see Wölfflin, *Ausg. Schr.* 186.

**2.73.4 praesumpta suspicione** Cf. 3.46.1 *praesumpta spes* (similarly Val. Max. 1.5.3), Sen. *Dial.* 6.7.4 *praesumpta opinio* (also Quint. 2.17.28), Quint. 1 *pr.* 20 *praesumpta desperatione*.

**2.73.4 interpretabantur** *constitit* above makes this correction inevitable.

**2.74.1 consultatum . . . praeficeretur** Perhaps regular procedure for filling the vacancy caused by the sudden death of a *legatus Caesaris*.<sup>2</sup> Tiberius confirmed Sentius' appointment, for he still occupied the post in A.D. 21 or later (*CIL* 3.6703). At i.60 and ii.97.1 we find *legati legionum* acting *pari iure* in the absence of a governor, but in such troubled times normal practices might fall into abeyance.

Why, one wonders, did not Germanicus appoint Piso's successor? He may have intended to govern Syria himself, or else he was too far gone to make the decision.

**2.74.1 Vibium Marsum** C. Vibius Marsus. *PIR*<sup>1</sup> V 388, *RE* 8A. 1973-5 = Vibius 39 (Hanslik). See also Grant, *Aspects* 55-6. *Suffectus* in A.D. 17. He became proconsul of Africa and, after surviving Tiberius by the skin of his teeth (6.47.2-48.1), legate of Syria (11.10.1). T. calls him *inlustris studiis*.

**2.74.1 Cn. Sentium** Cn. Sentius Saturninus. *PIR*<sup>1</sup> S 295, *RE* 2A.1528-31 = Sentius 11 (Groag). *Suffectus* in A.D. 4.

**2.74.1 quaesitum** 'The question lay', Furneaux. But very close in sense to *certatum*: cf. ii.38.1 *numquam postea nisi de principatu quaesitum*.

<sup>1</sup> In Ptolemaic times Alexandrian physicians had performed dissection of human bodies and probably vivisection too: see Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1.348ff. But apparently the practice did not spread or long continue.

<sup>2</sup> An imperial legate's removal by a higher authority other than the *princeps*, as on this occasion, was too exceptional a contingency to have been provided for.



## COMMENTARY 2.74.1

**2.74.1 *seniori . . . concessit*** Similarly 30.1 *nec ipsi inter se concederent*, 3.43.3 *Varro inuvalidus senecta uigenti Silio concessit*. Pace Furneaux, this is not an elliptical form of the expression found, e.g., at 11.24.3.

**2.74.2 *percaram*** See on 1.7.4 *permodesto*.

**2.74.2 *nomine Martinam*** T. attaches *nomine* to various foreign names, like Martina, e.g. A. 2.94, iv.82.1, 1.57.2, 2.62.2, 13.15.3 *attinebatur damnata ueneficii nomine Locusta, multa scelerum fama*, also to the names of Romans of low status, 1.35.5, and slaves, ii.72.2, 2.39.1. It may be disdainful, as is *quidam*, yet some of these foreigners are noble or royal. I think it serves rather as padding when only a single name is available and would sound bald in isolation.

**2.74.2 *Martinam*** See 3.7.2 *uulgatum . . . reperta* and note there. Her name, quite common epigraphically, gives no firm clue to her origin.

**2.74.2 *qui . . . instruebant*** Their haste evokes wry disapproval: cf. 57.2, 79.1, and Tiberius' remarks at 3.12.3-4. Where Germanicus is not directly involved T. can be a model of objectivity.

**2.75.1 at *Agrippina . . . obnoxia*** A long and carefully planned sentence in which, characteristically, the greater weight falls on the appendage introduced by the ablative absolute *miserantibus cunctis*. In such structures the main clause functions for T. as a pivot, not a climax. Here he contrives (i) to start a thread of narrative which he will resume momentarily at 79.1, when the paths of Piso and Agrippina cross, and again in the striking and unusual beginning of book 3, (ii) to fill out his portrait of Agrippina as a woman of indomitable determination and courage, (iii) to instil forebodings of the tragic future which awaits her and her family.

**2.75.1 *omnium . . . intolerans*** See on 1.31.4 *laborum intolerans*.

**2.75.1 *liberis*** See on 70.1 *infantibus liberis*.

**2.75.1 *pulcherrimo modo matrimonio*** A brachylogical ablative of quality, I think: cf. 1.19.2 *Blaesus multa dicendi arte*, 57.4 *uxor Arminii . . . mariti magis quam parentis animo*, 4.58.1 *profectio arto comitatu fuit*, 6.47.2 *Marsus quoque uetustis honoribus . . . erat*. But it could be taken as causal ablative.

**2.75.1 *uenerantes gratantisque*** Which is more jarring, juxtaposition of *-antes* and *-antes* or switch from *-es* to *-is*? Not knowing the answer I leave the paradosis undisturbed.<sup>1</sup> Halm wrote *uenerantis*, older editors *gratantesque*.

---

<sup>1</sup> The distribution of *-is* accusatives in *Ann.* 1-6 reveals nothing of note, save a slight tendency to clustering. And here *feralis* follows.



7 Tum exuto iustitio reditum ad munia, et Drusus Illyricos  
ad exercitus profectus est, erectis omnium animis <spe> 5  
petendae e Pisone ultionis et crebro questu quod uagus in-  
terim per amoena Asiae atque Achaiae adroganti et sub-  
2 dola mora scelerum probationes subuerteret. (nam uulga-  
tum erat missam, ut dixi, a Cn. Sentio famosam ueneficiis  
Martinam subita morte Brundisii extinctam uenenumque 10  
nodo crinium eius occultatum nec ulla in corpore signa  
8 sumpti exitii reperta.) at Piso, praemisso in urbem filio da-  
tisque mandatis per quae principem molliret, ad Drusum  
pergit, quem haud fratris interitu trucem quam remoto  
aemulo aequiorem sibi sperabat. Tiberius, quo integrum  
iudicium est



**7.1 exuto iustitio** Though T. likes this metaphor elsewhere (1.2.1n.), the present unparalleled expression is considerably more vivid than e.g. *iustitium remittere* (so Liv. 3.5.14, 10.21.6) and suggests simultaneously the shedding of clothes of mourning (see 2.2 above): cf. Sen. *Cons. Helv.* 16.2 *imposita lugubria numquam exuerunt*, [Quint.] *Decl.* 17.14 (p. 313.24) *non exuo, non depono sordes*. Cf. also 11.20.2 *otium exueret*, Petron. 121.141–2 *exuit ... moras* (TLL 5.2.2115.51–7). For the *iustitium* itself see above, p. 78 and n. 1, 6.1n. (*monuit edicto*).

**Drusus Illyricos ad exercitus profectus est** In AD 17 Drusus had been given a command in Illyricum with ‘proconsular *imperium*, covering the provinces of Pannonia and Dalmatia. That is obvious – and the historian did not need to register it’ (RP 3.1214). See further 2.44.1 and n., adding J. J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* (1969) 161 and 167–8 for the territory and its nomenclature. Journeys are elsewhere used, as here, to effect narrative transitions from one episode to the next (see P. G. Walsh, *Livy* (1961) 180–1, Kraus on Liv. 6.2.14); and T.’s reference to the seemingly unimportant detail of Drusus’ journey provides the background to Piso’s (otherwise unattested) meeting with Drusus (8.1–2), which in turn sets up the subsequent references to Tib.’s son at 11.1 and 19.3.

The *iustitium* (above) seems not to have ended till late March or early April (6.3n. *ludorum*). Hence from T.’s text one would naturally infer that Drusus’ visit to Illyricum was extremely brief, since he returns at 11.1 below to celebrate an *ouatio* which in the event was deferred and, after the intervening narrative of Piso’s trial (12–19.2), is at length recorded at 19.3. The *ouatio* is dated to 28 May by the *Fasti Ostienses* (19.3n.). None of this seemed at all controversial until the discovery of the *senatus consultum* resulting from Piso’s trial, which is dated to 10 December.

Now an inscription found on the island of Issa, off the Dalmatian coast, appears to record that Drusus dedicated a parade-ground there in AD 20: *Drusus Caesar T[ | Augusti nepos cos. de[ | pontifex augur camp[ | Publio Dolabella leg. pro* (D. Rendić-Miočević, *VAHD* 54 (1952) 49–50 and plate 11). If one infers from the words *cos. de[*s. that the dedication took place late in the year, a natural conclusion to draw from the combined evidence of the inscription and of T.’s text is that the dedication took place without Drusus’ being present, since he had returned to Rome to celebrate his *ouatio* in the first half of the year (so Wilkes (above) 229). But, since *SCPP* carries the date of 10 December, and since T. links Piso’s trial with Drusus’ return from Illyricum (11.1), it would be possible to argue that the Issa inscription complements this joint evidence and that both Piso’s trial and Drusus’ visit to Illyricum took place late in the year. On this hypothesis, however, we would also have to assume that the date of Drusus’ *ouatio* has been wrongly recorded on the *Fasti Os-*



*tienses* or that it is not to be linked, as it is by T., either with Drusus' visit or with Piso's trial. Alternatively one could argue that Drusus made two visits to Illyricum, the first in the spring (recorded by T.) and the second later (recorded by the Issa inscription), and that T. has confused the latter with the former and has mistakenly associated it with Drusus' *ouatio* on 28 May.

On the other hand, we know both that members of the imperial family were sometimes designated to consulships well in advance (23.1n. *ludorum*) and that there was no regular timetable of consular elections in Tib.'s reign (49.2n. *sententiaque*). On either or both of these bases one could argue that the words *cos. de[s.]* in the Issa inscription do not point to a date late in AD 20 and that the inscription does not contradict the chronological inferences which scholars have drawn from T.'s narrative. If so, we are returned to the fundamental problem that T.'s narrative and SCPP seem chronologically incompatible. See further above, pp. 67–75.

**erectis omnium animis <spe> petendae e Pisone ultionis** T. characteristically uses an appended abl. abs. rather than a main verb to introduce the avenging of Germanicus which is the main theme of this section (above, p. 110).

The abl. abs. is followed in the paradosis by an apparent instance of the genit. gerundive of purpose, while the parallel abl. *crebro questu* (below) is followed by a *quod*-clause. Although such *uariatio* of genit. gerundive ~ *quod* would certainly be Tacitean (cf. 9.2, *H.* 4.25.2), this is one of the harshest exs. of the former construction in T. (Platner 467–8): whereas in other cases the genit. is either dependent on a noun (e.g. 12.24.1) or is used where the subject of the clause or phrase acts for the sake of (achieving) something (e.g. 9.2, 27.1, 41.3, 2.59.1, 13.11.2), neither of these conditions obtains here. What one might naturally expect after *erectis* is either *in/ad spem* (as 2.25.1 *ad spem belli ... erexit*, *H.* 1.4.3 and *H.*) or *spe* (as Cic. *Fin.* 1.67, Flor. 2.5.6, Amm. 20.4.5, 27.12.7): see esp. Cic. *Clu.* 200 *spe ... erigere animum*, a passage which T. echoes later in this episode (16.3n. *quatenus*); for *spe ... ultionis* cf. 13.19.3. We have therefore printed Freinsheim's supplement, which is also palaeographically simple (haplography).<sup>1</sup> For the resulting *uariatio* of abl. ~ *quod*-clause see

<sup>1</sup> It would be even simpler to combine Heinsius' *petendae ... ultioni* with the suggestion that T. originally wrote *set crebro questu* (cf. 4.7.1 *set crebro querens*, where M reads *-s et crebro querens*). For the normal *ad* + gerundive (as *H.* 5.15.2 *ad maturandum summae rei discrimen erexit*) T. regularly prefers the dat. gerundive of purpose (Adams (1972) 372), with which the *constructio ad sensum* of *animis* seems much less harsh (cf. e.g. *H.* 4.10.1 *motis ad ultionem animis*, Cic. *Acad.* 2.11 *ad audiendum animos ereximus*).



Sörbom 115, Martin (1953) 91–2, Catterall 316–17. For *petendae* ... *ultionis* cf. Liv. 31.24.2, Sen. *Ira* 2.32.3, Clem. 1.19.3, [Quint.] *Decl.* 331.23–5 (p. 199W), Apul. *Flor.* 6.

**crebro questu** Abl. of attendant circumstances and parallel to the abl. abs. *erectis* ... *animis* above; for such *uariatio* see Martin (1953) 92.

**per amoena Asiae atque Achaiae** The cities of Asia 'were natural stopping places in a Roman gentleman's grand tour of the East' (Nisbet–Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.7.1). For neut. plur. *amoena* + T.'s favourite genit. construction (1.3n.) cf. *H.* 3.76.2, Val. Fl. 1.843, Quint. 12.9.2.

**adroganti et subdola mora** Delay was expected of the Roman abroad (e.g. Hor. *Ep.* 1.3.5 *an pingues Asiae campi collesque morantur?*), but that of Piso, who had been so counselled by the incongruously named Domitius Celer (2.77.3 *an festinamus cum Germanici cineribus adpellere, ut te inauditum et indefensum planctus Agrippinae ac uulgu imperitum primo rumore rapiant?*), was *adrogans et subdola*: the former adj. looks back alliteratively to his wandering *per amoena Asiae atque Achaiae* (he prefers tourism to facing justice), the latter looks forward likewise to *scelerum* ... *subuerteret* (he is actually perverting the course of justice while on his tour: see 2n. below). Each adj. is also applied elsewhere to Tib. himself (1.8.5 and 1.81.2, 6.51.3): it is typical of a tyrant to eliminate good men and to be surrounded by those like himself (Plat. *Rep.* 567b–c, Xen. *Hiero* 5.2, Arist. *Pol.* 1314a4–5; Walker 214, 242 n. 1). For *adroganti* cf. also Quint. 12.3.12 *pigritiae adrogantioris*.

**probationes** 'proofs' (*OLD* 4, a meaning first attested in Sen. *Contr.* 7 *praef.* 1; see also H. on *H.* 2.63.1). The plur. form, despite the single piece of evidence at 2 below, is the natural exaggeration of the crowd.

**7.2 uulgatum erat missam, ut dixi, ... famosam ... Marti-**  
**nam** A cross-reference (cf. 18.1n.) to 2.74.2. The tense of *uulgatum erat* indicates anteriority to the time of *crebro questu quod ... subuerteret*. T. regularly couples *famosus* with an abl. (G–G 450a) but the construction seems not to be found earlier than his contemporaries Plin. *Ep.* 2.11.1, Suet. *Claud.* 16.1. For Cn. Sentius Saturninus see 2.74.1n.; *RP* 3.1379.

**nodo** For the hair-style see Nisbet–Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 2.11.24.

**nec ulla ... signa sumpti exitii reperta** *sumo* can be used equally of drinking (*OLD* 3a), e.g. *uenenum* (Nep. *Hann.* 12.5), and of committing suicide (*OLD* 5d), e.g. *sumendae mortis* (50.2, 13.30.2, but elsewhere usually with *sponte*); *exitium* can be used equally as a synonym for *mors* (*OLD* 3), 2) and metonymically of the cause of death (*TLL* 5.2.1531.48ff., *OLD* 3), e.g. of poison at Sil. 13.296–7 *dum dat penetrare medullas | exitio*. Whatever the right combination of meanings here (there is a similar case at 4.11.1



*exitium offerret*), the important point is that the sentence is negated (*nec ulla ... signa ... reperta*). According to some scholars 'the inference would seem to be that she had not committed suicide, but had been murdered in some subtle manner' (F.); others believe that the accent is on *signa* ('there were no *signs* that she had committed suicide <but she had>'), arguing that the absence of signs in her case provided evidence that she had poisoned Germanicus, the circumstances of whose death had been unclear (2.73.4 *praetuleritne ueneficii signa parum constitit*). Either interpretation is possible in itself, but the context seems decisively to favour the former. Given the relationship between this and the preceding sentence (*nam*), an interpretation is required which explains the people's complaints (*crebro questu*) that Piso himself was responsible for perverting the course of justice (*subdola mora scelerum probationes subuerteret*). It is perhaps worth adding both that according to Suet. (*Cal.* 1.2) and Dio (57.18.9) Germanicus' body did reveal traces of poison and that there seems no reason why Martina, an experienced and notorious poisoner, should have committed suicide or be thought to have done so.

**8.1 at Piso** T. now turns from complaint and rumour about Piso (7.1 *questu*, 2 *uulgatum erat*) to the man himself, who is increasingly the focus of attention until his arrival in Rome at 9.3 below. His is the first in an antiphonal series of names and references to individuals (esp. *Piso ... Drusum ... Tiberius ... Drusus Pisoni ...*), suggesting the almost pre-ordained manoeuvres in which the protagonists engage before the inevitable trial. For T.'s favourite use of transitional *at* see 1.46.1n.

**filio** M. Calpurnius Piso, who had been with his father in the east (2.76.2n.); for his subsequent fortune see 17.1–18.1 below. There was also another son, Gnaeus (17.4n.).

**per quae principem molliret** In the event Tib.'s only modifications will come after Piso's death (18.1 *mitigata*).

**ad Drusum pergit** Piso, so similar to Germanicus in many ways (above, p. 111), is now repeating the action taken by his alleged victim two years earlier (2.53.1 *uiso fratre Druso in Delmatia agente*): 'eine tragische Ironie' (K.).

*pergere* is a synonym for the simple *ire* and replaced in Livy's later books by the pleonastic *pergere ire* (Adams (1974) 56–7), which T., like Sallust, does not use.

**haud ... trucem quam ... aequiorem** (1) Editors usually understand *tam* with *trucem* (so too G–G 1246a). This form of ellipse does not recur in T. but is found sometimes in Plautus and Livy (Ogilvie on 2.56.9), in whose examples, however, the second adj. is not comparative. (2) G. suspected 'more in this passage than a simple ellipse of *tam*' (1.124 n. 1). Perhaps we should understand *magis* or *potius* (so Ritter