BEYOND TEUTOBURG: TRANSGRESSION AND TRANSFORMATION IN TACITUS *ANNALES* 1.61–62

VICTORIA E. PAGÁN

T HE YEAR IS 15 C.E. Germanicus conducts operations on the Rhine. The mission: to secure the territory for Rome and subdue the Cherusci and neighboring tribes. Soldiers advance through the noiseless swamp toward a break in the trees. Through the low branches weak light signals a clearing. The stench of death and decay is long gone, and without its warning the sight before them is the more unexpected, the more terrifying. In front of them lies a battlefield strewn with corpses and debris—the very place where Varus lost three legions in humiliating, brutal defeat six years before.

Tacitus' suspenseful account of the return to Teutoburg (1.61–62)[1] fuels considerable debate about the actual location of the defeat of Varus. Even a brief survey of studies over the course of the last century, from Mommsen in 1885 to Leise in 1986, reveals that scholars continue to scrutinize the archaeological, numismatic, and textual evidence. General agreement places the infamous battlefield between the Ems and the Weser rivers; specific agreement has only just been achieved.[2]

Our concern is not, however, to reconsider Tacitus' geography of the lower Rhine; it is to examine the way these two startling paragraphs evoke the themes of transgression and transformation in the *Annales*. The battle of the Teutoburg forest in 9 C.E. falls beyond the temporal boundaries of the

---

1. All references by book, paragraph, and sentence are to the *Annales* (unless otherwise indicated) according to the Teubner editions by Borzsák 1992 and Wellesley 1986; alternate readings are noted.

2. Furneaux 1896, 260 and Koestermann 1963, 209 follow the location of Mommsen 1885 at Barenau, based on coin hoards (catalogued by Mommsen 1885, 14–30; see also Mommsen 1887, p. 52, n. 1 and 1992, 126–27). Henke and Lehmann 1910, 43–96 review previous hypotheses on the location from 1631 up to 1909. Köhler 1925 discusses the locations of the two camps of the legions. Wolterstorff 1949, 135–46 follows Köhler. John 1950 and Koestermann 1957, 440–43 elaborate Mommsen's proposition. Walser 1951, 63 argues that Tacitus' depiction of this pathetic scene deceives the reader about the actual location of the Romans in Germany. Schöning 1963 attempts to answer the question based on his personal military experience in both world wars. Wells 1972, 240–41 follows Mommsen and Koestermann 1957. Leise 1986 uses routes through watersheds to examine the geography of the entire military operation. Tönnies 1992, 461–65 tries to reconcile 1.60.3 and Mommsen's theory with recent archaeological evidence at Kalkriese. Schlüter 1999 provides a wealth of archaeological evidence, pinpointing the three-day skirmish at the foot of the Kalkrieser Berg. Goodyear 1981, 393 calls Tacitus "the most ungeographical of historians," a pun on Mommsen 1887, p. 197, n. 1: "A worse narrative . . . is hardly to be found even in this most unmilitary of all authors." On the other hand, Horsfall 1985, 199 duly emphasizes the rhetorical nature of Latin topographical writing: "No expectation existed in Augustan Rome that the geographical information contained in a work of literature should be precise." Of course there remains the characteristically sagacious pronouncement of Syme 1958 tucked under page 393 (n. 2) on Tacitus' location of the battle: "Was it possible to be much more precise—or necessary?" The entire *Historikerstreit* is parodied by Völker et al. 1996, 40.

Annales, which formally begin with the accession of Tiberius in 14. Thus the battle described in 1.61–62 falls beyond the temporal boundaries of the narrative. Elsewhere Tacitus rearranges the sequence of events, disregarding the actual temporal sequence.[3] For example, the recent discovery of the inscription of the *senatus consultum de Pisone patre* proves that Tacitus' account of the trial of Piso diverges from the chronology of events preserved in the inscription.[4] It has been shown that Tacitus usually rearranges events occurring within the same consular year.[5] But 1.61–62 exceeds this customary, negligible tendency. It is the most extended, self-contained flashback in the *Annales,* and it reaches across the greatest length of time, six years. Privileged as it is, at the beginning of the work, the return to Teutoburg demands an answer to a pressing question: What is a narrator, who from the start proclaimed his devotion to *urbem Romam* (1.1.1) at the accession of Tiberius (1.1.3), doing in the middle of the Teutoburg forest in the time of Augustus? The answer begins with attention to the temporal and spatial elements in the passage, together with the larger context of Germanicus' campaigns on the Rhine and the characterization of Tiberius as it unfolds in the first hexad. From this point of view, Tacitus' Teutoburg proffers a glimpse of the way in which a narrative that transgresses its own limits is emblematic of imperial attitudes toward boundary violation more generally.

The return to Teutoburg also reveals two attempts at transformation, the one a success, the other a failure. By burying the remains, Germanicus effectively transforms the *Teutobergiensis saltus* from a battlefield to a cemetery. But the memory of Teutoburg has plagued Roman consciousness for six years. If successful in his campaign, Germanicus has a chance to transform the defeat of the hapless Varus into his own personal victory. If successful, Germanicus also has the chance to annex territory that Augustus was never able to gain. Fearing any such aggrandizement by posterity, Augustus warned against expansion (1.11.4).[6] In giving alternative explanations,[7] *incertum metu an per invidiam,* Tacitus reduces Augustan foreign policy to the personal level of petty-minded animosity. Still, Augustus' fear was unnecessary; Germanicus fails too. But this part of the story must wait until

---

3. Martin and Woodman 1996, 75 assert that Tacitus' readers "would not have been unduly troubled by the displacement."

4. Eck 1993, 203; Caballos, Eck, and Fernández 1996, 153; Martin and Woodman 1996, 69.

5. Ginsburg 1981, 131–42.

6. Augustan imperial policy alternated between expansion and containment; see Gruen 1996, 147–97. "Augustus was less concerned with a systematic plan for world dominion than with a systematic construction of his image as world conqueror" (147). "Definition of a general Augustan 'policy' on Germany would be difficult to formulate and probably pointless to attempt. To designate it either as 'defensive' or 'imperialistic' risks oversimplification. And it would be erroneous to consider Roman actions in Germany as following a static plan" (186).

7. On the significance of the second alternative in 6.38, see Whitehead 1979, 491; Vielberg 1987, 93–94. When Tacitus gives two reasons for a statement, the second is usually meant to be considered more seriously than the first (Develin 1983, 85; see also the remarks of Goodyear 1972, p. 154, n. 1, p. 198 ["the sinister alternative"]). Cf. Whitehead's qualification: "When . . . Tacitus did wish to load the choice one way or the other, it was virtually always toward the second (or last) alternative" (493). Earlier, Ryberg 1942 examined how Tacitus guides the reader's interpretation of the facts. Lucas 1974, 105 charts the increasing frequency of alternative explanations from the *Agr.* and *Germ.* to the *Hist., Ann.* 1–6, and *Ann.* 11–16. See Rabinowitz 1987, 154–58, "Rules of Surplus," on the reader's tendency, when presented with an excess of inconsistent information, to "trust the last" (155).

Tacitus first dangles before the reader the possibility of not only recupera-
tion but even expansion in the aftermath of the *clades Variana*. This episode
is not the only instance of a failed attempt at transformation from defeat to
victory; the theme looms large in accounts of foreign affairs in the *Annales*
from the Rhine to the Euphrates.[8] At Rome, however, it is also manifested
in the continuing struggle between slavery and freedom, between the stark
victories of the *princeps* and the hollow victories of the defeated *senatores*.[9]
Yet while *imperium* demands that there be winners and losers, it is not always
easy to discern the difference in the *Annales*.[10] The distinction is deliberately
opaque at Teutoburg.

We begin with an analysis of the rather lengthy paragraph 1.61:

> igitur cupido Caesarem invadit solvendi suprema militibus ducique, permoto ad misera-
> tionem omni qui aderat exercitu ob propinquos, amicos, denique ob casus bellorum et
> sortem hominum. praemisso Caecina, ut occulta saltuum scrutaretur pontesque et aggeres
> umido paludum et fallacibus campis imponeret, incedunt maestos locos visuque ac memo-
> ria deformes. prima Vari castra lato ambitu et dimensis principiis trium legionum manus
> ostentabant; dein semiruto vallo, humili fossa accisae iam reliquiae consedisse intellege-
> bantur. medio campi albentia ossa, ut fugerant, ut restiterant, disiecta vel aggerata. adia-
> cebant fragmina telorum equorumque artus, simul truncis arborum antefixa ora. lucis
> propinquis barbarae arae, apud quas tribunos ac primorum ordinum centuriones macta-
> verant. et cladis eius superstites, pugnam aut vincula elapsi, referebant hic cecidisse lega-
> tos, illic raptas aquilas; primum ubi vulnus Varo adactum, ubi infelici dextera et suo ictu
> mortem invenerit; quo tribunali contionatus Arminius, quot patibula captivis, quae
> scrobes, utque signis et aquilis per superbiam inluserit.

> Therefore a desire to perform the obsequies for the soldiers and their leader seized Ger-
> manicus Caesar; the entire army which was present was moved to pity because of their
> relatives and friends, and in the end because of the misfortunes of war and the lot of man-
> kind. While Caecina was sent in advance in order to examine the hidden areas of the for-
> est and to construct bridges and causeways over the damp marshes and deceptive plains,
> they penetrated into the mournful places unsightly in appearance and memory. Varus' first
> camp with broad circumference and measured headquarters was evidence of the work of
> three legions; thereupon from the half-leveled rampart and the shallow trench it was un-
> derstood that the already diminished remnants of the legions had pitched there. In the
> middle of the plain the whitening bones were scattered or heaped as the men had fled or
> stood their ground. Lying nearby were the broken pieces of weapons and the limbs of
> horses, likewise human heads were nailed to the trunks of trees. In the neighboring groves
> were the barbarian altars near which they had immolated the tribunes and centurions of
> the first ranks. And the survivors of this disaster, having escaped battle or capture, were
> recounting that here the legates fell, there the eagles were taken; where the first wound
> was inflicted upon Varus, where he met death with an unlucky right hand from his own
> blow; on which platform Arminius harangued his men, how many yokes for the captives,
> the mass graves, and that in his arrogance he mocked the standards and eagles.

---

8. E.g., the campaigns of Corbulo (beginning at 13.8.1), conducted under the shadow of the devastat-
ing defeat of Crassus at Carrhae in 53 B.C.E., did not significantly alter the boundary between Rome and
Parthia.

9. E.g., 1.81.3. Walker 1952, 25–26; Jens 1956, 346–49; Shotter 1966, 267; Wirszubski 1968, 124–25,
135–37, 160–67; Martin 1981, 120, 187.

10. E.g., 3.65.3 (senators compared to slaves); 4.34–35 (Cremutius Cordus is forced to commit suicide,
but his books survive). On forced suicide, see Plass 1995, 92–115.

In this paragraph the ordinary components of a military operation (*milites, duces, exercitus, casus bellorum, aggeres, castra, legiones, valla, fossa, tela, tribuni, centuriones, vincula, aquilae*) are combined in such a striking way as to create a battle narrative unparalleled in Latin literature, not the least for its graphic qualities. Wellesley finds ten motifs common to the ten major battle scenes in the Tacitean corpus,[11] and 1.61 includes four of these: the Roman order of deployment (*prima . . . dein*), the enemy commander's speech (*contionatus Arminius*), catalogue of Roman losses (*raptas aquilas, vulnus Varo adactum*), and tableau (*antefixa ora*). Thus, as a battle narrative, 1.61 resembles the typical pattern of a set piece. In eight of the ten battle narratives that Wellesley surveys (except the civil war battles of Bedriacum and Cremona), the Romans are clearly successful in overcoming the enemy. Four of eight successes conclude with an explicit mention of victory. Tacitus calls Idistaviso, for example, *magna ea victoria* (2.18.1).[12] The trouble is, of course, that by the time Germanicus reached the *saltus Teutoburgiensis,* and by the time Tacitus came to narrate the return, Teutoburg had become synonymous with Carrhae, that is, synonymous with utter annihilation. There is no other way to narrate it. And yet Tacitus is not so constrained by the exigencies of the historical facts or so bound to a sense of generic decorum that he cannot vary the rhetorical motifs of historiography and recombine traditional diction to create this unique scene. Rather he uses them to transform defeat into victory—albeit temporarily.

Before considering the singular nature of the return to Teutoburg, it is worth noticing the poetic, specifically Virgilian, diction that suffuses the passage.[13] Verbal echoes allow Baxter, carefully collating phrases and individual words, to posit the not implausible analogies between Aeneas and Germanicus, Turnus and Arminius.[14] But Aeneas vanquishes Turnus in hand-to-hand combat; Arminius is betrayed by his own people. The correspondence is not exact.[15] Nor does it need to be. Walker, Syme, Goodyear, and even Baxter note that Tacitus' use of Virgil usually evokes a general atmosphere and is not intended to activate the richness of intertextual allusion to specific lines of the *Aeneid*.[16] What then can we make of the Virgilian tone of 1.61? To be sure, it demonstrates that Tacitus was an avid and attentive reader of Virgil and that the poet remained a pervasive influence among Roman writers well into the Principate. Such conclusions duly enhance Virgil's status among Roman authors. But beyond lexical scrutiny, the thematic hints of the *Aeneid* in 1.61–62 put Virgil in the service of Tacitus.

11. Wellesley 1969, 85.

12. Cf. 12.35.3 (against Caratacus): *clara ea victoria*; 14.37.2 (against Boudicca): *clara et antiquis victoriis par*; *Agr.* 38.1 (Mons Graupius): *praedaque laeta victoribus.*

13. E.g., *albentia ossa,* cf. *Aen.* 12.36; *antefixa ora,* cf. *Aen.* 8.196–97; *vulnus adactum,* cf. *Aen.* 10.850. Other verbal echoes in this passage are collected by Furneaux 1896, 64–65; Koestermann 1963, 212; Walker 1952, p. 72, n. 5; Soubiran 1964, 56–58, who also notes similarities in metrical patterns; Baxter 1972, 254–57; Woodman 1979, 147; Goodyear 1981, 108–9; Putnam 1989, 563–64. Syme 1958, 357–58 also comments on the poetic intensity of 1.61.

14. Baxter 1972, 268–69.

15. 2.88.2: *dolo propinquorum cecidit.* Tacitus proceeds to style Arminius *liberator haud dubie Germaniae,* and so accord him a degree of success unavailable to Turnus. See Straub 1980, 223–31.

16. Walker 1952, 11; Syme 1958, 357; Baxter 1972, 255; Goodyear 1981, 108–9; Tarrant 1997, 69–70.

Both authors are consumed with the desire to depict the cost (and the failure) of empire. Like the soldiers who return to Teutoburg, Aeneas mourns openly when he beholds the price for his survival sculpted for all to see on the walls of the emerging Carthage (1.453–93). Like the desire that compels Germanicus, the obligation to bury fallen companions pursues Aeneas until he completes the task (Misenus, 6.156–82; Palinurus, 6.373–81). Both Virgil and Tacitus attempt to come to terms with the political events of the past that have conclusively shaped their own current circumstances. Aeneas fulfills the destiny granted by Jupiter, but at the expense of his questionable actions at the end of the epic. Both Virgil and Tacitus question the price tag put on *imperium sine fine* (1.279). There was peace, says Tacitus, but it was costly: *pacem sine dubio post haec, verum cruentam* (1.10.4).[17] It is perhaps in this that Tacitus most closely approximates Virgilian thought, for, according to one critic, "success tainted by spiritual failure" is the hallmark of the *Georgics*.[18] In a passage that exceeds the temporal bounds of the narrative, Virgil incorporates images of future civil wars into the end of Book 1 of the *Georgics* (461–97) in a list of portents, a technique advanced several times in the *Aeneid*.[19] While plowing a field, a farmer will inadvertently unearth the weapons, helmets, and bones of the slain: *grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulcris* (1.497). Similarly, the dual nature of success and failure is ossified at Teutoburg. The soldiers, like the farmer, engaged in their respective—and respectable—labor, happen upon, quite unexpectedly, and pause to marvel at, the most gruesome reminder of the wages paid for their own freedom from strife. One may become anesthetized by the benefits of *imperium,* but its violence is inescapable. In this sense, then, the return to Teutoburg is indeed Virgilian.

On the one hand, 1.61–62 is typical of *Schlachtsschilderungen.* But such set pieces are usually employed by historians to describe pitched battles in action, as they happen. Tacitus' Teutoburg is entirely *post factum,* and thus perhaps better categorized as an aftermath rather than a battle narrative. Every battle offers a chance to narrate its aftermath.[20] Among extant historians, Livy and Tacitus take advantage of the opportunity in passages that echo each other. In a passage that shares features with 1.61–62, Livy recounts that Hannibal visited the scene of the battle of Cannae (22.51.5–6). The remains at both Teutoburg and Cannae reveal that some soldiers fled while others stood fast (1.61.2: *ut fugerant, ut restiterant;* 22.51.6: *aut pugna . . . aut fuga*); both fields were strewn with the bodies of cavalry and infantry alike (1.61.3: *adiacebant fragmina telorum equorum artus;*

---

17. Cf. *Agr.* 30.6: "auferre trucidare rapere falsis nominibus imperium, atque ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant."

18. Thomas 1988, 21.

19. E.g., the speech of Jupiter (1.257–96); the parade of heroes (6.756–886); the shield of Aeneas (8.608–731).

20. Contra Woodman 1979, pp. 147 and 232, n. 8: "The very paucity of such 'visits to battle-fields' in Latin literature is another reason why I do not believe there can have been a common literary prototype from which Livy, Vergil, Lucan and Tacitus all derive: if such a prototype had existed, it would surely have been used more frequently than this."

22.51.6: *pedites passim equitesque*). Both generals bury the dead (1.61.1: *cupido Caesarem invadit solvendi suprema;* 22.52.6: *consulem quoque Romanum conquisitum sepultumque quidam auctores sunt*). But certain differences between Livy and Tacitus are noteworthy: Hannibal intentionally returns *postero die* (22.51.5), while Germanicus inadvertently arrives at Teutoburg *sextum post cladis annum* (1.62.1). Hannibal's purpose is to collect spoils and inspect the slaughter (22.51.5: *ad spolia legenda foedamque . . . spectandam stragem*); Germanicus, recovering the lost standards of the Roman legions, is compelled solely by desire to bury the dead (1.61.1: *cupido Caesarem invadit solvendi suprema*).

And so although the passage is colored by reminiscences of Virgil and styled after Livy, it is a product distinctly (in light of our extant sources) Tacitean. Woodman attributes this phenomenon to self-imitation. To wit: it is generally accepted that Tacitus wrote the *Historiae* before the *Annales.* Since the battle of Bedriacum in 69 was a relatively recent event (one that occurred in Tacitus' own lifetime), his account of that battle and its aftermath at *Historiae* 2.70 was most likely based on reliable eyewitness accounts.[21] The defeat at Teutoburg, on the other hand, occurred more than one hundred years before Tacitus took up the *Annales.* In light of the limited sources available to him, Tacitus created his version of the visit to the battlefield at Teutoburg based on his own account of the visit to the battlefield at Bedriacum. Therefore the story of the return to Teutoburg is an instance of *inventio,* based on an earlier, more reliable, account. Thus it is a rare exercise in self-imitation.[22] Tacitus may have re-read Virgil and Livy, but he re-wrote himself.

Once we recognize the self-imitation, it becomes clear that when he came to write of the defeat at Teutoburg, such images of desolation had been haunting him for many years. This most recent, indeed this final, attempt to materialize such blurred and troubling images produces a remarkable portrait of a fractured world, "une vision funeste."[23] The twentieth-century painting of Anselm Kiefer, entitled *Varus,*[24] graphically illustrates the ghostly phenomenon. The diminishing perspective of the path through the woods carries the viewer back in time. The artist makes no attempt to depict the slain bodies, the *antefixa ora.* Indeed, the trees are spattered with blood, but the words written across them, and not the skulls nailed to them, must suffice the imagination. Kiefer has inherited two millennia of the reception

21. Both Woodman 1979 and Jones 1971, 74–76 argue against the postulation of Syme 1958, 180–81, 674–76 of a third, lost source for the Battle of Bedriacum; instead they argue that Tacitus and Plutarch relied on memory, discussion, and autopsy.

22. Woodman 1979. A similar argument is made by Martin 1955, 123–28 about the relationship between the accounts of the accessions of Tiberius and Nero; see also Charlesworth 1927, 55–57. *Pace* Morgan 1992, 22–26, who dismantles Woodman's argument, objecting that it "has called into question Tacitus' historical reliability without adequate grounds, besides obscuring the literary artistry with which he composed his accounts, first of Vitellius' visit to Bedriacum, and then of Germanicus' pilgrimage to the site of the Varian disaster" (26).

23. Soubiran 1964, 56.

24. Schama 1995, plate 16; Huyssen 1989, 26–27 argues that Kiefer's work is "about the ultimate inseparability of myth and history."

of the *Hermannsschlacht*; Tacitus is no less an heir to the always already formulated, century-old mythologies of Varus and Arminius.[25]

In the account of the mock wedding of Nero and Pythagoras (15.37), Tacitus, master of chiaroscuro, manipulates the shadows cast in the night in order to create a picture of the unspeakable, broken morals of Neronian Rome. At Teutoburg, instead of casting the picture in the shadows, he locates the vision of the battlefield in the interplay, not between light and darkness or appearance and reality, but between appearance and memory, between the visions and the memories they evoke (*visuque ac memoria*). As the soldiers advance, they encounter increasingly less sophisticated means of defense: first they see the camp, then a partially demolished wall, finally a mere trench (*castra—vallo—fossa*). At the same time, the physical remains on the battlefield itself become increasingly gruesome. Of course one expects to find corpses and broken weapons on a battlefield; but as they proceed they discover the mutilated body parts of animals and the skulls of men displayed quite unnaturally. Their tour of this "museum of calamity" as Schama calls it,[26] culminates in the *barbarae arae*, a remarkable play on words. The phrase resounds in our ears because of the repetition of the sound *arae*[27] and it disturbs us because of the oxymoron: any sense of piety that an altar may evoke is defiled by the hideous acts of the barbarians. The further the soldiers advance toward the center of the battlefield, the further they recede from civilization.[28]

This movement through space is syncopated with a movement through time. As the soldiers move toward the center of the battlefield, they advance toward the moment of the battle, a static moment in the past. Every step forward leads them to a point further back in time. This forward motion emphasizes their active participation in a temporal progression that usually characterizes the future.[29] But as the soldiers march forward to meet the events of the battle, time moves backward to meet the soldiers. In the heart of the Teutoburg forest, the two converge. There the soldiers of Germanicus come face to face with the vision of Varus' men. Time and space collapse into a point of absolute zero. Neither past, nor present, nor future; time stands still in this uncharted no-man's land.

At first the relics speak for themselves; the *castra Vari* and the *accisae reliquiae* are the subjects of the verbs *ostentabant* and *intellegebantur*. But the increasingly grotesque remains require more explanation from the sur-

---

25. On Arminius and the defeat of Varus in the ancient literary tradition (e.g., Ov. *Tr.* 4.2, in which because of his exile Ovid can only imagine the triumph in his mind's eye, much the way Tacitus imagines the defeat; Manilius 1.896–903; Strabo 7.1.4; Vell. Pat. 2.117–20; the contemporary Suet. *Aug.* 23.2, *Tib.* 17.1; and the later Dio 56.18.3–23.1 and Flor. *Epit.* 2.30.34–39), see Timpe 1970, 117–30; Lehmann 1990, 143–64; see also the collection of sources in Kestermann 1992. For the phrase "always already" see Jameson 1981, 9. On the identification of Arminius with Hermann, see Kelley 1993, 162–63.

26. Schama 1995, 89.

27. For the paronomasia, see Woodman 1979, p. 233, n. 13. According to Soubiran 1964, 60 the parechesis is not clumsy: "elle suggère concrètement la barbarie des rites d'immolation et la répulsion du narrateur romain."

28. Soubiran 1964, 59: "Nous entrons ici dans un autre univers."

29. For the relationship between time and space in Roman culture, see Bettini 1991, 113–93; for the subject's participation in the temporal process, see 131.

vivors. These visions activate their memory. The whitening bones, heaped up or scattered about, remind them that some fled while others stood their ground. The barbarian altars remind them of the brutal human sacrifices. Then they are able to recall quite vividly the details of Varus' suicide as well as the content of Arminius' harangue. Memory completes the picture and the oneiric battle is suspended in time and space before our eyes. The archaeology of Teutoburg is complete, yielding a museum of sorts, with its artifacts and interpretations.[30]

Thus Tacitus manages to transport the reader wholesale to the year 9. It is only with great effort that the reader recalls his or her distance from the epicenter of Teutoburg. Like a set of concentric circles, so the *Varusschlacht* is circumscribed first by Germanicus' return in 15, then by Tacitus' production of the narrative one hundred years later,[31] and finally by a reading on the eve of the twenty-first century, with countless reverberations and interpretations resonating between each ring.[32] The vivid description of 1.61 forces the reader to visualize the incremental approach to the center of the battlefield. Then, having diverted attention with the cumulative details of the spatial confines of the narrative, Tacitus transports the reader unaware across the temporal boundaries. Thus he makes the journey across the spatial rings patent, while he disguises the transgression across the temporal rings.

This broadly conceived temporal transgression gives rise to a more specific observation. As noted earlier, the battle at Teutoburg antedates the time of the *Annales*. Throughout his scholarship, Syme repeats the refrain that Tacitus had difficulty with his choice of the year 14 as the beginning of the *Annales;* too much happened that required explanation.[33] But Teutoburg is no simple backtracking; this is not the typical "zig-zag" of a historical narrative attempting to catch up to itself.[34] The four opening paragraphs of Book 2, for example, provide background information about Rome's relations with Armenia prior to the accession of Tiberius. But the flashback at Teutoburg is by no means digressive. It is integral to the action of the narrative. Germanicus is on campaign when the past rises up like a specter. Moreover, digressions are signaled in a traditional manner: "I return to the main topic."[35] Instead of such a boldly stated return, Tacitus begins paragraph 62 with an unassuming anastrophe: *igitur omnis qui aderat*

---

30. Museums solidify time and space in a contrived eternity; see Crimp 1983 on death and decay in the museum; Bann 1984, 77–92 on the poetics of the museum, esp. 88–89 on the power of representation to silence an event.

31. For a final, sound rejection of Syme's Hadrianic dating of the *Annales,* see Bowersock 1993, 10.

32. On the conflict between the time of the author and the time of his subject see Barthes 1986, 129–30. For Bakhtin 1981, 250, the conflict is the matrix that constitutes the *chronotope* (the inseparability of space and time); see also Holquist 1990, 113.

33. 3.24.3: "sed aliorum exitus, simul cetera illius aetatis memorabo, si effectis in quae ⟨te⟩tendi, plures ad curas vitam produxero." (Martin and Woodman 1996 read *si effectis quae intendi.*) Syme 1958, 372–74 and 427, 1970, 6, 1974, 483–84, 1978, 197–98, 1984, 1027–28 and 1041–42. Martin and Woodman 1996, 230 "are skeptical." Cf. Griffin 1995, 33–37; Kraus and Woodman 1997, 91. See also the remarks of Goodyear 1972, 99–100.

34. On "zig-zag history," see Barthes 1986, 129.

35. E.g., 4.33.4: *sed ad inceptum redeo;* 6.22.4: *ne nunc incepto longius abierim;* Sall. *Iug.* 4.9: *nunc ad inceptum redeo;* 42.5: *quam ob rem ad inceptum redeo;* Sall. *Cat.* 7.7: *ni ea res longius nos ab incepto traheret;* see Fraenkel 1957, 98; Wiedemann 1979, 13–14; Woodman 1983, 162, 1988, 184.

exercitus.[36] Just as Germanicus finds Teutoburg without fanfare, Tacitus leads the reader back to the present time of the narrative without the usual proclamation. By narrating events that took place in the year 9 within the account of the year 15, Tacitus achieves an easy exchange between past and present, disguising the actual interruption of the temporal surface of the narrative.

Then at 1.62 Germanicus transforms the museum into a cemetery:

> igitur omnis qui aderat exercitus sextum post cladis annum trium legionum ossa, nullo noscente, alienas reliquias an suorum humo tegeret, omnes ut coniunctos, ut consanguineos aucta in hostem ira maesti simul et infensi condebant. primum exstruendo tumulo caespitem Caesar posuit, gratissimo munere in defunctos et praesentibus doloris socius. quod Tiberio haud probatum, seu cuncta Germanici in deterius trahenti, sive exercitum imagine caesorum insepultorumque tardatum ad proelia et formidolosiorem hostium credebat; neque imperatorem auguratu et vetustissimis caerimoniis praeditum adtrectare feralia debuisse.

> Therefore the entire army that was present six years after the defeat buried the bones of the three legions, with no one knowing whether he was covering with earth the remains of strangers or of members of his own family; but saddened and at the same time hostile, as their anger toward the enemy increased, they buried all as though close and related. Germanicus Caesar first set up an altar by raising a burial mound, a most welcome duty toward the dead as he was conscious of the grief of those present. This was hardly acceptable to Tiberius, whether he interpreted all of Germanicus' deeds less favorably, or whether he believed that the army had been deterred from battle and had become more afraid of the enemy because of the image of the slain and unburied; and that a general endowed with the augurate and the most ancient of ceremonies ought not to handle corpses.

In this paragraph Tacitus effectively collapses both time and space. First of all, the same soldiers return to perform the rites that ought to have been performed six years ago.[37] Moreover, the narrative has not advanced since the army first came upon *Teutoburgiensis saltus* at 1.60.3. Only now at 1.62 does Germanicus proceed to fulfill the desire that first impelled him toward the battlefield at the beginning of paragraph 61. Woodman notes this ring composition; Tacitus begins and ends the episode with the notion of burying the dead.[38] But all that transpires between 1.60.3 and 1.62.1, namely the soldiers' recreation of the battle of Teutoburg out of the relics and memories, is but a momentary materialization, evaporated into the mist, a chimera leaving no trace. Having transgressed the *terminus post quem* of the *Annales,* Tacitus pilots us safely back on course to the year 15.

Although time leaves a faint trace on the whitening bones, reminding the reader of its ravaging effects on the corpses, still it makes no significant mark on the lived action of the narrative. In a similar way, space is of little

---

36. Bettini 1991, 139: "Repetition as such tends to *negate* time, certainly not to mark its progression."
37. Tacitus compresses six years in the *Agricola;* cf. Cizek 1968, 246–47: "dans le récit de Tacite, les six années passées par le général en Bretagne ont un cours plus simple et plus bref que les trois années vécues par l'aristocratie romaine tout entière à la fin du règne de Domitien." See also Syme 1958, 391 and n. 6 on the compression of time in 12.31–40 and 12.50.
38. Woodman 1979, 145, 1988, 171–72.

consequence. With the simple relative pronoun, *quod*, Tacitus redirects at-
tention from the distant lands of the lower Rhine to the capital. The effect is
stunning. It seems that Tiberius pronounces judgment on Germanicus' action
almost as soon as it is performed. No account is taken of the great distance
a messenger needs to traverse to inform Tiberius of the pollution that
Germanicus incurs. No account is taken of the time such a long journey re-
quires. As quickly as Germanicus raises the burial mound, so it seems
Tiberius condemns him. Then the narrative promptly returns to the Rhine:
"sed Germanicus cedentem in avia Arminium secutus . . . " (1.63.1).

Thus Tacitus is capable of collapsing time and space in the narrative, and
the result has far-reaching implications. In the *Fasti,* Ovid gives voice to the
very essence of *imperium Romanum:* "For other nations their land is given
a fixed boundary; the extent of the city of Rome is likewise the extent of the
Roman world."[39] For Ovid, the contiguity of *spatium urbis et orbis* is a for-
mula for successful empire. Tacitus achieves the collapse of *spatium urbis
et orbis* by the simple *quod,* which no doubt implies the sinister omnipres-
ence of the emperor. No matter how far Germanicus travels, Tiberius still
knows all. The innuendo is a gentle yet brilliant stroke, subtly embellishing
the dark portrait of the emperor. Once perhaps *spatium urbis et orbis* was
the prerogative of victorious *imperatores prisci;* but under the Principate,
only one may lay claim to its recompense.[40]

This completes the formal analysis of the paragraphs in question. Our
findings are not casual, for from this reading it is now possible to locate the
return to Teutoburg in the larger theme of the *Annales*. In sum, the inherent
transgression of the initial temporal terminus of the narrative reflects the
general theme of transgression so prevalent in the *Annales*. Before conclud-
ing, it remains to place the burial of the legions of Varus in the larger con-
text of Germanicus' campaigns on the Rhine.

The transformation from battlefield to cemetery suggests two further types
of moral transgression, both suitably paradoxical. First, the religious injunc-
tion to bury the dead has been ignored.[41] Far from the city of Rome, two cul-
tures have come into brutal conflict. There, where the Germans defile the
dead, Germanicus intends to impose the Roman standard practice of burial.
Yet in expiating the *barbarae arae* of the battlefield he actually incurs ritual
pollution.[42] Thus the attempt to correct the German transgression results in
still further deviation. Teutoburg, located on the periphery of the Roman em-
pire where Roman meets barbarian, represents, as it were, a category crisis

---

39. Ov. *Fast.* 2.683–84: "gentibus est aliis tellus data limite certo; / Romanae spatium est urbis et orbis
idem." For a review of the phrase *urbs et orbis* throughout Latin literature, see Börner 1958, 131–32;
Bréguet 1969, 140–52; on the Ovidian pun, see Hardie 1986, 364–66; Nicolet 1991, 33; Romm 1992, 121–
23; Edwards 1993, 19–20; Whittaker 1994, 29.

40. Cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.4.15: *res est publica Caesar.* See Laruccia 1980 on the peace that makes the glories of
old impossible; cf. 2.88.1: *qua gloria aequabat se Tiberius priscis imperatoribus;* Dio 61.30.5.

41. Cf. Woodman 1988, 169.

42. According to Suet. *Gaius* 3.2, Germanicus actually handled the corpses: "Caesorum clade Vari-
ana veteres ac dispersas reliquias uno tumulo humaturus, colligere sua manu et comportare primus
adgressus est."

that requires resolution.[43] Germanicus' resolution, however, only further complicates matters.

Secondly, we are not fully aware of Germanicus' exorbitance, indeed in the etymological sense of the word, until Tiberius condemns it.[44] The sharp and sudden shift in focus back to Rome reminds the reader that Germanicus is far from the center, perilously close to the outer limits of the empire, which Augustus had warned against extending (1.11.4).[45] In this sense, Teutoburg adumbrates Germanicus' future excursions as a voyager.[46] Like Odysseus, voyager par excellence, Germanicus also embarks on a sort of *katabasis* at Teutoburg, mingling with the dead (*ossa . . . tegeret*, 1.62.1) and transgressing the boundary between life and death. Like Caesar at the Rubicon or Alexander at the Granicus, Germanicus also has a desire for worlds beyond, a desire encapsulated in the precise moment when the adventurer crosses a river and thereby transgresses a natural geographically defined boundary.[47] And so Germanicus on the banks of the Rhine; the transgression is more than a wish to exceed the limits of the known world. The entire region is a sort of palimpsest where he tries to erase the degradation of the defeat of Varus and his three legions. According to Suetonius, Augustus intentionally commemorated the disaster annually, in sadness and mourning.[48] Germanicus, having stumbled unexpectedly upon this "museum of calamity," transforms it into a proper cemetery. But while he does not succeed in transforming Teutoburg into a fully fledged Roman victory, at least he is able to palliate the humiliation of the past.

The motif of Germanicus' exorbitance is further developed in the narrative of the campaigns at 2.5–26 and, as with Caesar and Alexander, this extravagance is also punctuated by the crossing of yet another river.[49] In the next year, not long after the visit to Teutoburg, Germanicus draws up a large fleet concentrated at the *insula Batavorum* (2.6.2–3). From there he launches an expedition against the Chatti; then the army advances toward the Visurgis river (2.7.1–2.9.1). Up to this point the campaign progresses without impediment; however, after Germanicus crosses the Visurgis (*Cae-*

---

43. The term "category crises" refers to boundaries established by society (slave/master, Jew/Gentile, owner/worker, sacred/secular) that become blurred or indistinct, epitomized by the obliteration of the ultimate binary opposition of male/female, as in the case of transvestism. See Garber 1992, 16–17, 32, 34, 58.

44. On geographical exorbitance as moral transgression, see Gillies 1994, 18, 20, 112–16, 122–23.

45. On the notions of expansion and limitation of empire in the literature of the Augustan age and the Principate, see Nicolet 1991, 29–56; Romm 1992, 135–37; Whittaker 1994, 25–26; on Augustan policy, see Gruen 1996.

46. His travels took him to Egypt, as far as Elephantine and Syene, poised on the edge of the Roman empire (*claustra olim Romani imperii*, 2.61.4); on voyagers, see Gillies 1994, 19–25.

47. Soubiran 1964, 63 compares Lucan's Caesar and Tacitus' Germanicus; on Alexander the Great, see Borzsák 1982, 46–56; on Caesar, see Masters 1992, 1–10; on the Alexander tradition in Roman literature, see Romm 1992, 123, 137–40.

48. Suet. *Aug.* 23.2: "diemque cladis quotannis maestum habuerit ac lugubrem."

49. Caes. *B Gall.* 4.16 provides a startling comparison; Caesar decides to cross the Rhine simply as a show of force ("cum intellegerent et posse et audere populi Romani exercitum Rhenum transire," 4.16.1). When he is finished, he retreats again ("se in Galliam recepit pontemque rescidit," 4.19.4). Thus he shows that he is not only capable of transgressing the limits of *imperium Romanum* (indeed metaphorically), but he is equally capable of holding his extravagance in check. Germanicus has no such vision or self-control. Devillers 1994, 33–34 compares 2.5–26 to the beginning of *B Gall.* 5; both narratives aggrandize the general and his operations.

sar transgressus Visurgim, 2.12.1), unusual things begin to happen. First, in an unprecedented display, he disguises himself as an auxiliary soldier in order to ascertain the mood of his troops (2.12–13). Next, he has a strange dream, the second of the only two recorded by Tacitus in the first hexad (2.14). Then, although the battle of Idistaviso is a resounding success for the Romans (2.16–18), upon their return to winter quarters they encounter a violent storm (2.23–24). The survivors of the shipwreck return from beyond the known world to tell of unknown birds and sea monsters, half man, half beast (2.24.4).[50] They had crossed the boundary between Roman and non-Roman, human and nonhuman, and finally between the known and the unknown world.[51]

Germanicus' continual desire to transgress boundaries on the periphery of the Roman world—geographical and moral—poses a threat to the stability of Rome. Tiberius remains in the city; as *princeps* he is the center of the Roman world and the head of state (cf. 1.6.3). Germanicus, however, repeatedly tests the limits of the known world and attempts to transgress the *ne plus ultra.* Tiberius and Germanicus thus share a paradoxical relationship, in which the activity of the one is defined by the inactivity of the other. The periphery is determined solely by its relation to the center; the position of the one necessarily defines the position of the other. In such a configuration, *imperium* comprises a static center and a dynamic periphery; stability depends on a balance between the two. Equilibrium is achieved when the force of the one is neither greater nor less than the force of the other. So to the extent that Tiberius remains static, Germanicus can exercise autonomy at the outer limits of the empire. But when Germanicus oversteps his bounds, when he exerts greater centrifugal force than the center is capable of sustaining, then Tiberius must react with an equal and opposite force.[52] He recalls Germanicus from the Rhine altogether. It is a prudent and reasonable decision; in his letters Tiberius states plainly: enough is enough (*satis iam eventuum, satis casuum,* 2.26.2).[53] But, according to Tacitus, Germanicus interprets it differently and, reading between the lines (*intellegeret*), he attributes his recall to Tiberian jealousy and dissimulation.[54]

Perhaps out of jealousy of his successful campaigns against the Germans, perhaps out of prudence because the Romans had suffered enough casualties, Tiberius recalls Germanicus from the Rhine, bids him celebrate the already

---

50. Cf. the fragmentary epic poem of the survivor Albinovanus Pedo, preserved by Sen. *Suas.* 1.14–15; see Furneaux 1896, 386; Syme 1958, p. 277, n. 5; Tandoi 1964, 129–68 and 1967, 5–66, esp. 7–14; Morford 1967, 31; Benario 1973; Romm 1992, 143–47; Courtney 1993, 315–19.

51. Braund 1996, 21.

52. Cf. Habinek 1998, 152–53.

53. For the tone of impatience in the phrase *satis iam,* see Fraenkel 1957, 243.

54. 2.26.5: "fingi ea seque per invidiam parto iam decori abstrahi intellegeret." On Germanicus' ability "to read between the lines," see Sinclair 1995, 64. This is another instance of Tacitus' brilliant use of the loaded alternative (see n. 7 above) extended over the course of an entire paragraph. On Tiberius' attitude toward Germanicus' campaigns, see Goodyear 1981, 258, esp. n. 3: "Tiberius had no substantial reason for the *invidia* Tacitus imputes to him, though he might resent Germanicus' easily won popularity." I believe the phrase *per invidiam* purposely echoes Augustus' reason against expansion at 1.11.4; according to Tacitus, when it comes to Germany, like father, like son.

awarded triumph, and makes him consul (2.26).[55] Tiberius puts an end to
Germanicus' travels in Germany and calls him home, thereby collapsing the
relationship between the peripheral, dynamic figure and the central, static
figure. *Spatium urbis et orbis idem;* the distinction between the city of
Rome and the edges of the known world collapses yet again. But German-
icus, so it seems, lives his life on the edge. His last mission is to the East,
and there he dies. Only then does he actually journey back from the periph-
ery to the imperial center: Agrippina the Elder carries his ashes all the way
from Antioch to Corcyra, to Brundisium, and finally to Rome.[56] The senate
proposes three triumphal arches to the memory of Germanicus: the first, of
course, at Rome, in the Circus Flaminius on the bank of the Tiber, in the
heart of the empire; the second, on the bank of the Rhine, on the western
edge of his achievements; and the third on Mt. Amanus, marking his east-
ernmost activity.[57] Thus honors decreed after his death inscribe his legend
as a voyager across the landscape of the empire.

                              *   *   *

Through the geographical and moral transgressions of Germanicus, the
battlefield at Teutoburg is metamorphosed into a cemetery; defeat, if not
completely changed into victory, is somewhat mitigated. Through the tem-
poral and spatial transgressions of the narrative Tacitus likewise effects a
transformation in the myth of the *Teutoburgerwald.* He could have told the
story of the *clades Variana* in the first ten paragraphs of Book 1, with the
other pre-Tiberian information. It was, after all, an Augustan event. But, by
withholding the account, by placing it squarely in the realm of Tiberius, and
by framing his version of the story within the campaigns of Germanicus, he
adds another layer of meaning. Here is one last chance for the Romans to
efface the humiliation, to transform defeat into victory, to conquer the insur-
gent German tribes once and for all. Latent in the *Teutoburgiensis saltus*
which the oblivious soldiers stumble upon, is a rare opportunity. But Ger-
manicus proves inferior to the task; Tiberius proves too jealous to brook a ri-
val; Arminius proves too formidable an enemy.[58] For but a moment, for only
two paragraphs, the resurrection of Teutoburg suspends before the eyes of all
the possibilities for correcting mistakes, for exacting vengeance upon ene-
mies, for expanding empire. And then, as quickly as it rises, so it dissolves.
It is a treasured pattern in the *Annales,* to tell the history of the transgressive

55. Tacitus gives notice of the award of the triumph to Germanicus at 1.55.1; see Ginsburg 1981, pp. 18
and 107, n. 13. On 2.26, see Timpe 1968, 59–65.
56. 2.75.1: "ascendit classem cum cineribus Germanici"; 3.1.1–2: "Agrippina Corcyram insulam
advehitur . . . ruere ad oppidum Brundisium"; 3.4.1: "conlucentes per campum Martis faces." Versnel 1980,
549 calls this a "tristful triumph." Cf. the journey of Lucan's Cornelia, 9.172–81, bereft even of Pompey's
ashes.
57. 2.83.2: "arcus additi Romae et apud ripam Rheni et in monte Suriae Amano cum inscriptione rerum
gestarum"; Circus Flaminius: *Tabula Siarensis* frag. 1 lines 9–21; Mt. Amanus: frag. 1 lines 22–25; banks
of the Rhine: frag. 1 lines 26–34; see Potter 1987, 269–76.
58. Straub 1980, 228 argues that while the obituary of 2.88 marks the beginning of the end of Roman
rule in Germania, it is also a metaphor for the futility of senatorial opposition.

Julio-Claudian dynasty as the transformation of circumstances from bad to worse.

Boundaries are most clearly recognized when under attack and are guarded more carefully when threatened. Transgression, on the other hand, can only occur when firm, established limits are in place. Thus the act of crossing a boundary serves to define the very limit it violates.[59] This contradiction is evident in Roman imperial politics. On the one hand, territorial expansion (and its benefits) depends on the deliberate transgression of boundaries, both geographical and political. Caesar built a prosperous military career on this fact,[60] and the provinces that he subdued became the cornerstones of a lucrative empire. Yet even the casual reader of the *Annales* is always aware that transgression is intolerable and must be censured. Agrippina the Younger is the obvious example.[61] A successful senator balances these competing and conflicting tendencies between overstepping bounds in order to expand opportunity and observing bounds in order to preserve *mos maiorum*. Ideally, the result is a well-ordered Principate. Good men under bad emperors know how to walk the tight rope between defiance and servitude, between observing political decorum and maintaining self-respect. The life of Agricola eloquently demonstrates that obedience and submission accompanied by activity and vigor can achieve a degree of honor. A perilous career, utterly useless to the state and culminating in an ostentatious death, is foolhardy and scarcely recommended (Tac. *Agr.* 42.4). In the *Annales,* Marcus Lepidus alone approximates Agricola's moderation, and his success rests in his ability to bend, but not break (*flexit,* 4.20.2).[62] Such is the fine line that proved Germanicus' undoing. Any hope of expansion of empire, even the hope of restitution (certainly not recuperation) of the lost legions of Varus, was vitiated by the turpitude of his geographical, and moral, exorbitance.

The ghost of Varus is a fitting coda. Even after his bones have been buried, he still walks the earth, haunting Caecina in a restless dream (1.65.1–2). Just as Germanicus and his troops violated the boundary between living and dead, so Varus continues to transgress the boundary between life and death. During battle the next day, when the circumstances of the massacre are unwittingly recreated, yet another fleeting image is momentarily inscribed upon the palimpsest of history and Arminius gets the last word. "Behold Varus and his legions defeated yet again by a similar fate!"[63] And then, as swiftly as it materializes, so the Teutoburg Forest, like the dream of Caecina, vanishes, reverting to its primordial anonymity. The problem that Tacitus set before himself was to visualize such a place, and to lay the vision

---

59. On the interdependence of limits and transgression, see Foucault 1977, 33–36; Botting 1993, 273.

60. Cf. n. 49 above.

61. In her marriage to her uncle Claudius she defies (and thus redefines) the law; she contrives to put her son in power; she plots the murder of her husband/uncle; she commits incest. Nero's plot to murder her is a perverse desert. On her transgression, see Paratore 1952, 54; Dickison 1977, 640; Kaplan 1979, 413–14; Santoro-L'hoir 1992, 133, 1994, 17; Fischler 1994, 120.

62. Syme 1970, 30–49; see also Classen 1988 on the quietism of Agricola.

63. 1.65.4: "en Varus et eodem[que] iterum fato vinctae legiones." On the emendations of this line, see Goodyear 1981, 116–17; on the function of dreams in Tacitus, see Pelling 1997, 205–10, esp. 207.

before his reader's eye. He is not without comrades in this task, both ancient and modern;[64] he is however, without rival. As the Romans had to abandon hope of recuperating the losses of the *clades Variana,* so we must no longer condemn the geographical inaccuracy of Tacitus' Teutoburg. Tiberian wisdom, as distressing as that may be, prevails: enough is enough.[65]

University of Wisconsin

LITERATURE CITED

Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin.

Bann, S. 1984. *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-Century Britain and France.* Cambridge.

Barbon, P., and B. Plachta. 1995. "Chi la dura la vince"—"Wer ausharrt, siegt." Arminius auf der Opernbühne des 18. Jahrhunderts. In *Arminius und die Varusschlacht: Geschichte-Mythos-Literatur,* ed. R. Wiegels and W. Woesler, 265–90. Paderborn.

Barthes, R. 1986. *The Rustle of Language.* Trans. R. Howard. New York.

Baxter, R. 1972. Virgil's Influence on Tacitus in Books 1 and 2 of the *Annals. CP* 67 (4): 246–69.

Benario, H. W. 1973. The Text of Albinovanus Pedo. *Latomus* 32:166–69.

Bettini, M. 1991. *Anthropology and Roman Culture: Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul.* Trans. by J. Van Sickle. Baltimore.

Bidart, F. 1997. The Return. In *Desire.* New York.

Bömer, F. 1957–58. *P. Ovidius Naso Die "Fasten."* 2 vols. Heidelberg.

Booker, J. 1975. The Major *Hermannsschlacht* Dramas. Ph.D. diss., University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Borzsák, S. 1982. Alexander d. Gr. als Muster taciteischer Heldendarstellung. *Gymnasium* 89:37–56.

———, ed. 1992. *Cornelii Taciti Libri Qui Supersunt: Ab Excessu Divi Augusti Libri 1–6.* Vol. 1, part 1. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig and Stuttgart.

64. On the *Hermannsschlacht* in the post-Tacitean tradition, see Vigfusson and Powell 1886, 5–28; Uhl 1898; Kesting 1962; von Petrikovits 1966, 175–76; Hobsbawm 1983, 275; Czech 1992, 29; Weinbrot 1993, 177, 181; Schama 1995, 100–134; Wiegels and Woesler 1995. See Kesting 1962, 112–27 on the *Hermanns-denkmals* in Detmold and New Ulm, Minnesota; Motz 1975 commemorates the centennial of the monument in Detmold. In 1529, Ulrich von Hutten's *Arminius,* a dialogue in Latin, was published posthumously; this work influenced the later interpretations of Frischlin, Grabbe, Moscherosch, Lohenstein, Klopstock, and Kleist; see Roloff 1995. *Die Hermannsschlacht* is the subject of no fewer than eighty-two dramas (the best known by Kleist in 1809 and Grabbe in 1835); see Booker 1975. The more than three thousand pages of Lohenstein's novel *Grossmütiger Feldherr Arminius samt seiner durchlauchtigsten Thusnelda* were published in 1689. Klopstock wrote the lyric poems "Hermann und Thusnelda" (1752), and "Hermann" (1767), and the dramas *Hermannsschlacht* (1769), *Hermann und die Fürsten* (1784), and *Hermanns Tod* (1787). Operas include Hasse's *Arminio* (two versions, 1730 and 1745) and Handel's *Arminio* (premiered in 1737, revived in 1935 and 1972). Between 1676 and 1794, no fewer than fifty-four operas on the theme of Arminius were performed from London to Dresden to Rome; see Barbon and Plachta 1995. On the painting by Kiefer, see n. 24 above. The most recent treatment of the story is Bidart's 1997 verse translation of 1.61–62, "The Return." The twentieth century has seen three film renditions of the battle; see Völker et al. 1996, 39; for Tacitean technique that "invites comparison with the cinema," see Goodyear 1972, p. 196, n. 2. Finally, visit the web site for the Völker et al. 1996 film (in Latin, with German subtitles), *Die Hermannsschlacht,* at http://us.imdb.com/Title? Hermannsschlacht.

65. Sincere thanks to the editor, both anonymous readers, and A. Wolpert; for Gerda Seligson, with gratitude and affection.

Botting, F. 1993. Power in the Darkness: Heterotopias, Literature, and Gothic Labyrinths. *Genre* 26:251–82.

Bowersock, G. 1993. Tacitus and the Province of Asia. In *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition*, ed. T. J. Luce and A. J. Woodman, 3–10. Princeton.

Braund, D. 1996. *Ruling Roman Britain: Kings, Queens, Governors and Emperors from Julius Caesar to Agricola.* London and New York.

Bréguet, E. 1969. *Urbi et orbi:* Un Cliché et un thème. In *Hommages à Marcel Renard,* ed. J. Bibauw, vol. 1, 140–52. Collection Latomus, vol. 101. Brussels.

Caballos, A., W. Eck, and F. Fernández. 1996. *El Senadoconsulto de Geneo Pisón Padre.* Seville.

Charlesworth, M. 1927. Livia and Tanaquil. *CR* 41:55–57.

Cizek, E. 1968. La Structure du temps et de l'espace dans l'*Agricola* de Tacite. *Helikon* 8:238–49.

Classen, C. J. 1988. Tacitus—Historian between Republic and Principate. *Mnemosyne* 41:93–116.

Courtney, E. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets.* Oxford.

Crimp, D. 1983. On the Museum's Ruins. In *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture,* ed. H. Foster, 43–56. Port Townsend, WA.

Czech, K. P. 1992. Rome's German Nightmare. *The Quarterly Journal of Military History* 5(1):24–31.

Develin, R. 1983. Tacitus and Techniques of Insidious Suggestion. *Antichthon* 17:64–95.

Devillers, O. 1994. *L'Art de la persuasion dans les "Annales" de Tacite.* Collection Latomus, vol. 223. Brussels.

Dickison, S. K. 1977. Claudius: Saturnalicius Princeps. *Latomus* 36:634–47.

Eck, W. 1993. Das s. c. de Cn. Pisone patre und seine Publikation in der Baetica. *CCG* 4:189–208.

Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome.* Cambridge.

Fischler, S. 1994. Social Stereotypes and Historical Analysis: The Case of Imperial Women at Rome. In *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night,* ed. L. Archer, S. Fischler, and M. Wyke, 115–33. New York.

Foucault, M. 1977. A Preface to Transgression. Trans. D. Bouchard. In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice,* ed. D. Bauchard, 29–52. Ithaca.

Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace.* Oxford.

Furneaux, H. 1896. *The "Annals" of Tacitus.* 2d ed. Vol. 1. Oxford.

Garber, M. 1992. *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety.* New York.

Gillies, J. 1994. *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference.* Cambridge.

Ginsburg, J. 1981. *Tradition and Theme in the "Annals" of Tacitus.* New York.

Goodyear, F., ed. 1972. *The "Annals" of Tacitus Books 1–6.* Vol. 1, *"Annals" 1.1–54.* Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, vol. 15. Cambridge.

———. 1981. *The "Annals" of Tacitus Books 1–6.* Vol. 2, *"Annals" 1.55–81* and *"Annals" 2,* Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, vol. 23. Cambridge.

Griffin, M. 1995. Tacitus, Tiberius and the Principate. In *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World: Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz,* ed. I. Malkin and Z. W. Rubinsohn, 33–57. Leiden.

Gruen, E. 1996. The Expansion of the Empire Under Augustus. In *The Cambridge Ancient History.* 2d ed. Vol. 10, ed. A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin, and A. Lintott, 147–97. Cambridge.

Habinek, T. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome.* Princeton.

Hardie, P. 1986. *Virgil's "Aeneid": Cosmos and Imperium.* Oxford.

Henke, O., and B. Lehmann. 1910. *Die neueren Forschungen über die Varusschlacht.* Gütersloh.

Hobsbawm, E. 1983. Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870–1914. In *The Invention of Tradition,* ed. E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger, 263–307. Cambridge.

Holquist, M. 1990. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. London and New York.

Horsfall, N. 1985. Illusion and Reality in Latin Topographical Writing. *G&R* 32:197–208.

Huyssen, A. 1989. Anselm Kiefer: The Terror of History, the Temptation of Myth. *October* 48:24–46.

Jameson, F. 1981. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca.

Jens, W. 1956. *Libertas* bei Tacitus. *Hermes* 84:331–52.

John, W. 1950. *Die Örtlichkeit der Varusschlacht bei Tacitus: Eine Quellenuntersuchung*. Göttingen.

Jones, C. P. 1971. *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford.

Kaplan, M. 1979. *Agrippina semper atrox:* A Study in Tacitus' Characterization of Women. In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History,* ed. C. Deroux, vol. 1, 410–17. Collection Latomus, vol. 164. Brussels.

Kelley, D. R. 1993. *Tacitus Noster:* The *Germania* in the Renaissance and Reformation. In *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition,* ed. T. J. Luce and A. J. Woodman, 152–67. Princeton.

Kestermann, D., ed. 1992. *Quellensammlung zur Varus-Niederlage und den germanisch-römischen Kriegen*. Meinberg.

Kesting, H. 1962. *Der Befreier Arminius im Lichte der geschichtlichen Quellen und der wissenschaftlichen Forschung*. Detmold.

Koestermann, E. 1957. Die Feldzüge des Germanicus 14–16 n. Chr. *Historia* 6:429–79.

————, ed. 1963. *Cornelius Tacitus: "Annalen."* Vol. 1, *Books 1–3*. Heidelberg.

Köhler, F. 1925. *Wo war die Varus-schlacht*. Dortmund.

Kraus, C., and A. J. Woodman. 1997. *Latin Historians*. Greece and Rome, New Surveys in the Classics, no. 27. Oxford.

Laruccia, S. 1980. The Wasteland of Peace: A Tacitean Evaluation of *Pax Romana*. In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History,* ed. C. Deroux, vol. 2, 407–11. Collection Latomus, vol. 168. Brussels.

Lehmann, G. 1990. Zur historisch-literarischen Überlieferung der Varus-Katastrophe 9 n. Chr. *Boreas* 13:143–64.

Leise, W. 1986. *Wo Arminius die Römer schlug: Wege auf Wasserscheiden führen zum Ort der Varusschlacht*. Münster.

Lucas, J. 1974. *Les Obsessions de Tacite*. Roma Aeterna, vol. 8. Leiden.

Martin, R. 1955. Tacitus and the Death of Augustus. *CQ* 5:123–28.

————. 1981. *Tacitus*. Berkeley.

Martin, R., and A. J. Woodman, eds. 1996. *The "Annals" of Tacitus Book 3*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, vol. 32. Cambridge.

Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's "Bellum Civile."* Cambridge.

Mommsen, T. 1885. *Die Örtlichkeit der Varusschlacht*. Berlin.

————. 1887. *Provinces of the Roman Empire*. Part 1. Trans. W. Dickson. New York.

————. 1992. *Römische Kaisergeschichte nach den Vorlesungs-Mitschriften von Sebastian und Paul Hensel 1882/86,* ed. B. Demandt and A. Demandt. Munich.

Morford, M. 1967. *The Poet Lucan*. Oxford.

Morgan, M. G. 1992. The Smell of Victory: Vitellius at Bedriacum (Tac. *Hist.* 2.70). *CP* 87(1):14–29.

Motz, U. 1975. *Das Hermannsdenkmal und die Schlacht im Teutoburger Wald*. Detmold.

Nicolet, C. 1991. *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Jerome Lectures, vol. 19. Ann Arbor.

Paratore, E. 1952. La figura di Agrippina minore in Tacito. *Maia* 5:32–81.

Pelling, C. 1997. Tragical Dreamer: Some Dreams in Roman Historians. *G&R* 44:197–213.

Plass, P. 1995. *The Game of Death in Ancient Rome: Arena Sport and Political Suicide*. Madison.

Potter, D. 1987. The *Tabula Siarensis,* Tiberius, the Senate, and the Eastern Boundary of the Roman Empire. *ZPE* 69:269–76.

Putnam, M. 1989. Virgil and Tacitus *Ann.* 1.10. *CQ* 39:563–64.

Rabinowitz, P. 1987. *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation.* Ithaca.

Roloff, H.-G. 1995. Der *Arminius* des Ulrich von Hutten. In *Arminius und die Varusschlacht: Geschichte-Mythos-Literatur,* ed. R. Wiegels and W. Woesler, 211–38. Paderborn.

Romm, J. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction.* Princeton.

Ryberg, I. S. 1942. Tacitus' Art of Innuendo. *TAPhA* 73:383–404.

Santoro-L'hoir, F. 1992. *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms: "Man," "Woman," and the Portrayal of Character in Latin Prose. Mnemosyne* Supplement, vol. 120. Leiden.

———. 1994. Tacitus and Women's Usurpation of Power. *CW* 88:5–25.

Schama, S. 1995. *Landscape and Memory.* New York.

Schlüter, W. 1999. The Battle of the Teutoburg Forest: Archaeological Research at Kalkriese near Osnabrück. In *Roman Germany: Studies in Cultural Interaction,* ed. J. D. Creighton and R. J. A. Wilson, 123–59. *JRA* Supplement, no. 32. Portsmouth, RI.

Schöning, A. 1963. *Die Örtlichkeit der Varusschlacht in mathematischer Sicht.* Detmold.

Shotter, D. 1966. *Ea simulacra libertatis. Latomus* 25:265–71.

Sinclair, P. 1995. *Tacitus the Sententious Historian: A Sociology of Rhetoric in "Annales" 1–6.* University Park, PA.

Soubiran, J. 1964. Thèmes et rythmes d'Epopée dans les *Annales* de Tacite. *Pallas* 12:55–79.

Straub, J. 1980. *Liberator haud dubie Germaniae:* Zeitkritik im Urteil des Tacitus über Arminius. *WJA* 6:223–31.

Syme, R. 1958. *Tacitus.* 2 vols. Oxford.

———. 1970. *Ten Studies in Tacitus.* Oxford.

———. 1974. History or Biography: The Case of Tiberius Caesar. *Historia* 23:481–96.

———. 1978. *History in Ovid.* Oxford.

———. 1984. How Tacitus Wrote *Annals* 1–3. In *Roman Papers,* vol. 3, ed. A. Birley, 1014–42. Oxford. First published in *Historiographia Antiqua. Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* (Louvain, 1977), 231–64.

Tandoi, V. 1964. Albinovano Pedone e la retorica Giulio-Claudia delle conquiste. *SIFC* 36: 129–68.

———. 1967. Albinovano Pedone e la retorica Giulio-Claudia delle conquiste. *SIFC* 39: 5–66.

Tarrant, R. J. 1997. Aspects of Virgil's Reception in Antiquity. In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil,* ed. C. Martindale, 56–72. Cambridge.

Thomas, R. F. 1988. *Virgil "Georgics."* 2 vols. Vol. 1, *Books 1–2.* Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge.

Timpe, D. 1968. *Der Triumph des Germanicus: Untersuchungen zu den Feldzügen der Jahre 14–16 n. Chr. in Germanien.* Bonn.

———. 1970. *Arminius-Studien.* Heidelberg.

Tönnies, B. 1992. Die Ausgrabungen in Kalkriese und Tac. *Ann.* 1.60.3: Eine Lösung für die Varusschlachtfrage in Sicht? *Hermes* 120:461–65.

Uhl, W. 1898. *Das Portrait des Arminius.* Königsberg.

Versnel, H. 1980. Destruction, *Devotio* and Despair in a Situation of Anomy: The Mourning for Germanicus in Triple Perspective. In *Perennitas: Studi in onore di Angelo Brelich,* 541–68. Rome.

Vielberg, M. 1987. *Pflichten, Werte, Ideale: Eine Untersuchung zu den Wertvorstellungen des Tacitus.* Stuttgart.

Vigfusson, G., and Powell, F. 1886. *Sigfred-Arminius and Other Papers.* Oxford.

Völker, C., et al. 1996. Monumental, magisch, masslos: Deutschland im Jahr 9! *Die Hermannsschlacht* Der Spielfilm. *Grabbe-Jahrbuch* 15:38–47.

von Petrikovits, H. 1966. Arminius. *Bonner Jahrbücher* 166:175–93.

Walker, B. 1952. *The "Annals" of Tacitus: A Study in the Writing of History.* Manchester.

Walser, G. 1951. *Rom, das Reich und die fremden Völker in der Geschichtsschreibung der frühen Kaiserzeit: Studien zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Tacitus.* Baden-Baden.

Weinbrot, H. 1993. Politics, Taste, and National Identity: Some Uses of Tacitism in Eighteenth-Century Britain. In *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition,* ed. T. J. Luce and A. J. Woodman, 168–84. Princeton.

Wellesley, K. 1969. Tacitus as Military Historian. In *Tacitus,* ed. T. Dorey, 63–97. London.

————, ed. 1986. *Cornelii Taciti Libri Qui Supersunt: Ab Excessu Divi Augusti Libri 11–16.* Vol. 1, part 2. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig and Stuttgart.

Wells, C. 1972. *The German Policy of Augustus.* Oxford.

Whitehead, D. 1979. Tacitus and the Loaded Alternative. *Latomus* 38:474–95.

Whittaker, C. R. 1994. *Frontiers of the Roman Empire: A Social and Economic Study.* Baltimore and London.

Wiedemann, T. 1979. *Nunc ad inceptum redeo:* Sallust, *Jugurtha* 4.9 and Cato. *LCM* 4:13–16.

Wiegels, R., and W. Woesler, eds. 1995. *Arminius und die Varusschlacht: Geschichte-Mythos-Literatur.* Paderborn.

Wirszubski, C. 1968. *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome.* Cambridge.

Wolterstorff, G. 1949. Vari castra: Zu Tacitus *Annalen* 1.61. *Gymnasium* 56:135–46.

Woodman, A. J. 1979. Self-Imitation and the Substance of History: Tacitus, *Annals* 1.61–5 and *Histories* 2.70, 5.14–15. In *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature,* ed. D. West and A. J. Woodman, 143–55. Cambridge.

————. 1988. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies.* Portland, OR.

————, ed. 1983. *Velleius Paterculus: The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative* (2.41–93), Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, vol. 25. Cambridge.