

MUTINY AND MADNESS: TACITUS *ANNALS* 1.16–49*

A. J. WOODMAN

I

In his discussion of Tacitus as a literary artist, Ronald Mellor writes: “The most extraordinary of the Tacitean tableaux is his account of the mutinies in Book 1 of the *Annals*” (1993.124). In this judgement he agrees with F. R. D. Goodyear, who, in the introduction to his commentary on Book 1 of the *Annals*, had written: “The most notable example of vast elaboration in Tacitus is provided by his account of the mutinies of A.D. 14” (1972.30). The mutinies attracting these superlatives are those in Pannonia, to where Tiberius’s son Drusus was dispatched, and Germany, where Tiberius’s adopted son Germanicus was in command; and Tacitus’s account of them (16–30 and 31–49 respectively) takes up more than half his narrative of the year as a whole (6–54):

No sufficient explanation of this scale of treatment [continues Goodyear] can be based on the assumption that Tacitus considered the mutinies of special historical importance, since he is so careful to disentangle them from political events at Rome . . . Tacitus makes so much of the mutinies mainly because they afford him an unrivalled opportunity to deploy all his resources of style

* References to the *Annals* omit the title (e.g., 6.51.3); references to Book 1 omit also the book number. All translations are my own, those of the *Annals* being taken from Woodman 2004.

in a type of narrative very congenial to him. Here, on a fuller scale than elsewhere, he can combine pictorial and dramatic treatment, presenting a series of vivid and exciting scenes, varied in character and tempo, but held together by recurrent imagery and skilful planning of the stories as a whole.

Although other discussions have appeared in the intervening years,¹ Goodyear's treatment remains much the most detailed;² but in the following paper it will be argued that he misread Tacitus's "recurrent imagery" and underestimated his "skilful planning." As a result, the commentator, like others before and since, misinterpreted the significance of Tacitus's account of the mutinies.

II

In his commentary, Goodyear says that "detailed similarities" between Tacitus's accounts of the Pannonian and German mutinies "are not all that frequent" (1972.255). Yet in 1906, E. Bacha, the thesis of whose book was that much of the *Annals* comprised what he variously called "narrations géminées" or "histoires dédoublées," provided a comparative analysis of the two mutinies to illustrate a "conte géminé";³ and in 1973, D. O. Ross, whose contribution is acknowledged by Goodyear, maintained that "the mutiny of the armies in Germany is presented as an exact parallel to the Pannonian mutiny."⁴ Nevertheless, neither Bacha's brief treatment nor Ross's more extended discussion gives any real idea of the extent to which Tacitus's account of one mutiny is a mirror image of the other; and in later scholarship the parallelism of the two accounts is stated as a fact rather than illustrated by evidence.⁵ In what follows, therefore, I present a list of various correspondences between the narratives of the two mutinies.

1 See, e.g., Schulz 1996, Williams 1997 (esp. 46–61), O'Gorman 2000.25–41, Malloch 2004, and Pagán 2005. Much of the scholarship relates to Tacitus's presentation of Germanicus in particular: see the bibliographies in Goodyear 1972.239 and Benario 1995.134–36. The discussion by Pelling 1993 is outstanding.

2 Goodyear 1972.194–314 (or 194–323, if one follows him in thinking that Tacitus's account of the mutinies extends to chap. 52).

3 Bacha 1906.103–04 and, for the comparative analysis, 287–90.

4 Ross 1973.209–27 (quotation from 211). For his acknowledgement of Ross's paper, see Goodyear 1972.240 n. 1.

5 See, e.g., Pelling 1993.68, Williams 1997.47 (but see also 57–58), O'Gorman 2000.26.

- (i) Each mutiny begins in the same way, with references to its causes (16.1: “nullis nouis *causis*” ~ 31.1: “isdem *causis*”), its hopes (16.1: “ex ciuili bello *spem* praemiorum” ~ 31.1: “magna *spe* fore ut . . .”), to several legions being held in the same summer camp (16.2: “*aestiuis* . . . simul . . . *habebantur*” ~ 31.3: “isdem *aestiuis* . . . *habebantur*”), to the news of Augustus’s death (16.2: “*fine Augusti* . . . *auditis*” ~ 31.4: “*audito fine Augusti*”), to the atypically light duties in which the legions were involved (16.2: “intermiserat solita *munia*” ~ 31.3: “*leuia munia*”), and to the mutinies’ initial stages (16.2: “*eo principio*” ~ 32.1: “*ea* . . . *principium*”).
- (ii) In each mutiny, the troops are described as impressionable (16.3: “imperitos *animos* . . . impellere” ~ 31.4: “implere⁶ . . . rudes *animos*”), and they complain about their thirty or more years of service (17.2: “*tricena aut* quadragea *stipendia*” ~ 35.2: “*tricena aut* supra *stipendia*”), about the price of remissions (17.4: “*uacationes* . . . redimi” ~ 35.1: “*pretia uacationum*”), and about wounds and blows (17.4: “*uerbera et uulnera*” ~ 35.1: “ex *uulneribus, uerberum* . . .”). They demand remedies for their troubles (17.1: “*remedia*” ~ 35.2: “*mederetur*”) and immediate discharge from service (19.4: “*peteret* . . . *missionem*” ~ 31.4: “*missionem* . . . exposcerent”).
- (iii) In each mutiny, the savagery of the centurions is a source of grievance (17.4: “*saeuitiam centurionum*” ~ 31.4: “*saeuitiam* . . . *centurionum*”), and the centurions themselves are attacked with blows (20.1: “*centuriones* . . . *uerberibus* insectantur” ~ 32.1: “*uerberibus* mulcant”).
- (iv) In each mutiny, the troops strip off their clothing and reveal their physical condition as a reproach (18.1: “*hi uerberum notas, illi* . . . *nudum corpus exprobrantes*” ~ 34.2: “*quidam* . . . *alii*,” 35.1: “*nudant* . . . *corpora* . . . *uerberum notas exprobrant*”).
- (v) In each mutiny, a camp prefect is attacked (20.1–2 ~ 38.1–2), and, in each, a distinguished third party becomes the victim of unsubstantiated rumour, is assaulted, almost killed,

6 For which Acidalius proposed *impellere*: see below, note 52.

and rescued only at the last minute (27.1–2: Cn. Lentulus ~ 39.3–4: Munatius Plancus).

- (vi) In each mutiny, the emperor's son arrives after the trouble has started and is greeted outside the camp by legions in uncharacteristic mode (24.3: "*obuiaie . . . legiones*" ~ 34.1: "*obuias*" [sc. *legiones*]) before he enters the fortifications (25.1: "*postquam uallum introiit*" ~ 34.2: "*postquam uallum iniit*").
- (vii) In each mutiny, the commanding officer offers to die rather than to relinquish loyalty: in Pannonia, it is Blaesus (18.3: "*clamitans 'mea potius caede . . . fidem . . .'*"), in Germany, it is Germanicus himself (35.4: "*moriturum potius quam fidem exueret clamitans*").
- (viii) In each mutiny, the troops alternate between uproar and silence (25.2: "*atrox clamor et repente quies*" ~ 32.3: "*pariter ardescerent, pariter silerent*"); in each, there are corpses thrown beyond the fortifications of the camp (29.4: "*corpora extra uallum abiecta*" ~ 32.1: "*exanimos ante uallum . . . proiciunt*"); in each, there are references to the besieging of a member of the imperial family (28.4: "*quo usque filium imperatoris obsidebimus?*" ~ 42.2: "*qui filium imperatoris . . . circumsedistis?*");⁷ and, in each, the troops are made to reflect on the concessions which they have extorted by force: in Pannonia, this is a source of satisfaction to them (19.5: "*necessitate expressa quae . . .'*"); in Germany, of guilt (39.2: "*quae per seditionem expresserant*").
- (ix) In each mutiny, there is a headlong leap from a tribunal or platform (23.1: "*praeceps*" ~ 35.4: "*praeceps*"), a grovelling at feet (23.1: "*pedibus aduolutus*" ~ 32.2: "*cum . . . pedibus . . . aduolueretur*"), and a *legatus* who is the subject of a counterfactual statement (23.2: "*ac ni . . . legati*" ~ 39.4: "*ac ni . . . legatus*").⁸

⁷ At 28.4, the *imperator* is Tiberius and the *filius* is Drusus; at 42.2, the wording is nicely ambiguous: the *imperator* may be either Tiberius or Germanicus and the *filius* either Germanicus or Gaius (Caligula).

⁸ At 23.2, *legati* = "imperial governor"; at 39.4, *legatus* = "envoy."

- (x) In each mutiny, there is a debate about how to restore the situation (29.3: “certatum inde . . .” ~ 36.1: “consultatum ibi . . .”), and, in each, there is a reference to the severity of the measures taken (29.3: “*remediis . . . ad asperiora*” ~ 44.4: “*asperitate remedii*”).
- (xi) In each mutiny, there is a secondary outbreak of trouble (20.1: “*ante coeptam seditionem*” ~ 38.1: “*coeptauere seditionem*”); in each, a letter from the emperor (one genuine and the other fake) plays a crucial role (25.3: “*litteras patris . . . in quibus perscriptum erat*” ~ 36.3: “*placitum ut epistulae nomine principis scriberentur*”); in each, the narrative returns briefly to Tiberius in Rome (24.1–2 ~ 47.1–3); and, in each, there is a *peripeteia* (28.1–2: an eclipse of the moon ~ 40.4–41.3: the departure of Germanicus’s wife and child).
- (xii) Each mutiny concludes with the troops seeing their circumstances in terms of impiety and atonement (30.3: “*impios . . . non aliud . . . quam si . . . piaculo*” ~ 49.3: “*piaculum . . . nec aliter . . . quam si . . . impiis*”).⁹

Naturally these correspondences should not be used to disguise differences. For example, the narrative of the Pannonian mutiny falls neatly into five episodes or acts,¹⁰ whereas that of the German mutiny, which is longer by a third, is perhaps less clear-cut.¹¹ Again, similar incidents do not necessarily involve equivalent individuals (e.g., in ix, the jumper at 23.1 is a leading mutineer, but at 35.4 it is the commanding officer) or occur in the same sequence in each narrative (e.g., in viii, corpses are ejected at the very end of the Pannonian mutiny at 29.4 but at the very start of the German

9 At 30.3, *piaculo* is usually translated as “(from) their guilt” or “(from) their sin” (see the note of Goodyear 1972), but it is arguable that it may mean “(by) their act of atonement,” in which case the noun will have the same meaning as at 49.3.

10 I 16–19, II 20–23, III 24–27, IV 28–29.2, V 29.3–30.4. This is very similar to the scheme drawn up by Everts 1926.24–41, except that he prefers: IV 28, V 29–30. Koestermann 1963 (on 1.24.1) sees two principal divisions (16–23, 24–30), though on 20.1 he remarks “Ein neuer Akt beginnt.”

11 It is nevertheless possible to see the German mutiny as falling into five acts too: I 31–32, II (33) 34–37, III 38–39, IV 40–44, V 45–49. This is, again, very similar to the scheme of Everts 1926.41–54, given that he stops his analysis at chap. 44: I 31–32 (33–34.1), II 34.1–38, III 39, IV 40–44. (Chapter 33 provides background on Germanicus: hence its uncertain status in these various schemes.)

mutiny at 32.1).¹² On the other hand, the broad structure of each narrative is the same (the *peripeteia*, for example, occurs at the equivalent moment in each case), and the listed similarities are not only very numerous, systematic, and detailed, but they embrace incidents, motifs, and language. Such parallelism is clearly exceptional,¹³ and, indeed, Tacitus himself, during his narrative of the second mutiny, goes out of his way explicitly to refer back to the first (31.1: “Isdem ferme diebus, isdem causis,” 5: “ut Pannonicas inter legiones”). Why does his narrative present such an insistent parallelism of treatment?

III

In 15 B.C., Tiberius Nero and Claudius Drusus, sons of Livia and stepsons of her second husband, the emperor Augustus, campaigned against the Raeti and Vindelici in the Alps. The historian Velleius Paterculus describes the campaign as a test (95.1: “Caesar haud mediocris belli mole experiri statuit”) and as an operation in which the responsibilities were divided between the two brothers (95.1–2: “adiutore operis dato fratre ipsius,” “diuisis partibus”). It seems quite likely that the campaign was commemorated on coins which were struck at Lugdunum in the same year and on which Tiberius and Drusus are represented by two soldiers.¹⁴ The brothers’ success was certainly celebrated at the *princeps*’ request (Suet. *Vit. Hor.*) in a pair of Horatian odes (4.4 and 4.14), the second of which exhibits several similarities with Velleius’s account.¹⁵

Tiberius next embarked on a campaign in Pannonia in 13 B.C. (Vell. 96.2–3), about which Augustus later boasted in his *Res Gestae* (30.1):

Pannoniorum gentes, quas ante me principem populi Romani exercitus nunquam adit, deuictas per Ti. Neronem, qui tum erat priuignus et legatus meus, imperio populi Romani subieci protulique fines Illyrici ad ripam fluminis Danuui.

12 See also notes 7–9 above.

13 It obviously amounts to more than the kind of doublet in which Bacha 1906 was interested. For definitions and discussion of doublets, see Oakley 1997.102–04, Kraus 1998.

14 See Rose 1997.15 and 219 n. 68.

15 See Kiessling-Heinze 1964 on C. 4.14.14, and, on 4.4, note Damon 2002. Further, see Kuttner 1995.193, 298 n. 60; her discussion of Tiberius and Drusus (chap. 8) is fundamental.

The nations of the Pannonians, which before my principate the army of the Roman people never approached, were conquered by Ti. Nero, who at the time was my stepson and legate, and I subjected them to the command of the Roman people, and I extended the boundaries of Illyricum to the bank of the River Danube.

Correspondingly, in the following year, Drusus was sent to Germany (Vell. 97.2–3), where he penetrated as far the River Elbe. Yet this fraternal partnership of labours was cut short by Drusus's premature death in summer camp in 9 B.C. (Suet. *Claud.* 1.3). Tiberius famously dashed to be at his brother's side before he died, and then he accompanied the body all the way back to Rome, where eulogies were spoken by himself and Augustus and the name Germanicus was given to Drusus and his descendants.¹⁶ The fact that both brothers received imperatorial salutations in this period, although the exact chronology is controversial,¹⁷ was deemed by Tacitus as sufficiently significant to be recorded at the start of the *Annals* (1.3.1: "Augustus . . . Tiberium Neronem et Claudium Drusum priuignos imperatoriis nominibus auxit"),¹⁸ and they are both very likely depicted as *imperatores* on a plaque from the Rhineland.¹⁹ The author of the *Consolatio ad Liuiam*, a poem written to console Livia on the death of her son, compares Drusus and Tiberius to the Dioscuri (283–90), a comparison which recurs in Ovid (*Fast.* 1.705–08) and then later in Valerius Maximus in his section on *fraterna beneuolentia* (5.5.3).

The events of 9 B.C. acquire an extra significance retrospectively from the fact that they are the subjects with which Livy's history of Rome concludes. Syme believed that this was a matter of deliberate choice on the historian's part: "The wars of Tiberius and Drusus in 12–9 B.C. were the high epoch of the Augustan conquests," he wrote, noting that, in 8 B.C., the *pomerium* of the city of Rome was extended in order to advertise their achievement.²⁰ "The year 9 B.C. therefore appears to be both a necessary

16 Suet. *Claud.* 1.3, Dio 55.2.3. See, too, Rose 1997.17, 221 n. 87.

17 See, e.g., Syme 1984.1201–04 as against Barnes 1974.22; also Kuttner 1995.190, 298 n. 58.

18 So Goodyear 1992.161; contra, Syme 1984.1021.

19 See Kuttner 1995.31, 173–74.

20 Syme 1979.447. Syme quotes Dio 55.6.6 as evidence, though he adds that the extension is not mentioned in the *Res Gestae*.

and an attractive terminal date.”²¹ But whether this was the case is uncertain and, for present purposes, does not matter; the important fact is that Livy’s terminal date and the events of 9 B.C. were one and the same.

Tiberius proceeded to conclude the campaign in Germany which his brother had begun, winning a triumph in 7 B.C. at which he promised to restore the temple of Castor and Pollux at Rome, a promise which scholars assume was given in his brother’s name as well as his own.²² But he then withdrew from public life in the following year and retired to the island of Rhodes. Meanwhile, Augustus was treating his grandsons, the brothers Gaius and Lucius Caesar, in a fashion which recalled his previous, albeit less accelerated, treatment of Tiberius and Drusus. The young Caesars, too, became known as the Dioscuri and were dispatched to east and west respectively.²³ Thus, although their careers were cut short by their early deaths in A.D. 2 and 4, they not only confirmed a pattern but also set a model for the future.

There had been a long tradition of brothers fighting on behalf of Rome.²⁴ We are told by the elder Pliny, for example, that Ennius added Book 16 to his *Annales* in order to pay tribute to the exploits of T. Caecilius Teucer and his brother.²⁵ What Augustus did was to take advantage of his own extensive family to formalise the role played by brothers in the new world of the principate. Near the end of his long reign, we find Ovid using the term Dioscuri to describe Germanicus, Tiberius’s nephew and adopted son, and the younger Drusus, Tiberius’s natural son (*ex Ponto* 2.2.83–84): this is a sure sign that they have succeeded to the roles occupied by Gaius and Lucius and, before them, by Drusus and Tiberius. The careers of Germanicus and Drusus assume a “striking parallelism” which continues under Tiberius until Germanicus’s premature death in A.D. 19.²⁶

21 Syme 1979.448. Our knowledge of Livy’s lost books, such as Book 142, depends on their extant summaries (*periochae*). A complicating factor in the case of *per.* 142 is that its actual last words are *clades Quinctilii Vari*, a reference to the famous disaster of A.D. 9. Most modern scholars regard these words as an interpolation, since it seems unlikely that Livy would have leapt from 9 B.C. to A.D. 9 without (it appears) treating the years in between. If the words are not interpolated, the same consideration suggests that the summariser is alluding to a “flash forwards” which Livy has integrated into his narrative of 9 B.C.

22 See Poulsen 1991.120–22, 126.

23 Poulsen 1991.122–26.

24 See Bannon 1997.136–48.

25 Plin. *NH* 7.101. See Skutsch 1985.563, 569–70.

26 See Levick 1966.239–44 (quotation from 239); also Woodman and Martin 1996.3–4.

The joint help which they supplied to the *princeps* is attested by the contemporary Strabo roughly a year earlier (6.4.2), and it was in his role as one of the two fraternal partners that Germanicus was addressed by Ovid at some point between Augustus's death in A.D. 14 and the poet's own death in A.D. 17 (*Fast.* 1.10–12):

saepe tibi pater est, saepe legendus auus;
quaeque ferunt illi pictos signantia fastos,
tu quoque cum Druso praemia fratre feres.

Often you will have to read of your father and grandfather; and the prizes which they carry off, and which adorn the painted *fasti*, you too, along with your brother Drusus, will carry off.

In anticipation of the military prizes that the two brothers will win, the poet looks forward to exploits that will recall those of their fathers and will be celebrated by some latter-day Horace. If “brilliance at soldiering” was one of the recognised criteria of preferment for senators during the first period of Tiberius's reign, as Tacitus says (4.6.2: “mandabatque honores . . . claritudinem militiae . . . spectando”), it was *a fortiori* expected of members of the imperial house. As Kuttner remarks: “All forms of ultimate power in Rome were grounded upon demonstrated military capability.”²⁷

Tacitus's parallel treatment of Drusus and Germanicus in Book 1 of the *Annals* constructs the brothers as a pair and thereby identifies them as the latest in a tradition of fraternal partnerships which Augustus had initiated with their fathers. The frontiers of the empire provide the earliest possible arena in which Tacitus can present the credentials of the two young men whose assistance for their father he will eventually use to define that same first period of Tiberius's reign (6.51.3: “donec Germanicus ac Drusus superfuere”).²⁸

27 Kuttner 1995.176. See Ash in this volume on the tensions between emperors and their generals in this respect.

28 For this, see Woodman 1989.199–200 [evidently unknown to Hurlet 1997] = Woodman 1998.158–59 (and 240–41).

IV

“Recurrent imagery may to some extent colour and unify Tacitus’ account of the mutinies as a whole,” says Goodyear. “If there is any dominant image in this section of Tacitus’ narrative, it is that of a fire which starts gradually, then breaks out uncontrollably, but finally is quietened and dies” (1972.216 on 22.1). Yet the first clear metaphors we encounter are not those of fire at all. Percennius, one of the two named ringleaders of the Pannonian mutiny, urges his fellow soldiers to seek *remedia* for their grievances (17.1) and assures them that there is only one *leuamentum*, “alleviation,” to which they can resort (17.5: “nec aliud leuamentum quam si certis sub legibus militia iniretur”). Percennius evidently sees the soldiers’ salvation in medical terms (for *leuamentum*, see, e.g., Sen. *Epist.* 94.24: “ne medicina quidem morbos insanabiles uincit, tamen adhibetur aliis in remedium, aliis in leuamentum,” “not even medicine overcomes incurable diseases, but it is applied in some cases as a remedy and in others as an alleviation”),²⁹ although he makes no attempt to describe the grievances themselves in corresponding terms of illness. Nevertheless, when the soldiers next start to act on Percennius’s advice, Tacitus himself tells us that they are suffering from *furor* (18.2: *eo furoris uenere ut . . .*). Now *furor* or “madness” was an extremely common metaphor which was used particularly in political writing and was a favourite of Cicero;³⁰ but its application to a mutiny of soldiers had occurred most strikingly of all in Livy’s account of the mutiny with which Scipio Africanus was confronted in Spain in 206 B.C.³¹ Livy’s account appears in Book 28 (24.5–29.12), and not only does it exhibit a large and varied number of expressions denoting madness,³² but, as we shall

29 See also Martin and Woodman 1989 on 4.66.1.

30 See Opelt 1965.140–42; Goodyear 1972.206 (on 1.18.2) refers to Weische 1966.25–26; note also Skard 1942.146, 158–60. A classic example is Virg. *Aen.* 1.149: *furor arma ministrat*.

31 No example earlier than this of Livy is listed in *TLL* 6.1.1631.24–31 (“speciatim i. q. seditio, rebellio militum”). See also note 32 below. This same mutiny had previously been described by Polybius (11.25–30), who introduces his description with an elaborate analogy between the body/bodily illness and the army/mutiny (11.25.1–7); but there is no reference to mental illness.

32 E.g., 28.24.5: *furor in castris . . . ortus*, 24.6: *motae . . . mentes*, 24.10: *ex contagione furoris*, 24.12, 25.7: *insanabilis*, 25.12, 27.11: “et causa et origo omnis furoris penes auctores est; uos contagione insanistis” (12: *amentiae*), 28.8: *non ad ultimum dementis*, 29.3, 29.8: *sana mens*. This is not the first episode in which Livy has used madness words of a mutiny: see 7.39.10 and Oakley 1998 ad loc.

see, it constitutes the principal intertext for Tacitus's narrative of the Pannonian and German mutinies.³³

Since Tacitus at 18.2 unequivocally sees the Pannonian mutiny in terms of *furor*, it is worth asking if this or related metaphors are to be found in the sentence with which he makes the transition from domestic to foreign affairs (16.1):

Hic rerum urbanarum status erat, cum Pannonicas legiones
seditio incessit, nullis nouis causis nisi quod mutatus
princeps licentiam turbarum et ex ciuili bello spem prae-
miorum ostendebat.

This was the condition of City affairs when mutiny be-
fell the Pannonian legions, not from any novel causes
except that it was a change of princeps which offered
the licence for disruption and, resulting from civil war,
the hope of prizes.

One of the meanings of *status* is “condition” in the medical sense (*OLD* 5). The verb *incedo* is used transitively by Tacitus elsewhere of illness (3.71.2: “quotiens ualetudo aduersa flaminem Dialem incessisset”), while Livy had used the intransitive construction (28.46.15: “pestilentia incesserat pari clade in Romanos Poenosque,” 29.10.3: “tanta incesserit in ea castra uis morbi”; cf. Mela 3.65: *morbus incessit*). One of the regular meanings of *causa* is “the cause of a disease,”³⁴ and, since medical writers believed that “it is changes which are chiefly responsible for diseases” (Hippoc. *Hum.* 15),³⁵ it is possible to see *mutatus* in the light of this belief.³⁶ It is therefore

33 This is not the impression to be derived from the single parallel reproduced by Syme 1958.733–34 (App. 54: “Livian Style”). It should be noted that the mutiny described by Curtius at 10.2.12ff. not only uses madness words (e.g., 12: *uaecordes*, 21: “*furiosae consernationis oblitus, remedia insanabilibus conor adhibere*,” 22: *insanire*), but also has thematic similarities to Tacitus (e.g., 12: “*omnes simul missionem postulare coeperunt, deformia ora cicatricibus canitiemque caput ostentantes*,” 30: *desiluit deinde . . . de tribunali*).

34 See Langslow 2000.189.

35 Quoted by Padel 1992.52. In the past twenty-five years or so there have been a number of books on ancient madness, e.g., Hershkovitz 1998; for madness as a subject in modern historiography, see, e.g., Porter 2002.

36 If this is the case, the emphasis of the ablative absolute “*nullis nouis causis nisi quod mutatus princeps . . .*” falls on *princeps*: hence the translation “not from any novel causes except that it was a change of princeps which . . .”

arguable that the reference to *furor* at 18.2 activates retrospectively a series of medical metaphors at 16.1, and this argument seems to be confirmed by Tacitus's reference here to "civil war," since *furor* was "un véritable synonyme de *bellum ciuile*" (Jal 1963.422). Tacitus, in this introductory sentence, is resorting to the motif of *corpus imperii*,³⁷ contrasting the "condition" of affairs in the city with the "madness" to be found elsewhere in the body of the empire.³⁸

The troops' activities, encouraged by the speech of Percennius, are at last interrupted thanks to the persistence of their commanding officer, Blaesus (19.1). Deploying an oratorical skill which belies his name (19.2: *Blaesus multa dicendi arte . . .*, "with considerable oratorical skill Blaesus [lit. 'stammering'] . . ."), he judiciously avoids accusing his men of madness, although he does mention the civil wars (19.3: *ne ciuiliū quidem bellorum*). At first, he manages to restore a modicum of calm (19.5), but troops sent to Nauportus before the mutiny had begun (20.1: "ante *coeptam seditionem*" ~ Liv. 28.29.12: *seditio . . . coepta*)³⁹ cause a resurgence of trouble (20–21.1), whereupon Blaesus orders some men to be flogged and shut in prison (21.1: *adfici uerberibus, claudi carcere*). Since these punishments for mutiny are identical with some of the treatments recommended for both acute and chronic insanity (Cels. 3.18.4: "qui uiolentius se gerunt uincire conuenit," "it is appropriate to fetter those who act more violently"; 10: "in quibus continendis plagae quoque adhibentur," "and in controlling them even blows are applied"; 21: *uinculis, plagis coercendus est*, "he is to be compelled by fetters and blows"), it is as if Blaesus has privately come to a correct diagnosis of the soldiers' disorder and his instruc-

37 For this, see Béranger 1953.218–37.

38 This sentence constitutes the reason why Goodyear 1972 believes that Tacitus "disentangles" (30) or "seems explicitly to separate" (195) the mutinies from events in Rome; in this he follows Koestermann 1963.117–18 (on 1.16–30). Other examples of similar sentences or expressions are assembled by Häussler 1965.369. Whether a medical metaphor is active in any of them (e.g., *διάθεσις* at Polybius 9.22.7) will naturally depend upon the context of each. Thus in Tacitus's famous sentence at *Hist.* 1.4.1 ("repetendum uidetur qualis status Urbis, quae mens exercituum, quis habitus prouinciarum, quid in toto terrarum orbe ualidum, quid aegrum fuerit," "it seems necessary to recall what the condition of the City was like, what the mind of the army was, what the state of the provinces, what was healthy across the whole of the globe, and what diseased"), it is clear from the two final adjectives that *status*, *mens*, and *habitus* are to be understood metaphorically as technical medical terms.

39 This expression recurs only at *Hist.* 2.88.1, 3.11.4, and Pliny *Pan.* 8.5: *ut . . . seditio . . . coeperit*.

tions are those of a physician trying to grapple with cases of madness. Yet his instructions are frustrated: the prison is rushed and its inmates released (21.3). *Flagrantior inde uis*, says Tacitus (22.1), a phrase where Goodyear sees the first of his alleged fire metaphors. Yet *uis*, “violence,” is almost technical of disease (as, e.g., 4.66.1: “maior in dies et infestior uis,” Liv. 28.29.3: “uis morbi . . . in uestras mentes inuasit,” 29.10.3 [above]), while the adjective *flagrans* is used of fever by Apuleius (*Met.* 10.25: *flagrantissimis febribus ardebat*; cf. Juv. 13.11–12: “flagrantior aequo / non debet dolor esse uiri nec uulnere maior”). The point is that, in the ancient world, fever was often thought to be associated with madness (e.g., Cels. 3.18.1), and there can be no doubt about the continuing madness of the Pannonian soldiers since in the next sentence Tacitus describes them as *turbatos* (22.1), another term regularly used of mental disturbance (cf., e.g., 4.22.1: *turbata mente*, 13.3.2: *C. Caesaris turbata mens*, Liv. 3.47.4: *tanta uis amentiae . . . mentem turbauerat*; OLD 5b, cf. 8a).

At this moment, the second named ringleader, Vibulenus, delivers a speech which increases the intensity of the mutiny (22.1–23.5),⁴⁰ and this, in its turn, leads Tiberius to send his son Drusus to deal with the mutineers (24). When he confronts them in camp, they alternate between loud uproar and sudden silence, for which Tacitus uses an expression (25.2: “*repente quies*”) similar to that used by Livy during his mutiny narrative in Book 28 (~ Liv. 28.25.11: “*repentina quies*”).⁴¹ The letter of Tiberius which Drusus reads out has little or no effect, and the men resume their rampaging (26–27) until interrupted by a lunar eclipse (28.1), to describe which Tacitus borrows the verb *languescere* from Book 28 of Livy.⁴² Ignorant of its cause, the soldiers interpret it as an omen of their actions, and, once the moon becomes permanently shrouded in cloud, they conclude that the gods are averse to their mutiny (28.2: *sua facinora auersari deos*). Drusus, taking advantage of their despondency and believing, like Scipio Africanus before him, that chance situations should be turned to good effect (28.2:

40 Tacitus’s expression is *incendebat haec* (23.1), a usage of the verb which is acknowledged to be extremely odd. Fletcher 1983.300 offers as a parallel Cic. *Clu.* 44: *incendebat eius amentiam . . . mater*. It is possible that Tacitus is continuing to talk in terms of fever.

41 Livy, in fact, uses *repentina quies* in his description of a Spanish revolt which is contemporary with the mutiny. The phrase recurs only at Liv. 1.13.4; *repente quies* only at Aetna 281.

42 *Languescere* is used by Livy on only two occasions, one of them immediately before the phrase *repentina quies* (see above): 28.25.11: “*tranquillam seditionem iam per se languescentem repentina quies . . . fecit*.”

“quae casus obtulerat in sapientiam uertenda” ~ Liv. 28.44.8: “*oblata casu flectere ad consilium*”),⁴³ orders a round of the tents to be made, a practice employed by Scipio’s tribunes as described by Livy (28.3: *circumiri tentoria* ~ Liv. 28.25.5: *circumeuntes . . . tentoria*).⁴⁴ Through the efforts of some reliable soldiers, the mutineers are calmed down and brought under control (28.3–6), whereupon Drusus gets the men to agree to his proposal that a letter be sent to Tiberius by means of legates (29.1–2).

That the above allusions to Book 28 of Livy cannot be accidental is confirmed when Tacitus next describes the debate between Drusus and his advisers as to what should be done with the mutineers (29.3–4):

certatum inde sententiis, cum alii opperiendos legatos atque interim comitate permulcendum militem censerent, alii fortioribus remediis agendum: nihil in uulgo modicum: terrere, ni paueant; ubi pertimuerint, impune contemni; dum superstitio urgeat, adiciendos ex duce metus sublati seditionis auctoribus. promptum ad asperiora ingenium Druso erat.

Livy 28.26.2: *certabaturque sententiis* utrum in *autores* tantum *seditionis* . . . animaduerneretur, an . . .⁴⁵

A conflict of opinion then followed, since some proposed that they should wait for the legates and in the meantime manipulate the soldiery by being affable, while others that they should act with stronger remedies: there was nothing moderate about a crowd: they terrorized unless they were panicking; when they were thoroughly afraid, they

43 This parallel, in fact, comes from a speech of Scipio in the *following* year, 205 B.C. Combinations of *casus* and *offerre* are not uncommon (three times elsewhere in Livy, for example, and once each in a sprinkling of other authors), but the synonymy of *in sapientiam uertenda* and *flectere ad consilium*, as well as the relationship with Book 28, suggests a precise relationship between the two examples quoted.

44 This parallel is noted by Weissenborn-Müller 1910 ad loc. but not by any Tacitean commentator that I have seen. The expression recurs only at *HA Sev. Alex.* 51.5.

45 *Sententiis certari* is a Livian phrase (elsewhere at 26.32.1, [conjectural at 30.7.6], 42.50.1, and *per.* 49); Tacitus alludes to the example in Book 28. Tacitus also has *diuersis sententiis certabatur* at *Hist.* 4.76.1. The phrase *sententiis decertare* at Liv. 7.39.9 is an otherwise unexampled Livian variant (also in a mutinous context): see Oakley 1998 ad loc.

could be despised with impunity: while they were still gripped by superstition, there should be an extra admixture of dread on the part of the leader by removing the instigators of the mutiny. Drusus was instinctively ready for the more drastic of these alternatives.

Livy: And there was a conflict of opinion as to whether it was only against the instigators of the mutiny . . . that measures should be taken, or . . .

The first group of advisers advocate a conciliatory approach which they express in medical terminology: *permulcere* is used technically of massaging the body (e.g., Cels. 4.32.1: “*leuiter unctis manibus corpus permulcere*,” “lightly soothing the body with oiled hands”), although sometimes it is employed in an extended sense of soothing the mind (as in Sen. *Ira* 3.9.2: “*mentes aegras studia laeta permulcent*,” “pleasant studies soothe diseased minds”); and gentle rubbing was, in fact, one of the treatments used on the insane (Cels. 3.18.14: *frictio admoueretur lenis*). But the second group of advisers urge that Drusus should resort to “stronger remedies” (*fortioribus remediis*). *Fortis* is an almost technical adjective when applied to remedies and the like: Tacitus repeats the usage in Book 4 (8.3: *fortiora solacia*), his friend Pliny plays with it when he writes that “the disorders are stronger than the remedies” (*Epist.* 4.25.5: *uitia remediis fortiora*), and Ovid had referred to “strong medicaments” (*Ars Am.* 2.489: *medicamina fortia*). The second group of advisers continues by specifying that an extra element of fear should be added by the leader: fear is recommended in cases of chronic insanity (Cels. 3.18.21: “*subito etiam terrori et expauescere in hoc morbo prodest*,” “being suddenly terrified and panicking is also beneficial in the case of this disease”), while *adicere*, an extremely common verb in Celsus, is perhaps used on the analogy of its employment as a technical term for introducing extra ingredients when mixing medicine (as Plin. *NH* 24.70: “*ipsa [sc. folia] uero adiecto melle gangraenis inlinuntur*”; see *OLD* 5). Drusus was therefore presented with two alternatives, and Tacitus tells us that he was attracted to “the more drastic” (29.4: *ad asperiora*; contrast Liv. 28.26.3: *uicit sententia lenior*): *asper* is even more commonly used of remedies than is *fortis* (e.g., Cels. 2.13.2 “*asperioribus medicamentis non opus est*”; see *OLD* 14).

Drusus’s drastic measure of slaughtering the ringleaders has the desired effect, while the onset of premature winter weather also helps to dampen the soldiers’ spirits (30.3):

durabat et formido caelestis irae, nec frustra aduersus
 impios hebescere sidera, ruere tempestates: *non aliud
 malorum leuamentum quam si* linquerent castra infausta
 temerataque et soluti piaculo suis quisque hibernis red-
 derentur.

Still persisting too was their alarm at the heavens' anger:
 it was not without reason that, in the face of impiety, the
 planets grew dull and storms plunged down: there would
 be no other alleviation of their afflictions, they said, than
 if they were to leave their inauspicious and defiled camp
 and each man, thus released from his impiousness,⁴⁶ were
 restored back to his own winter camp.

After the preceding series of sustained medical metaphors, it seems impos-
 sible to understand *malorum* as anything other than "afflictions,"⁴⁷ and the
 men now express themselves in the same words as those used by Percen-
 nius at the very start of the mutiny (~ 17.5: "nec aliud leuamentum quam
 si . . ."). "Whether the echo is deliberate," remarks Goodyear, "and, if it is,
 what Tacitus intended by it, I cannot tell" (1972.205 on 17.5). In fact, the
 echo underlines the realisation to which the men have come as a result of
 the eclipse. At the beginning, they were persuaded by Percennius to think
 that, if only they were to mutiny, they would find remedies for their troubles;
 but the eclipse persuaded them that the gods were against their enterprise,
 and they now believe that their only remedy is to extricate themselves from
 the pollution they have caused by their mutiny (*temerata, piaculo*). Since
 madness was a traditional consequence of pollution,⁴⁸ the soldiers' statement
 amounts to an admission that they have been mad. Thereupon the legions
 disperse, and Drusus returns to the City "because the immediate condition
 there had subsided well enough": *considerare* is a final term with medical
 applications (cf. 14.61.4: "modicis remediis primos motus consedissee").⁴⁹

It is thus seen that the "recurrent imagery" which unifies Tacitus's
 narrative of the Pannonian mutiny is not fire but *furor*. Moreover, the

46 See note 9 above for this phrase.

47 For this meaning of *malum*, cf. Langslow 2000.148.

48 See Parker 1996.128–29, 218.

49 See *TLL* 4.435.39–45. However, Goodyear 1972.216 (on 22.1) sees the verb as a signifi-
 cant example of the alleged fire imagery ("note particularly 1.30.5 *concederant*").

account also exhibits an equivalent of the agonistic element which seems to have been endemic in ancient medical writing and practice.⁵⁰ Blaesus's diagnosis has emerged as superior to that of the ringleader Percennius; and, although Blaesus disappears from the scene when Drusus arrives, it is clear from the measures which Drusus takes (29.4–30.1) that he, too, treats the soldiers as madmen.

V

The greater severity of the mutiny in Germany, where the soldiers offer to swing their might behind Germanicus if he should wish to supplant Tiberius (31.1), is reflected in the greater elaboration and precision with which Tacitus treats the army of Lower Germany in the opening scene. Its soldiers are afflicted by “frenzy” (31.3: *in rabiem prolapsus est*;⁵¹ cf. 31.1: *legiones turbatae*), and troublemakers “fill” their minds (31.4: *implere . . . animos*): if the text is right, Tacitus may be thinking of the notion that “fullness” can create disturbance in one’s mental or physical system.⁵² At the start of the next paragraph, Tacitus ascribes “derangement” or *uecordia* to the German soldiers and describes them as *lymphati* (32.1). *Lymphati* inevitably suggests water,⁵³ as if the soldiers were affected by the notorious wetness and marshiness of Germany;⁵⁴ and the author of *The Sacred Disease* maintained that “madness comes from moistness” (17). The same medical author continues by explaining that “when the brain is abnormally moist, of necessity it moves” (*Morb. Sacr.* 17), and Cicero says that the insane are defined as those whose “mind is disturbed by some movement as if by a disease” (*Tusc. Disp.* 3.11: “mens motu quasi morbo perturbata”). It is therefore no surprise that Tacitus’s next observation concerns “movement” (32.3): “id militares animos altius coniectantibus praecipuum indicium

50 On this, see Barton 1994.145–49.

51 *Rabies* is also used of this same mutiny by Velleius (125.1).

52 The commentators cite several alleged parallels (see, e.g., Furneaux 1896 and Koestermann 1963), of which Goodyear 1972 repeats two; but neither is helpful since each exhibits an abl. instr. and is therefore quite different. Acidalius proposed *impellere*. For “fullness” see, e.g., Thuc. 2.51.4 (where the commentators make no comment, but this is presumably the passage alluded to by Parker 1996.220) or Hippoc. *Diaet.* 88 (cited by Padel 1992.56).

53 See *TLL* 7.2.1945.11ff., Maltby 1991.355, Oakley 1998 on Liv. 7.17.3.

54 For such environmental determinism, see, e.g., Rives 1999.16–17, and note esp. Hippoc. *Aer.* 7 on the effects of marshy water (e.g., fever in summer and delirious illnesses amongst younger people in winter).

magni atque implacabilis motus quod . . .” Although the primary meaning of *motus* here is “revolt” or “mutiny” (*OLD* 9a–b), the sustained metaphors suggest also the meaning of “a disturbance of the mental or bodily functions” (*OLD* 8a). Indeed, the whole sentence suggests the doctor’s manner: *indicium* is a straightforward and very common medical term (“symptom”: *OLD* 4a), *implacabilis* (“irremediable”) is used of *amentia* by the fourth-century A.D. writer Chalcidius in his rendering of the Platonic expression “utterly mad” (*Tim.* 27c), and *coniectantibus* recalls Celsus’s definition of medicine itself as the *ars coniecturalis* (*praef.* 48; cf. 2.6.16). Tacitus concludes the section by proceeding to describe a kind of group hysteria, with the soldiers behaving as if they were under direction (32.3).

It is at this point that Germanicus arrives on the scene (34.1). His presence leads to further speeches, and the veterans both demand a remedy for their exhaustion (35.2: *mederetur fessis*) and offer to support any attempt that Germanicus might make on the principate (35.3). Germanicus’s reaction is one of horror, and he leaps down from his platform “as if contaminated by their crime” (35.4: *quasi scelere contaminaretur*), the verb suggesting not only pollution but also contagion, which will recur later. But Germanicus’s way is blocked by a soldier who offers him a sword with which to kill himself. “Even to the madmen,” writes Tacitus (35.5: *etiam furentibus*),⁵⁵ “that seemed savage and a sign of evil behaviour,” and there was a lull while Germanicus escaped to his tent and deliberated about the remedy (36.1: *consultatum de remedio*). Yet the remedy proposed (a forged letter from Tiberius) fails to convince the mutineers, to whose demands Germanicus gives in (37).

Soon afterwards, however, a secondary outbreak occurs and, “with the enlargement of the disturbance” (38.2: *intumescente motu*), the camp prefect, M’. Ennius, comes under threat. Goodyear acknowledges that *intumescere* is used in medical imagery by other authors, but, somewhat perversely, he maintains that any such imagery “is evanescent here”; yet it is hard not to see a connection with the “fullness” and “movement” which characterised the initial outbreak (31.4, 32.3). At any rate, Ennius overcomes the threat and leads back into winter quarters men described as *turbidos et nihil ausos* (38.2), the adjective suggesting “disordered in mind” (*OLD* 5b)

55 It is on this passage that Goodyear 1972.263 belatedly collects the expressions for “senseless, raging fury” that he finds in Tacitus’s account of the mutinies, although on 18.2 he had earlier made a brief and different type of comment (206). Such piecemeal treatment (and neither of these notes is cross-referenced to the other) is obviously not very satisfactory.

as well as “mutinous” (*OLD* 6). In the meantime, senatorial ambassadors reached Germanicus at Ara Ubiorum, where two legions from the original mutiny, together with some veterans, were wintering (39.1). “Panicked, and deranged by their complicity,” they were overtaken by the fearful thought that the ambassadors had come to annul the concessions which they had won (39.2: “pauídos et conscientia uecordes intrat metus”).⁵⁶ Their derangement takes the form of attacking, and almost killing, the blameless leader of the embassy, Munatius Plancus, during the night (39.3–4). At daylight, Germanicus addresses the men and explains why the embassy had come; unlike Blaesus and Drusus during the Pannonian mutiny, Germanicus acknowledges the frenzy of the troops (39.6: “fatalem increpans rabiem” ~ Liv. 28.34.4: “fatalem rabiem . . . accusat”),⁵⁷ but, at the moment, is careful to deflect any blame away from them and to allege that the responsibility for the recurrence of the outbreak was that of the gods (“neque militum sed deum ira resurgere”).

Germanicus now becomes the subject of a general complaint: even if he himself is unwilling to proceed to the loyal army of Upper Germany, how can he possibly keep his pregnant wife and young son amongst madmen (40.2: *inter furentes*)? As a result, Germanicus decides to send them to safety, but this decision proves to be the turning point of the whole mutiny, since the soldiers are appalled that their actions have forced the removal of a youngster who had been born in their camp (41.2: “infans in castris genitus” ~ Liv. 28.27.2: “a pueritia in castris habitus”).⁵⁸ It is at this moment that Germanicus takes another calculated risk: he begins a speech (42.1: “Non mihi . . .” ~ Liv. 28.27.1: “Numquam mihi . . .”) in which he actually calls the soldiers “madmen” (42.1: *a furentibus*) and then, like Scipio in Book 28 of Livy, debates whether or not they deserve to be called soldiers (42.2):

56 For similar connections between consciousness of guilt and madness, see Cic. *Verr.* 5.73: “conscientia sceleris et furore ex maleficiis concepto excitatus,” Sall. C. 15.4–5: “conscientia mentem excitam uastabat . . . in facie uoltuque uecordia erat,” Curt. 6.9.32: *conscientia sceleris . . . amens*; also Vretska 1961 on [Sall.] *Ep. Caes.* 2.12.8, McGushin 1977 on Sall. C. 15.3–5, and Oakley 2005 on Liv. 9.26.7.

57 This parallel is mentioned by Andresen 1916.761 and by Fletcher 1971.146, evidently forgetting that Andresen had already published it.

58 Although numerous scholars (e.g., Furneaux 1896, Andresen 1916.759, Syme 1958.733, Goodyear 1972.290) note that early sentences from Scipio’s speech at 28.27.3–4 lie behind early sentences of Germanicus’s speech at 42.2 (see just below), no one seems to have realised that this first sentence of Scipio’s speech lies behind the *narrative* with which Tacitus introduces that speech.

quod nomen huic coetui dabo? militesne appellem qui filium imperatoris uestri uallo et armis circumsedistis? an ciues, quibus tam proiecta senatus auctoritas? hostium quoque ius et sacra legationis et fas gentium rupistis.

Livy 28.27.3–4: quos ne *quo nomine* quidem *appellare* debeam scio. *ciues?* *qui* a patria uestra descistis. *an milites?* *qui* imperium auspiciumque abnuistis, *sacramenti religionem rupistis.*)

What name shall I give to this throng? Is it soldiers I am to call you, who have invested the son of your Commander with rampart and arms? Or citizens, by whom the senate's authority has been so flung aside? You have shattered the rights due even to an enemy, a legation's sanctity, and the law of nations.

Livy: I do not know even by what name to call you. Citizens? You who have revolted from your fatherland. Or soldiers? You who have rejected command and the auspices and shattered the obligation of your oath.

Germanicus ends his speech with a prayer in which he addresses Augustus and his own father, Drusus, and affects to believe that the troops confronting him are the very same as those led by his father (43.3–4):

tua, diue Auguste, caelo recepta mens, tua, pater Druse, imago, tui memoria istis cum militibus, quos iam pudor et gloria intrat, eluant hanc maculam irasque ciuiles in exitium hostibus uertant. uos quoque, quorum alia nunc ora, alia pectora contueor, si legatos senatui, obsequium imperatori, si mihi coniugem et filium redditis, discedite a contactu ac diuidite turbidos.

Rather, Divine Augustus, may it be your spirit, now welcomed back to heaven, rather, my father Drusus, may it be your image and your memory which—along with these self-same soldiers of yours, whom shame and thoughts of glory are already permeating—wash away this stain and divert the anger of civil war to the extermination of the

enemy. And you too, on whose now changed faces and hearts I am gazing, if you are restoring the legates to the senate and compliance to your Commander, if to me you are restoring my spouse and son, turn away from contagion and isolate the turbulent elements.

As is appropriate in a context of madness or disease, the prayer is apotropaic (*uertant*).⁵⁹ Germanicus wants Augustus's and Drusus's help in being rid of the mutiny, which he describes as a "stain" (*maculam*). His point is that, if they can be purified of their pollution, they will simultaneously be cured of their madness.⁶⁰

Finally, Germanicus concludes by addressing the soldiers themselves and "is represented as skilfully imagining the existence of the change of feeling which he desires to produce" (Furneaux 1896 on 43.4). His audience is envisaged as being won over by his speech and as constituting a different body of men from the *turbidos* from whom they must isolate themselves in order to avoid further contagion (*contactu*). His bold plan works: the men express remorse and seek out the ringleaders of the mutiny, who are then butchered (44.1–3). When the veterans next follow the example thus set by the serving soldiers, they are sent to Raetia on the pretext of defending the province, but, in reality, to tear them away from a camp where the risk of contagion remained: the camp was "still brutalised as much by the drastic nature of the remedy as by the memory of the crime" (44.4: "ut auellerentur castris trucibus adhuc non minus asperitate remedii quam sceleris memoria").

After the camp had been calmed down in this way (45.1: *compositis*, another medical term),⁶¹ Germanicus prepared to move against the legions wintering at Vetera (45.2). After an interval during which the narrative reverts to Rome (46–47), his preparations for these remaining mutineers were in place (48.1). But he gave his subordinate officer, Caecina, the chance to sort things out in advance of his own arrival, saying that, unless punishment were exacted from the mutinous, he himself would resort to

59 See, e.g., Nisbet-Hubbard 1970 on Hor. C. 1.21.13.

60 For the purification of an army after demonstrations of indiscipline, see Parker 1996.22–23, referring to Xen. *Anab.* 5.7.35 and Curt. 10.9.11, although *eluant* implies a different ritual from that described by Curtius. I am most grateful to Professor Parker for discussion of these matters.

61 See *TLL* 3.2118.2–15, cf. 21–29.

indiscriminate slaughter. Caecina duly responds (48.2–3), but his measures get out of hand. “It was a different scene from that of all the civil wars which have ever taken place,” comments Tacitus (49.1: “diuersa omnium quae umquam accidere ciuiliū armorum facies”): so indiscriminate was the slaughter that, when Germanicus eventually arrived on the scene, he wept, calling the results not a cure but a disaster (49.2: “non medicinam illud . . . sed cladem appellans”).

Tacitus’s account of the mutiny in Germany concludes with the soldiers’ yearning to attack their German enemy “as an expiation of their madness: the shades of their fellow soldiers would be appeased, they said, only if they sustained honourable wounds on their impious breasts” (49.3: “piaculum furoris, nec aliter posse placari commilitonum manes quam si pectoribus impiis honesta uulnera accepissent”). Germanicus fell in with their desires and assembled a force including eight cavalry wings “whose self-control in that mutiny was undefiled” (49.4: “quarum ea seditione intemerata modestia fuit”). The “recurrent imagery” of madness is thus maintained to the very end of the account.

VI

The dispatch of Drusus to Pannonia (24.1) meant that, for the first time in more than twenty years, the Danube and Rhine commands were held by two young men who were not only the sons of the brothers who had held those same commands in 12–9 B.C., namely Tiberius himself and the elder Drusus, but who, thanks to the device of adoption, were also brothers themselves and fulfilling the same roles. This remarkable double identity of person and place creates an expectation that history will begin to repeat itself and that Tacitus’s *Annals*, as if collapsing the intervening years, will start where Livy’s *ab Vrbe Condita* had left off, and that Drusus and Germanicus will embark on the kind of paternal exploits to which Ovid had but recently looked forward (above, p. 311): indeed Germanicus, whose very name was identical with that of his father, is made by Tacitus to address his own soldiers as if they were his father’s (43.3: above, p. 322–23). Yet, instead of such exploits, the two young men are obliged to combat mutiny in their own ranks; Germanicus’s voice serves only to emphasise how different the present is from the past: rather than continuing the imperialism of Book 142 of Livy, Tacitus’s principal textual relationship is with the madness of the Spanish mutiny in Book 28.

The narrative which attracted the superlatives of Mellor and Good-

year comprises two detailed and comprehensive case studies of collective madness. The scale of the narrative implies a condition so serious and widespread that it requires special treatment, and who better to supply this treatment than the new emperor himself? Tiberius chose to refer to himself by implication as “the good and health-giving *princeps*” (Suet. *Tib.* 29: *bonum et salutarem principem*). This “title” was dutifully repeated by his contemporary, Valerius Maximus (2.9.6a: *salutaris principis*, 8.13 *praef.*; cf. 9.11 *ext.* 4: *princeps . . . salutari dextera*), who introduces his work by addressing Tiberius as “the surest health for his country” (*praef.*: *certissima salus patriae*). After the suicide of Cn. Piso during his trial for treason in A.D. 20, the subsequent *senatus consultum* refers to the soldiers’ knowledge that “the health of our empire depends on the protection of that [sc. the imperial] house” (*SCPP* 162–63: “cum scirent salutem imperi nostri in eius domus custodia positam esse”), and it mentions “the name of the Caesars which brings health to this City and to the empire of the Roman people” (*SCPP* 165: “salutare huic urbi imperioque populi Romani nomen Caesarum”).⁶² It is therefore not surprising that Wallace-Hadrill should say of Tiberius’s reign that “*Salus Augusti* is not just the Safety of the ruler, but the Saving Power that flows from him” (1981.309). On the coins of the years A.D. 22–23 there appeared the legend *SALVS AVGVSTA*; ten years later still, an inscription bears the legend *SALVS PERPETVA AVGVSTA*.⁶³ It seems not unreasonable to see *salus*, unattested on the coins of Augustus and not to recur until the reign of Nero,⁶⁴ as one of the self-claimed virtues of the Tiberian principate. Moreover, in the years before he became *princeps*, Tiberius had established a reputation for looking after the health and welfare of his soldiers in precisely the same two areas of the empire which had now succumbed to the madness of mutiny (Vell. 114.1: “per omne belli Germanici Pannonicique tempus nemo e nobis . . . imbecillus fuit cuius salus ac uoletudo non ita sustentaretur Caesaris cura tamquam districtissimus ille tantorum onerum mole huic uni negotio uacaret animus,” “Throughout the whole time of the German and Pannonian war, none of us . . . was ill whose well-being and

62 See Eck, Caballos, and Fernández 1996.254. Note also Syme 1986.448.

63 *RIC* 1².97 no. 47; *CIL* 11.4170. The coin legend is primarily associated with the recovery of Livia from a serious illness (see Woodman and Martin 1996 on 3.64.3), and the inscription relates to the fall of Sejanus (see, e.g., Rogers 1943.28), but it seems to be accepted among many numismatists that such legends were perceived as having a wider significance as well (see, e.g., Fears 1981).

64 Wallace-Hadrill 1981.323. See also Fears 1981.890–93.

health were not sustained by Caesar's care, as if his attention, preoccupied though it was with the heavy responsibility of his very great burdens, were free for this single concern"). Clearly no one was better qualified to deal with the present emergency.

It is precisely this point which is dealt with in chapters 46–47, on reactions in Rome.⁶⁵ Though placed towards the end of the narrative of the German mutiny, these chapters represent a time when both mutinies were in progress simultaneously (cf. 46.1). The community, says Tacitus, began to accuse Tiberius of not doing enough: he ought to confront the mutinous troops in person (46.2) and to apply compresses to the soldiers' spirits (46.3: *militaribus animis adhibenda fomenta*),⁶⁶ a recommendation in line with one of the treatments for madness, which is that the sufferer's head should be bathed (Cels. 3.18.8: "caput . . . aqua deinde fouere . . . aut prius fouere . . . et iterum fouere"). The critics' use of the medical metaphor indicates that they are appealing to Tiberius's metaphorical expertise as the *salutaris princeps* which he claimed to be. But Tiberius, in his implied response, deploys a related metaphor and turns it back on them: it would be wrong for him to abandon the *caput rerum* (47.1). As *princeps* he is in a position to see the needs of the *corpus imperii* as a whole;⁶⁷ it was better to act "through his sons" (47.2: *per filios*).

65 These chapters begin with the expression *At Romae*, often used when Tacitus switches from foreign to domestic affairs, but whether in this instance they are to be regarded rather as an integral part of the German narrative is unclear. Since Tacitus's account of A.D. 14 does not cover the whole of that year, the question was unfortunately beyond the scope of Ginsburg 1981, from whom readers of the *Annals* learned so much about the author's arrangement of his material.

66 For *adhibere* as a medical term, see, e.g., 14.6.3: "medicamina uulneri et fomenta corpori adhibet," Curt. 10.2.21 (above, n. 33); *OLD* 7.

67 Tacitus later introduces the first of the treason cases as follows (1.73.1): "Haud pigebit referre in Faianio et Rubrio, modicis equitibus Romanis, praetemptata crimina, ut quibus initiis, quanta Tiberii arte grauissimum exitium inrepperit, dein repressum sit, postremo arserit cunctaque corripuerit noscatur," "It will not be irksome to record the charges brought in the test cases of Faianus and Rubrius, modest Roman equestrians, in order to become acquainted with the initial phases from which, given the degree of Tiberius's skill, a form of extermination of the utmost severity crept in, was then suppressed, and finally flared up and gripped everything." In his commentary on this sentence, Goodyear 1972 sees that each of the four verbs in the indirect question is a medical metaphor, but, since *initia* too is a technical medical word (the initial phase of a disease: *OLD* 3a), it follows that *arte* must be an allusion to the *ars medica* (*OLD* *ars* 5b): Tacitus is making the paradoxical point that the progress of the disease of *maiestas* was being supervised by the individual who had the responsibility of curing it.

What is meant by his acting through his sons is revealed only too clearly in the final stages of the German mutiny, when Germanicus's own instructions lead to his tearful acknowledgement that the soldiers' indiscriminate butchery had not constituted medicine but a disaster (49.2: above, p. 324). This was scarcely the behaviour of an ideal general (Veg. *Mil.* 3.4: "si *ferri medicinam* necessitas extrema persuaserit, rectius est more maiorum in auctores criminum uindicari ut ad omnes metus, ad paucos poena perueniat," "If extreme necessity urges the medicine of the sword, it is better that vengeance be taken upon the instigators of the crimes, in accordance with ancestral custom, so that all are affected by dread, but only a few by punishment").⁶⁸

VII

Germanicus's dereliction of duty in the matter of punishment is compounded when he follows rather than leads his soldiers in their expiatory attack on the Germans (49.4: *sequitur ardorem militum Caesar*: above, p. 324).⁶⁹ And his passivity in the matter of this attack is itself compounded when he achieves military success (51.3–4). At this point, where Tacitus's narrative returns to Rome for the remainder of the year (52–54), we are told that Tiberius experienced mixed feelings about Germanicus: he was delighted that the mutiny had been suppressed, but "because Germanicus had won the soldiers' goodwill by lavishing money and speeding their discharge, and also owing to his warlike glory, he was tense" (52.1).⁷⁰ And Germanicus's *gloria* would again be problematic two years later, when, after a series of exploits in Germany, he is recalled to Rome by letter from Tiberius (2.26.2–3). The young man demurs, whereupon he is told abruptly by his adoptive father that "if there must still be war, he should leave some raw material for the glory of his brother Drusus, who, there being now no other enemy, could not, except in the Germanies, acquire the name of 'commander' and carry off the laurel" (2.26.4: "si foret adhuc bellandum, relinqueret materiem Drusi

68 Ash 362–63 in this volume discusses another general, Corbulo, and his attitude to discipline.

69 See Woodman 1998.218–19 and 227–28.

70 In their various ways, commentators (see, e.g., Koestermann 1963 or Goodyear 1972 ad loc.) have expressed surprise that so distinguished a general as Tiberius should be exercised over a minor success of Germanicus, but Tacitus is borrowing from Sallust (see Woodman 1998.233–34).

fratris gloriae, qui nullo tum alio hoste non nisi apud Germanias adsequi nomen imperatorium et deportare lauream posset").⁷¹

Drusus duly celebrated his triumph in A.D. 20 (3.19.3). Originally the honour was intended to be shared with Germanicus (2.64.1: "decreuere patres ut Germanicus atque Drusus ouantes urbem introirent"), but the latter, in another resemblance to his father, had died prematurely (late in A.D. 19). This meant that Drusus, like his father Tiberius many years before, was obliged to continue alone. In A.D. 22, he was granted *tribunicia potestas*, and, when Tiberius presented the young man's credentials to the senate by letter, the *princeps* wrote as follows: "Nor was it now hastily, but after undergoing trial for eight years, suppressing mutinies and settling wars, that the triumph-holder and two-times consul was being enlisted as participant in the familiar toil" (3.56.4: "neque nunc propere sed per octo annos capto experimento, compressis seditionibus, compositis bellis, triumphalem et bis consulem noti laboris participem sumi"). Drusus had thus passed with flying colours the same kind of test which his father had been set by Augustus almost forty years before (above, p. 308).

It was in the interests of parity as well as protocol that, when the mutinies were concluded in A.D. 14, Tiberius should grant to Drusus's Pannonian army the same concessions as Germanicus had granted to the German (1.52.3). But in the very next year, Tiberius, taking advantage of a discussion of taxation, slipped in the comment that the state was unequal to its burden unless soldiers were discharged after a minimum of twenty years' service. "Thus the ill-advised decisions of the very recent mutiny, whereby they had extracted a limit of sixteen years' service, were abolished for the future" (1.78.2). Tacitus's remark is veritably Thucydidean in the eloquence of its understated brevity.⁷²

VIII

Tacitus's narrative is perhaps suggestive of Thucydides in other ways too. Whatever the exact moment in Book 2 when the Peloponnesian War actually begins,⁷³ readers do not have long to wait before the plague falls upon Athens (2.48.2: ἐνέπτεσε, cf. 3: ἐπιπέσοι), reversing all the

71 See Morello in this volume for Tacitus and the letters of Tiberius.

72 Cf. esp. the "dry and devastating comment" (Macleod 1983.107) at Thuc. 3.68.5; further, Kitto 1963.284–85.

73 For this question, see Hornblower 1991.236–37.

blessings and advantages which Thucydides had set up in Pericles' funeral speech. Later, towards the end of Book 3, Thucydides gives us another formal description, of the discord which afflicts Corcyra and whose onset is expressed in metaphorical terms as if it were an illness (3.82.2: ἐπέπεσε).⁷⁴ No one disputes that these individual episodes have a wider significance and are being described by Thucydides in such detail because they are symptomatic of what happens in war.

When Tacitus was writing his *Annals*, the empire had been in existence for almost one and a half centuries, and his readers knew from personal experience that the accession of each new *princeps* was supposed to be regarded as a new dawn. Indeed, Tacitus himself had described the accessions of Nerva and Trajan in precisely these terms (*Agr.* 3.1, 44.5). But this is not how Tiberius's accession is described at the start of the *Annals*. After the briefest account of domestic affairs (1.6–15), none of which suggests a new dawn,⁷⁵ Tacitus passes immediately to the two highly unusual set-piece descriptions of the mutinies, which are seen in sustained metaphorical terms of (mental) illness. It is as if Tacitus has combined Thucydides' plague and *stasis* into a single narrative and placed it as early as possible in his account of Tiberius's reign for maximum dramatic effect. The very legions upon whom the imperial security depended—"praecipuum robur . . . commune in Germanos Gallosque subsidium," as Tacitus will later describe those on the Rhine (4.5.1)—are shown to be vulnerable to collective madness. This is not only the first and greatest of a number of paradoxes or reversals,⁷⁶ but an omen of things to come in the now missing later books of the *Annals*, "where the power of the legions will at last be shatteringly unleashed."⁷⁷

University of Virginia

74 See Hornblower 1991 ad loc., Price 2001.15, 28–29.

75 In fact, the words *comparatione deterrima*, "the basest of comparisons," at 1.10.7 seem designed to remind readers *per contrarium* that it was conventional to greet each new *princeps* with a *comparatio* in which he would be compared favourably with his predecessor(s) but which Tacitus has pointedly omitted.

76 See, e.g., Woodman 1998.95–96.

77 Pelling 1993.69, referring to Syme 1958.375.

For their comments on earlier drafts of this paper, I am extremely grateful to R. Ash, C. S. Kraus, D. S. Levene, B. M. Levick, R. H. Martin, and C. B. R. Pelling.