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Introduction

Victoria Emma Pagán

Res ipsa hortari uidetur... supra repetere: “The very subject matter seems to urge me to look back” (Sal., Cat. 5.9). So Sallust, at a loss as exactly how to begin his account, says in his magisterial preface to the Catilinarian Conspiracy. He chooses to go back, albeit momentarily, to the founding of Rome: urbes Romam (Cat. 6.1). Of course, the vanishing horizon of Sallust’s first work turns out to be the inaugural words of Tacitus’ last (urbem Romam, Ann. 1.1.1). For Sallust, urbs Roma is a point of retreat at the start of a career; for Tacitus, the point of departure at the end. This companion is born of such a tension, between retreat and departure, the tradition of established scholarship and the innovation of groundbreaking discovery. This is not the first companion to Tacitus. While the contributions to this volume were being written, Tony Woodman’s Cambridge Companion to Tacitus was in production and published in 2009. That companion concludes with an essay by Mark Toher on “Tacitus’ Syme,” and so in a Tacitean move (that simultaneously betrays and flaunts the anxiety of influence), Syme’s Tacitus shall introduce this companion.

Toher provides a biographical sketch of Ronald Syme’s life in Oxford together with an assessment of his two colossal and most famous works, The Roman Revolution and Tacitus. Toher locates the impact of Syme’s influence on the study of Tacitus in a pervasive identity crisis:

It is fair to say that our understanding of Tacitus, who he was and why he wrote, is in significant part due to Syme’s own analysis of him; much that is generally accepted by scholars of Tacitus is due to Tacitus. The problem is then compounded by the fact that in Tacitus there is a fair amount of complementary and complimentary projection: the Tacitus that emerges from Tacitus has features that were characteristic of Syme himself. (Toher 2009, 325)
It is often noted that Tacitus was of provincial origin and Syme was from New Zealand; the one lived among the learned aristocracy of Rome, the other of Oxford. On every page Syme adopts for himself the terse, pointed, sententious style of Tacitus (e.g., “Aufidius cannot compete.” “Small things, but significant.” 1958, 276, 389). Of course, having thoroughly ingested Tacitus, Syme could not help but write like him; imitation was as much an occupational hazard for Syme as it was for Tacitus, who imitated his literary predecessor Sallust. Yet the sympathies run deeper than biographical coincidence or literary form.

Among its many purposes and achievements, Syme’s *Tacitus* in two volumes is a thoroughgoing demonstration of the influence of contemporary events in Tacitus’ own lifetime upon his writing. While the argument is orchestrated across hundreds of pages, it crystallizes here:

The early chapters of Book I [of the *Annals*] depict political behavior, pitilessly—the fraudulent protestations of loyal subjects, discreetly modulated between mourning and rejoicing, and the eager rush to voluntary enslavement. State ceremonial, public professions, and secret conflicts—the whole thing may seem to hint and foreshadow the accession of Hadrian. (Syme 1958, 481)

Syme announces unequivocally the narrative principles governing the structure of Tacitus’ *Annals*. We have come to call this kind of historical explanation “meta-history,” and though the term was coined in 1854 (according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, third edition, April 2010; online version http://www.oed.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/Entry/234359, November 2010; accessed January 3, 2011), Hayden White redefined the term in 1973 with the seminal publication of *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. In the introduction, White describes the pervasive force of meta-history: “even the works of those historians and philosophers of history whose interests were manifestly nonpolitical, such as Burckhardt and Nietzsche, have specific ideological implications. These works, I maintain, are at least consonant with one or another of the ideological positions of the times in which they were written” (White 1973, 26–27). Just as the accession of Hadrian casts a palpable shadow across Tacitus’ account of the reign of Tiberius, so *The Roman Revolution* bears the imprint of events in Europe from 1937 to 1939, when the work was composed. Although the method of “tropes” that White so carefully developed to explain the mechanics of meta-history begins to list when freighted with history’s heaviest cargo, the Holocaust (White 1987, 76–80), nevertheless White succeeds in forcing an explicit recognition of this phenomenon to which all historians are subject. Such awareness of the cultural contexts of our own times unites these contributions under one cover and makes companions of us all.
Our understanding of the cultural contexts in which Tacitus wrote his five surviving works hinges on a chronology that is not always as accurate as we would like. The *Agricola* is a biography of Tacitus’ father-in-law who was governor of Britain; references to Nerva as still alive (*Ag*. 3.1) and then Trajan as princeps (*Ag*. 44.5) suggest the work was begun in 97 CE and completed in 98. A reference to the second consulship of Trajan in 98 (*Ger*. 37.2) is the only evidence for the date of the *Germania*, an ethnographic treatise on the Germani written on the heels of the biography. The *Dialogus de Oratoribus* was written some time between 98 and 103, an “uncomfortably wide” margin (Brink 1994, 275) that cannot be secured by internal reference. Its location in this volume indicates my allegiance to a later date. Thanks to the letters of Pliny on the eruption of Vesuvius (*Ep*. 6.16, 20), we know that Tacitus was working on the *Histories* in 106, and it is assumed that he finished this work before embarking on his last masterpiece, the *Annals*, the date of which hinges on an internal reference to the “Red Sea” (*rubrum mare*, *Ann*. 2.61.2). If this refers to the modern Red Sea, then a date after 106 is given; if the Persian Gulf is meant, then the date may be pushed as far forward as 117. It is generally accepted that the *Annals* were begun under Trajan but not completed until after the accession of Hadrian in 117 (Potter 1991; Rutledge 1998, 141–143). Of the death of Tacitus, no evidence obtains.

Similarly, the year and place of Tacitus’ birth are unknown; based on the dates of his public offices, it can be reasonably inferred that he was born in 56 or 57 CE. He would have been a teenager in 69, when the Roman world was ravaged by civil war. He refers to himself as a young man at the time of the dramatic date of the *Dialogus*, that is, in 75 (*iuuenis admodum audui*, *Dial*. 1.2). Though not born in Rome he completed his education there. According to the *Agricola* (9.6) he married in 77. After a short period of military service as a tribune, he obtained the quaestorship in 81 or 82, which brought him membership to the Senate. The next step on the *cursus honorum* would have been the aedileship; he speaks of his praetorship and priesthood of the Fifteen in 88 CE (*Ann*. 11.11.1). Thus, his career continued uninter rupted through the early years of Domitian’s reign. It is likely that he was appointed a legionary legate; we know that he was absent from Rome when Agricola died in 93 and he had been abroad for four years (*Ag*. 45.5). He held the suffect consulship in the second half of 97 (Plin., *Ep*. 2.1.6), when a revolt by the praetorian guard essentially forced Nerva to adopt Trajan; in such a climate he embarked on his literary career. An inscription testifies to his proconsulship of Asia in 112/13 (see Birley 2000, 235–236). Mention of the “Red Sea” occurs so early in the *Annals* (2.61.2) as to suggest that the later books must have been composed after 117.

What this chronological sketch reveals in full force is that Tacitus did not retire to the library. His political career and his literary output overlap, a fact
which above all distinguishes him from other ancient historians. Thucydides was an exile, Polybius a hostage, Sallust a senatorial reject: respectable history, so it seems, comes from outsiders. As a corollary, questionable history emanates from the inside: Caesar, Velleius, Josephus. Therefore, Tacitus’ success as a historian and a statesman unnerves the reader, especially since he was ushered into political life by Domitian. This quandary is the starting point for Dylan Sailor’s groundbreaking study, *Writing and Empire in Tacitus*, which explores the relationship between Tacitus’ literary career marked by “the pervasiveness and intensity of the sense of alienation his work radiates” (2008, 49) and a successful political career that implicates him in the very system he critiques. Tacitus is “proto-liberal” (Sailor 2008, 319) and repulsively imperialistic: “If we call his stance on the Principate ‘alienated,’ the right word for his relationship to the empire is ‘implicated’” (Sailor 2008, 321). Or, in the words of the Renaissance historian Francesco Guicciardini: “Cornelius Tacitus is very good at teaching subjects how to live and act prudently, just as he teaches tyrants how to establish tyranny” (as cited by Burke 1969, 163). Tacitus achieves the alienation necessary to validate his work as a historian, while his participation in the imperial project lends his literary career the necessary credentials. As a result we cannot unhitch Guicciardini’s maxim; we cannot choose our Tacitus. We certainly cannot ignore him, for to Tacitus we owe the bulk of our understanding of Roman Britain, the tribes of the Germani, the development of oratory, and the principate from the accession of Tiberius to the reign of Vespasian (with regrettable losses in the reigns of Caligula, Claudius, and Nero).

Within these narrative accounts of Roman history ranging from 14 to 93 CE, Tacitus takes a fair amount of chronological liberties. For example the *Annals* begins with the accession of Tiberius and would have ended most likely with the fall of Nero. However, the digression on the origin of law at *Annals* 3.25.2–3.28.2 allows Tacitus to comment on a number of events that predate the reign of Tiberius, while the digression on luxury at *Annals* 3.52–55 leads him beyond the reign of Nero to speak of Vespasian as chiefly responsible for frugal behavior (*praecipuus adstricti moris auctor Vespasianus*, 3.55.4). Of course, ancient historians had long since used digressions for chronological in- and ex-trusions; likewise, temporal displacement is the historian’s prerogative. Yet until the discovery of the inscription of the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre* (Eck, Caballos, and Fernández 1996) in Spain in the late 1980s, we had limited understanding of Tacitus’ method and purpose for displacement.

The trial of Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso (*Ann*. 3.10–19) is the longest and most detailed narrative of a legal proceeding in the extant *Annals*. Piso was indicted for treasonable tampering with the army in Syria and with the murder of Germanicus by poison (3.13.1–2). The Roman people eagerly awaited
Piso’s conviction, and when it appeared he might be acquitted, they threatened to riot. Piso was escorted home to ensure his safety. His wife Plancina was a co-defendant, but secured the protection of Livia (3.15.1). Disheartened by his wife’s desertion and the indubitable outcome of the trial, Piso committed suicide. Tiberius acquitted his sons and deferred to Livia in the case of Plancina. Piso was convicted posthumously and the Senate voted offerings of thanks for the avenging of the death of Germanicus. Tacitus records the trial between the approach of the *Ludi Megaleses* (April 4–10) and the *ouatio* of Drusus (May 28); however, according to the inscription the *senatus consultum* was passed on December 10. Thus, Tacitus manipulates the chronological order of events to fit his narrative sequence (see the discussions in Woodman and Martin 1996, 67–77; Eck, Caballos, and Fernández 1996, 109–121; Talbert 1999 warns against privileging either Tacitus or the inscription). By lodging the trial of Piso and its aftermath at the beginning of Book 3, he is able to connect the story with the death of Germanicus and Piso’s usurpation of Syria at the end of Book 2. This is but one example of the way Tacitus combines the science of history writing with the artistry of storytelling (see also Damon 1999). Of course, Tacitus is not the only historian to bend time to his purpose, but his extant writings treat time in such a way as to generate a unique matrix that affords us glimpses of moments in the history of imperial Rome like no other. Moreover, in Tacitus’ treatment of time, especially in the pervasive comparisons of (degenerate) present to (honorable) past, his moralizing tone rings clear.

Complementing Tacitus’ artistic manipulation of time is his refined sense of space and geography, again pressed into the service of morality. Rome is always at the forefront of his narratives, and always there is a dichotomy between capital and provinces, center and periphery. Yet Tacitus resists a one-to-one correspondence between the near and the far, the morally good and the morally reprehensible. Sometimes events in Rome are proper when compared to activities on the edges of the empire; sometimes Rome all but collapses because of its immorality. Sometimes when confronted with extreme circumstances at the edges of the empire, a Roman will fall short. Sometimes non-Romans, whether in their homelands or in the Senate house, are portrayed as morally upright. Instead of neat maps that indicate precisely where morality resides, Tacitus creates intricate patterns of space and time that convey his implicit moral value judgments. The result is a sort of echo-chamber: one can never be quite sure whether the opinions expressed are those of the times narrated or those of Tacitus’ own day.

Thus, the assessment of Tacitus as a “gigantic figure,” in the words of R. G. Collingwood (1946, 38), still holds. His magisterial style is without peer. His history is inextricably bound with his philosophy of human nature. He is keen to portray the struggle between individual and society, perhaps most
memorably characterized by the ever-troubled relationships between princeps and Senate, general and soldier, governor and provincials. His prose is haunted by an eerily familiar sense of survivor’s guilt, his narratives are intricate, and his speeches a tour de force of rhetoric and meta-history. Although his expressions are terse, his implications ring clear, and his indictment of those who fall short of his exacting moral standards still seethes with the anger he so baldly abjured. By providing standard background information necessary for enhanced appreciation, the Blackwell Companion to Tacitus aims to give a broad introduction to the fundamentals of Tacitean studies. At the same time, however, the volume showcases new theoretical approaches that enrich our understanding of this complex author. The traditional and the innovative need not reconcile. Rather, in dialogue under one cover, the two can equip a new generation of scholars to examine for themselves the richness of Tacitean thought.

The volume is divided into five sections, although the divisions are somewhat artificial, for some essays can be lodged comfortably under more than one rubric and some are best read in pairs. If the essays are read in succession, a sort of story emerges, beginning with the early modern rediscovery of Tacitus, moving through his life and works, focusing on his engagement with the literature of his times, and culminating with theoretical approaches that extend our understanding of Tacitus beyond the boundaries of the discipline of history. In deliberate contrast to the Cambridge Companion to Tacitus, which devotes six of twenty-one chapters to the reception of Tacitus, this volume has no such section, although Charles Murgia, James Rives, Herbert Benario, and Daniel Kapust necessarily include key aspects of the early modern and twentieth-century reception of Tacitus in their chapters. Given the now well-established centrality of reception studies in Classics, we might reasonably expect an entire companion devoted to the Tacitean tradition (cf. Farrell and Putnam 2010, a volume devoted exclusively to the reception of the Aeneid).

Part I, “Texts,” begins with the discovery of the manuscripts of Tacitus, which enables our study of the historian. Annals 1–6 (Books 5 and 6 incomplete) survive in a single manuscript, the so-called First Medicean, from which was produced the editio princeps of 1515. Annals 11–16 and Histories 1–5 (also with major lacunae) are transmitted in the so-called Second Medicean; the minor works derive from a ninth-century manuscript. Murgia thus reviews the transmission of the Tacitean texts from antiquity to the present day. The next five essays introduce the works of Tacitus in what I take to be their order of composition. Sailor outlines the structure and content of the Agricola and discusses praise and blame, the critiques of empire and principate, the generic diversity of the Agricola, and its value as a historical source.
Rives argues for a unified reading of the *Germania*, whose ethnographic first part typically receives more attention because of its fascinating content and its construction of Roman identity, while the second half surveys the individual peoples across the Rhine and across the Danube. The first part may be fairly considered “a description of a genus and the second part as an enumeration of its species” (p. 53). Furthermore, though brief in comparison to the *Histories* or *Annals*, nevertheless the *Germania* does address politics, especially in its response to Caesar’s *Gallic War*. While Tacitus’ purpose in writing the *Germania* may not be recoverable, the purpose to which this slender treatise was put, especially in early twentieth-century Europe, bears witness to the consequences of reception.

While Sailor and Rives acknowledge the value of the *Agricola* and *Germania* as sources for ancient history, Steven Rutledge takes the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* foremost as a source for social and cultural history of imperial Rome. This shift in focus disarms the contradictions inherent in the dialogue that have occupied scholarship and instead allows us to appreciate the wide range of opinions about the place of rhetoric in elite life, all of which are validated by their very inclusion in the tapestry of the dialogue: complexity is everything.

Jonathan Master leads the reader through an introduction to the *Histories* with keen attention to Tacitus’ style. Because only Books 1–5 survive, we are left with fewer than two of the twenty-eight years originally treated, two of the most tumultuous years in Roman history. As a result, the *Histories* has been a rich source for civil war, mutiny, and the collapse of military power (e.g., Ash 1999; Manolaraki 2003); however, Master opens up new avenues of inquiry with his attention to ethnic identity and the tensions among provincials that civil war undoubtedly raised.

Part I closes with the essay by Herbert Benario, who puts the *Annals* in the context of Tacitus’ career and earlier works and follows the story of the Julio-Claudians with particular attention to the theme of dissimulation that suffuses *Annals* 1–6. From the reign of Nero, Benario selects the memorable accounts of the assassination of Agrippina the Younger and the persecution of the Christians as exemplary of Tacitus’ narrative artistry. His essay ends with a survey of Tacitus’ popularity through the ages.

In the three essays of Part II, “Historiography,” we learn how Tacitus used sources, engaged with other historians, and managed to explain the causes and effects of history in spite of the epistemological dilemma that the principate created. David Potter shows how Tacitus was constrained by his sources and by his audience or, rather, how author and audience were implicated in the process of historical analysis: the sort of history Tacitus wrote – the history of the governing class and its power – “could become very personal very fast”
(p. 126). This is best demonstrated not in Tacitus’ sources _per se_, but in his evaluation and use of sources. By summary, aggregation, suppression, and supplementation, Tacitus can bring the whole tradition of Roman historiography to bear on his particular presentation of history to the audience of his day. This audience, Arthur Pomeroy reminds us, would have been intimately familiar with the traditions of Roman historiography and its various subgenres and topoi. In his plays with the annalistic form and his evident engagement with the narrative patterns of Livy, Tacitus asserted his _auctoritas_ (“clout”) and _fides_ (“reliability”) and thereby competed in the arena of Roman historiography. Our portrait of Tacitus’ method of writing history is rounded out by Olivier Devillers, who takes as his starting point the epistemological difficulty posed by a political system that vests all power in one man, such that information is monopolized by one and therefore less accessible to the historian who seeks to explain events. A close reading of _Histories_ 1.1–49 reveals the persuasive methods that Tacitus deploys in response to the gaps in information caused by the concentration of power. It is a commonplace in the scholarship that historiography changed markedly from republic to principate; however, Devillers analyzes precisely the effect this change had on Tacitus’ writing.

Part III, “Interpretations,” demonstrates the broad scope of possibilities open to the reader of Tacitus. Like Rutledge, Christopher van den Berg appreciates the social and cultural history evident in the _Dialogus_ and sets aside the internal contradictions to explore instead the concept of deliberative oratory in theory – and its practice in the _Annals_. The _Dialogus_ thus becomes central to our understanding of the rest of Tacitus’ corpus, so much of which is oratorical.

The next two essays explore specific aspects of the _Histories_. Kathryn Williams examines three passages on senatorial embassies to rebellious legions that expose the shifting political and military dynamics of the empire and new imperial diplomatic procedures. Furthermore, in these passages Tacitus reinforces his judgments on senators, Stoic philosophers, and the generals in play. Rebecca Edwards argues that Tacitus makes allusions throughout the _Histories_ to acts suggestive of _deuotio_, a religious ritual in which an expiatory sacrifice averts disaster; however, the _deuotiones_ of Galba and Otho do not achieve their intended effect. Instead, the disease that ravages Rome requires a _remedium_ which, according to Tacitus, only Vespasian can provide.

The essays by Barbara Levick and Holly Haynes (situated squarely in the middle of this volume) tackle the concept of truth and all of its thorny implications. Levick is sensitive to the obstacles that Tacitus faced when writing the history of the Tiberian principate: the difficulties as well as the opportunities “lay in interpreting literary and documentary material in the clouded atmosphere of an inefficient despotism constructed on the base of a rivalrous,
unscrupulous, and voluble aristocracy” (p. 266). Tacitus struggled for truth, and when it could not be obtained, he signaled the impasse to his reader. For Haynes, history and historiography are inextricable. The truth in the Annals resides not so much in the stories of the degeneracy of the princeps as in the language that reinforces such degeneracy. Tacitus’ writing demands that the reader be honest about his attitude toward power. Much of the unease generated in the Annals derives from readers’ attempts to dissimulate complicity in the formulation and maintenance of power, to pretend that they would behave differently if confronted with a tyrannical princeps. Levick and Haynes show, in their radically different ways, that neither Tacitus nor the reader can hide from the necessity of truth.

Certain characters dominate the Annals – Tiberius, Germanicus, Nero – but Seneca the Younger is especially fascinating because so much of his literary corpus survives. Rather than measure the Tacitean portrait against Senecan self-fashioning, James Ker explores the speeches and letters of Seneca that do not survive but are written into the Annals by Tacitus, who records not so much the content as the perceptions of and reactions to Seneca’s writing. Ker concludes his sophisticated analysis: “Tacitus, then, puts the reader in a position to assemble the narrative of Seneca as a complicated elite actor in the history of the early principate and more particularly as someone whose writings influenced Tacitean style and were an integral part of the actions of Seneca which Tacitus commemorates” (p. 327). This conclusion about Seneca as writer leads to deeper investigation of intertextuality in Tacitus.

Throughout his career Woodman “has consistently sought to illuminate the meaning of historiographical texts by studying their intertextuality and intratextuality” (Kraus, Marincola, and Pelling 2010, 4). In Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry published in 1998, Stephen Hinds maps a hitherto uncharted spectrum of intertextuality ranging from the precisely formulated “fundamentalist” allusion to the “zone of zero-interpretability,” in which allusions are so vague as to be impossible to interpret. The next year (1999) was a watershed. David Levene and Damien Nelis hosted the conference that would result in the 2002 publication of Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography, a collection of essays that address the interactions of poetry and history writing. The essays of Part IV, “Intertextuality,” reflect the impact of Woodman’s approach and the profound changes wrought in the scholarship by these two momentous publications at the end of the twentieth century. Christopher Krebs leads the discussion by proposing that an expression in the Agricola is a pointed allusion to the opening sentence of Sallust’s Catilinarian Conspiracy that more generally reveals Tacitus’ assimilation of a formative thought found in the speech of Lepidus (Hist. 1.55). The next four essays explore intertextuality more generally. Like Ker who reevaluates the Tacitean Seneca,
Christopher Whitton forces us to reconsider the standard interpretation of an inferior Pliny riding the coat-tails of the superior Tacitus and questions the degree to which Tacitus may have been a willing associate of Pliny. Whitton argues that Tacitus reciprocated Pliny’s call to collaboration; the two men may have held similar attitudes toward the principate, though expressed in different ways.

The next three essays explore Tacitus and the poets. Beyond quantitative analysis (and the numbers are impressive: Schmaus 1887 posited nearly 500 Vergilian correspondences in Tacitus), Timothy Joseph examines representative passages of Tacitus that approximate the language, form, or “sympathy” of epic poetry and Vergil and Lucan in particular. Eleni Manolaraki and Antony Augoustakis focus specifically on the influence of Silius Italicus on the portrait of Germanicus. Catherine Keane masterfully elucidates the extent of engagement between Tacitus and Juvenal; although Juvenal clearly draws on Tacitus, he does not simply convert history to satire. The process is creative and dynamic, and the result is an adaptation that “changed the look of Roman satire itself” (p. 425). By bringing to light the range of allusions in and to Tacitus, from the obvious to the vague, the contributors in Part IV document the influences on, and the influences of, Tacitus across Latin literature, thereby proving the hermeneutic value of allusion.

The essays of Part V are more interdisciplinary and are intended to engage scholars beyond Classics. Thomas Späth analyzes contradictory paradigms of masculinity in Tacitus through the critical theoretical lenses developed by Joan Scott, Judith Butler, and Michel Foucault. Our understanding of masculinity in Tacitus is complemented by Kristina Milnor’s perceptive observations on female domesticity and the increasing force that women’s domestic roles exerted on imperial politics. The contributions by Späth and Milnor will therefore be of interest to scholars of gender and women’s studies. Nancy Shumate deftly deploys postcolonial theory so as to expose latent ideologies that underpin Tacitus’ conception of Roman identity; it is in this broader intellectual context that Jonathan Master’s essay and continued research on ethnicity in the Histories resonate all the more fully. For the resonances of Tacitus across the ages, Daniel Kapust brings a political theorist’s eye to the study of Tacitus; he traces the strands of Tacitean thought that have shaped European intellectual history and offers an interpretation of his own: his portrait of a balanced, even-handed Tacitus brings suitable closure to the volume.

Yet after twenty-four essays there is no doubt that, in the words of Syme, “There is work to be done” (1968, 145). Res ipsa hortari uidetur . . . supra repetere is the scholar’s manifesto, and it is the sincere hope that the very subject matter of the contributions in this volume will urge readers to further research.