

## THE LANGUAGE OF THE LATER BOOKS OF TACITUS' *ANNALS*<sup>1</sup>

THE demonstration by E. Wölfflin<sup>2</sup> that between the *Histories* and *Annals* Tacitus progressed towards a more archaic and artificial style is well known. From the outset Tacitus adhered to the traditional Roman view that history should be composed in an archaic language remote from everyday usage; but he was apparently at first not fully aware of the possibilities of the archaizing style. New archaisms and artificial usages suggested themselves as he advanced; and others, which he had used sporadically even early in the *Histories*, were allowed to oust ordinary alternatives completely.

E. Löfstedt<sup>3</sup> was able to add some further evidence to that of Wölfflin, and at the same time he suggested that although Tacitus moves towards greater artificiality of diction in the first half of the *Annals*, he returns in the later books, and particularly after 12, to a more 'normal' 'classical' style. This view was supported in greater detail by N. Eriksson,<sup>4</sup> and gained wide acceptance until questioned recently by F. R. D. Goodyear.<sup>5</sup> It is my purpose here to show with new evidence that it cannot stand.

There is indeed much linguistic change within the *Annals*, but it cannot be characterized generally as a movement towards greater normality. Some artificial usages are certainly discarded; but others are taken up. There are in addition changes of preference which cannot be described as representing either a tendency towards the more artificial or towards the more normal. The *Annals* thus present a complexity of changes of differing types. Perhaps the only development which is consistently maintained is that away from formal rhetoric.

This confused picture need cause puzzlement only if it is assumed that all stylistic change is conscious and made with a definite end in view. In fact, the idiolect of any writer will in time almost inevitably show changes of a haphazard kind. He may set out to modify his style in a definite way, just as Tacitus did between the *Histories* and *Annals*; but he will also be bound to make modifications, often perhaps unconsciously, of an inexplicable kind, which in their diversity will match the diversity of the influences to which he is exposed. Modern research has shown that a writer will for no apparent reason have a taste for different words and expressions at different points of his career.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Dr. R. M. Ogilvie for much helpful criticism of an earlier draft of this paper. I have also benefited from discussion with Professor F. R. D. Goodyear.

<sup>2</sup> *Philol.* xxv (1867), 92 ff.; xxvi (1867), 92 ff.; xxvii (1868), 113 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, ii (Lund, 1933), 283 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus* (Lund, 1934).

<sup>5</sup> 'Development of Language and Style in the *Annals* of Tacitus', *J.R.S.* lviii (1968), 22 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., G. Udny Yule, *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary* (Cambridge, 1944), 130 and (for examples from specific writers) 149; D. Young, *Greece & Rome*, vi<sup>2</sup> (1959), 96 ff.; K. J. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*, Univ. of California Press, 1968, e.g. pp. 87-90; H. Tränkle, 'Beobachtungen und Erwägungen zum Wandel der livianischen Sprache', *Wien. Stud.* lxxxi (1968), 103 ff. (modifying the earlier view that Livy's style becomes less archaizing after the first decade).

He will tend, for example, to pick up new words from works he has read or speakers he has heard. These may become components of his own vocabulary, or he may use them only temporarily before discarding them. Sometimes they may be fashionable terms which will be dropped when they lose their impact in society. Again, he will sometimes be moved to drop a word because he becomes conscious that he has overused it. The desire for variation is a factor which has been shown to have exercised a strong influence in the micro-context on Tacitus;<sup>1</sup> so he may have sought to avoid monotony in the context of larger sections of his work. Since he had to narrate numerous events of the same kind (e.g. battles) it is understandable that he should have desired frequent alterations of vocabulary. Archaisms and artificial words in particular could easily pall through overuse.

Finally, it is worth emphasizing that it is no longer possible to place Latin words in any but the most general stylistic classes (e.g. archaisms, vulgarisms). An archaizing historian who discards an archaism or artificial word may be motivated not by an impulse to 'normalize' his vocabulary but rather by a feeling that the 'normal' term to which he turns has some particular quality, now lost on us, which makes it preferable to the corresponding archaism. If we knew more about the quality of Latin words, we would perhaps find that many of the apparently conflicting changes in the later *Annals* had as their common inspiration Tacitus' desire to maximize the effectiveness of his language.

The assessing of stylistic change within a work involves problems of method, some of which must briefly be mentioned. It will be convenient to point out a few faults of procedure which occur in earlier writers on Tacitus.

1. Eriksson saw the normalization of Tacitus' style as consisting in a movement towards a more 'Ciceronian' vocabulary. However, many words which Cicero employs had fallen out of use between the late Republic and the end of the first century A.D. If the language of the later books of the *Annals* is more normal than that of the early books, it will have a closer affinity with the ordinary educated usage of the early Empire. This is represented above all among extant writings by the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* collected by the Elder Seneca.<sup>2</sup> In conjunction with these two works we can also take into account the *Declamationes Minores* of ps.-Quintilian, which are very similar in vocabulary, but unfortunately are of uncertain date. Other useful guides are Petronius (excluding the speeches in the *Cena Trimalchionis*)<sup>3</sup> and Quintilian (though both are capable of artificialities of vocabulary), Vitruvius, Celsus, and Scribonius Largus.

2. Much of Eriksson's evidence consists of archaic, poetic, or rare words which occur only once or twice in the first 6 books of the *Annals* and never again; or, conversely, of classical words which occur only once or twice in the last 6 books. Against such evidence must be set the numerous examples, not mentioned by Eriksson, of (a) archaisms etc. which are found sporadically

<sup>1</sup> See G. Sörbom, *Variatio sermonis Tacitei aliaque apud eundem quaestiones selectae* (Uppsala, 1935).

<sup>2</sup> The question whether Seneca has remembered the actual wording of the speakers he purports to quote, or whether he recorded the drift of their arguments in his own style, is irrelevant here.

<sup>3</sup> Löfstedt was aware of the need to contrast Tacitean usage with the educated language of the early Empire. He occasionally refers to Petronius as a representative of the latter: see *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Uppsala, 1911), 168 f., 256 f.

only in the later books, and (b) ordinary words which are found only in 1-6.<sup>1</sup> Moreover isolated deviations from a norm scarcely provide sound proof of stylistic change.

3. It is not justifiable to compare the distribution of two words (or usages) unless they are interchangeable. One, or both, may be restricted to contexts of certain types. *Servitus*, for example, is found predominantly in speeches in the historical works, but its archaic synonym *servitium* is used in the narrative as well. Again, two words may differ slightly in usage, though identical in meaning. It was argued, for instance, by Wölfflin that the poeticism *senecta*<sup>2</sup> increases from *Histories* to *Annals* at the expense of the commonplace prose term *senectus*.<sup>3</sup> But Wölfflin did not observe that there is a clear distinction between the two words. While almost half the examples of *senectus* (6 : 14) are in the nominative, *senecta* is found only in the oblique cases. Secondly, *senecta* is used 16 times (over 60 per cent of all instances) in the ablative (never with a preposition), but *senectus* only 3 times (twice with a preposition).<sup>4</sup> The pair are genuinely comparable only in the accusative, genitive, and dative cases.

Similarly Eriksson compared the frequencies of *dignitas* and *dignatio* without noting that in certain functions *dignitas* only is admissible:<sup>5</sup>

(a) The set phrase *ex dignitate* occurs 4 times in the historical works, but *ex dignatione* is avoided. For *ex dignitate* see, e.g., *Rhet. Her.* 2. 20, *Cic. ad Brut.* 1. 2. 2, *Fam.* 5. 8. 4, *Liv.* 5. 23. 11, *Sen. Dial.* 4. 6. 2.

(b) Only *dignitas* is used with the adjectives *senatoria* and *equestris* (4 times). Both phrases are common during the Empire (*T.L.L.* v. 1. 138. 4 ff., 17 ff.).

<sup>1</sup> e.g. (a) *adusque* 14. 58. 4, *alimonium* = *alimentum* 11. 16. 3, *audentia* = *audacia* 15. 53. 2, *citus* = *cito* 12. 12. 3, *dehonestamentum* = *dedecus* 12. 14. 3, 14. 21. 4, *dissero* = *dissero* 12. 11. 1, 13. 38. 3, *dido* 11. 1. 2 (see *Lex. Tac.* s.v. 'fama' for alternatives), *diutinus* = *diuturnus* 14. 18. 2, *dignus* + gen. 15. 14. 1, *disterno* = *divido* 11. 10. 2, *funus* = *cadaver* 13. 17. 3, 15. 71. 1 (see E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI*<sup>2</sup>, p. 178), *genero* 15. 23. 1 (see E. Fraenkel, *Horace*, 293 n. 3), *illo* = *illuc* 15. 60. 4, *intorqueo* 14. 36. 3, *inultus* = *impunitus* 13. 25. 2, *moenia* = *portae*, *urbs* 14. 24. 4, *obtego* = *protego* 16. 5. 3, *partio* = *partior* 12. 30. 2, *permeo* = *pervenio* 14. 58. 4, *popularis* = *populus* 12. 16. 1, 14. 24. 4, *praevalidus* = *validissimus* 15. 20. 1, *queritor* 16. 34. 2, *regno* trans. 13. 54. 1, *retego* = 'reveal' 15. 74. 1, *rebello* = *descisco* 12. 50. 2, *innumerus* 12. 29. 3, 12. 56. 3, 14. 53. 5, *eo infitias* = *infitor* 15. 2. 3, *merso* = *mergo* 15. 69. 2, *subvecto* = *subveho* 15. 43. 3; (b) *eligo* = *deligo* (see Wölfflin, *Philol.* xxvi (1867), 108), *firmus* = *validus* 3. 18. 1, 4. 62. 1, *apparatus* = *paratus* 2. 69. 2, *capillus* 4. 57. 2 (see H. Tränkle, *Wien. Stud.* lxxxi (1968), 123), *cadaver* 1. 22. 2, 2. 18. 1 (see Norden l.c.), *consimilis* 3. 13. 2, *satietas* 1. 49. 2, *firmitas* = *firmitudo* 4. 63. 1, *taceo* = *sileo* 4. 60. 2, *tacitus* = *silens* 2. 43. 5, *adpropinquo* = *propinquo* 6. 50. 2.

Synonyms of or alternatives to all the above occur in the opposite half of the *Annals*.

<sup>2</sup> See J. P. Krebs and J. H. Schmalz, *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache*<sup>7</sup> (Basel, 1905), s.v.

<sup>3</sup> *Philol.* xxv (1867), 101.

<sup>4</sup> The disproportionate frequency of *senecta* in the ablative, and its absence in the nominative, can be paralleled in other prose authors. Before Tacitus the word is used in prose by Nepos (*Vir. Ill. frg.* 15, in H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, ii), Varro (*Ling.* 5. 5), Livy (6 times), Valerius Maximus (4. 3. ext. 3, 8. 13. ext. 1), and Pliny the Elder (43 times, often with a concrete meaning). The nominative occurs only 3 times (*Liv.* 2. 40. 6, *Plin. Nat.* 8. 116, 30. 69), but the ablative once in Nepos, once in Varro, 4 times in Livy, and 28 times in Pliny. Pliny has *senectus* 10 times in the nominative, but only 5 times in the ablative. *Senecta* had originally been an adjective. In Plautus it is still found 7 times in the fossilized ablative expression *senecta aetate*, as well as 3 times on its own (always in the phrase *in senecta*). Apparently when detached from *aetate* to form an independent substantive it continued to be regarded as more acceptable in the ablative than in other cases.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 17 f.

(c) *Dignitas* is twice used in the expression *dignitas formae*; there is no comparable example of *dignatio*.

(d) *Dignatio* is always used independently, but *dignitas* is a number of times linked with other substantives. The combinations *dignitas/aetas*, *dignitas/fama*, and *dignitas/salus* are elsewhere common (*T.L.L.* v. 1. 1139. 32 ff.).

(4) An increase in the incidence of a word will only be significant if the word has an interchangeable synonym which does not increase at the same rate. If it has no synonym, its frequency will obviously depend solely on the subject-matter.

There follows a collection of new evidence bearing on the problem and also of all convincing earlier evidence, some of which seems to have gone unnoticed.<sup>1</sup> In the section on vocabulary, changes which, broadly, are of the opposite kind to those noted by Eriksson and Löfstedt have for convenience been treated separately, along with the few idiosyncratic variations of taste which cannot be classified in terms of a movement towards, or away from, a more normal style. However, it would almost certainly be an oversimplification to suggest that there are developments of two main types taking place side by side in the *Annals*. But, as seen above, it is not possible now to classify words or usages with any accuracy, nor can we ever be sure of Tacitus' motives in altering a habit. We can only correct Eriksson's one-sided picture by providing some generally conflicting evidence.

The view of Goodyear<sup>2</sup> and R. H. Martin<sup>3</sup> that changes of taste are not confined to the last hexad but are likely to occur anywhere will be confirmed repeatedly.

#### RHETORIC AND SENTENCE STRUCTURE

Various rhetorical devices diminish in frequency in the course of the *Annals*, but none, it appears, increases. There is not simply a sharp change in either 11 or 13; rather, modifications are observable even within the first hexad (particularly after 1). Tacitus' conservatism places him in the tradition of Sallust.<sup>4</sup>

K. Jax demonstrated that combinations of synonyms (or near synonyms) decline progressively from the minor works through to the end of the *Annals*.<sup>5</sup> Within the *Annals* they are at their most frequent in the first 3 books:<sup>6</sup>

|              |             |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|--------------|-------------|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 152          |             | 16 | 18 | 20 | 7 | — | 7 | 2  | 3  | 6  | 3  | 5  | 6  |

O. Mebs noted a decrease in the incidence of anaphora in 11–16 (140:90),<sup>7</sup> but when his statistics are corrected to make allowance for examples in speeches it becomes clear that the change is only apparent.

<sup>1</sup> The quality of earlier evidence has been decided according to the last three principles listed above. It will be seen that almost all examples of normalization presented by Eriksson have been considered unconvincing.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> '*Quibus and quis in Tacitus*', *C.R.* n.s. xviii (1968), 144 ff.

<sup>4</sup> On the identical treatment by Tacitus and Sallust of one type of hyperbaton see J. N. Adams, *P.C.P.S.* n.s. xvii (1971), 8 f.

<sup>5</sup> 'In componendis synonymis quae ratio adhibita sit in Taciti Germania et Agricola', *Studi in onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli* (Firenze, 1955), 431.

<sup>6</sup> Jax was careful to distinguish between examples found in narrative and those in speeches. Throughout most of the *Annals* the majority of instances are in narrative. In 16, however, 5 of the 6 are in speeches.

<sup>7</sup> *Über den Gebrauch der Anaphora bei Tacitus* (Erlangen, 1918), 26, 33, 43.

According to Seneca the Elder tricola and tetracola were so favoured in the rhetorical prose of the Empire that writers sometimes added meaningless cola simply to produce a triadic or tetradic structure: *Contr.* 9. 2. 27 'dixit Murreddius . . . illud tetracolon "serviebat forum cubiculo, praetor meretrici, carcer convivio, dies nocti". novissima pars sine sensu dicta est, ut impleretur numerus. quem enim sensum habet "serviebat dies nocti"? hanc ideo sententiam rettuli quia et in tricolis et in omnibus huius generis sententiis curamus ut numerus constet, non curamus an sensus.' There is undoubtedly an element of exaggeration in Seneca's remarks, but it is certainly true that tricola of various kinds, often with parallelism of structure, are common in many imperial writers (and also Cicero).<sup>1</sup>

Tacitus inevitably falls into tricola often, and indeed at *Ann.* 3. 4. 1 employs an example (containing also a double chiasmus) which has some similarity to a type criticized by Seneca the Elder as tainting contemporary oratory: 'miles cum armis, sine insignibus magistratus, populus per tribus'; cf. Sen. *Contr.* 2. 4. 12 'hanc controversiam cum declamaret, Maximus dixit tricolon tale, qualia sunt quae basilicam infectant . . . accusatur pater in ultimis annis, nepos in primis adoptatur, in mediis abdicatur filius' (text uncertain). But such artificial effects he adopts only rarely;<sup>2</sup> and there is evidence to show that in the later books he turned away from triadic structures to some extent.<sup>3</sup> This can be seen from the distribution of triple substantival groups,<sup>4</sup> triple adjectival groups,<sup>5</sup> and triple coordinate clauses (each with its own verb)<sup>6</sup> over various books of the *Annals*:

|             |     |    |    |    |
|-------------|-----|----|----|----|
| <i>Ann.</i> | 1   | 2  | 13 | 14 |
|             | 130 | 98 | 35 | 50 |

The incidence of the three devices in 1-2 is about 2.6 times that in 13-14.

Two of the most striking kinds of antithesis—those in which (1) two or more words in one clause or phrase are balanced by two or more contrary words in another clause or phrase (double antithesis) (e.g. 1. 2. 1 'tuta et praesentia quam vetera et periculosa mallent'); and (2) two or more antithetical pairs of words are juxtaposed (e.g. 1. 70. 3 'nihil strenuus ab ignavo, sapiens ab

<sup>1</sup> It would be difficult to establish objectively that there is any distinction in this respect between the rhetorical prose of the Empire and that of the Republic. E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*<sup>4</sup> (Leipzig-Berlin, 1923), 289 accepted the impressionistic statement of Seneca and included tricola among the distinctive features of the 'new style'.

<sup>2</sup> A. Draeger, *Über Syntax und Stil des Tacitus*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1882), 102.

<sup>3</sup> E. Lindholm, *Stilistische Studien zur Erweiterung der Satzglieder im Lateinischen* (Lund, 1931), 189 discusses only tricola (of an unspecified kind) with members of ascending length.

<sup>4</sup> Threefold groups of substantives, qualified or unqualified, whether in asyndeton or linked by copulative particles: e.g. *Ann.* 1. 2. 1 'ubi militem donis, populum annona, cunctos dulcedine otii pellexit' (in this case there are two series of three substantives; I

also include simple examples such as 1. 4. 1 'seque et domum et pacem sustentavit').

<sup>5</sup> Threefold groups of adjectives or of word groups with adjectival function: e.g. 1. 3. 1 'M. Agrippam, ignobilem loco, bonum militia et victoriae socium'.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. 1. 4. 2 'pauci bona libertatis in cassum disserere, plures bellum pavescere, alii cupere.' I have deliberately chosen three objectively-describable types of tricolon as test cases. The principles of colometry established by E. Fraenkel ('Kolon und Satz I', *Nachr. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss.*, 1932, 197 ff.; 'Kolon und Satz II', *Nachr. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss.*, 1933, 319 ff.; 'Noch einmal Kolon und Satz', *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse* 1965, Heft 2) admit of a degree of subjective interpretation and hence cannot serve as a basis for statistical analysis.

imprudenti, consilia a casu differre')<sup>1</sup>—diminish in the narrative portions of the later *Annals*. In books 1–3 I have noted 45 instances of the two in narrative, but in 13–15 (of comparable length) only 14.<sup>2</sup>

There is a marked diminution of asyndeton in the third hexad. Examples of the type comprising two or more unqualified words in juxtaposition are distributed thus:

|             |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| <i>Ann.</i> | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6  | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|             | 40 | 30 | 12 | 31 | 1 | 13 | 13 | 18 | 10 | 6  | 8  | 6  |

Note that in book 1 the device is more numerous than in the whole of the third hexad, and that in 11–13 it is more frequent than in 14–16.

Asyndeton bimembre of the type consisting of two substantives with qualifying or dependent words (adjectives or substantives in the genitive) undergoes a similar decline:

|     |       |       |
|-----|-------|-------|
| 1–6 | 11–13 | 14–16 |
| 51  | 10    | 6     |

Parallelism of phrases and clauses is particularly frequent in *Annals* 1, but thereafter decreases:<sup>3</sup>

|             |     |    |    |
|-------------|-----|----|----|
| <i>Ann.</i> | 1   | 4  | 14 |
|             | 136 | 64 | 61 |

The distribution in narrative is as follows:

|    |    |    |
|----|----|----|
| 86 | 61 | 40 |
|----|----|----|

Thus the decline apparent in 4 is slightly more marked by 14.

Hyperbaton in its many forms is a distinctive feature of much literary prose of both the Republic and early Empire, but Tacitus, like Sallust, allows it only sparingly. Examples consisting of a substantive separated from an adjective by a verb occur only 11 times in the *Annals*, 8 times in the first 6 books.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, the intensive superlative (= 'very —'), which is employed to excess in much rhetorical prose and is found disproportionately often in speeches in the *Annals* (30 times out of 60 examples), is in narrative used predominantly (in about two-thirds of cases) in the first 6 books (22:8).

The sentence and phrase structure of the *Annals* is more notable for uniformity than for change. There is, for example, similar flexibility in the position of verbs in relation to their subjects and objects in all parts of the work; and the length of sentences and the degree and nature of subordination remain constant. But a few modifications are observable.

A frequently-noted characteristic of Tacitus' style is his use of appended clauses or phrases which come, often unexpectedly, after the main verb of a sentence.<sup>5</sup> Constructions of this kind are found throughout the historical

<sup>1</sup> The examples of antithesis given at *Rhet. Her.* 4. 21 are of the first type.

<sup>2</sup> The speeches in 1 to 3 contain about 21 examples, and those in 13 to 15 about 10.

<sup>3</sup> The figures comprise examples of parallel finite clauses (e.g. 2. 19. 1 'pugnam volunt, arma rapiunt') and of parallel phrases or word-groups within finite clauses (e.g. 1. 2. 1 'militem donis, populum annona

. . . pellexit'). On parallel constructions in general see J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), 726 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See Adams, *op. cit.* 9.

<sup>5</sup> For a full description of the various types see A. Kohl, *Der Satz nachtrag bei Tacitus* (Würzburg, 1960).

works, but it is nevertheless possible to see some development in Tacitus' practice.

One of the most common types is that consisting of a participial or adjectival phrase following a verb and standing in agreement with a substantive or pronoun which precedes the verb: e.g. *Ann.* 1. 54. 2 'Maecenati obtemperat effuso in amorem Bathylli'; 2. 3. 1 'victo Vononi perfugium Armenia fuit, vacua tunc interque Parthorum et Romanas opes infida ob scelus Antonii.'<sup>1</sup> The usage often has much the same function as that of a subordinate clause in more conventional prose. Its pedigree can be traced back to Sallust and perhaps even to Thucydides.<sup>2</sup> In equal portions of *Annals* 1-4 and 12-15<sup>3</sup> it occurs 67 times and 117 times respectively, thereby increasing in the later books by about 75 per cent. The change is real, for participial and adjectival attributes are found constantly throughout the *Annals*; there is an abundance of sentences in the early books which could have been rearranged so that the attribute followed the verb.

The placing of prepositions in anastrophe falls in frequency in 13-16, as Goodyear has shown:<sup>4</sup>

|                                      |     |       |       |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
|                                      | 1-6 | 11-12 | 13-16 |
|                                      | 238 | 65    | 100   |
| <i>expected on even distribution</i> | 218 | 56    | 129   |

Finally, indirect commands introduced by *ut* precede the verb on which they depend (the less usual position) more often in the first hexad (25 times) than later (6 times).

These data cannot be characterized in general terms. The latter two changes may be taken as evidence for an unremarkable trend towards normalization; but at the same time Tacitus was developing his use of the appended construction.

#### VOCABULARY AND MORPHOLOGY

Wölfflin was the first to find evidence that Tacitus continued to eliminate banal words and expressions even in the later books of the *Annals*. He showed that *quasi*, which is rare in the first hexad, becomes frequent later, particularly after 12, at the expense of *tamquam*;<sup>5</sup> that variants of the traditional antithesis *adversus/secundus* become increasingly common after the start of the *Annals*;<sup>6</sup> and that the archaism *dehinc* (= *deinde*) is twice as frequent in the last 6 as in the first 6 books.<sup>7</sup>

Similarly R. B. Steele noted an increase in the incidence of the archaic/poetic usage *quo*+subjunctive (without a following comparative) for final *ut*<sup>8</sup> in 11-16:<sup>9</sup>

|              |             |     |       |
|--------------|-------------|-----|-------|
| <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> | 1-6 | 11-16 |
| 4            | 9           |     | 24    |

<sup>1</sup> The degree of pause after the verb varies from case to case.

<sup>2</sup> See Adams, *op. cit.* 8 f.

<sup>3</sup> The whole of books 3, 12, 13, 14, and 15; books 1. 1-65, 2. 1-73, and 4. 1-64.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* (see above, p. 350 n. 5), p. 30.

<sup>5</sup> *Philol.* xxiv (1866), 118. *Quasi* is the word

preferred by the archaizers Fronto and Apuleius: see Hofmann and Szantyr, 596.

<sup>6</sup> *Philol.* xxv (1867), 124.

<sup>7</sup> *Philol.* xxvii (1868), 148.

<sup>8</sup> On *quo* see Hofmann and Szantyr, 679 f.

<sup>9</sup> *A.J.P.* xix (1898), 255.

Finally, Eriksson showed that the use of *cognomentum* for *nomen* increases in 11-16.<sup>1</sup>

Similar evidence can be added:

*litterae*, *epistula*: in the first century A.D. *epistula* was the word in regular use; the archaism *litterae*, which had been by far the more popular term under the Republic, is preferred only by the historians Livy, Curtius, and Tacitus. Its disappearance may have been caused by its inability to express plurality.<sup>2</sup> The following statistics illustrate imperial usage:

|                                      | <i>epistula</i> | <i>litterae</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Livy                                 | —               | 286             |
| Seneca the Elder                     | 22              | —               |
| Velleius                             | 4               | —               |
| Valerius Maximus                     | 2               | 1               |
| Seneca the Younger                   | 82              | 3               |
| Curtius                              | 13              | 31              |
| Pliny the Elder                      | 19              | —               |
| Quintilian                           | 22              | 1               |
| ps.-Quintilian ( <i>Decl. Min.</i> ) | 2               | —               |

In Tacitus the distribution of the two words is as follows:

|                 | <i>Minor works</i> | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann. 1-6</i> | <i>11-16</i> |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <i>litterae</i> | 1                  | 18           | 38              | 17           |
| <i>epistula</i> | 5                  | 38           | 12              | 2            |

*Epistula* still predominates in the *Histories*, but has been eclipsed by the first hexad of the *Annals*. Its elimination is complete by the last 6 books, for the remaining examples are formulaic and could hardly have been avoided: 15. 35. 2 'quin [innobiles] habere, quos ab epistulis et libellis et rationibus appellet'; 16. 8. 1 'praeficeretque rationibus et libellis et epistulis libertos'.

*sons*, *insons*, *nocens*, *innocens*: neither *sons* nor *insons* had any currency from at least as early as the late Republic onwards.<sup>3</sup> They are avoided by the author of the *ad Herennium*, Caesar, Seneca the Elder, Petronius, Quintilian, and ps.-Quintilian (all of whom use *nocens* and *innocens*), and used only 5 times by Cicero (once—at *Leg.* 3. 6—in a law). Seneca the Younger has *sons* 7 times and *insons* 11 times in his tragedies, but neither in the philosophical works. Apart from the poets the historians make most use of the two words (Livy 16 times, Curtius 11, Valerius Maximus 9, Tacitus 23).

For Tacitus the two pairs were freely interchangeable, as is clear from the following groups of passages:

*Ann.* 15. 35. 3 *quamvis sontem* . . . victurum tamen fuisse, si clementiam iudicis expectasset.

*Hist.* 2. 10. 2 *quamvis invisum ac nocentem* more tamen audiendum censebant.

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. 13.

<sup>2</sup> The assertion of Krebs and Schmalz, s.v. 'epistula', that *litterae* could be used of both private and public correspondence, but *epistula* only of the former, is not borne out by the evidence, at least from the imperial period. The title of one of the imperial

secretaries was *ab epistulis*.

<sup>3</sup> In Plautus *insons* is almost as frequent as *innocens* (7 : 11). *Sons* is found only at *Capt.* 476. The monosyllable may have been displaced first. Once *nocens* established itself as the everyday word its negative form would have tended to oust *insons*.

*Ann.* 2. 31. 3 iuravitque Tiberius petiturum se vitam *quamvis nocenti*, nisi voluntariam mortem properavisset.

*Ann.* 6. 29. 2 quam *etsi nocentem* periculi tamen expertem fuisse.

*Ann.* 15. 44. 5 unde *quamquam* adversus *sones* et novissima exempla meritos *miseratio* oriebatur . . .

*Ann.* 3. 22. 1 Quirinius post dictum repudium adhuc infensus quamvis infami ac *nocenti miserationem* addiderat.

*Ann.* 14. 44. 4 at quidam *insones peribunt*.

*Hist.* 1. 6. 1 inauditi atque indefensi tamquam *innocentes perierant*.

In the first hexad the current terms are preferred in the proportion 2:1, but in 11–16 *sons* and *insons* predominate by almost 4:1:

|                         | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> 1–6 | 11–16 |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|
| <i>nocens, innocens</i> | 12           | 12              | 4     |
| <i>sons, insons</i>     | 2            | 6               | 15    |

It is of note that the examples of *sons* and *insons* in the passages quoted above are from the third hexad, but those of *nocens* and *innocens* are all in the *Histories* or first hexad of the *Annals*.

*super*+ablative (= *de*): in prose from the Augustan age onwards *super* with the sense *de* occurs only in archaizing writers, and then often in a formulaic usage (governing *res*). Moreover frequently the contexts in which it appears are official or formal.

In the first century of the period it is found 13 times in Livy, always with *res* as object and usually in official contexts. Later the Younger Pliny uses it twice (*Epist.* 2. 11. 11, 2. 18. 4), both times in the expression *super tanta re* (note the context at *Epist.* 2. 11. 11: 'super tanta re in illo coetu praesente Caesare dicendum erat'). There are 3 instances in Suetonius, of which 2 have *res* as object (*Iul.* 5, *Tib.* 13. 2) and the other is in an official context: *Iul.* 20. 1 'nec quoquam reperto, qui super tali consternatione referre aut censere aliquid auderet' (the reference is to a proposal in the senate); 107 in the archaizer Gellius (twice as many—28—in the first two books as in any other two books), of which 52 govern *res*;<sup>1</sup> and about 86 in Ammianus, who even seems to prefer it to *de*.

For much of the Republic also *super* was uncommon. In prose of the last century B.C. it is found only 3 times in Cicero's letters (twice—*Att.* 10. 8. 10, 16. 6. 1—in the phrase *hac super re*, and once—*Att.* 14. 22. 2—in official phraseology), twice in Sallust (*Iug.* 71. 5, *Hist.* frg. 3. 86), and once in Nepos (at *Paus.* 4. 1, perhaps for variation).

Earlier Plautus uses it 11 times, but it is almost always in special contexts. Twice it governs *res* (*Amph.* 58, *Most.* 727) and 8 times words denoting women.<sup>2</sup> The reason for the latter usage is unclear. Elsewhere in early Latin there are examples in the Twelve Tables (5. 3 'uti legassit super pecunia tutelave suae rei, ita ius esto': see Cic. *Inv.* 2. 148, *Rhet. Her.* 1. 23), Cato (*Orat.* frg. 109, in the phrase *super tali re*; the passage apparently refers to the censor's custom of consulting a *consilium*), Pacuvius (237 *qua super re*) and Afranius (343). The

<sup>1</sup> For a full collection of examples see O. Gotzes, *De quibusdam sermonis Gelliani proprietatibus observationes* (Halis, 1883), 32 f. It may be an indication of the formality of the word that Gellius uses it 42 times in

chapter headings.

<sup>2</sup> *amica*: *Bacch.* 177, 367, 562, 607; *anu*: *Cist.* 660; *ancilla*: *Cas.* 254; *vicina*: *Mil.* 1212; *filia*: *Aul.* 683.

word may have fallen out of use soon after Plautus and survived only in officialese.<sup>1</sup> It is common in the late legal language.<sup>2</sup>

Tacitus uses *super* more often than any earlier writer (28 times, always in the historical works). He often has it with *res*, but the further he progresses the greater his boldness in adopting it with words other than *res*. In the *Histories* it is found with another word once (out of 5 examples, i.e. in 20 per cent of cases), in *Ann.* 1-6 6 times (45 per cent) and in 11-16 11 times (92 per cent).

*ludicrum*: the substantival use of *ludicrum* (= *ludi*) is found throughout Livy (17 times) and then later in his imitator Curtius. No doubt Tacitus picked it up from earlier historians. It is used only twice in the first hexad, but 12 times in 11-16. *Ludi* does not show a comparable increase.

*simul* = *et*, *simul . . . et*: in ordinary prose *simul* can link (1) two co-ordinate clauses or sentences: e.g. *Caes. Gall.* 6. 23. 2 f. 'hoc proprium virtutis existimant, expulsos agris finitimos cedere neque quemquam prope audere consistere; simul hoc se fore tutiores arbitrantur, repentinae incursionis timore sublato'; (2) two parallel, or nearly parallel, subordinate clauses: e.g. *Cic. Verr.* 5. 44 'cum ipsa (navis) quoque esset ex praeda, simul cum ipse decederet'; *Caes. Gall.* 6. 34. 8 *ut . . . simul ut*; *Quint.* 1. 1. 12 *quia . . . simul quia*; cf. *Cic. Verr.* 1. 124 *ne . . . simul ut*; or (3) (only very rarely) two long phrases between which a copulative particle would be awkward: *Cic. Verr., act. pr.* 12 'cuius praetura urbana aedium sacrarum fuit publicorumque operum depopulatio, simul in iure dicundo bonorum possessionumque contra omnium instituta addictio et condonatio'; *Pis.* 76 'vestrae fraudes, vestrum scelus, vestrae criminationes insidiarum mearum, illius periculorum nefarie fictae, simul eorum qui familiaritatis licentia suorum improbissimorum sermonum domicilium in auribus eius impulsu vestro conlocarant, <vestrae cupiditates provinciarum effecerunt> ut . . .' (cf. *B. Alex.* 74. 3). But it is not used to join either single words or small groups of words (= *simul . . . et* or simply *et*).

This latter usage is about twice as frequent in the later books as in 1-6 (9:17).<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., *Ann.* 1. 70. 2 'impulsu aquilonis, simul sidere aequinoctii . . . rapi agique agmen'; 3. 24. 2 'sed aliorum exitus, simul cetera illius aetatis memorabo'; 11. 21. 2 'largitione amicorum, simul acri ingenio quaesturam . . . adsequitur'; 12. 8. 2 'veniam exilii . . . simul praeturam impetrat'; 12. 29. 1 'odio accolarum, simul domesticis discordiis circumventus'; 14. 6. 1 'observans etiam Acceroniae necem, simul suum vulnus adspiciens'.

It is found first in a prayer in Plautus (*Stich.* 404 'Neptuno gratis habeo et Tempestatibus; simul Mercurio'), then in Cicero's verse (*Arat.* 36 'Electra Steropeque, simul sanctissima Maia'; cf. 101), and occasionally in Sallust (see below), Livy (33. 3. 12 'multa iam saepe memorata de maiorum virtutibus, simul de militari laude Macedonum cum disseruisset'), and Pliny the Elder (*Nat.* 7. 91 'scribere aut legere, simul dictare et audire').<sup>4</sup> Tacitus has it considerably more often than any earlier writer of either prose or verse.

<sup>1</sup> Like certain other archaisms (see B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter* (Lund, 1945), 25 ff.), particularly those associated with the legal and official languages, it is found only sporadically in the poets. All 3 instances in Horace (*Carm.* 3. 8. 17, 4. 2. 42, *Carm. Saec.* 18) are in passages with an official ring.

<sup>2</sup> See W. Kalb, *Roms Juristen, nach ihrer Sprache dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1890), 105.

<sup>3</sup> See *Lex. Tac.* 1503.

<sup>4</sup> *Simulque* is a common Plinian usage which could have been substituted (*Nat.* 12. 116, 15. 91, 15. 124).

W. Kroll found 22 instances of *simul* = *et* in Sallust.<sup>1</sup> But almost all are unremarkable, for they belong to classes (1) and (2) above. Of the remaining 4, only one links two examples of the same part of speech or two short expressions with the same construction: *Iug.* 76. 2 'ubi oppidanos proelio intentos, simul oppidum et operibus et loco munitum videt'. The rest (e.g. *Cat.* 56. 5 'fretus . . . simul . . . existumans'; cf. 17. 7, *Iug.* 46. 1) stand between members different in kind. Tacitus too (probably in imitation of Sallust) sometimes employs the word in conjunction with *variatio* (e.g. *Hist.* 1. 70. 1, 1. 70. 3, *Ann.* 2. 42. 3) but he also makes frequent use of it to join phrases of the same type.

*amnis, flumen*: these words cannot be interchanged with complete freedom in the Tacitean idiolect, for *amnis* is occasionally employed with what was regarded as its etymological meaning (denoting a river which surrounds something, <*ambio*: Varro, *Ling.* 5. 28 'amnis id flumen quod circuit aliquod: nam ab ambitu amnis.' See Virg. *Aen.* 6. 550, Tac. *Ann.* 15. 4. 2 *amnis* . . . *ambit*; cf. *Hist.* 4. 12. 2, 4. 71. 4, *Ann.* 1. 9. 5, 6. 37. 3), and it also shows some tendency to be used of the great rivers of the Empire (e.g. Rhine, Euphrates, Tigris, Jordan).<sup>2</sup> But differences of usage alone cannot account for the changing distribution of the two words:

|               | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 | 11-16 |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|
| <i>flumen</i> | 28           | 27              | 6     |
| <i>amnis</i>  | 17           | 19              | 18    |

By the Ciceronian period at the latest *amnis*, which had once been in regular use, was obsolete.<sup>3</sup>

*coniux*: this word, the standard poetic term for 'wife', was current in ordinary educated prose from the late Republic onwards only in formulae expressing collectively the various objects of a man's family, and occasionally patriotic, loyalties. The most frequent is *coniux et liberi* (see *T.L.L.* iv. 342. 65).<sup>4</sup> As an independent term it is used only sporadically in prose, and then usually for a special reason or in the higher (poeticizing) genres. Tacitus does not use it on its own before book 12 of the *Annals*, but in 12-14 he has it 8 times (about as often as *uxor*). He then drops it in 15-16.

*testificor*: this word, a synonym (in Tacitus) of the normal *testor*, occurs only in the later books (7 times). It makes its first appearance in Licinius Crassus (*ap.* Cic. *de Orat.* 2. 224), is common in the Ciceronian period (in Cicero it is usually technical—'testify'—rather than a general term for *testor*, as in Tacitus), but thereafter falls into disuse: the only post-classical examples in prose before Tacitus are at Liv. 33. 12. 12 and Col. 1. 4. 2. Tacitus must have adopted it as an archaism.

The verbal formation *-ficare* is not prolific until the Christian era.<sup>5</sup> It produces only 10 words in old Latin, 6 in the Ciceronian period, and 7 in the period from the death of Augustus to the death of Trajan. Moreover a number of

<sup>1</sup> *Glotta*, xv (1927), 285.

<sup>2</sup> See K. Gries, *Constancy in Livy's Latinity* (New York, 1949), 21 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See K. van de Heyde, '*Flumen, fluvius, amnis*', *Mnem.* lx (1932), 135 ff.

<sup>4</sup> For further examples and discussion, see

my forthcoming article (Sect. IV) 'Latin Words for "Woman" and "Wife"' in *Glotta*.

<sup>5</sup> For a full collection of verbs of this type see X. Mignot, *Les verbes dénommatifs latins* (Paris, 1969), 352 ff.

these, like *testificor*, are short-lived (perhaps an indication of the uneasiness which the Romans felt about compound words).<sup>1</sup>

*quando* (= *quoniam*): an artificial usage rarely found in the ordinary prose of either the Republic or early Empire.<sup>2</sup> It is infrequent at the start of the *Annals*, but outnumbers *quoniam* in the later books (3 times in books 1-4, against 11 instances of *quoniam*, but 17 times in 5-16, against only 5 instances of *quoniam*). In this case the change of taste takes place after book 4.

*neque . . . neque*: one of the most easily recognizable features of Tacitus' style is its lack of *concininitas*. In one respect at least this feature becomes more marked in the later *Annals*: the correlative *neque . . . neque* declines in frequency after the first three books:<sup>3</sup>

| <i>Minor works</i> | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann. 1-3</i> | <i>4-6</i> | <i>11-16</i> |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| 16                 | 31           | 24              | 6          | 6            |

In the narrative it is distributed thus:

| <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann. 1-6</i> | <i>11-16</i> |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 24           | 13              | 5            |

The variants *neque . . . aut* and *nec . . . aut*, which are common in poetry,<sup>4</sup> are fairly evenly distributed throughout the historical works.<sup>5</sup> The diminution of *neque . . . neque* is therefore genuine.

*Nec . . . nec* is about as common in the minor works (13 times) and in *Histories* 1 (7 times) as *neque . . . neque*, but is thereafter all but dropped. It occurs 3 times in the rest of the *Histories*, and only 3 times in the whole of the *Annals*. *Neque* was a word of higher stylistic level than *nec*.<sup>6</sup>

*praecipuus*: almost always has full superlative rather than intensive force (= 'special') in Tacitus.<sup>7</sup> In the *Annals* it replaces *maximus*, which Tacitus may have regarded as hackneyed.<sup>8</sup> The latter is used, other than in expressions in which it is unavoidable (*circus maximus*, *pontifex maximus*, with *multo* and after *quam*), only in the first 6 books (6 times).<sup>9</sup>

These, then, are the main changes which seem to indicate a movement towards greater artificiality in books 11-16. I now give some examples of idiosyncratic stylistic fluctuation which cannot be reduced to any general rule:

*quamquam*, *quamvis*: by the early Empire these two words had become totally interchangeable, each having widened its function under the influence of

<sup>1</sup> See the comments by Mignot, loc. cit. on *causifico*, *cerifico*, *fructifico*, *largifico*, *ludifico*, *mitifico*, *modifico*, *notifico*, *orbifico*, *pacifico*, *purifico*, *turpificatus*, and *versifico*.

<sup>2</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr, 607 do not sufficiently emphasize the rarity of the word in this sense in ordinary prose.

<sup>3</sup> The figures given by Löfstedt, *Roman Literary Portraits* (Oxford, 1958), 160 are inaccurate.

<sup>4</sup> See *T.L.L.* ii. 1568. 1 ff.

<sup>5</sup> See *Lex. Tac.* 923b, 935b. *Nec . . . aut* is preferred in the *Histories* (20:5), *neque . . . aut* in the *Annals* (26:10).

<sup>6</sup> See Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, i. 332 ff.

<sup>7</sup> See Wölfflin, *Philol.* xxvi (1867), 161. However Wölfflin was wrong to say that the word is always so used. See *Ann.* 13. 30. 2, 14. 57. 3, 16. 14. 1.

<sup>8</sup> See Löfstedt, *Peregrinatio*, 71 f. on a similar adjective (*parvus*) apparently avoided by Tacitus as hackneyed.

<sup>9</sup> 2. 56. 1, 3. 19. 2, 3. 40. 2, 4. 6. 2, 4. 10. 1, 6. 39. 3. At 4. 10. 1 for the Med. *plurimis maximeque fideis auctoribus* Ritter suggested *maximaeque fidei*. *Maximeque fidis* (Beroaldus) is less plausible, for Tacitus has *fidissimus* 9 times, but *maxime fidus* nowhere else.

analogy.<sup>1</sup> During the first century *quamvis* tended to take over in ordinary speech (already in Celsus and Seneca the Elder *quamquam* had been almost completely displaced),<sup>2</sup> though *quamquam* lingered on in some idiolects. Thus Tacitus prefers *quamquam* by 30:7 in the minor works, and Quintilian still favours the word.

*Quamquam* continues to predominate in the *Histories* (41:21) and, more markedly, *Annals* 1-6 (70:21), but in the later *Annals* *quamvis* increases (30:31). The preference for *quamquam* in 1-6 cannot be taken as conscious archaizing because of the similar situation obtaining in the minor works. Tacitus was simply behind the developments of his time for much of his career, but ultimately he fell under their influence.<sup>3</sup>

*deligo, lego*: *deligo* had been common in prose at the end of the Republic, but by Tacitus' time it was an archaism. *Eligo* was the equivalent term in ordinary educated use. *Deligo* is avoided by Vitruvius, Petronius, and Seneca the Elder, and used only once by both Seneca the Younger (*Dial.* 1. 3. 14) and ps.-Quintilian (*Decl. Min.* p. 143. 25). All of these writers (and particularly Seneca the Elder and ps.-Quintilian) have *eligo* frequently.

It was shown by Wölfflin that *eligo* is dropped by Tacitus after *Annals* 1.<sup>4</sup> It can be added that *lego*, which is no less rare under the Empire than *deligo*, continues to be used (with diminishing frequency) until book 12, after which it too is dropped:<sup>5</sup>

|               | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 | 11-12 | 13-16 |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| <i>lego</i>   | 22           | 12              | 3     | —     |
| <i>deligo</i> | 21           | 48              | 8     | 29    |

This is a case then of one *recherché* term replacing another. It would be meaningless to attempt to relate the change to a development towards, or away from, a more 'normal' style. Tacitus' taste has undergone an idiosyncratic modification.

The modification can, however, be more generally characterized. It seems that as Tacitus advanced he developed a liking for the emphatic form of compounds, regardless of their stylistic level.<sup>6</sup>

An example of an artificial compound to some extent displacing a commonplace simple verb is provided by the pair *exterreo/terreo*. The former is found only once in the minor works, in a Sallustian imitation: *Agric.* 36. 3 'exterriti sine rectoribus equi'; cf. Sall. *Hist. frg.* 1. 139 'equi sine rectoribus exterriti'.

<sup>1</sup> See Hofmann and Szantyr, 603 ff.; Krebs and Schmalz, s.v.

<sup>2</sup> See Hofmann and Szantyr, 602.

<sup>3</sup> Similar idiolectal variations can be seen in the poets. In the first century the older word succeeded in establishing itself as the stock poeticism only in certain authors: Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, 124 n.

<sup>4</sup> *Philol.* xxv (1867), 108.

<sup>5</sup> In books 1-12 *lego* and *deligo* tend to occur in clusters, a phenomenon probably due to unconscious association. *Deligo* is found twice in successive chapters in two different places in *Annals* 1 (58, 59, 64, 65); 3 times in 8 chapters in 2 (40, 43, 47); twice in successive chapters (47, 48), 3 times in 4

chapters (72, 73, 75), and twice in 5 chapters (52, 56) in 4; 4 times in 2 chapters (2, 3) and 6 times in 9 chapters (41-9) in 6; and twice in the same chapter (66) in 12. *Lego* is found twice in 5 chapters (43, 47) in 1; twice in 5 chapters (48, 52) in 2; 3 times in 6 chapters (30, 32, 35) in 3; and twice in the same chapter (16) in 4. On word clusters in Livy, see K. Gries, *C.Ph.* xlvii (1951), 36 f.

<sup>6</sup> It is a mistake to assume that compound verbs are uniformly of lower stylistic level than their corresponding simple verbs (if they are synonyms). The reverse is often true. Each pair must therefore be considered as an individual case.

In the *Histories* it is still comparatively rare, but by 11-16 it is more than 3 times as common as *terreo*:<sup>1</sup>

|                 | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann. 1-6</i> | <i>11-16</i> |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <i>terreo</i>   | 16           | 7               | 5            |
| <i>exterreo</i> | 6            | 12              | 18           |

*Exterreo* had been a favourite word of Virgil (21 times). The only other early imperial writers who use it with any frequency are Livy (10 times in the first decade, and 3 times in the fourth),<sup>2</sup> Silius Italicus (13 times), and, above all, Tacitus (37 times). Clearly it must have had an artificial flavour at the time of Tacitus.

Throughout the Republic and early Empire the word is used in prose mainly in the passive, and particularly in the past participial forms.<sup>3</sup> The first prose author to admit the active was Livy (5 times). Tacitus, however, uses active forms freely (12 times).

It is difficult to distinguish the pair *struo/exstruo* stylistically.<sup>4</sup> The compound seems to have been the word in everyday use at the end of the Republic (it is preferred by 17:4 in the Caesarian corpus and 11:1 by Cicero), but later Vitruvius overwhelmingly favours *struo* (38:10). However Quintilian (4 times), Seneca the Elder (3 times), and Tacitus in the minor works (3 times) all restrict themselves to *exstruo*.<sup>5</sup> Vitruvius' taste for *struo* should therefore perhaps be seen in the light of his stylistic pretensions.

As used by Tacitus the two words are interchangeable when literal. Compare the following groups of passages:

*Ann.* 1. 78. 1 templum ut in colonia Tarraconensi strueretur (cf. 2. 49. 1, 6. 45. 1).

15. 74. 1 templum Saluti exstrueretur eo loci (cf. *Dial.* 20. 7, *Agric.* 21. 1, *Hist.* 4. 84. 3).

6. 45. 1 ne publice quidem nisi duo opera struxit, templum Augusto et scaenam Pompeiani theatri.

*Hist.* 4. 22. 1 subversa longae pacis opera, haud procul castris in modum municipii exstructa.

*Hist.* 2. 67. 2 tertiadecimani struere amphitheatra iussi.

*Ann.* 13. 31. 1 molem amphitheatri . . . exstruxerat.

15. 30. 1 structam ante augurale aram.

*Hist.* 2. 95. 1 exstructis in campo Martio aris.

<sup>1</sup> There are a few places where *exterreo* has the meaning 'frighten away', but these are not numerous enough to alter the general picture given by the statistics. See *T.L.L.* v. 2. 2025. 65 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For archaisms or poetic words found at the beginning of the work, then dropped until the later books, see H. Tränkle, *Wien. Stud.* lxxxi (1968), 118 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cicero (3 times), Caesar (5 times), Seneca the Elder (once), Curtius (once), Columella (once), and Asconius (once) have only passive forms. Of the poets, Lucretius

and Virgil allow only the passive, but Horace (once), Ovid (3), Val. Flacc. (2), Silius (7), and Statius (once) use the active as well.

<sup>4</sup> Only literal examples are considered here. *Struo* has a metaphorical use not shared by *exstruo*.

<sup>5</sup> For inscriptional examples of *exstruo* from the late first century A.D. see *Epistula Vespasiani ad Saborenses*, A.D. 78 (see C. G. Bruns, *Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui*<sup>7</sup> [Tübingen, 1909], 255); *Lex arae urbanae*, A.D. 84-96 (Bruns, op. cit. 288).

Again it is the compound which takes over:

|                | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 | 11-16 |
|----------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|
| <i>struo</i>   | 8            | 12              | 3     |
| <i>exstruo</i> | 9            | 5               | 12    |

*Adipiscor* and the archaism *apiscor* cannot be fully substituted for each other, for the simple verb is avoided in the past participial form. But a comparison of their distributions in other forms shows that the compound rises slightly in favour in the later books:

|                  | <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 | 11-16 |
|------------------|-----------------|-------|
| <i>adipiscor</i> | 1               | 7     |
| <i>apiscor</i>   | 8               | 4     |

*Perpetro* is another recherché compound which increases in incidence at the expense of an equally recherché simple verb (cf. *deligo*, *lego*). Before Tacitus *perpetro* is found only in Plautus, Varro (*Ling.* 7. 110), Livy (24 times), and Curtius (3 times, twice in phrases taken from Livy).<sup>1</sup> Similarly *patro* had long been artificial.<sup>2</sup> The distribution of the pair is as follows:

|                 | <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 | 11-16 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------|
| <i>patro</i>    | 9               | 10    |
| <i>perpetro</i> | 1               | 9     |

Finally, the following compounds of various kinds are found only or mainly in 11-16, while their corresponding simple verbs occur at least once in 1-6: (figures in brackets show number of occurrences) *expromo* (4), *emergor* (4), *expurgo* (1), *expio* (1), *evinco* (3:6), *perfungor* (1:4), *perpopulor* (1), *evertor* (5), *adhortor* (1), *enumero* (2), *exposco* (2:4), *expostulo* (3:7), *adquiro* (4), *conitor* (5), *contego* (1:3), *pernotesco* (1:3), *evulgo* (3), *pervulgo* (2), *revalesco* (1), *praeparo* (2), *decerto* (1), *demoror* (2), *denego* (3), *demereor* (1), *depello* (1:3) (of banishment), *depopulor* (2), *inlaresco* (1), *dedico* (1), *evalesco* (1), *emitto* (1) (of weapons), *extimesco* (3), *expeto* (2:5), *extollo* (1) (lit.), *exsolvo* (1) (of vows), *conservo* (1), *comprobo* (1), *commuto* (2), *comparo* (1), *concupisco* (3), *confido* (1:2), *confirmo* (1), *adjirmo* (2), *conflagro* (1), *consaluto* (1:2), *constituo*+infin. (1), *conqueror* (2:4), *contendo*+infin. (1).

The number of compounds confined to or predominating in 1-6 is strikingly smaller: *occido* (4), *permunio* (2), *percolo* (1), *perstimulo* (1), *pertempto* (1), *adpropinquo* (1), *conterreo* (1), *exsatio* (2), *inardesco* (1).<sup>3</sup>

*constitit*, *constat*: from *Annals* 12 onwards Tacitus uses *constitit* (impersonal) exclusively (9 times) for *constat*, but earlier he prefers the latter (by 10:1 in the minor works and *Histories*). But in this case we cannot specify that a change occurs within the *Annals*, for neither form is frequent in 1-11 (*constat* twice, *constitit* once).

The most striking examples which have been noted of an apparent development towards stylistic normality in the later books are the gradual diminution

<sup>1</sup> 4. 13. 16 *sacrificio perpetrato* (cf. Liv. 25. 16. 2, 44. 22. 16, 44. 37. 13); 7. 2. 29 *perperata caedes* (cf. Liv. 1. 6. 1, 45. 5. 5, 45. 5. 11).

<sup>2</sup> See E. Fraenkel, *J.R.S.* xli (1951), 193;

Tränkle, *Wien. Stud.* lxxxix (1968), 126.

<sup>3</sup> Some of the above compounds may at times have nuances of meaning which distinguish them from their simple verbs, but the general picture is clear.

of *neque*,<sup>1</sup> of *e* before consonants,<sup>2</sup> and of the third declension accusative plural form *-is*,<sup>3</sup> and the sudden discarding of *ni*, *forem*,<sup>4</sup> and *quis*<sup>5</sup> after 12. It has also been shown with some plausibility that *russum* (= *rursus*), *adversum* (= *adversus*), *obsidium* (= *obsidio*), *necessitudo* (= *necessitas*), *loci* (= *loca*), postponed *quippe*, *formido*,<sup>6</sup> *polliceor* (= *promitto*),<sup>7</sup> and *antire* (= *anteire*)<sup>8</sup> decline in the later books, and that correlative *aut . . . aut*<sup>9</sup> and *timor*<sup>10</sup> rise.

Some of this evidence requires further comment:

*adversus*, *adversum*: it is possible that the increase of *adversum* in the later books (see below) does not reflect a change in Tacitean usage but is due to manuscript vagaries. However, the authenticity of the general picture presented by M is strongly supported by the fact that 30 of the 64 instances of *adversum* attested in the *Annals* are before vowels (obviously a disproportionately high figure), but only 18 of the 80 of *adversus*. It is highly likely that Tacitus tended to observe such a distinction between the two words. *Verum*, for instance, is used disproportionately often before vowels.<sup>11</sup>

Moreover there is at least one idiom in which *adversum* occurs a number of times to the virtual exclusion of *adversus* (governing a plural present participle which has the *-is* accusative form).<sup>12</sup>

The distribution of the two words is as follows (Eriksson's figures are inaccurate):

|                 | <i>Ann. 1-2</i> | <i>3-6</i> | <i>11-14</i> | <i>15-16</i> |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>adversum</i> | 10              | 38         | 4            | 12           |
| <i>adversus</i> | 20              | 7          | 42           | 11           |

Tacitus does not simply move from one form to the other after 6; rather, his preference fluctuates constantly. Note in particular the rise of *adversum* in 15-16.

If examples found before vowels are considered separately from those before consonants, similar fluctuations can be seen:

Before vowels:

|                 | <i>Ann. 1</i> | <i>2-6</i> | <i>11-14</i> | <i>15-16</i> |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>adversum</i> | 4             | 17         | 2            | 7            |
| <i>adversus</i> | 5             | 1          | 9            | 3            |

Before consonants:

|                 | <i>Ann. 1-2</i> | <i>3-6</i> | <i>11-14</i> | <i>15-16</i> |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>adversum</i> | 4               | 23         | 2            | 5            |
| <i>adversus</i> | 15              | 7          | 33           | 8            |

<sup>1</sup> Noted by Gerber and Greef, *Lex. Tac.* 911b; cf. the more detailed statistics given by Goodyear, op. cit. 31.

<sup>2</sup> See Goodyear, op. cit. 30.

<sup>3</sup> See G. C. Tingdal, *Åndelsen -is i Akus. Plur. hos de Efteraugusteiska Författarne* (Göteborg, 1916), 70 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See H. C. Nutting, 'The Use of *forem* in Tacitus', *Univ. of Cal. Publ. in Class. Philol.* vii. 209 ff.

<sup>5</sup> See Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, ii. 285; R. H. Martin, *C.R. n.s.* xviii (1968), 144 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See Eriksson's index for these words.

<sup>7</sup> See R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 739 n. 7; cf. I. G. Burnet, 'Linguistic "Normality" in Tacitus: *promitto* and *polliceor*', *B.I.C.S.* xvi (1969), 63 ff.

<sup>8</sup> See C. Brakmann, *Mnem.* liii (1925), 179 f., 183 f.

<sup>9</sup> See Wölfflin, *Philol.* xxv (1867), 124.

<sup>10</sup> See Eriksson's index.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Wölfflin's remarks on *dein* and *deinde* (*Philol.* xxv [1867], 105 f.).

<sup>12</sup> *Ann.* i. 23. 5, i. 36. 2, 4. 25. 3, 4. 51. 1, 6. 1. 2. For *adversus* cf. 13. 10. 1.

*Adversum* is an archaism. Sallust may have taken it over from Cato's *Origines*, where it is attested,<sup>1</sup> and Tacitus from Sallust. Sallust has it only in the *Jugurtha*.<sup>2</sup>

*e, ex*: the decline in the frequency of *e* before consonants which M shows in 13–16 is certainly a genuine stylistic change, for *e* continues to predominate until the end of the work in certain quasi-formulaic expressions and types of expression (above all before proper names; cf. *e numero, e provincia, e domo, e superiore, e convicio, e praesentibus*). Conversely *ex* is preferred as well in the early as in the late books in certain other expressions (especially those denoting origin and cause: *Lex. Tac.* 332; cf. *ex diverso, magna ex parte, ex modo, ex dignitate, ex more*).

*quippe*: it was pointed out by Eriksson that examples of *quippe* occupying second position in their clause are less common in the second half of the *Annals* than in the first.<sup>3</sup> But more detailed examination of the evidence shows that Tacitus' changes of preference are more numerous than Eriksson allowed. *Annals* 1 reveals a closer affinity with the *Histories* than with some of the later books of its hexad: all but 1 of its 10 examples are in the initial position. In books 2–4 the postponed use is slightly more favoured than the initial (13:10), but in 5–12 it falls off (3:13). In 13 and 14 it disappears completely (initial use 17 times), but in the last two books it returns (6:10).

*formido*: this word declines after the first two books of the *Annals* rather than in the third hexad (as asserted by Eriksson).<sup>4</sup>

The third declension accusative plural in *-is*: the observation of G. C. Tingdal that *-is* undergoes a continuous diminution in the *Annals* seems to have gone unnoticed. There are twice as many instances in 1 as in any other book:

|             |    |    |    |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| <i>Ann.</i> | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|             | 26 | 11 | 13 | 12 | — | 8 | —  | 2  | 2  | 5  | 1  | 1  |

This decline is similar to that of other usages in Tacitus (e.g. asyndeton), a fact which suggests that it may be genuine. Moreover the ending frequently recurs in certain words, not only in both halves of the *Annals*, but also in the *Histories*.<sup>5</sup> While it is unlikely that scribes repeatedly introduced it in the same words by accident, it is highly probable that Tacitus considered it more appropriate in some words than in others.<sup>6</sup> Note also the idiom mentioned above in which present participles ending in *-is* are governed by *adversum*.

Some new evidence can be added to the above:

*atque, ac*: these and the other copulative particles are not completely inter-

<sup>1</sup> See *T.L.L.* i. 850. 63 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, ii. 291.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. 89. The usage *-is* is found frequently in Pliny the Elder (*Thesaurus* material) and Tacitus' *Annals*, but elsewhere rarely. On Tacitus, see Wölfflin, *Philol.* xxv (1867), 120.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. 16.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. *omnis* (6 times *Annals*, 7 times *Histories*), *tris* (3 times *Annals*, twice *Histories*), *pluris* (4 times *Annals*), *partis* (3 times *Annals*),

*resistentis* (twice *Annals*), *insignis* (twice *Annals*), *ingruentis* (twice *Annals*), *hostilis* (twice *Annals*), *hostis* (3 times *Histories*), *pontificis* (twice *Annals*). See Tingdal, loc. cit.

<sup>6</sup> Euphony is one factor which might determine a writer's choice. At 13. 21. 1 ff. Aulus Gellius quotes and discusses a remark by Valerius Probus that in deciding between *-es* and *-is* a writer should be guided by his ear.

changeable in sense and usage, but they overlap to a considerable extent.<sup>1</sup> A writer's choice was determined largely by stylistic considerations.<sup>2</sup> *Atque* was a word of high style.<sup>3</sup> Tacitus uses it more often in the first half of the *Annals* than in the second:

| <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 | 11-16 |
|--------------|-----------------|-------|
| 271          | 253             | 113   |

If the proportion of instances of *atque* used as a copulative linking pronouns, substantives, and adjectives to those of copulative *et* is tabled in various sections of the *Annals*, it is seen that *atque* declines continuously:

| 1-6   | 11-12 | 13-16 |
|-------|-------|-------|
| 1:3.6 | 1:5.1 | 1:7.5 |

See further below, p. 369 on *atque* before consonants.

*ignarus, nescius*: these words are completely synonymous in Tacitus. Not only do they occur in the passive as well as the active in the historical works (*Lex. Tac.* 552b, 936b), but they also alternate in identical or similar contexts. Note the following pairs of passages:

*Ann.* 4. 50. 4 Turesis sua cum manu noctem opperitur, haud nescio duce nostro.

13. 40. 1 repente agmen Romanum circumfundit, non ignaro duce nostro.

3. 46. 1 inconditique ac militiae nescii oppidani.

*Hist.* 3. 56. 2 ignarus militiae, improvidus consilii (cf. 1. 88. 2).

*Ann.* 4. 13. 3 adultus inter extorres et liberalium artium nescios.

6. 21. 1 litterarum ignarus.

15. 9. 2 imminentium nescius.

*Hist.* 1. 29. 2 ignarus futuri.

*Ann.* 3. 1. 1 violenta luctu et nescia tolerandi (almost = 'incapable of').

2. 43. 2 ingenio violentum et obsequii ignarum.

6. 32. 4 eo de homine haud sum ignarus sinistram in urbe famam . . .

4. 32. 1 levia memoratu videri non nescius sum.

*Hist.* 4. 37. 3 dispersos et nescios miles noster invaserat.

*Ann.* 14. 3. 3 pars (navis) ipso in mari per artem soluta effunderet ignaram ('off her guard').

*Nescius* had fallen into disuse long before the time of Tacitus.<sup>4</sup> With one exception it is restricted in late Republican prose to two formulae: *non sum nescius*<sup>5</sup> and *ne forte sis nescius*.<sup>6</sup> The exception is in Varro: *Rust.* 3. 16. 7 *neque*

<sup>1</sup> See R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre*<sup>4</sup>, ii (revised by A. Thierfelder) [Darmstadt, 1962], 33; on Tacitus see L. Kienzle, *Die Kopulativpartikeln 'et, que, atque' bei Tac., Plin., Sen.* (Tübingen, 1906), 17 ff., 21 ff. (on *atque*).

<sup>2</sup> See Kühner and Stegmann, loc. cit.; cf. G. Merten, *De particularum copulativarum apud veteres Romanorum scriptores usu* (Marburg, 1893), 2.

<sup>3</sup> See *T.L.L.* ii. 1050, 10 ff.; Löfstedt,

*Peregrinatio*, 85 ff.

<sup>4</sup> In early Latin it may have been in use. It is used 3 times by Plautus, against 2 instances of *ignarus*.

<sup>5</sup> *Rhet. Her.* 1. 10, 3. 27, Cic. *Sull.* 28, *Fin.* 1. 1, 5. 51, *de Orat.* 1. 45, *Fam.* 5. 12. 2, 13. 7. 1, *Att.* 16. 15. 2. There are occasional variations of number and gender. Note also *Deiot.* 8 *non erant nescii*, which is of the same structure but is in the third person.

<sup>6</sup> *Font.* 2, *Att.* 15. 11. 4.

*tamen nescia suae imbecillitatis*. In imperial prose before Tacitus the word occurs only twice in Livy,<sup>1</sup> twice in Columella (1 praef. 12, 1. 8. 4), and once in Quintilian (1. 3. 12).

Tacitus' use of the pair provides a striking example of fluctuating taste. *Ignarus* is preferred markedly in the *Histories*, and to a lesser extent in *Annals* 1-2. In 3-5, however, *nescius* comes into favour. *Ignarus* is predominant in 6-14, but in the final two books *nescius* again increases:

|                | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> 1-2 | 3-5 | 6-14 | 15-16 |
|----------------|--------------|-----------------|-----|------|-------|
| <i>ignarus</i> | 30           | 9               | 7   | 33   | 2     |
| <i>nescius</i> | 2            | 4               | 12  | 7    | 6     |

For the return of a more artificial usage in 15-16, see on *adversum* and postponed *quippe* above, and see *Lex. Tac.* 911b on *neque* in 16.

*-avisse(t)*: the syncopated forms of the perfect infinitive active and the pluperfect subjunctive active of first and fourth conjugation verbs and of certain similar second and third conjugation verbs (e.g. *compleo*, *cupio*, *concupisco*, *peto*, *quaero*) were in regular imperial use, while the full forms were archaic. See Quint. 1. 6. 20 ff. 'sed abolita atque abrogata retinere insolentiae cuiusdam est et frivola in parvis iactantiae. multum enim litteratus, qui sine aspiratione et producta secunda syllaba salutarit ("avère" est enim), et "calefacere" dixerit potius quam quod dicimus et "conservavisse", his adiciat "face" et "dice" et similia. recta est haec via: quis negat? sed adiacet et mollior et magis trita.' Cf. 1. 6. 17 (on *audivisse* and *scivisse*).

In the minor works there are no uncontracted forms, but 22 syncopated. Similarly in the *Histories* there are only 5 uncontracted forms, but 49 syncopated. In the *Annals*, however, uncontracted forms predominate by 108:32.

The full forms fall off slightly but perceptibly after the first few books of the *Annals*. The proportion of contracted to uncontracted forms in various sections of the work is as follows:

|                 |       |       |
|-----------------|-------|-------|
| <i>Ann.</i> 1-3 | 4-12  | 13-16 |
| 1:5             | 1:3.3 | 1:2.5 |

Tacitus seems to have become uneasy about archaic and artificial word forms in the late *Annals*. A number decline (cf. *adversum*, *ursum*, *quis*, *antire*, *-is*), but none increases. In the late Republic and the Augustan period there had taken place a movement to eliminate anomalous forms, largely perhaps under the impetus of analogists such as Julius Caesar.<sup>2</sup> Virgil and Livy both show greater hesitancy in admitting old forms than their predecessors Lucretius and Sallust.<sup>3</sup> Of the forms mentioned above, for instance, *adversum*, *-avisset*, and *quis* are all frequent in Sallust's later writings, but largely or completely avoided by Livy. Tacitus seems to have moved slightly away from the Sallustian practice towards that of Livy (and probably that of other more recent historians, such as Aufidius Bassus and Servilius Nonianus). However he undertook no

<sup>1</sup> 27. 7. 5 (*haud nescius*), 43. 13. 1 (*non sum nescius*).

<sup>2</sup> On the analogists see F. H. Colson, 'The Analogist and Anomalist Controversy', *C.Q.* xiii (1919), 24 ff.

<sup>3</sup> On archaic forms as a characteristic of the style of Sallust rather than Livy, see

Tränkle, *Wien. Stud.* lxxxi (1968), 133. On Virgil's sparing use of archaic forms see M. Leumann, *Mus. Helv.* iv (1947), 126 f. Sallust was probably following the annalistic tradition in using unusual forms (see, e.g., the fragments of Cn. Gellius).

systematic removal of old forms from his vocabulary; only *quis* is abruptly discarded.

*tutor, tueor*: both Plautus and Terence always employ *tutor* for *tueor* (in the sense 'guard'; Plautus occasionally has *tueor* = 'see'), but by the late Republic the frequentative was no longer in use, except in the past participial form *tutatus*, which provided a substitute for the avoided past participle of *tueor*.<sup>1</sup> In Cicero's speeches there are almost 90 examples of *tueor*, but only 7 of *tutor*, of which 5 are in the form *tutatus* and another is needed in polyptoton: *Phil.* 4. 2 'qui rem publicam libertatemque vestram suo studio . . . tutatus est et tutatur'. In the letters, where *tueor* is used more than 100 times, the sole example of *tutor* is a past participle. In the rhetorica *tutor* occurs twice, once as a past participle and once as a present infinitive. It is only in the philosophica that Cicero has *tutor* more than once in forms other than *tutatus*, and even there *tueor* still predominates (118:8).

Under the Empire Vitruvius, Seneca the Elder, Seneca the Younger, Petronius, Quintilian and ps.-Quintilian (*Decl. Min.*), *et al.* avoid *tutor* completely.

Before Tacitus the only writers of prose who use the frequentative with any freedom are Sallust (8 times; *tueor* twice) and, in particular, Livy (over 100 times). In the first decade Livy employs it scarcely less often than *tueor* (20:23).<sup>2</sup> In the third, however, *tueor* predominates by almost 2:1 (58:30), in the fourth by almost 3:1 (61:21), and in the fifth by about 4:1 (31:8).

In Tacitus *tutor* is at its most frequent in the first hexad; it then declines to the position which it had had in the *Histories*:

|              | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 | 11-16 |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|
| <i>tutor</i> | 1            | 7               | 1     |
| <i>tueor</i> | 15           | 7               | 11    |

*atque* before consonants: *atque* is usually found before vowels, but many writers employ it at least occasionally before consonants as well, chiefly under the influence of the rhythm of the clausula. No less than 92.9 per cent of pre-consonantal examples in a representative selection of Cicero's works have been shown to occur in the clausula;<sup>3</sup> and a considerable proportion of examples in Livy, Curtius, Seneca the Elder, Seneca the Younger, Mela, ps.-Quintilian, Quintilian, and Pliny the Younger are also so placed.<sup>4</sup>

But certain writers who pay little attention to clausulae, including Tacitus, also admit pre-consonantal *atque*. One of the main motivating influences was the fact that *atque* before consonants (as well as before vowels) had established itself as a literary usage in old Latin.<sup>5</sup> Thus Cato has it incessantly in his speeches and *Origines*, but not in the less elaborate *de Agricultura*, and Ennius appears to have made some use of it in his prose translation of Euhemerus. There are also examples in the annalists (e.g. Claudius Quadrigarius).

<sup>1</sup> On which see Krebs and Schmalz, s.v. 'tueor'.

<sup>2</sup> Counting only forms in which both words are used: *tutaba(n)tur*, *tutabor*, *tutandus*, *tutans*, *tuta(n)tur*, *tutare(n)tur*, *tutari*, *tutatus*, and the corresponding forms of *tueor*.

<sup>3</sup> By J. Wolff, *Jahr.* xxvi (1901), 637 ff.

<sup>4</sup> On Curtius, Seneca the Younger (who

almost without exception has the word in the clausula), and Pliny the Younger see Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, 83 n. On the other writers I have consulted the *Thesaurus* material.

<sup>5</sup> See W. Kroll, *Glotta*, xxii (1934), 7 n. 6; Fraenkel, *Eranos*, xlix (1951), 56.

Obviously later writers who looked to early Latin for inspiration would have been tempted to take the usage up. It is almost certainly in imitation of Cato that Sallust adopts it (at all points of the colon) with such frequency (over 300 times).<sup>1</sup> Indeed he has it in certain phrases in which Cato had employed it, a sure sign of indebtedness: *atque pulcher* (Cato, *Orat.* 56, *Orig.* 110, *Sall. Cat.* 20. 3); *a. strenuus* (Cato, *Orig.* 83, *Sall. Cat.* 51. 16, *Iug.* 22. 3); *a. superbia* (Cato, *Orat.* 163, *Sall. Cat.* 2. 5, 23. 6, *Iug.* 14. 11, 41. 3, 85. 45); *a. pecunia* (Cato, *Orat.* 177, *Sall. Iug.* 27. 2, 35. 8).

Tacitus uses *atque* before a consonant only once in the *Histories*. But in the *Annals* he replaces the phrase *haec ac talia* by *haec atque talia*,<sup>2</sup> and also has the word 27 times in other expressions (two of which are also found in Sallust).<sup>3</sup> Of these latter 27 instances 23 occur in the first hexad.

It is possible that Cato and Sallust had so effectively made preconsonantal *atque* a personal mannerism that its excessive employment by later historians would have savoured of intolerable dependence. Tacitus is not alone among imperial historians in using it only sparingly. Curtius has it perhaps only twice,<sup>4</sup> and Velleius only 9 times. Even Livy's 72 instances do not represent a very great frequency. Apparently Tacitus experimented in the first hexad before discarding the usage.

*et . . . et* (repeated, but not correlative): this usage is rare in 4-12, but is no less frequent in 1-3 than in the last hexad:

|                  |     |                 |      |       |
|------------------|-----|-----------------|------|-------|
| <i>Hist.</i> 1-3 | 4-5 | <i>Ann.</i> 1-3 | 4-12 | 13-16 |
| 42               | 15  | 31              | 9    | 27    |

Note that it decreases at the end of the *Histories*, but rises again at the start of the *Annals*.

#### SYNTAX

Such syntactic changes as do occur are of diverse types. I make no attempt to classify them generally.

The omission of *se* in *oratio obliqua*: The omission of the subject accusative in the *acc. c. infin.* construction occurs at least occasionally in most writers and is common in historians other than Velleius.<sup>5</sup> The ellipse is usually an easy one. Tacitus' liking for the usage increases: in the minor works he rarely allows it, but in the *Annals* in particular it becomes very frequent:

|                    |              |             |     |       |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------|-----|-------|
| <i>Minor works</i> | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> | 1-6 | 11-16 |
| 5                  | 42           | 83          | 82  |       |

Most writers seem to omit *se* (as distinct from *eum* etc.) considerably more often with the future active than with other tenses of the infinitive.<sup>6</sup> It is

<sup>1</sup> A full collection of examples is to be found in A. Kunze, *Sallustiana* (Leipzig, 1892), 4 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See *Lex. Tac.* 106a; Wölfflin, *Philol.* xxv (1867), 134.

<sup>3</sup> *atque periculum* (*Sall. Cat.* 4. 1, 4. 4, 30. 5, 52. 2, *Tac. Ann.* 2. 40. 2); *aequabilis atque constantius* (*Sall. Cat.* 2. 3, *Tac. Ann.* 15. 21. 4).

<sup>4</sup> See R. Novak, *Wien. Stud.* xv (1893), 257 ff.

<sup>5</sup> See Kühner and Stegmann, i. 700 ff.;

Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, ii. 262 f.; Hofmann and Szantyr, 362; S. Fritsch, *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Velleius Paterculus* (Arnstadt, 1876), 15.

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., L. Kühnast, *Die Hauptpunkte der livianischen Syntax*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin, 1872), 108; H. Lindgren, *Studia Curtiana* (Uppsala, 1935), 56. See also the examples quoted from Cicero and Caesar by J. Lebreton, *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Paris, 1901), 377 f.

conceivable that the reason for this would emerge if we could elucidate the obscure origin of the *-urus esse* infinitive, which in early Latin often appears in the form *-urum esse* irrespective of the number and gender of its subject (expressed or unexpressed).<sup>1</sup> It is sufficient here to note the phenomenon.

In the *Histories* Tacitus rarely omits *se* with tenses other than the future, but in the *Annals* he becomes progressively less restrictive:<sup>2</sup>

|                 | <i>se omitted with future<br/>active infinitive</i> | <i>with other<br/>tenses</i> |
|-----------------|---|------------------------------|
| <i>Hist.</i>    | 9 (75% of all instances)                            | 3                            |
| <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 | 14 (67% „ „ „ )                                     | 7                            |
| 11-16           | 19 (55% „ „ „ )                                     | 15                           |

The nominative use of the *ab urbe condita* construction: In this construction the participle is not predicative but has the role of a verbal substantive.<sup>3</sup> Thus at *Ann.* 1. 8. 6 'occisus dictator Caesar aliis pessimum, aliis pulcherrimum facinus videretur' the words *occisus . . . Caesar* are roughly equivalent to some such phrase as *caedes Caesaris*.

The device is found only twice in *Annals* 13-15, but is strikingly frequent in the earlier books (some 29 times in books 1-3).<sup>4</sup> Perhaps Tacitus became aware that it was an obtrusive mannerism of his style.

The use of the final infinitive with verbs for *ut*+subj.: During the late Republic and, in particular, the early Empire, the range of verbs which might take the final infinitive instead of *ut*+subj. was considerably extended by analogy, not only in the poets and artificial writers but also in ordinary prose.<sup>5</sup> Thus, for instance, while in classical Latin *ut*+subj. is the usual construction with *permitto* (found 24 times, e.g. in the speeches of Cicero, where the infinitive occurs only once), in the early Empire it is replaced by the infinitive (in Seneca the Elder the infinitive predominates by 11:1, in Seneca the Younger by 46:0, and in Quintilian by 17:1). The analogy of *sino* may have provided the impetus for the change.

Tacitus shows a taste for the infinitive construction which becomes more marked in the later *Annals*. In the historical works there are about 20 verbs

<sup>1</sup> See Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, ii. 11 ff.; Hofmann and Szantyr, 343.

<sup>2</sup> The following are the examples included in the table: (a) *se* omitted with future active infinitive: *Hist.* 1. 50. 3, 2. 9. 2, 2. 32. 2, 3. 13. 3, 3. 20. 2 (twice), 3. 77. 1, 4. 14. 4, 4. 56. 3, *Ann.* 1. 7. 4, 1. 19. 4, 1. 25. 3, 1. 35. 4, 2. 71. 5, 2. 79. 1, 2. 83. 3, 3. 14. 4, 3. 47. 2, 3. 58. 2, 3. 72. 2, 4. 40. 3, 5. 9. 1, 6. 48. 2, 11. 25. 3, 11. 30. 2, 12. 7. 1, 12. 34. 1, 12. 45. 1, 12. 47. 1, 13. 14. 3, 13. 38. 3, 13. 42. 4, 13. 56. 1, 14. 1. 2, 14. 29. 1, 15. 5. 4, 15. 29. 1, 15. 42. 2, 15. 43. 2, 15. 52. 1, 16. 24. 1, 16. 28. 2; (b) *se* omitted with other tenses of the infinitive: *Hist.* 1. 51. 4, 2. 18. 2, 4. 25. 1, *Ann.* 1. 8. 4,

2. 58. 1, 2. 63. 1, 3. 8. 2, 4. 8. 3, 4. 39. 2, 4. 39. 4, 11. 3. 2, 11. 17. 1, 12. 47. 3, 13. 38. 1, 13. 46. 2, 13. 49. 4, 14. 35. 1, 14. 48. 2, 15. 17. 2, 15. 27. 2, 15. 36. 3, 15. 51. 2, 15. 55. 1, 15. 62. 1, 16. 25. 1.

<sup>3</sup> E. Laughton, *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford, 1964), 59 ff.

<sup>4</sup> 1. 8. 6, 1. 16. 1, 1. 19. 5, 1. 24. 1, 1. 33. 3, 1. 36. 2, 1. 42. 1, 1. 52. 1, 1. 59. 1, 1. 63. 2, 1. 72. 4, 2. 2. 3, 2. 47. 2, 2. 57. 1, 2. 82. 3, 2. 84. 2, 3. 5. 1, 3. 9. 3, 3. 22. 1, 3. 24. 1, 3. 28. 4, 3. 31. 2, 3. 46. 4, 3. 50. 3, 3. 52. 1, 3. 52. 3, 3. 54. 2, 3. 54. 5, 3. 71. 2, 13. 9. 3, 14. 14. 3.

<sup>5</sup> See Hofmann and Szantyr, 345 f. for a brief discussion.

which are used both with *ut* and the infinitive.<sup>1</sup> The distribution of the two constructions with these is as follows:

|            | <i>Hist.</i> | <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 | 11-16      |
|------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|
| <i>ut</i>  | 20 (2:1)     | 20 (1:1)        | 10 (1:3.8) |
| infinitive | 11           | 22              | 38         |

Note, for example, the change in the construction used with the following verbs:

|                 | <i>Ann.</i> 1-6 |               | 11-16     |               |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|
|                 | <i>ut</i>       | <i>infin.</i> | <i>ut</i> | <i>infin.</i> |
| <i>perpello</i> | 4               | 2             | —         | 3             |
| <i>suadeo</i>   | 3               | 1             | —         | 4             |
| <i>hortor</i>   | 3               | 1             | 1         | 4             |

There are in all 2 instances of the final infinitive with verbs in the minor works, 22 in the *Histories*, 34 in *Annals* 1-6, and 50 in 11-16.<sup>2</sup>

It is not possible to describe the rise of the infinitive as representing a progression towards, or away from everyday Latinity, for Tacitus shows the same liking for the construction both with verbs with which it had become standard (e.g. *permitto*), and those with which it was abnormal (e.g. *impello*, *impetro*).<sup>3</sup> He was in sympathy with a modern tendency in the educated language, and was prepared to extend it.

*Ad+gerundive*: With a selection of examples Wölfflin showed that often when *ad+gerundive* appears in the *Annals* instead of the archaizing dative of purpose with the gerundive, Tacitus was led to use it by the requirements of sense, euphony, or variation.<sup>4</sup>

The following table shows all examples in the *Annals* of those instances of *ad+gerundive* for which the dative of the gerundive could apparently have been substituted without difficulty:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *admonéo*, *agito*, *certo*, *cohortor*, *do*, *edico*, *hortor*, *impello*, *impetro*, *induco*, *mando*, *mereo*, *monéo*, *oro*, *pango*, *perpello*, *postulo*, *suadeo*, *subigo*, *urgeo*. I omit *permitto* as a special case. The infinitive had effectively ousted *ut* in all genres. Tacitus uses *ut* with the word only at *Ann.* 3. 63. 1, where the infinitive would have been awkward.

<sup>2</sup> See the *Lex. Tac.* under the words mentioned above and also under *accingo*, *adnitor*, *aemulor*, *ambio*, *conitor*, *dehortor*, *denuntio*, *deposco*, *exposco*, *impero*, *incumbo*, *inlicio*, *insto*, *nitor*, *nuntio*, *praeepto*, *praescribo*, *scribo*.

<sup>3</sup> On these two words see Krebs and Schmalz, s.v.

<sup>4</sup> *Philol.* xxv (1867), 114. Eriksson (op. cit. 25) disregarded Wölfflin's remarks in his discussion of the frequency of the two constructions. Since he merely tabulated all occurrences without reference to their context his statistics are of little value.

<sup>5</sup> The instances included in the table are: 1. 2. 1, 1. 5. 1, 1. 7. 7, 1. 23. 1, 1. 41. 2, 1. 64.

2, 1. 71. 1, 1. 71. 2, 1. 76. 4 (twice), 6. 3. 2, 6. 46. 5, 6. 48. 2, 6. 50. 4, 11. 9. 1, 12. 8. 1, 12. 10. 1, 13. 8. 3, 14. 5. 1, 14. 23. 1, 14. 36. 3, 14. 38. 1, 14. 39. 1, 15. 4. 3, 15. 53. 3, 15. 56. 2, 15. 66. 2, 16. 14. 1, 16. 19. 3, 16. 22. 1, 16. 24. 1 (twice), 16. 32. 3 (twice). In the following passages it has been possible to see a reason for the avoidance of the dative+gerundive: 2. 6. 3 (variation), 2. 43. 4 (Wölfflin, loc. cit.), 2. 79. 1 (*ad dicendam causam*; this and similar phrases are always used by Tacitus instead of the dative with the gerundive), 3. 30. 2 (Wölfflin, loc. cit.), 3. 38. 2 (*ad dicendam . . . causam*), 3. 39. 1 (variation), 3. 49. 2 (*ad dicendum testimonium*), 3. 56. 4 (Wölfflin, loc. cit.), 3. 63. 4 (euphony), 4. 16. 4 (Wölfflin, loc. cit.), 4. 41. 1 (used with *impello*, which always takes *ad* rather than the dative in Tacitus), 4. 48. 2 (Wölfflin, loc. cit.), 4. 73. 1 (clarity), 5. 11. 1 (variation), 11. 37. 2 (*dicendam ad causam*), 12. 14. 1 (*exuendam ad fidem*; Tacitus avoids *fides* in the dative with a gerundive, but uses *ad fidem* with a gerundive a number of times), 13. 5. 1 (*ad causam*

|             |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| <i>Ann.</i> | 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|             | 10 | — | — | — | — | 4 | 1  | 2  | 1  | 5  | 4  | 7  |

The change in the later books is clear.<sup>1</sup> Note too that Tacitus' practice in book 1 has not altered greatly from that in the *Histories*.<sup>2</sup>

Ellipse of *esse*: It was shown by C. Stuhl that Tacitus was less ready to drop *esse* in 11–16.<sup>3</sup> It is possible to confirm this conclusion with new evidence.

When two perfect (future perfect, pluperfect) passive verbs with the same subject are linked by a copulative or disjunctive particle, Tacitus either omits the auxiliary (usually *est* or *sunt*) with both, or expresses it with one or the other (but never with both). The ellipse of the auxiliary with both verbs is more frequent in the first six books than in the later:

|  |                 |         |
|--|-----------------|---------|
|  | <i>Ann.</i> 1–6 | 11–16   |
| <i>Auxiliary omitted with both verbs</i> | 15 (4:1)        | 8 (1:1) |
| <i>Auxiliary omitted with one verb</i>   | 4               | 10      |

It should now be evident that the stylistic change within the *Annals* defies neat description. It would perhaps be true to say that Tacitus was a writer always dissatisfied with his own style. On the one hand he constantly sought greater artificiality; but at the same time he tired frequently even of remote words and usages. But we must also concede the possibility that he was subject to irrational fads and that some of his modifications were unconscious.

*Christ's College, Cambridge*

J. N. ADAMS

*orandam*), 13. 31. 2 (*ad retinendam . . . fidem*), 13. 38. 3 (variation), 13. 39. 1 (clarity), 14. 26. 1 (Wölfflin, loc. cit.), 14. 51. 1 (clarity), 15. 58. 3 (*dicendam ad causam*).

<sup>1</sup> The figures are only approximate, for Tacitus' intentions may sometimes escape a modern reader. Nevertheless it is reasonably

certain that the classical construction is used more freely in the second half of the *Annals* (with the change coming at 6).

<sup>2</sup> On the *Histories* see Wölfflin, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> *Quibus condicionibus Tacitus ellipsim verbi admiserit et qua ratione excoluerit* (Würzburg, 1900).