

## A RHETORICAL FIGURE IN LATIN HISTORICAL STYLE: THE IMAGINARY SECOND PERSON SINGULAR

KRISTINE GILMARTIN

*Rice University*

In that lavish description of Agrippina's arrival in Italy with which he opens Book 3 of the *Annals*, Tacitus adorns one sentence with a potential subjunctive in the second person singular:

postquam duobus cum liberis, feralem urnam tenens, egressa navi defixit oculos, idem omnium gemitus, neque *discerneres* proximos alienos, virorum feminarumve planctus, nisi quod comitatum Agrippinae longo maerore fessum obvii et recentes in dolore anteibant. (3.1.4)

The stylistic elaboration of this passage has been seen as a result of the conflict between fact and impression in Tacitus' account of Germanicus.<sup>1</sup> An accurate reading of it is thus important, ultimately, for our comprehension of the historian's presentation of Germanicus and his popularity. To understand the tone here, in turn, requires an understanding of the force and effect of this use of the second person singular. Commentators, however, say nothing particular about the usage.<sup>2</sup> Without knowledge of how the device is used by Tacitus and other historians, a reader who feels drawn into the scene by this *discerneres* may well conclude that the form here is a normal means to heighten pathos. As Goodyear has recently pointed out in regard to alliteration,

<sup>1</sup> See B. Walker, *The Annals of Tacitus* (Manchester 1960<sup>2</sup>) 110 ff.; she notes this passage specifically on pp. 58 and 125.

<sup>2</sup> H. Furneaux, *The Annals of Tacitus* I (Oxford 1896<sup>2</sup>), does not comment on *discerneres*. E. Koestermann, *Annalen* I (Heidelberg 1963) 418, compares it to *Ann.* 6.7.3, *neque discerneres alienos a coniunctis*, but neither here nor in commenting on the later passage (Band II [1965] 254) does he say anything about the use of the second person singular. F. R. D. Goodyear's new commentary has not yet reached *Annals* 3. He makes no comment in *The Annals of Tacitus* I (Cambridge 1972) on the use of the device in *Ann.* 1.32.3.

however, subjective impressions of the "expressiveness" of stylistic features are too often vague and dubious.<sup>3</sup> As he suggests, we need first to consider the discussion of the usage by ancient authors, then to calculate its frequency of occurrence and study the examples found, in order to reach an accurate knowledge of any such phenomenon. With this information as background, the Tacitean passage, and many other passages, can be read with a greater sensitivity and interpreted with greater confidence.

Among ancient writers on style and rhetoric, only "Longinus" discusses the special use of the second person singular. In one section of *On the Sublime*, the device is briefly considered and some conclusions about its effect are drawn: "In like manner the interchange of persons produces a vivid impression, and often makes the hearer feel that he is moving in the midst of perils."<sup>4</sup> Noting Herodotus' use of it in a passage on Egyptian geography (2.29), "Longinus" comments: "Do you observe, my friend, how he leads you in imagination through the region and makes you *see* what you hear? All such cases of direct personal address place the hearer on the very scene of action" (26.2). The section concludes: "You will make your hearer more excited and more attentive and full of active participation, if you keep him on the alert by words addressed to himself" (26.3). In fact, although most of the examples in this section of "Longinus" come from poetry, the rhetorical theory of *enargeia*, "making hearing sight," was regularly applied to historiography, as the critical comments of Polybius, Plutarch and Lucian attest. In Polybius' criticism of Phylarchus, "always trying to bring horrors vividly before our eyes," the dangers of applying this technique to historical narrative are clearly set forth.<sup>5</sup>

Plutarch and Lucian, however, like the author of *On the Sublime*, consider *enargeia* in historical writing with approval. Plutarch discusses it as a characteristic of Thucydides' work:

Assuredly Thucydides is always striving for this vividness (*ἐνάργεια*) in his writing, since it is his desire to make the reader a spectator, as it

<sup>3</sup> Goodyear (above, note 2) 336-41.

<sup>4</sup> "Longinus," *On the Sublime* 26.1. All quotations of "Longinus" are from the translation of W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge 1907<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>5</sup> Polybius 2.56.8. I quote W. R. Paton's translation in the Loeb edition (Cambridge, Mass., 1922). Polybius' digression on Phylarchus covers 2.56-63. For further discussion see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* I (Oxford 1957) *ad loc.*

were, and to produce vividly in the minds of those who peruse his narrative the emotions of amazement and consternation which were experienced by those who beheld them.<sup>6</sup>

Lucian says that the task of the historian is "to give a fine arrangement to events and illuminate them as vividly as possible (*εἰς δύναντον ἐναργέστατα*).<sup>7</sup> The historian has succeeded best, "when a man who has heard him thinks thereafter that he is actually seeing what is being described."<sup>8</sup> These general remarks, however, and even the specific observations of "Longinus," do not fully enlighten us about historians' use of this second person singular. Is "Longinus" right to make no distinction, for example, between Homer's use of it and Herodotus'? Nor are possible differences between the practice of Greek and Roman writers considered by the ancients.<sup>8</sup> The comments of "Longinus" do not enable us to judge whether the example in the Tacitean description of Agrippina is trite or unique, whether Tacitus uses the device differently from other historians or not.

The modern grammarians provide some information to increase our understanding of this usage. The indefinite second person singular is most completely discussed under the potential constructions (optative and subjunctive).<sup>9</sup> Kühner-Gerth list as comparable: *ῥόμην ἄν, ᾧετό*

<sup>6</sup> Plutarch, *On the Fame of the Athenians* 347A. I quote F. C. Babbitt's translation in the Loeb edition (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).

<sup>7</sup> Lucian, *How to Write History* 51. I quote K. Kilburn's translation in the Loeb edition (Cambridge, Mass., 1959).

<sup>8</sup> D. A. Russell, in his commentary on "Longinus" *On the Sublime* (Oxford 1964), notes that "The imaginary second person . . . is much less common in Greek than in Latin (where all styles welcome it) . . . but it is not exactly rare" (144). Roman writers, e.g., *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.68) and Quintilian (6.2.32-36), do discuss *enargeia* in oratory but never refer to this use of the second person singular. For modern discussions of *enargeia*, none of which mentions the use of the second person either, see: G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim am Glan 1954) 130 ff.; H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich 1960) 399 ff.; G. Calboli, *Rhetorica ad C. Herennium* (Bologna 1969) 435-36; Kroll, *RE Supplbd.* 7, 1111-12.

<sup>9</sup> For Greek: Kühner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hannover 1898<sup>3</sup>) 392.5, 396.2; Goodwin-Gulick, *Greek Grammar* (Boston 1930) 1327, 1335; Schwyzer-Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik* II (Munich 1959), IV. 3. For Latin: Kühner-Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (Hannover 1912<sup>2</sup>) 46.2, 46.3b, 119 Anm. 21; Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* II (Munich 1965) 185 IV a, b. See also L. Quicherat, *Mélanges de Philologie* (Paris 1879) 144-54; P. Lejay, "Essais et Notes sur Virgile: L'Expression d'un Sujet Indéterminé en Latin," *RPh* 40 (1916) 149-63; J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (Basel 1950<sup>2</sup>) 109-11.

τις ἄν, ἔγνω τις ἄν, ἤσθετό τις ἄν, εἶδες ἄν, ἡγήσω ἄν (392.5). Of the examples cited, the only ones with the second person are from Homer, Euripides and Xenophon. Examination of the texts, indeed, reveals that Herodotus, Thucydides and Polybius do not employ the second person singular as Tacitus does in that description from *Annals* 3.<sup>10</sup> Kühner-Stegmann, however, provide examples of this kind of second person singular, imperfect subjunctive, from Plautus, Terence, Cicero, Sallust, Livy, Velleius, and Tacitus (46.3b). The indefinite third person potential in this tense is frequent in questions, but otherwise rare (46.3b). In the present and perfect subjunctive, the second person singular and the third person with *aliquis* or *quispiam* seem equally common (46.2).<sup>11</sup> Although the grammarians' range of examples is larger than that of "Longinus," they document a grammatical construction without making any comments about its function as a literary device.<sup>12</sup> Some distinction needs to be made between the use of the form in different types of writing before we can fully understand its effect.

This imaginary second person may occur within a didactic dialogue or may be an appeal to the listener or reader of a narrative.<sup>13</sup> Certainly

<sup>10</sup> Herodotus does use it in geographical (e.g., 2.29.3) and technical passages (e.g., 2.5.2), and in digressions (e.g., 1.139). The only examples from Polybius are found in a long simile (1.81.8-9), which is introduced, however, with *τις*. The example from Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (8.1.33) is part of a summary of institutions and general behavior. The only narrative use of this device in a Greek history that I have been able to find is Xenophon *Hell.* 6.4.16, where the reactions in Lacedaemon to the news of the Spartan defeat at Leuctra are described. The Greek historians' preference for *τις* over the second person singular in such potential appeals is clear, and even the device with *τις* is more common in Xenophon and Polybius than in the 5th century writers.

<sup>11</sup> The grammarians' discussions of ways to express French *on* and German *man* in Latin (Kühner-Stegmann 119 Anm. 21; Quicherat and Lejay, above, note 9) do not suggest that indefinite pronouns (*aliquis*, *quis*, *quispiam*, etc.) with the third person were not as readily available for this use as the second person singular. An example from Livy: . . . *ut facile quis cerneret, ubi primum conserendi manum cum hoste data occasio esset, aut victoria egregia aut morte memorabili finituros bellum* (44.34.9), illustrates this third person construction. The second person singular in such phrases, however, is overwhelmingly preferred. This Livian instance itself seems to be the result of a desire for *variatio*, since the description here concluded is introduced by *videres* (44.34.8).

<sup>12</sup> Lejay (above, note 9) 163 classes the use of the second person singular subjunctive as a grammatical, not a stylistic, figure, but his discussion (p. 155) does not sufficiently distinguish the various uses of it. He never cites an example like that found in *Ann.* 3.1.4.

<sup>13</sup> For the imaginary interlocutor, especially in satire, see Lejay (above, note 9) 155, 157; H. C. Nutting, "Note on the indefinite second person singular," *CPCP* 8, 4 (1927)

in plays, letters, dialogues, orations, or other literary forms in which there is an addressee, the second person is less unexpected, and less likely to produce the effect "Longinus" speaks of, than it is in a work written largely in the third person.<sup>14</sup> In a passage from the *Germania*: *omne robur in pedite, quem super arma ferramentis quoque et copiis onerant: alios ad proelium ire videas, Chattos ad bellum* (30.3), the visual appeal of the form resembles that in the description of the crowd which welcomed Agrippina. The difference between the time-scheme of a treatise and of a history, however, does make the device affect the reader slightly differently. A treatise generally states facts rather than narrating specific events in chronological sequence. The reader is transported by this *videas* in space, but not necessarily in time.<sup>15</sup> Since an historical narrative relates the past to the present, the use of the second person can be one means of moving effectively back and forth between the two.

Not all examples of the second person singular in an historical work, however, are instances of this rhetorical figure. In the speeches addressed to an individual, for example, the second person naturally occurs. Many gnomic generalizations are phrased in it: *nil tuto in hoste despicitur: quem spreveris, valentior neglegentia facias* (Curt. 6.3.11), as are geographical<sup>16</sup> or technical explanations: *palmetis proceritas et decor, balsamum modica arbor; ut quisque ramus intumuit, si vim*

---

241-50. The use of the second person singular which "Longinus" discusses is an appeal to the hearer (26.3); see also Wackernagel (above, note 9) 109.

<sup>14</sup> Although the first person (both singular and plural) is used in histories, the narrative is basically presented in the third person.

<sup>15</sup> The examples from Vergil's *Georgics*: *videas* (1.387), *mirabere* (4.197), are quite comparable to those from the *Germania*, although the poem does also have an addressee. Cato uses the second person singular didactically throughout *De Agri Cultura*; the treatise does not have an addressee. In *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, another early work in prose, this person is used to the addressee (e.g., 1.1.1, 2.31.50), for generalizations (e.g., 2.23.37), and occasionally for didactic instructions (2.27.43, 2.28.45). The historians' use of the second person singular in geographical and technical explanations, and in digressions, is similar to the didactic use of it in treatises. There are no examples of the use of this person as a descriptive device in *De Agri Cultura* or *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.

<sup>16</sup> "Longinus" says that the second person in geographical descriptions places "the hearer on the very scene of action" (26.2), and the example from Sallust's *Catiline* 55.3 (location of the *Tullianum*) is a fine instance of this (cf. Livy 9.2.8: topography of the Caudine Forks). In general, however, geographical examples of the device in the Roman historians occur in digressions, not in the regular narrative of events.

*ferri adhibeas, pavent venae* (Tac. *Hist.* 5.6.1). Similar are examples in philosophical introductions (e.g., Sall. *Cat.* 3.2) and in digressions from the narrative of events (e.g., Tac. *Ann.* 4.33.4). With these distinctions made, Tacitus' use of *discerneret* in *Annals* 3.1.4 can be properly defined as a special stylistic device within a third person narrative of the past, not merely as a grammatical construction similar to that used in Terentian or Ciceronian dialogue.

More evidence from the texts is necessary, however, to reach full understanding of the effect of the figure in this Tacitean passage, or in any passage from a Latin historian. We shall examine all the extant books of the Roman historians for examples of the indefinite second person singular used in the narrative with this kind of potential appeal to the reader.<sup>17</sup> We shall then study these examples to learn who employs it and how, and how well the analysis of "Longinus" agrees with the actual practice of the Roman historians. No examples of it from the early annalists and historians are found in Peter's collection of the fragments, nor are there examples from the fragments of early Latin poetry.<sup>18</sup> In a narrative fragment from a speech of Cato, however, the device appears in a vivid description: *deinde, postquam Massiliam praeterimus, inde omnem classem ventus auster lenis fert, mare velis florere videres*.<sup>19</sup> Similar examples are to be found in the narrative

<sup>17</sup> In strict grammatical terms, not all of these appeals are independent potential subjunctives. Some are in result clauses, relative clauses, conditions, etc., but the potential meaning in them is usually perceptible.

<sup>18</sup> H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* (Leipzig 1914). In fact, there are no examples of this narrative use of the second person in any of the fragments. There are, however, examples found in technical explanations, e.g., *sed sagittam atque lapidem deorsum an sursum mittas, hoc interest* (Claudius Quadrigarius; fr. 85). No instances are found in the fragments of Ennius, Livius Andronicus, and Naevius included in *Remains of Old Latin* I and II, ed. and trans. E. H. Warmington (Cambridge, Mass., 1961). Except for the example from Cato discussed below, there are none in H. Malcovati's *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (Torino 1955<sup>2</sup>). The available evidence does not permit the classification of this use of the second person singular as an archaism.

<sup>19</sup> H. Malcovati (above, note 18) fr. 29. Norden comments on this fragment in *Die antike Kunstprosa* I (Leipzig 1898), and finds Ennian influence in the use of *florere* (p. 168). Whether the device of *videres* was also taken over from Ennius is impossible to tell from the surviving evidence. Since the figure is not uncommon in Homer, and the poetic influences on Hellenistic and later historiography are considerable, there remains some possibility that Roman historians were also influenced in their employment of it by poetry. In the *Aeneid*, however, the device is never used during the course of the narrative, as it is in Homer, but only in the *ekphrasis* of Aeneas' shield (8.650, 676, 691). Here the forms call attention to descriptions (really almost narratives) of battles in Roman

portions of Cicero's speeches, for instance: *vix erat hoc plane imperatum cum illum spoliatum stipatumque lictoribus videres* (*Verr.* 4.86). The dearth of examples from other kinds of early narrative and the fact that Latin prose was first polished in oratory suggest that the figure came into Latin historical style from oratory.<sup>20</sup> However, its different force in these two genres must again be distinguished. Although Cicero used the second person singular in his description of Antony's extravagance, for example, he turns to the second person plural to make a stronger, direct appeal: *conchyliatis Cn. Pompei peristromatis servorum in cellis lectos stratos videres. Quam ob rem desinite mirari haec tam celeriter esse consumpta* (*Phil.* 2.67). For the historians, however, who did not address their audience thus directly, the potential appeal to the reader in this second person singular was a uniquely useful stylistic technique.

Although the device is not found in any of Caesar's own works, a single example occurs in *Bellum Hispaniense*:

cum nostri in opere essent, equitum copiae concursus facere coeperunt, simulque vociferantibus legionariis, cum locum efflagitarent ex consuetudine insequendi, existimare *posses* paratissimos esse ad dimicandum. (25.2)<sup>21</sup>

The accidents of literary survival have made this for us the first example of this second person singular from an historical work. Although the style of *Bellum Hispaniense* is generally deplored, the author, as Klotz remarked, "will Schriftsteller sein."<sup>22</sup> Here he has varied a Caesarian

---

history: Porsenna and Horatius at the bridge (650) and Actium (676, 691). The first two examples make a purely visual appeal, the third introduces a comparison.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Chausserie-Laprée's discussion, in *L'Expression narrative chez les historiens latins* (Paris 1969), of the probable sources for a particular stylistic device found in the historians but not in the fragments of the annalists (p. 567). He stresses as significant: (1) the existence of a parallel construction in Greek historians, and (2) Cicero's effective use of it. The example of the second person from Xenophon (*Hell.* 6.4.16) and those from Cicero (e.g., *Verr.* 4.86) give us a similar background for the development of this device in the historians. (Chausserie-Laprée 668 notes the Ciceronian passage, *Verr.* 4.86, as "une scène pathétique," although he does not mention *cerneres* among the stylistic devices used.)

<sup>21</sup> I quote the text of G. Pascucci (Firenze 1965). In his commentary on this passage (p. 290), he notes the similar sentence in Caesar *B.G.* 7, and labels the use of the second person singular "retorica."

<sup>22</sup> *RE* 10.275.

phrase, *ut qui propinquitatem loci videret paratos aequo Marte ad dimicandum existimaret* (B.G. 7.19.3), with this rhetorical flourish. Whether he knew the device from contemporary prose or from authors he read in school, it is highly unlikely that his single use of it influenced any of the great historians.

This second person singular is found in Sallust, and then in all the extant Roman historians: Livy, Trogus,<sup>23</sup> Velleius, Curtius, Tacitus and Ammianus. The basic facts of its frequency and distribution in each of these authors provide the data for a preliminary overview of its use in historical prose. In the case of Sallust the statistical picture is very likely to be distorted because of the loss of the *Histories*.<sup>24</sup> Two examples are found in the 51 pages of the *Catiline* and one in the 94 pages of the *Iugurtha*, for an overall frequency of 1/48.3 pages.<sup>25</sup> Livy's practice can be seen best when the frequency is considered by pentads. He seems to have adopted the figure with great enthusiasm, employing it 7 times in Books 1–5 (1/47.9 pages), but then he dropped it completely in the second half of the first decade.<sup>26</sup> After that

<sup>23</sup> For Trogus, we must depend upon the epitome of Justin. The most recent study, O. Seel's *Eine römische Weltgeschichte* (Nürnberg 1972), dates Trogus after 14 A.D., near to Velleius, "in dessen zeitliche und milieubedingte Nachbarschaft Trogus zu rücken scheint" (p. 284). He dates Justin about A.D. 200 (p. 300). Whether the examples of this device found in Justin are to be credited to him or to Trogus cannot be decided with absolute certainty. Stylistic features in Justin seem generally to be treated as Trogus': e.g., by R. B. Steele, in "Pompeius Trogus and Justinus," *AJP* 38 (1917), who lists the examples of the indefinite second person among rhetorical features which have parallels in Livy (pp. 20–21). Seel believes that for wide stretches of the text Justin followed Trogus "bis in den Wortlaut hinein" (p. 3), although he also notes that Justin had some rhetorical ambition and probably added "etwas Zierliches, ein wenig Geklingel, Klauseln und dergleichen" (p. 4). I believe that Trogus, like his predecessors and contemporaries, Sallust, Livy and Velleius, did use the device, and I consider that the few instances found in the epitome come from the original text.

<sup>24</sup> As it happens, there are no examples from Maurenbrecher's *Historiarum Reliquiae* (Leipzig 1893).

<sup>25</sup> Page numbers for all authors are counted from Teubner editions: Sallust, ed. Kurfess (1957); Livy, ed. Weissenborn and Müller, I (1915), II (1912), III (1909), IV (1914); ed. Weissenborn and Heraeus, V (1908; 1912); Justin, ed. Seel (1935); Velleius, ed. Stegmann de Pritzwald (1965); Curtius, ed. Hedicke (1912); Tacitus, ed. Koestermann, I (1965), II 1 (1961), II 2 (1964); Ammianus, ed. Gardthausen (1875; repr. 1967). The "old Teubner" pages of Livy, Justin and Curtius have about 40 more words per page, so that some slight reduction in the rates of frequency of these authors may be necessary. In the calculations, two instances of the device in one sentence are counted as one example. This occurs 7 times.

<sup>26</sup> Livy's enthusiasm for the device is most marked in Book 2 where there are 5 examples. Chausserie-Laprée (above, note 20) comments on the peculiar character



examples occur fairly steadily: 6 each from Books 21–25 and 26–30, 2 from Books 31–35, and then 5 each from Books 36–40 and 41–45. Livy's overall frequency is 1/61.4 pages. Examples are sometimes accumulated in important parts of the history—Book 22 (4), Book 29 (2), Book 30 (3)—but this practice is not consistent (none in Book 5). The device occurs 7 times in the 300 pages of Justin's epitome of Trogus (1/42.9 pages). Since the text has been reduced to about a tenth of the original by the epitomator, who may certainly have left out instances, it is difficult to estimate just how common the device was in Trogus' style. The examples which we have are in two distinct groups: 3 from the account of the Persian War in Book 2 (Marathon; Xerxes; Salamis), and 4 from the narrative about Alexander and his successors (2 from Book 11, and one each from Books 13 and 14). The lack of examples from the later books may, or may not, mean that Trogus reduced his usage of the device.<sup>27</sup> The highest frequency of all is found in Velleius, 1/14.6 pages.<sup>28</sup> No other historian uses, or overuses, this second person singular to that extent. In Curtius the device appears more frequently than in Livy (1/36.7 pages), and slightly more often in the later books: 3 examples in Book 9 and 2 in

---

of Book 2: "Toutes les structures et les techniques de l'expression dramatique s'y donnent constamment carrière. Jamais plus dans la suite de son oeuvre, ne se retrouvera pareil déploiement" (p. 524 n. 2). (This device is not, however, among those studied by Chausserie-Laprée).

<sup>27</sup> There are parallels in Tacitus and Ammianus for such a reduction. Mention should be made of an instance from the account of the Parthians in Book 41: *plerumque in ipso ardore certaminis proelia deserunt ac paulo post pugnam ex fuga repetunt, ut, cum maxime vicissete putes, tunc tibi discrimen subeundum sit* (41.2.9). The *putes* here is midway between the narrative use of the second person singular and that in technical explanations. It is not quite the same kind of appeal to the reader as *existimes* in Ammianus 23.6.80, although the contexts are similar. The example in Justin 6.8.2 is a generalization. Geographical uses of the second person singular occur in 4.1.10 and 4.1.18.

<sup>28</sup> Velleius' rate of frequency is most comparable to that of Florus, who uses the device 14 times in his epitome (1/12.6 pages). (The text counted is Rossbach's Teubner edition [1896].) An abundance of rhetorical appeals and exclamations characterizes Florus' work. This second person singular is only one feature of his stylistic elaboration, and not the most striking. In a study of this figure in Roman historical style, Velleius and Trogus-Justin have a place because of their chronological position between Livy and Tacitus. The examples from Florus' epitome, however, reveal only the abuse of the figure in a late Hadrianic author, and one who is not writing his own historical narrative, as Velleius is. For these reasons, the particular instances found in his work are not studied here. There are no examples of the device in other epitomes: the *Caesares* of Aurelius Victor or the *breviaria* of Eutropius and Festus.

Book 10. The statistics for Tacitus are particularly interesting, for not only does he, in the early *Annals*, exploit this device more than anyone except Velleius, but also its distribution in his work, from the *Histories* (1/39) to *Annals* 1-6 (1/28.3) to *Annals* 11-16 (1/94.5), shows the kind of variation which has been observed in his employment of other stylistic features.<sup>29</sup> The overall frequency for Tacitus is 1/41.4 pages. Four examples are found in the first 12 of the extant books of Ammianus (14-25), but only one in the last 6 (26-31). His overall frequency is the least of all the historians (1/119.8), but the continued use of the figure is noteworthy, not so much as a reflection of Tacitean style (the examples are not similar), but of traditional rhetorical style in Roman historiography.

While simple numerical frequency can give only a rough indication of how the device was employed, vocabulary does not turn out to be particularly revealing either. Verbs of visual and mental perception and operation predominate, with *credo* the overwhelming favorite: 20 instances among the 86 verb forms in the examples. All the historians except Trogus (Justin) and Velleius use it. Other verbs found in at least three of the historians are: *cerno* (6 times), *dico* (6), *discerno* (4), *puto* (6). Yet 32 different verbs appear, and each of the historians, except Curtius who has only *credo*, shows some variety in the verbs for this second person singular. Examination of the evidence also makes it clear that the device does not always occur in the narration of major events, but for all sorts of actions, no more for military ones than is to be expected considering the orientation of Roman history. The examples fall into three general and connected categories: first, some introduce a comment which simply heightens a description; second, some offer a similar emphasis in characterizations; third, some present an interpretation of the narrative. Consideration of the examples themselves will make clear the effects Roman historians achieved, and whether the reader *is* made to see what he hears and to feel more personally involved, as the theory of "Longinus" recommends.

<sup>29</sup> For a convenient summary of the evidence for changes in Tacitus' style and their pattern, see R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 340-63, 711-45. For further refinements, see R. H. Martin, "Quibus and Quis in Tacitus," *CR* 18 (1968) 144-46; F. R. D. Goodyear, "Language and Style in the *Annals* of Tacitus," *JRS* 58 (1968) 22-31; J. N. Adams, "The Language of the Later Books of Tacitus' *Annals*," *CQ* 66 (1972) 350-73.

Of all the examples from the Roman historians (79), 34 are used to ornament a description. This group is larger than either of the others, but does not quite constitute a majority (43%). Of these, 7 make a purely visual appeal, and 27 enhance the scene described by comparison of it or the persons in it to some other situation.<sup>30</sup> One of the three instances in Sallust is of this type. Livy shows a greater preference for it, and such examples comprise about 42% of all his uses of the device. Three of Trogus' 7 examples are descriptive. All of those from Curtius (9) fall into this category, and all but one of those from Ammianus (80%). Tacitus employs this type three times (20%), Velleius only once (11%). Livy's frequency (42%) is close to the overall frequency of the descriptive type (43%), and thus may be taken as normal. Velleius and Tacitus use this type less often than we might expect, Curtius and Ammianus far more.

The 7 examples in which the appeal is simply visual do serve to make the reader part of the scene, as "Longinus" suggests. Sallust and Livy apply the figure to descriptions of battles: *eos, uti quaeque Iugurthae res erant, laetos modo, modo pavidos animadvorteres* (*Iug.* 60.4); *et fugientem navem videres vertice retro intortam victoribus inlatam . . .* (*Livy* 28.30.9; cf. 30.10.17-18; 44.34.8). Whether his attention is directed to people or things, the reader is certainly meant to see what he hears. Anxiety and pathos may also be invoked, as when Livy draws our eyes to the faces of people at Rome after news of the defeat at Lake Trasimene:

inde varios voltus digredientium ab nuntiis *cerneres*, ut cuique laeta aut tristia nuntiabantur, gratulantesque aut consolantes redeuntibus domos circumfusos, feminarum praecipue et gaudia insignia erant et luctus. (22.7.12; cf. 33.48.11)

The example from Tacitus' description of Agrippina quoted at the

<sup>30</sup> Examples of these two types can be found in Greek: for the purely visual, Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.16: "And on the following day one could see (*ἦν ὁρᾶν*) those whose relatives had been killed going about in public with bright and cheerful faces, while of those whose relatives had been reported as living you would have seen (*ἄν εἶδες*) but few, and these few walking about gloomy and downcast" (similar to *Livy* 22.7.12). I quote C. L. Brownson's translation in the Loeb edition (Cambridge, Mass., 1921). For the comparison so introduced, see Homer *Il.* 15.697-98: *φαίης κ' ἀκμηῆτας καὶ ἀτειρέας ἀλλήλοισιν/ἄντεσθ' ἐν πολέμῳ, ὥς ἐσσυμένως ἐμάχοντο*. The introduction of actual similes with the second person singular can be found in Cicero: *canis venaticos diceret* (*Verr.* 4.31; cf. *Sull.* 59).

beginning of this paper belongs with this small sub-group. The distinction which Tacitus suggests the reader would not have been able to make (*neque discerneres proximos alienos*) is purely visual, and this second person singular does increase his participation in the scene. As we can appreciate now, however, this particular type is rare both in Tacitus and in the other Roman historians. The heightened pathos even seems excessive, less justified here than in Livy's powerful description of the terrible effects of the loss at Lake Trasimene. Tacitus' use of the device in a way unusual for him is part of a conscious elaboration of style in this passage to render the excessiveness of the public's behavior. Fact and impression are not divergent in the presentation, and the artificiality of style may even suggest a critical attitude toward such display. In general, this visual appeal with the second person seems simply to highlight the emotions of crowds, to make the reader aware of what men contemporary with an event were feeling (Sall. *Iug.* 60.4; Livy 22.7.12, 33.48.11; Tac. *Ann.* 3.1.4).

A description is emphasized slightly differently when the figure introduces a comparison (usually implied, occasionally a real simile). Instead of looking at the scene only, the reader is urged to react with the particular feelings which the compared situation, or the discrepancy between the real and the compared situation, suggests. Livy most often invokes shame or disapproval in this way: *iniussu signa referunt, maestique—crederes victos—exsecrantes nunc imperatorem, nunc navatam ab equite operam, redeunt in castra* (2.43.9; cf. 2.35.5, 3.35.3-4, 22.46.4, 37.59.2). Livy also employs the device to sum up an impressive description of the Africans' reaction to the Roman landing: . . . *sed pecora quoque prae se agrestes agebant, ut relinqui subito Africam diceret* (29.28.3), and to make the reader appreciate Scipio's confidence before Zama: *celsus haec corpore, vultuque ita laeto, ut vicisse iam crederes, dicebat* (30.32.11; cf. 2.49.4). The examples from Trogus all contain comparisons which convey praise or blame (2.9.72, 11.6.4-5, 11.6.6). Most unusual is the comment on the officers in Alexander's army, where the second person singular introduces both a purely visual picture and a comparison: *ordines quoque nemo nisi sexagenarius duxit, ut, si principia castrorum cerneret, senatum te priscae alicuius rei publicae videre diceret* (11.6.6). Curtius used the device invariably to present a comparison, and his only aim seems to be to make the action described

sound more amazing. He does *not* in fact make the reader feel more actively involved in Alexander's mourning for the wife of Darius, for example: *crederes Alexandrum inter suas necessitudines flere et solacia non adhibere, sed quaerere* (4.10.23), or in his shipwreck: *findi crederes undas et retro gurgites cedere . . . cum amne bellum fuisse crederes* (9.4.14), or in the seditious outbreak of his soldiers: *crederes uno ore omnes sustulisse clamorem: ita pariter ex tota contentione responsum est omnes queri* (10.2.18). The suggested comparison implies the greatness of Alexander's lamentation, the violence of the waters, and the loudness of the shout, but as the reader turns his thought to the comparison, he is distanced from the actual scene. The device serves as a kind of italics, but actually does not strongly involve the reader as "Longinus" advises. The examples from Curtius, especially when compared with those from Livy, demonstrate what is well-known: Curtius is not a great stylist.<sup>31</sup> In his writing, what could be an effective rhetorical appeal is inept.

Velleius' one example in this category resembles Livy's use of the figure in the description of Scipio (30.32.11), but goes further in its attempt to influence the reader's view: *putares Sullam venisse in Italiam non belli vindicem, sed pacis auctorem* (2.25.1). The paradoxical antithesis thus introduced is meant to arouse strong approval, but the effect is not to increase a sense of involvement in Sulla's march through Italy. In a passage in the *Histories*, Tacitus uses *crederes*, somewhat as Livy had (e.g., 2.43.9), to make the reader appreciate shameful conduct: *alium crederes senatum, alium populum: ruere cuncti in castra, anteire proximos, certare cum praecurrentibus . . .* (1.45.1). A certain grudging approval is suggested this way in his description of the behavior of the mutinous soldiers in lower Germany:

id militares animos altius coniectantibus praecipuum indicium magni atque implacabilis motus, quod neque disiecti nec paucorum instinctu,

<sup>31</sup> His limiting the device to the form *crederes* and using it only to introduce these simple comparisons seems to be another instance of that "sameness of expression for similar situations" which has been noticed in his style; see J. Wight Duff, *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age* (London 1964<sup>3</sup>) 91. Even the scenes he uses it in are similar: lamentation (4.10.23, 10.5.21), soldiers' impulsive behavior (6.2.16, 7.4.35, 10.2.18), startling occurrences in nature (8.4.12, 9.4.14—twice, 9.9.16). Florus, despite his overuse of the figure, has much more variety both in the verbs employed and in the types and scenes, e.g., 1.13.27 (description of a triumph), 2.13.5 (analysis of the forces in the civil war).

sed pariter ardescerent, pariter silerent, tanta aequalitate et constantia, ut regi *crederes*. (*Ann.* 1.32.3)

The discipline, however, is not merely made more impressive by this suggestion of what the reader might have believed. Since the compared situation is not remote from the real one, the proposed conclusion provides a simple insight into the action described, not simply an emotional cue. Ammianus uses the device most frequently to introduce rather exotic similes: . . . *sparsique cataphracti equites quos clibanarios dictitant, personati, thoracum muniti tegminibus et limbis ferreis cincti, ut Praxitelis manu polita crederes simulacra, non viros* . . . (16.10.8; cf. 25.1.13, 26.6.15). In only one example, from a description of the Persians, does the comparison he offers increase understanding, not just admiration:

adeo autem dissoluti sunt et artuum laxitate, vagoque incessu se iactitantes, ut effeminatos *existimes*, cum sint acerrimi bellatores, sed magis artifices quam fortes, eminusque terribiles . . . (23.6.80)

The reader's sense of the perilousness both of the Persians, and of superficial judgments about them, is heightened by this use of the second person singular. The artificial similes, however, serve only to titillate him without increasing his sense of participation in events. The analysis of "Longinus" is not wholly sufficient for the examples of the Roman historians' use of this device in descriptions. In the purely visual appeals, the reader is made to "see what he hears," but when comparisons are so introduced, his emotions are sometimes guided as well as simply raised to a higher pitch.

The employment of the figure in characterizations may be seen as a development of its use in descriptive passages, for the character sketch is a special kind of description. Yet the appeal here is not specifically visual, and the reader is not involved in a particular event in the way "Longinus" suggests. This type is the least common of the three we have identified and seems to have precedents not in the Greek writers but in Cicero.<sup>32</sup> Of all the 79 examples of the device, 17 (from only 5 of the 7 historians) are found in characterizations

<sup>32</sup> The device is frequent, for example, in Cicero's *Brutus* as he characterizes different orators: e.g., . . . *quaereres in iudiciis fortasse melius, in re publica quod erat esse iudicare satis* (268; cf. 111, 130).

(about 21%). Thirteen come from recognizable character sketches; the other four are briefer comments on character added to a narrative of action. In Livy and Tacitus this type appears about as often as we might expect considering the percentage of all the examples that fall into this group: 5 times in Livy (16%), 4 times in Tacitus (27%). In contrast, 55% of the examples from Velleius (5 of 9) occur in such passages. Thus Velleius both employed the figure more frequently than the other Roman historians and exploited it for characterizations as they did not. The usual effect of this second person singular in characterizations suggests why.

Sallust strengthens his witty critique of Sempronia this way: *pecuniae an famae minus parceret, haud facile discerneres* (Cat. 25.3). Trogus passes from what the reader would see to a simple condemnation of the character: *ceterum si regem spectes, divitias, non ducem laudes* (2.10.21, Xerxes). In 9 of the other examples of this kind, however, the figure enhances a favorable assessment of the character. Livy praises major actors this way: *itaque haud facile discerneres utrum imperatori an exercitui carior esset* (21.4.3, Hannibal; cf. 30.26.9, Fabius Maximus; 39.40.5 and 40.9, Cato). In Trogus' evaluation of the successors of Alexander, the second person introduces a flattering comparison, something the other historians seem not to do in passages of characterization. The sentence is also interesting because it contains a potential with the third person as well (cf. Livy 44.34.8-9):

nam eius virtutis ac venerationis erant, ut singulos reges *putares*; quippe ea formae pulchritudo et proceritas corporis et virium ac sapientiae magnitudo in omnibus fuit, ut *qui* eos *ignoraret*, non ex una gente, sed ex toto terrarum orbe electos *iudicaret*. (13.1.10-11)

Velleius glorifies with this device not only Tiberius (*sed in hoc viro nescias utrum magis mireris quod laborum periculorumque semper excessit modum an quod honorum temperavit*; 2.122.2), but also other successful military leaders: Metellus Macedonicus (1.11.5), Sentius Saturninus (2.105.2), and Junius Blaesus (2.125.5). In none of these passages does the appeal to the reader actually stimulate an attempt at discernment, only admiration.

An interesting variation is found in Livy's assessment of P. Scipio's career:

nobilior prima pars vitae quam postrema fuit, quia in iuventa bella adsidue gesta, cum senecta res quoque defloruere, nec praebita est materia ingenio. quid ad primum consulatum secundus, etiam si censuram *adicias*? (38.53.9-10)

This rhetorical question involves the reader not so much in praising Scipio's character as a contemporary, but in participating as a fellow historian in Livy's judgment. Velleius, in his analysis of Brutus and Cassius, relates the reader to the characters with the device more realistically than he does elsewhere: *fuit autem dux Cassius melior, quanto vir Brutus: e quibus Brutum amicum habere malles, inimicum magis timeres Cassium* (2.72.2). In the case of these men, the suggested preference and fear contribute to a realization of the perils of those times, although the artificiality of a summarizing epitaph like this lessens the immediacy of the appeal. When Tacitus employs the figure in characterization in the *Histories*, the results are similar: *palam laudares, secreta male audiebant* (1.10.2, Mucianus); *prorsus, si luxuriae temperaret, avaritiam non timeres* (2.62.1, Vitellius); *innocentiam iustitiamque eius non argueres; sermonis nimius erat* (3.75.1, Flavius Sabinus). The reader judges the characters here both as a contemporary and as an historian, but although the form may direct his attention more forcibly to the particular person, the proposed evaluations are seldom more than simple praise or blame. The single instance of this type from the *Annals* combines the critical orientation of the Livian example (38.53.10) with the immediacy of a contemporary's conclusion. After giving some reports of Corbulo's strict discipline, Tacitus says:

quae nimia et incertum an falso iactata originem tamen e severitate ducis traxere; intentumque et magnis delictis inexorabilem *scias*, cui tantum asperitatis etiam adversus levia credebatur. (11.18.3)

Here analysis of a personality and its reputation are encouraged and stressed. While in descriptive passages this device often simply heightens the reader's emotional response, in passages of characterization it usually serves to underline praise or blame.<sup>33</sup> Only occasionally does it stimulate thought rather than feeling.

<sup>33</sup> Some note of the use of this figure by Greek and Roman biographers is in order here. Xenophon introduces a description with it once in the *Agésilas* (1.26). (Curiously, the same simile in the *Hellenica* is suggested impersonally (3.4.17).) Examination



The Roman historians also employ this figure to suggest interpretations. In this third type, the second person singular appeals to the reader not merely to see, or to make an artificial comparison, but to draw a conclusion from sights or sounds, or from more general evidence, or about the historical sources for an event. This usage is a logical development from that in descriptions, but here the appeal does not just excite the reader's emotions about the action narrated, but stimulates him to reason about it. Two of the subtler instances found in characterizations (Livy 38.53.10; Tac. *Ann.* 11.18.3) also resemble those in this category. Examples of this type comprise about 36% of the total. It occurs once in Sallust and Ammianus, twice in Trogus, and three times in Velleius. In Livy the frequency for interpretations and for descriptions is the same (42%). Only Tacitus uses the second person singular most often in this thought-provoking way (8 examples; 53%).

The examples in which the device introduces an interpretation drawn from a visual appearance most resemble those used simply to increase the reader's admiration for something described. In a passage where Xerxes and Artemisia are contrasted, Trogus employs the second person to present a conclusion which is intermediate between simple visual observation and an actual interpretation: *quippe ut in viro muliebrem timorem, ita in muliere virilem audaciam cerneret* (2.12.24). Even when only a calculation of size is asked for, however, the effect can be more thoughtful: *cum Furius Camillus pro consule Africae legionem et quod sub signis sociorum in unum conductos ad hostem duxit, modicam manum, si multitudinem Numidarum atque Maurorum spectaret* . . . (Tac. *Ann.* 2.52.3; cf. Livy 29.26.2). Velleius begins his description of Octavian and Lepidus in a dramatic encounter during the Civil War with a quite neutral suggestion: *scires, quid interesset inter duces* . . .

---

of a selection (12) of Plutarch's *Lives* reveals no narrative uses of the second person singular. Nor are there examples from Nepos or Suetonius. Tacitus' *Agricola* has two, and they resemble those in characterizations in histories: *ceterum ex iracundia nihil supererat secretum, ut silentium eius non timeres* (22.4; cf. Vell. 2.72.2); *bonum virum facile crederes, magnum libenter* (44.2). Although the biographies in the *Historia Augusta* have addressees, the three narrative examples found in them are comparable. Two suggest comparisons in descriptive passages (*Alex. Sev.* 50.1; *Maxim.* 17.1) and one praises a character (*Gord.* 6.2). Clearly, the device was used in biography less than in history, but the few instances are similar.

(2.80.4), but at least the reaction desired from the reader is a somewhat intelligent appreciation. Sallust proposes a more significant deduction for the reader to make: *sed confecto proelio, tum vero cerneres, quanta audacia quantaque animi vis fuisset in exercitu Catilinae* (*Cat.* 61.1).<sup>34</sup> Similar is Trogus' conclusion to a detailed recital of the murder of Olympias: *ut Alexandrum posses etiam in moriente matre cognoscere* (14.6.11).

Some interpretations offered with the second person singular superficially resemble the implied comparisons classified as mere descriptive ornaments, but actually they present a real judgment to be accepted as true:

saeva ac deformis urbe tota facies: alibi proelia et volnera, alibi balineae popinaeque; simul cruor et strues corporum, iuxta scorta et scortis similes; quantum in luxurioso otio libidinum, quidquid in acerbissima captivitate scelerum, prorsus ut eandem civitatem et furere *crederes* et lascivire. (*Tac. Hist.* 3.83.2)

The device here encourages the reader not just to feel caught up in this terrible scene but to participate in Tacitus' view that the city was in fact both wanton and mad. The reader may be invited to interpret aural evidence as well, simply by Livy: *itaque taciti, ut iratos esse sentes, secuti sunt currum* (41.13.8), and more subtly by Tacitus:

illic miles cum armis, sine insignibus magistratus, populus per tribus concidissem rem publicam, nihil spei reliquum clamitabant, promptius apertiusque, quam ut meminisse imperitantium *crederes*. (*Ann.* 3.4.1)

In the description of the lamenting crowds a few paragraphs earlier (*Ann.* 3.1.4), only the reader's admiring gaze was called for. Here in the account of the behavior of the people at Germanicus' funeral, the same device impresses upon him not just appearances and emotions but the dangerous interpretation which might be made of them. The reader feels himself moving not in the midst of visible perils, but invisible ones. Tacitus also manipulates the common *crederes*-form in his comment on the crowd's applause for Nero's musical perfor-

<sup>34</sup> Chausserie-Laprée (above, note 20), in his discussion of this sentence (p. 525), notes *cerneres* as one of the weaknesses in this early trial of the *tum vero* sentence to introduce a tableau. Certainly the second person singular does not occur in this type of sentence in any of the other historians.

mance: *crederes laetari, ac fortasse laetabantur per incuriam publici flagitii* (Ann. 16.4.4). After presenting a hyperbole which the reader may accept as a mere stylistic ornament, the kind of comparison often found introduced by the second person singular in descriptive passages, Tacitus suddenly changes potentiality to probability. The peculiar effect here depends upon the variation of the usual way of using this device.

Some interpretations introduced with this figure are based not on visual appearance but on more general evidence. A few examples are transitional, as when Tacitus guides the reader's judgment of the contents of the *libelli* brought up against Libo Drusus: *inerant et alia huiusce modi stolidi vana, si mollius acciperes, miseranda* (Tac. Ann. 2.30.2). Comparable is Livy's exhortation to calculate the number of Roman prisoners held in Greece: *adice nunc pro portione, quot verisimile sit Graeciam totam habuisse* (34.50.7), where visual evidence is not supplied in the context. The examples of the interpretive type from Livy can be arranged in sequence as the judgment is based on more or less concrete, visible detail. He invites the reader to evaluate Roman actions, summarily stated, as possible proof for a victory: *nec aliud magnopere, cur vicisse crederes, fecisse Romanos, nisi quod postero die lacerassent proelio manentes intra vallum . . .* (40.50.3). His use of *cerneres* in suggesting the different attitudes toward the Romans and Macedonians: *principum diversa cerneret studia* (42.30.1), recalls his purely visual appeals (22.7.12, 33.48.11), but the discernment here has almost entirely passed out of the visual range.<sup>35</sup> Still more abstract and generalized is the conclusion he urges about the origin of liberty: *libertatis autem originem inde magis quia annuum imperium consulare factum est quam quod deminutum quicquam sit ex regia potestate numeres* (2.1.7). Two instances of Velleian interpretations proposed with the second person singular are similar. One is so general as to rouse little response from the reader: *neque reperias, quos aut pronior fortuna comitata sit aut veluti fatigata maturius destituerit quam Brutum et Cassium* (2.69.6). The appeal of the other is lessened because it invites speculation outside of reality.

<sup>35</sup> Ammianus' only use of the device to introduce an interpretation is similar: *nec defuere deinceps ex his emergentia casibus, quae dispiceres secundis avibus contigisse, dum punirentur ex iure, vel tamquam irrita diffuebant et vana* (15.2.9).

fuitque in confesso milites optimi imperatoris, imperatorem fugacissimi militis functum officio, ut *dubites*, suone an Cleopatrae arbitrio victoriam temperaturus fuerit, qui ad eius arbitrium direxerit fugam. (2.85.5-6)

This is like the descriptive type in which an exaggerated comparison is presented, and the reader's attention is removed from the narrated scene to some other. When the appeal is very remote, another rhetorical device may be needed to give emotional force to the desired interpretation. The rhetorical question serves this purpose in two of the Livian examples: *hanc modestiam aequitatemque et altitudinem animi ubi nunc in uno inveneris, quae tum populi universi fuit?* (4.6.12); *compares cladem ad Aegates insulas Carthaginensium proelio navali acceptam . . . ?* (22.54.11). In all these cases from Livy and Velleius, no clear visual evidence forms the background for the interpretation in which the reader is urged to participate, and when the whole presentation is so generalized and abstract, the potential personal involvement stimulated by the device becomes very weak.

Tacitus succeeded best in using the figure in non-sensory contexts without losing the specific force of its appeal:

et superior exercitus speciosus senatus populique Romani nominibus relictis tertium nonas Ianuarias Vitellio accessit; *scires* illum priore biduo non penes rem publicam fuisse. (*Hist.* 1.57.1)

Since the reader's thought is thus effectively turned to the anomaly of this allegiance, he participates attentively in Tacitus' sardonic appreciation of it. In the analytical summary of the situation at Rome just after the fall of Sejanus, Tacitus' reader is directed to details which are clearly defined:

quod maxime exitiabile tulere illa tempora, cum primores senatus infimas etiam delationes exercerent, alii propalam, multi per occultum; neque *discerneres* alienos a coniunctis, amicos ab ignotis, quid repens aut vetustate obscurum: perinde in foro, in convivio, quaque de re locuti incusabantur . . . (*Ann.* 6.7.3)

As in *Ann.* 3.1.4, quoted at the beginning of the paper, *discerneres* here is a stylistic adornment of an elaborately worked-up passage. Tacitus' versatility is shown in the different effects achieved with the same form. The suggested impossibility of perception here in *Ann.* 6.7.3 is not just a device to allow the reader to survey the past with

heightened, but comfortable, interest, but also a means to place him in that position where the failure to discern is disturbing and even dangerous. Often in Tacitus and in Livy (e.g., 2.1.7, 4.6.12, 22.52.11, 40.50.3), the reader participates in the actual situation and in the historian's judgment also. The figure especially facilitates this double participation (though "Longinus" says nothing about it), but when the past situation is safely over and done with, the effect is obviously contrived, a trick at which author and reader both connive. The special force in this particular example arises from Tacitus' exploitation of the sad truth that the problem of informers is indeed timeless.

Use of this device of the second person singular for interpretations of historical sources is especially characteristic of Livy, and 5 of his 13 examples in this category are of this special type. In general, these appeals for the reader's participation in Livy's historiographical labors do not seem intended to emphasize the event itself (often it is quite minor), but to evoke sympathy for the author: *mirari magis adeo discrepare inter auctores, quam, quid veri sit, discernere queas* (22.61.10; cf. 2.21.4). The historian thus enlists support for the source he prefers once: *plurimum annales, et quibus credidisse malis, ipsum Eumenen venisse tradunt* (42.11.1), but elsewhere neutrality is preserved (25.17.6, 44.13.12). The single instance of this type from Tacitus is both more confident and more thought-provoking: *haec vulgo iactata super id, quod nullo auctore certo firmentur, prompte refutaveris* (Ann. 4.11.1). This invites the reader's active thought rather than the belief or sympathy called for by Livy, and the event in question here, the death of Drusus and the rumors about it, Tacitus makes of exemplary significance (4.11.3). Just as the use of the second person singular for interpretations can be seen as an extension of its use for descriptions, these examples, in which it appeals for a judgment on different versions of some historical event, shade into those which appear in the historians' digressions and technical explanations. The categories defined for the study of this device cannot be rigidly bounded, for the evidence extends in a continuum. That the Roman historians exploited this person in their narratives, however, is now clear, as well as the fact that they used it more variously than the simple analysis of "Longinus" led us to expect.

Already in Sallust we find the figure employed in three different ways: to heighten our excitement in a battle-description, to emphasize

a sharp characterization, and to influence our interpretation of a major event. Livy most successfully exploits the emotional power of the device, when he uses it to stimulate the reader's sense of admiration or shame. Praise of various important characters is also strengthened in this way. The interpretations Livy presents with this person, however, are often general or historiographical and consequently less effective in involving the reader. Trogus most often introduced comparisons with the device, both in descriptions and in characterizations. The interpretations he offers (on general character as well as on particular actions) are all based on visual evidence. Like Livy (and Tacitus), he exploits the figure as an impressive conclusion to a detailed narrative (e.g., 14.6.10-11; cf. Livy 29.28.3, Tac. *Ann.* 1.32.3), a technique not found in the other historians. The examples from Curtius are repeated attempts to impress the reader with what is being described, but the suggested comparisons tend rather to weaken whatever immediate appeal the form might have had. Velleius uses the device more than any of the other historians, and most often and characteristically as a propagandist's tool to make the reader rate a person as the writer wants him to. His most neutral examples concern Brutus and Cassius, but his analyses proposed with this device do not really stimulate the reader's thought. Study, however, of the examples from these two less excellent stylists is useful. From them we can see how this device, when it dispenses with a visual appeal and does not substitute for it an appeal for thought, becomes a somewhat tiresome rhetorical trick. Tacitus' interest in it is clear both from its frequency in his works and from the experiments he made with it. When he uses it in descriptive passages or characterizations, the appeal is often for more than simple admiration, praise or blame. He varies the common types and successfully adapts this rhetorical device as part of his thought-provoking style. In Ammianus it is a rare and exotic feature, more a recognized way of introducing a striking simile than of making the reader see what he hears.

The figure of the second person singular, noted and analyzed by "Longinus" in Greek, was in fact exploited in Latin historical style, not Greek. Its long and varied use by Roman historians invites speculation on the meaning of this phenomenon. The Latin preference for the second person singular and the Greek preference for *τις*

may reveal less about the grammatical rules of the two languages than about the approach of the people who used them. Although the choice of the more personal second person singular in past potential clauses, rather than the impersonal third person, may have been determined largely by grammatical requirement or convention, we can expect great writers to make a virtue of such necessity. The preference for the concrete over the abstract, the subjective over the objective has been seen as characteristic of Latin literature.<sup>36</sup> Otis speaks of Tacitus' "sense of the Roman *persona*, his conception of history as something happening to his own Roman soul, as part of his own extended psychic development," and of the obvious difference between this conception and that of Herodotus, Thucydides or Polybius. The Greek historians do not exploit this recognized Greek rhetorical figure, perhaps because it is inappropriate in scientific analysis. This device of the second person singular did permit a special manipulation of time and person within a continuous narrative, however, and the Roman historians developed and used it for their special purpose: to help realize the personal dimension in history, this Roman "sense of history conceived as personal fate or destiny."

<sup>36</sup> J. Marouzeau, in "La propension au concret dans la langue et la littérature latines," *REL* 31 (1953) 102-06, briefly comments on this use of the second person singular. For a general discussion of significant differences between Greek and Roman writers see Brooks Otis, "The Uniqueness of Latin Literature," *Arion* 6 (1967) 185-206. The quotations which follow are from pp. 202 and 203 of this article.