OBITUARIES IN TACITUS' ANNALS

OBITUARIES

IN TACITUS' ANNALS

By

AUDREY MCSHERRY, B.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree Master of Arts

McMaster University

MASTER OF ARTS (1999)
(Classics)

McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Obituaries in Tacitus' Annals

AUTHOR: Helen Audrey McSherry, B.A. (Queen's University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor C. F. Eilers

NUMBER OF PAGES: v; 103

ABSTRACT

In his historical narratives, Tacitus includes obituaries of a few prominent individuals in Roman society. This thesis focuses on those obituaries which are found in the Annals. It will analyse how they function as a literary device and how they are applied to the narrative.

Chapter one discusses the possible origins or influences of the obituary. It looks at the contributions of the annales maximi (annals of the Pontifex Maximus), the laudatio funebris (Roman funeral speech), and the character sketch may have made to the obituary's form, content, and purpose.

Chapter two considers how the obituary is placed within the annalistic framework. It will compare Tacitus' placement of obituaries to their traditional position. How Tacitus differs from Livy will be discussed also to show further aspects of his style.

Chapter three will examine the composition and structure of Tacitean obituaries. It will determine typical remarks which Tacitus makes about an individual. Then it will consider the rhetorical nature of those remarks.

Chapter four discusses how Tacitus uses the obituary to advance themes in the Annals. It will also consider the effectiveness of the obituary in completing this task.

Chapter five will consider how Tacitus treats women by analysing the obituaries of two imperial ladies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study could not have been possible without the help and guidance of my supervisor, Dr. C. Eilers. I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. E. Haley and Dr. H. Jones for their interest and valuable suggestions. At last, but by no means least, I am also very thankful for the support and patience of my family and friends.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The obituaries in the Annals are amongst the most alluring features of the Tacitean narrative. In these obituaries, Tacitus summarises the lives of public figures. In varying degrees of detail, he relates their origins, public career, and personal innate character. Besides the prosopographic element, the Tacitean obituary is interesting because it advances the themes of the narrative. This thesis will examine how the obituary functions as a literary device and how it is applied to the narrative by Tacitus in the Annals.

Although there are about thirty obituaries throughout Tacitus' narrative, scholars seldom comment fully on them. Indeed, they are mentioned regularly in discussions on the annalistic method, but those comments are often brief and limited in scope. Syme has contributed greatly to our understanding of the Tacitean obituary. In his works, he primarily concentrated on the identification of the individuals named in the obituaries and how Tacitus uses this literary device to lament the loss of Republican freedom in Imperial Roman society.[1] While paying some attention to the content of obituaries within the Tiberian hexad, Ginsburg emphasizes the annalistic use of the obituary to mark the end of a narrative year.[2] Gingras and Woodman also analyse many of these obituaries, but they

---

[1]R. Syme, Ten Studies in Tacitus (Oxford, 1970), 79-90; idem, Tacitus (Oxford,1958).

[2]J. Ginsburg, Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus (New York, 1981).

limit themselves to their own area of interest.[3] Pomeroy too adds much to the discussion by investigating the custom of including obituaries in ancient historical writings.[4] This leaves several issues for us to explore further, which will be outlined in the following paragraphs.

One such issue is the origin or influences of the obituary, which will be treated in the first chapter. It will consider the development of the obituary as a literary device in order to explain its form, content, and purpose. First, it will discuss the annales maximi (the annals of the Pontifex Maximus) as a possible origin of the obituary since it is often believed to be the source of all Roman historiography. Second, the possible influence of the laudatio funebris (Roman funeral speech) will be analysed. Seneca the Elder outlines the development of the funeral oration as a motif in Roman historiography.[5] Other possibilities, however, need to be considered since certain aspects of the obituary reflect an influence other than the funeral speech. By the obituary's ability to criticise, the character sketch will also be considered. Lastly, this chapter will attempt to clarify the obituary's association with the annalistic method. By highlighting its appearances in both Greek and Roman historiography, the origins of the obituary will be further defined.

Chapter two will consider how the obituary is placed in the narrative. The

---

[3]M-T Gingras, "Annalistic Format, Tacitean Themes and the Obituaries of Annals 3," CJ 87 (1992), 241-256; A. Woodman, "Tacitus' Obituary of Tiberius," CQ 39 (1989), 197-205.

[4]A. Pomeroy, The Appropriate Comment (Frankfurt, 1991).

[5]Sen. Suas. 6. 21.

structural role and position of the obituary are better understood when the plan of a narrative year is set forth. To understand Tacitus' style and attitude towards the obituary, the traditional annalistic structure and the obituary's place within it will be examined first. Livy will be used as representing traditional practices to whom Tacitus will be compared. The obituary is often considered as one of many elements which Tacitus uses to challenge the annalistic framework, therefore this chapter will also question to what extent this statement is true.

The third chapter will examine the composition of Tacitus' obituaries. First, it will deconstruct three obituaries which commemorate men of different social status (a novus homo, an aristocrat, and a member of the imperial family). It will note the standard remarks which Tacitus makes about an individual and then it will establish a plan for the typical Tacitean obituary. It will also study these same remarks as further evidence of rhetoric's influence on Tacitus' historical writings. By referring to the guidelines set forth by Quintilian and Cicero regarding laudatory oratory, the similar topics shared by this branch of rhetoric and the obituary will be identified. Lastly, it will analyse any variations in length and detail among the obituaries and it will discuss their effect on the narrative.

The fourth chapter will consider how Tacitus uses the obituaries to further themes in the Annals. The effectiveness of the obituary rests on the historian's discretion. Tacitus decides who will be remembered and also selects for which reasons. First, it will examine how the obituary of Germanicus Caesar is used to reinforce the theme of

nostalgia for the Republic in the Tiberian hexad. As Syme noted, the theme of lost Republican freedom is important in Tacitus' narrative as a whole and in the obituaries in part. Obituaries, like that of Germanicus, effectively reflect the "death" of the Republic. Second, it will see how the obituaries of Lucilius Longus and Memmius Regulus convey Tacitus' criticism for the political regime in Imperial Rome (namely the rise of senatorial sycophancy and the decline in personal liberty).

The fifth chapter will analyse the obituaries of women. Indeed, most of these obituaries commemorate women who are also members of the imperial family. Nonetheless, writing an obituary for any woman presents a problem for Tacitus since they do not participate in public affairs. Therefore, the obituaries of Julia Maior and Livia will be examined to see how Tacitus overcomes this obstacle. These obituaries will also be studied to see how they relate to the characterisations of Julia Maior and Livia in the rest of the narrative. Thus, sex is a factor which must be discussed as influencing the Tacitean obituary.

In conclusion, the obituaries in the Annals of Tacitus deserve substantial study, which will broaden our understanding of them. This thesis intends to clarify the function of the obituary as a literary device, and to analyse its prosopographic and thematic elements as well. The proposed aspects are intended to combine features of existing scholarship, and also add a new element to the discussion.

CHAPTER 1

THE POSSIBLE ORIGINS OR INFLUENCES OF THE OBITUARY

Before the various aspects of the Tacitean obituary can be discussed adequately, the tradition which Tacitus inherited must be considered. The obituary is often described as a standard element of the annalistic method. It seems that scholars often consider this ample explanation of its existence and even its origin.[1] The reader expects the obituary to relate the origins, public career, and personal innate character of the deceased, yet seldom questions how this plan came to be. Generally, the obituary is taken for granted even though it was not always present in historiography.[2] For these reasons, this chapter intends to give the obituary some context. First, it will discuss the annales maximi (annals of the Pontifex Maximus) and the laudatio funebris (funeral speech) as possible influences since they are usually described as precursors to the obituary. It will also examine how these elements could have influenced the obituary. Second, it will discuss the role of the character sketch in aiding the development of this literary device. Lastly, it will clarify the assumption that the obituary originates from the Roman annalistic method.

---

[1]See M. Gingras, "Annalistic Format, Tacitean Themes and the Obituaries of Annals 3," CJ 87 (1992), 241; J. Ginsburg, Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus (New York, 1981), 35.

[2]E. Lofstedt, Roman Literary Portraits (Oxford, 1958), 177.

the deaths of a few priests on occasion.[7] The following passage, which appears near the end of the narrative year 210 B.C., exemplifies these notices:

> A few Roman priests died that year and successors were named. Gaius Servilius was made pontifex in place of Titus Otacilius Crassus; Tiberius Sempronius Longus, son of Tiberius, was made augur in place of Titus Otacilius Crassus. Likewise, Tiberius Sempronius Longus, son of Tiberius, was appointed decemvir of the performance of rites in place of Tiberius Sempronius Longus, son of Gaius. Marcus Marcius, rex sacrorum, died as well as Marcus Aemilius Papus, the chief curio. No priests were appointed that year in their places.[8]

This brief notice should not be confused with the obituary. This Livian excerpt gives little insight into the lives and reputations of Marcus Marcius and M. Aemilius Papus. Livy intends merely to record their deaths and to name their successors in this notice. In contrast, the obituary is more than a mere list of famous men who died.[9] Moreover obituaries are not isolated notices without connection to the narrative as a whole.[10] Therefore further proof is required to establish that these death notices which appear in the annales maximi are an influence on the obituary. Indeed, it can only be concluded (with any certainty) that the annales maximi are influential by providing a section in its

---

[7]Liv. 27. 6. 15-16; 33. 42. 5-6; 44. 18. 7.

[8]Liv. 27. 6. 15-16: Sacerdotes Romani eo anno mortui aliquot suffectique: C. Servilius pontifex factus in locum T. Otacilii Crassi; Ti. Sempronius Ti. f. Longus augur factus in locum T. Otacilii Crassi; decemvir item sacris faciundis in locum Ti. Semproni C. f. Longi Ti. Sempronius Ti. f. Longus suffectus. M. Marcius rex sacrorum mortuus est et M. Aemilius Papus maximus curio; neque in eorum locum sacerdotes eo anno suffecti.

[9]Ginsburg, 39. See also R. Syme, "Obituaries in Tacitus," in Ten Studies in Tacitus (Oxford, 1970).

[10]Ginsburg, 40.

narration of events in which the deaths of prominent Romans are recorded.

Seneca the Elder and the Influence of the Laudatio Funebris

Another natural place to begin a discussion on the obituary and its origins is Seneca the Elder. Seneca assumed the duty of recording the rise of rhetorical declamation in the early empire.[11] In writing about rhetoric, Seneca discusses briefly the obituary. He writes:

> Whenever historians record the death of a great man, they give a summary of his entire life and they express a funeral eulogy, so to speak. This was done once or twice by Thucydides; likewise, it was employed by Sallust for a few people. Livy, being generous, performed this custom for all great men; the historians following him did this very lavishly.[12]

Seneca seems to link the obituary with the laudatio funebris (funeral speech). The funeral oration was long viewed as an old Roman invention.[13] The orator, who delivered the speech at the rostra, was usually the deceased's son, being of suitable age, or another male relative.[14] Since the laudatio funebris can commemorate both the military and civil virtues

---

[11]J. Fairweather, Seneca the Elder (Cambridge, 1981), 3.

[12]Sen. Suas. 6. 21: Quotiens magni alicuius <viri> mors ab historicis narrata est, totiens fere consummatio totius vitae et quasi funebris laudatio redditur. Hoc, semel aut iterum a Thucydide factum, item in paucissimis personis usurpatum a Sallustio, T. Livius benignus omnibus magnis viris praestitit; sequentes historici multo id effusius fecerunt.

[13]Dion. Hal. Rom. Antiq. 1. 5. 17; Plut. Pub. 9. Our earliest example is Valerius Publicola's speech in honour of Brutus.

[14]Polyb. 6. 53. 2.

of an individual,[15] women were also given this honour.[16] This section will discuss how this speech possibly influenced the obituary by first clarifying the nature of the laudatio funebris. Using the speech of Q. Caecilius Metellus (as recorded by Pliny the Elder), similarities between the funeral speech and the obituary will be able to be identified.

By the end of the Republic, the funeral speech became increasingly uniform.[17] It was customary to eulogize the deceased first and then his ancestors. The speech places the deceased's actions and honours in the long line of descendants, and by doing so, reveals how he contributed to the familial glory.[18] The orator often referred to such aspects of the deceased's life as his country, his parents, and his ancestors. Relying upon these themes, there were two avenues for the orator to choose from when concluding.[19] He could illustrate how the deceased lived up to the good name of his country and his fathers, or, how by his achievements the deceased brought fame to a humble beginning. Perhaps this format arose from the belief that the audience likes to hear what the deceased

---

[15]C. Martha, Etudes Morale sur l'Anitquite (Paris, 1883), 4.

[16]In 390 B.C. (according to Livy, 5. 50. 7 and Plutarch Cam. 8. 3) the Senate extended this privilege to their funerals. The earliest example of such a speech at a woman's funeral, however, was not delivered until 102 B.C. by Quintus Lutatius Catulus (cos. 78 B.C) on his mother, Popilia (Cic. de or. 2. 44).

[17]Martha, 6; O.C. Crawford, "Laudatio Funebris," CJ 37 (1941/2), 22.

[18]E. Galletier, Etude sur la poesie funeraire Romaine d'apres les inscriptions (Paris, 1922), 105.

[19]Crawford, 23.

did for others rather than what he did for himself.[20]

A speech given by Q. Caecilius Metellus (cos. 205 B.C.) for his father, L. Caecilius Metellus (cos. 251 and 247 B.C.) illustrates the nature of this Roman custom. Delivered in 221 B.C., this speech is our earliest surviving fragment of a funeral speech.[21] Although Pliny the Elder incorporated it in his Natural Histories to show this family's change in fortunes, still we can determine some basic elements of the laudatio funebris. It reads as follows:

> Quintus Metellus, in the panegyric that he delivered at the funeral of his father Lucius Metellus the pontiff, who had been Consul twice, Dictator, Master of the Horse and Land-Commissioner, and who was the first person who led a procession of elephants in a triumph, having captured them in the first Punic War, has left it in writing that his father had achieved the ten greatest and highest objects in the pursuit of which wise men pass their lives. Lucius Metellus had made it his goal to be a first-class warrior, a supreme orator and a very brave commander, to direct of operations of the highest importance, to enjoy the greatest honour, to be supremely wise, to be deemed the most eminent senator, to procure great wealth in an honourable way, to leave many children, and to achieve supreme distinction in the state. Quintus Metellus stated that these things had fallen to his father's lot, and to that of no one else since Rome's foundation.[22]

---

[20]Quint. Instit. 3. 7. 15-16.

[21]D. Stuart, Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography (Berkeley, 1928), 213.

[22]Plin. N.H. 7. 139-140: Q. Metellus in ea oratione quam habuit supremis laudibus patris sui L. Metelli pontificis, bis consulis, dictatoris, magistri equitum, xvviri agris dandis, qui primus elephantos ex primo Punico bello duxit in triumpho, scriptum reliquit decem maximas res optumasque in quibus quaerendis sapientes aetatem exigerent consummasse eum: voluisse enim primarium bellatorem esse, optimum oratorem, fortissimum imperatorem, auspicio suo maximas res geri, maximo honore uti, summa sapientia esse, summum senatorem haberi, pecuniam magnam bono modo invenire, multos liberos relinquere et clarissimum in civitate esse; haec contigisse ei nec ulli alii post Romam conditam.

In keeping with tradition, this speech is given by a son in honour of his father. The orator first cites the offices held by the deceased: pontiff, consul, and dictator. He then proceeds to list ten other achievements which wise men pursue. By such proofs and distinction, Quintus Metellus leads his audience to make certain conclusions. They should admire the deceased for adding to his familial glory. They should also acknowledge that they too have benefited greatly by his acts. Therefore, they identify Lucius Metellus as a model and refer to the list of his achievements while pursuing glory themselves. This message is conveyed through strategic choices in the selection of materials and the style of presentation.[23] The speech is successful because it shows that the deceased lived in accord with virtus while he performed his obligations, displayed his self-control, and persevered during difficult times.[24]

Nevertheless, the association between the laudatio funebris and the obituary is rather tenuous. Let us return to Seneca the Elder, who makes the connection between the two, and consider what he was intending to do in Suasoriae 6. 21. He names Thucydides as the earliest historian to include obituaries. He then states that Sallust too gives this honour. Livy is the last historian to be named in this excerpt. Presumably, if Seneca had been able to consider Tacitus, he would have been included among the historians giving obituaries lavishly. Fairweather believes that Seneca is simply remarking upon how the

---

[23]W. Fisher, "Rationality and the Logic of Good Reasons," Philosophy and Rhetoric 13 (1980), 125.

[24]D. Ochs, Consolatory Rhetoric (South Carolina, 1993), 87-88.

funeral eulogy developed as a motif in historiography.[25] This explanation proves problematic because Seneca excludes Xenophon and Polybius. It would be understandable, and even expected, that a proper treatment of historical death notices would mention both of these men who had developed the theme greatly.[26] Xenophon describes the life of Cyrus the Younger and a few Greek Generals.[27] Polybius too often includes short career summaries which feature moral and social judgements at the deaths of leading political figures.[28] His absence in Seneca's Suasoria is especially perplexing since the Polybian obituary of Attalus, in an abbreviated form, appears in Livy's history.[29] It seems odd that Seneca would exclude Polybius who had so obviously influenced Livy, a historian Seneca admired. One is left to decide then whether Seneca is charting out the development of this literary device in historiography or summarising contemporary practice.[30]

Seneca's definition of the obituary as a type of funerary oration also needs further consideration. Indeed, the laudatio funebris and the obituary are similar by their pious

---

[25]Fairweather, 63.

[26]A. Pomeroy, The Appropriate Comment (New York, 1991), 123.

[27]Xen. Anab. 1.9 (Cyrus) and 2. 26 (Greek Generals).

[28]Polybius' history contains four major death notices: Philopoemon (23.12), Hannibal (23.13), Publius Scipio (23.14), and Attalus (18.41). See A. Pomeroy, "Polybius' Death Notices," Phoenix 40 (1986), 408.

[29]Liv. 33. 21. 1-5.

[30]A. Pomeroy, "Seneca on Death Notices," Mnemosyne 42 (1989), 105.

regard for ancestors,[31] chronological sequence, and enumeration of offices held by the deceased (a cursus honorum). Nevertheless, they differ in length, status of deliverer, and in detail of the career and

virtues of the deceased, which has led scholars to argue that this comparison must be avoided.[32] These points are clarified by comparing the funeral speech of Quintus Metellus to Livy's death notice of Gaius Marius (cos. 107 B.C.). Livy writes,

> He was a man, about whom, if you balanced his virtues against his vices, it would not be easy to say whether he was more useful in war than harmful in peace. He had saved the state under arms, but he was the first civilian to ruin it with every kind of fraud and finally overthrow it by force like an enemy.[33]

Gaius Marius' life is summed up briefly. Unlike Pliny the Elder's laudatio funebris, this death notice reports the judgements on the deceased and only offers brief justifications of them. Second, Livy has no familial connection to Marius. That being the case, he can write this death notice impartially. Finally, we learn of the deceased's reputation in Roman public life. Livy reminds us that Gaius Marius, a novus homo, had once been highly regarded as he had held the consulship numerous times.[34] Yet, his later

---

[31]Stuart, 200.

[32]Pomeroy (1989), 103; I. Bruns, Die Personlichkeit in der Geschichtsschreibung (Berlin, 1898), 55-56.

[33]Liv. Per. 80: vir, cuius si examinentur cum virtutibus vitia, haud facile sit dictu utrum bello melior an pace perniciosior fuit. adeo quam rem publicam armatus servavit, eam primus togatus omni genere fraudis postremo armis hostiliter evertit.

[34]Between 107 and 100 B.C. Marius was consul six times.

activities have obscured his good name. The death notice emphasizes the negative aspects of the deceased. Representative of misused ability, Marius is deemed a threat to the state when he overthrew libertas by force of arms and instituted dominatio.[35] This obituary exploits the antithesis between the benefits Marius gave in war to the harm he did in peace.[36] Overall, this death notice written by Livy shows how the obituary can present a more balanced portrait of the deceased than the laudatio funebris.

Perhaps Seneca is not suggesting that the laudatio funebris alone influenced the obituary.[37] Quite possibly, Seneca is referring also to Thucydides' evaluations of Themistocles and Pericles,[38] rather than to the only proper funeral oration (2. 35-46) in his history.[39] Although Sallust used this device sparingly, his comparison of Cato and Caesar stands out as a notable character analysis.[40] From the virtual absence of death notices in their works, therefore it could be that Seneca is actually considering their

---

[35]Pomeroy (1991), 157-158; R. Syme, The Roman Revolution (Oxford, 1939), 515.

[36]H. Hine, "Livy's Judgement on Marius (Seneca, Natural Questions 5. 18. 4; Livy, Periocha 80)," LCM 3 (1978), 84.

[37]Pomeroy (1989), 104. He disagrees with W. Edwards (Cambridge, 1928: 144) that Seneca is thinking of the Greek epitaphios. Pomeroy argues that Seneca is trying to find a Latin translation of encomium (qualifying his translation with quasi) which can be associated with funeral speeches in the Greek world.

[38]Thuc.: Themistocles 1.138; Pericles 2. 65.

[39]Pomeroy (1989), 104.

[40]Sall. H 2.37 and BC 54; T. Scanlon, The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust (Heidelberg, 1980), 85.

general evaluations of men.[41] The obituaries of Livy also lead us to look for an alternative influence since they reflect some features which are foreign to the funeral speech.[42]

The Influence of the Character Sketch

Arguably, the character sketch influenced the obituary as well. They both emphasize and fix the individual in the narrative. Indeed, the writer must justify a character's presence. Naturally, his entrance or exit would be the appropriate time for this to occur. Moreover, by isolating the individual, the writer can evaluate him critically. The portrait of Catiline by Sallust embodies these elements. He writes,

> Lucius Catiline was of noble birth. He had a powerful intellect and great physical strength, but a vicious and depraved nature. From his youth he had delighted in civil war, bloodshed, robbery, and political strife, and it was in such pursuits that he spent his early manhood. He could endure hunger, cold, and want of sleep to an incredible extent. His mind was daring, crafty, and versatile, capable of any pretence and dissimulation. A man of flaming passions, he was as desirous of other men's possessions as he was wasteful of his own; an eloquent speaker, but lacking in wisdom. His ambition was unrestrained and continually after things extravagant, impossible, beyond his reach.[43]

---

[41]Pomeroy (1989), 105.

[42]Livy: Romulus (1.15); Servius Tullius (1. 48); Valerius Publicola (2. 16); Menenius Agrippa (2.33); Manlius Capitolinus (6. 20); Camillus (7. 1); Fabius Cunctator (30. 26); Attalus (33. 21); Scipio Africanus (38. 53).

[43]Sall. BC 5: L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo pravoque. huic ab adulescentia bella intestina, caedes, rapinae, discordia civilis grata fuere, ibique iuventutem suam exercuit. corpus patiens inediae, algoris, vigiliae supra quam cuiquam credibile est. animus audax subdolus varius, cuius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator, alieni adpetens, sui profusus, ardens in cupiditatibus: satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum. vastus animus immoderata, incredibilia, nimis alta semper cupiebat.

With this character sketch, Catiline is introduced to the reader. The importance of his personality is obvious since Sallust begins the monograph with a description of it. It can be interpreted as implying that Catiline's nature was the root of this event. Sallust then briefly describes Catiline as intelligent yet vicious, resilient but monstrously ambitious. The reader accepts that Catiline, by his very nature, could be a corruptive force. Similarly, Livy's short obituary emphasizes Gaius Marius' life. Moreover, Marius is identified as an example just like Catiline. Marius is one of the many heroes who added to Rome's glory.[44] Yet, his later life exemplifies the danger of misdirected power. On the other hand, Catiline is a depraved and evil man. By this comparison common features of the character sketch and the obituary are seen. First, the individual is brought to the forefront of the narrative. Second, the individual's existence is codified and edited by the text's author who has particular purposes in collecting and publishing the information.[45]

Furthermore, the character sketch and the obituary can both be critical. As Scanlon notes, characterisation was known to the Greeks and the Romans as a method to convey virtues and vices.[46] Sallust recites the positive and the negative qualities of Catiline. Unfortunately, Catiline's passion and craftiness seem to overcome and to pervert his intelligence and eloquence. Livy also presents Gaius Marius through the death notice in the same manner. We cannot marginalise Marius' earlier fame, but at the end of

---

[44]S. Daitz, "Tacitus' Technique of Character Portrayal," AJP 81 (1960), 30.

[45]S. Swain, Portraits: Biographical Representation (Oxford, 1997), 2.

[46]Scanlon, 84.

his life any praise for the man has been tempered, if not reconsidered. Indeed, Livy allows that Marius was a great hero, but the excesses of his return to Rome in 87 B.C. make the historian restrain his charity.[47] Thereby, the possible influence of the character sketch must be acknowledged on the obituary since criticism of any kind had no place in the funeral speech.[48]

The obituaries in Tacitus' Annals are "marvellous devices" which also deserve attention.[49] It is beneficial to extend our search, beyond the historians mentioned by Seneca, and to include Tacitus since he uses the obituary extensively to complete the narrative year.[50] Moreover, the obituary has been recognised as one of the features which textures the Tacitean narrative by emphasizing individuals.[51] Although Thucydides, Sallust, and Livy include the obituary in their works, none does so as frequently as Tacitus.

The obituary of Curtius Rufus shows influences of the laudatio funebris. The

---

[47]Pomeroy (1991), 158.

[48]In Instit. 3. 7. 23-25 Quintilian notes Aristotle's suggestions on this topic. Aristotle proposed that the orator should deviate a little from the literal meaning of words and call a man brave instead of rash, liberal instead of prodigal, thrifty instead of miserly since the boundary between vice and virtue is often ill defined.

[49]R. Syme, Tacitus. (Oxford, 1958), 313.

[50]Ginsburg, 33.

[51]Daitz, 30. He argues that Thucydides subordinates individuals for the pattern of historical causation. Furthermore, Sallust's treatments of chief characters (Catiline and Iugurtha) have little bearing to this discussion since they are monographs. Finally, Livy presents heroes to the reader and delves very little into their personality.

obituary appears in the narrative year A.D. 47, and reads as follows:

> About Curtius Rufus' origins, some said he was a gladiator's son. I do not want to lie about his origin but would be embarrassed to tell the truth. When he grew up he was employed by the assistant to the governor of Africa. At Hadrumetum, while he was walking alone at midday in a deserted colonnade, a female figure of superhuman stature appeared to him and said: 'You are Rufus, who will come to this province as governor.' Encouraged by the omen he left for Rome, where his energetic personality, aided by subsidies from friends, won him the quaestorship. Then, defeating noble competitors, he became praetor. Tiberius supported him, muffling his inglorious birth with the remark 'Curtius Rufus' achievements are paternity enough.' Curtius lived to an advanced age. Although surly and cringing to his superiors, arrogant to his inferiors, and ill at ease with his equals, he gained consulship of Africa, where, his destiny fulfilled, he died.[52]

Tacitus adopts a chronological plan which is common to the funeral speech. He begins the obituary by referring to the deceased's father. Tacitus, however, refuses to give Rufus' origins much consideration. He provides only a rumour that Rufus was the son of a gladiator and a passing remark that his birth was inglorious. Tacitus grudgingly gives this information to the reader as if he is paying due respect to a tradition. Third, Curtius Rufus' career is outlined: aide to the governor of Africa, quaestor, praetor, consul, and governor. The obituary also relates how Rufus brought fame to his humble beginnings.

---

[52]Tac. Ann. 11. 21: De origine Curtii Rufi, quem gladiatore genitum quidam prodidere, neque falsa prompserim et vera exequi pudet. postquam adolevit, sectator quaestoris, cui Africa obtigerat, dum in oppido Adrumeto vacuis per medium diei porticibus secretus agitat, oblata ei species muliebris ultra modum humanum et audita est vox 'tu es, Rufe, qui in hanc provinciam pro consule venies.' tali omine in spem sublatus degressusque in urbem largitione amicorum, simul acri ingenio quaesturam et mox nobilis inter candidatos praeturam principis suffragio adsequitur, cum hisce verbis Tiberius dedecus natalium eius velavisset: 'Curtius Rufus videtur mihi ex se natus.' longa post haec senecta, et adversus superiores tristi adulatione, adrogans minoribus, inter pares difficilis, consulare imperium, triumphi insignia ac postremo Africam obtinuit; atque ibi defunctus fatale praesagium implevit.

According to Tacitus, it is thanks to the goodwill of friends, not skill or ability, that Rufus enjoyed any kind of success.

Traces of the character sketch are visible as well. This obituary temporarily emphasizes Curtius Rufus, while offering a respite from the narration of Roman politics. It also explains the deceased's presence in the narrative. According to Tacitus, his life underscores a theme of the Annals. Rufus is a remnant of Tiberius' reign, when men advanced in politics through friendship with the emperor. Moreover, Tacitus evaluates the deceased as surly and bullying. He is an example of the undeserving men of power. Again, the obituary shows the direct influence of the character sketch. Curtius Rufus is portrayed in a negative and critical light.

Conclusion

The origin of the obituary can be hypothesized finally. It appears in the works of Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. It is possible, therefore, to trace (perhaps rather crudely) the obituary's development as a literary device. They emerged from the Greeks' practice of biographical epilogues and characterizations.[53] The Romans adopted this device, not only for its narrative flare, but also as it complemented their own funerary customs, such as public funerals and memorial inscriptions. Moreover, a point must be made on the obituary's possible annalistic origins. The

---

[53]Loftsedt, 177.

historians, with the exception of Livy and Tacitus, in whose works a version of the obituary appear are non-annalistic sources. It seems that the obituary has roots in the historical style and that the association with the annalistic method came later.

Nevertheless, the popularity of the obituary is plain. Later historians like Livy and Tacitus differed from their predecessors in their increased use of the obituary. Perhaps this reflects a general trend in Roman historiography towards biography.[54] The Roman historians, by the imperial period, seem to acknowledge the personality as a discerning factor in political affairs, no matter how much they rely on rhetorical stereotypes.[55] The obituary accommodates this growing interest in the individual at a time when people are recognised as the instigators of events, no longer the pawns of historical forces.

---

[54]Daitz, 31.

[55]M. Sage comments on this issue in "Tacitus' Historical Works: a survey and appraisal." ANRW 33 (1990), 901. He believes that Tacitus was among the writers who saw personality and the individual as crucial motive forces in history. Yet, Sage points out that they were not the only force. He cites Annals 3. 55. 5 as proof that Tacitus was aware of divine powers as well.

CHAPTER 2

THE PLACEMENT OF THE OBITUARY

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate how obituaries are placed within Tacitus' Annals both in the general narrative of the history and in the sequence of events in a given narrative year. Although it may appear rather simple, it is quite a complex task. A logical start is at the beginning of the annalistic narrated year. This chapter will first consider the position of the obituary within the traditional annalistic structure. By analysing the sequence of the narrative, the reader will appreciate the structural role of the obituary. In contrast to that, it will then analyse how Tacitus approaches this tradition and also how he treats obituaries.

Traditional Annalistic Structure and the Obituary

Writers like Livy and Tacitus, in electing to write annalistic histories, accepted a common framework which their histories would follow. This framework reflected the tradition's origins as a city and priestly chronicle.[1] After the publication of the Annales Maximi (annals of the pontifex maximus) in approximately 123 B.C., the history of the

---

[1]M. Sage, "Tacitus' Historical Works: a survey and appraisal," ANRW 33. 2 (1990), 975.

Roman Republic rested upon an authoritative collection of material, set in a chronological framework, that imposed its tradition upon Roman historiography.[2] Republican practices such as the inauguration of magistrates also guided the writing of Roman history, arranged annalistically, well beyond the end of the Republic. Livy will be used as a guide to outline the traditional structure of an annalistic history and to determine the position of the obituary within it.

The beginning of the narrative year is ritually marked off. The names of the newly elected consuls begin the Livian year. Apparently, this was the standard procedure in the tabulae Pontificales.[3] The narrative year 486 B.C. illustrates this characteristic of the annalistic tradition when Livy writes:

> Then Spurius Cassius and Proculus Verginius were made consuls. Having made a covenant with the Hernici, two-thirds of their land was taken from them.[4]

When narrating early Republican history, Livy most often uses the opening formula of x, y consules facti.[5] This introduction illustrates a pre-occupation of Livy.

---

[2]A. McDonald, "The Style of Livy," JRS 47 (1957), 155.

[3]Servius, ad Aen. 1. 373: in qua praescriptis consulum nominibus et aliorum magistratuum digna memoratu notare consueverat domi militiaeque terra marique gesta per singulos dies...

[4]Liv. 2. 41. 1: Sp. Cassius deinde et Proculus Verginius consules facti. Cum Hernicis foedus ictum; agri partes duae ademptae.

[5]Ginsburg (1981), 11-12. She further states that even in later books (XXI-XLV), where the narrative of each year becomes more detailed and where the consular elections are recorded at the end of the previous year, Livy uses other formulae which focus on the first acts of the year.

He uses this formula to stress the annual election of consuls. He also emphasizes their first actions in office as the above passage shows. No sooner does the reader learn the names of the consuls, than he is informed that Spurius Cassius and Proculus Verginius were involved with agrarian legislation.

Livy's adherence to the annalistic tradition, as seen in his annual introductions, also has thematic importance. The necessity to begin the narrative again each year allows the historian to elucidate a point repeatedly.[6] As Ginsburg further remarks, Livy emphasizes the regular repetition of the constitutional processes, which then suggests that in their regularity lies the explanation for Roman success abroad.[7]

The style of the Livian introduction reveals a further characteristic of the annalistic tradition. As stated above, he begins the narrative with the account of the official events at the start of the calendar year. From the beginning, therefore, the reader has a strong sense of the chronological sequence of events. Scholars often regard the annalistic structure as rigid.[8] Indeed, it did impose certain demands on the writer; generally, the narrative needed to follow a chronological order.[9] An annalist, like Livy,

---

[6]Ibid, 30.

[7]Ibid, 29.

[8]B. Walker, The Annals of Tacitus: a study in the writing of history (Manchester, 1952), 13; Syme (1970), 79.

[9]R. Martin, "Structure and Interpretation in the 'Annals' of Tacitus," ANRW 33. 2 (1990), 1504.

could not overlook a year from the record because it had "no grist for his mill."[10]

Thus, the overall narrative of the year followed a natural chronological sequence. The names of the consuls led the writer to document the urban affairs at the start of the year. The elections were only part of the public transactions which were recorded. Other possibilities were Senate proceedings, legislation, trials, general business of the magistrates and priests, and governmental largesse.[11] Usually the writer would next describe the military activities of the magistrates during the campaigning season,[12] which again the above example illustrates. Finally, the narrative of the year would conclude with the events back at Rome which occurred at the end of that year. Thus, the Livian pattern, which is viewed as traditional, groups the material under three categories, or rather "constellations" or "clusters": res internae (domestic affairs), res externae (foreign affairs), res internae (domestic affairs).[13] Since Livy writes the year's narrative following this pattern, it reflected the rhythm of political life quite effectively.[14]

The place of the obituary in the annalistic structure can now be addressed. The narrative year or annalistic book is conducted often to a sharp and dramatic conclusion.[15]

---

[10]Ibid.

[11]P. Swan, "Cassius Dio on Augustus: A Poverty of Annalistic Sources?" Phoenix 41 (1987), 274.

[12]Sage (1990), 975.

[13]Swan, 274.

[14]Sage (1990), 975.

[15]Syme (1958), 266.

Often this climax is marked by the appearance of an obituary. Nevertheless, Ginsburg's study of the Livian narrative in Books XXI-XLV brings this assumption into question. As Livy begins the narrative year, so too does he conclude it. He remains steadfast in his over-riding interest in recording the important magisterial and religious events of the year.[16] Livy also includes in "end chapters" other incidents, which occurred near the end of the narrative year. They embody a great range of material from various aspects of public life in Rome. Livy regularly records the aediles of the year and their deeds (25. 2. 6-10; 33. 42. 8-11; 35. 10. 11-12), activities of the censors (27. 6. 17-18; 29. 37; 42. 10. 1-5), a list of the sacerdotes and pontifices who died during the year and their successors (27. 6. 15-16; 33. 42. 5-6; 44. 18.7), prodigia (26. 23. 4-6; 35. 9. 3-5; 40. 59. 6-8), natural disasters (24. 9. 6; 30. 26. 5-6; 35. 40. 7-8), dedications (34.53.3-7; 35. 41-8), and settlement of colonies (34. 53. 1-2; 35. 9. 7-8; 41. 13. 5).[17] Although Livy closed each year with a comment on the elections and priestly notices, no particular event is singled out or favoured as the above list shows.

Obituaries, nonetheless, appear throughout Livy's narrative of early Rome. Ginsburg, however, excludes obituaries from the above list despite the fact that Livy normally treats them as "end chapter" material.[18] It could be argued that their omission from her list should be seen as a concession since the Livian obituaries do not appear at

---

[16]Ginsburg, 34.

[17]Ibid, 32 and 111 n. 9.

[18]See Appendix A: "The obituaries of Livy".

consistent intervals. Although they tend to be placed at the end of the narrative year, they appear sporadically throughout the history.

Often the events dictate the placement of the obituary at the end of the narrative year. The notices pertaining to two of Rome's monarchs, Romulus (1. 15) and Servius Tullius (1. 48), end their respective narratives.[19] This arrangement proceeds naturally since the death of a king would end a chronicle of a regal period. Moreover, their placement gives due honours and respect to these monarchs since Livy fixes the reader's attention squarely upon them. Likewise, the obituary of King Attalus of Pergamum (33. 21) also falls at the end of the narrative year.[20] The position of the obituary of Attalus adds a further element to its interpretation. Despite being a foreign king, Livy treats Attalus as worthy of praise and respect just like Romulus and Servius Tullius.

The obituary can also satisfy annalistic conventions. Livy completes the narrative of 493 B.C. with the obituary of Menenius Agrippa (2. 33). This obituary acts as the final urban "cluster". Having described the Romans' victory over the Volscians, Livy returns to the city's affairs to chronicle Menenius' death and the names of the next year's consuls, Titus Geganius and Publius Minucius. Likewise, the obituary of Fabius Cunctator (30. 26) follows Livy's account of the activities in Africa. This obituary is one of the items which appears in the end chapter for the narrative year 202 B.C. Nonetheless, Livy

---

[19]The death notice of Romulus ends the narrative of c. 750 B.C.E. Livy completes c. 530 B.C.E. with the obituary of Servius Tullius.

[20]The obituary of Attalus ends 197 B.C.

concludes this particular year's narrative in his usual style. He records the games held during that year and the magisterial elections last.

There are exceptions, however, to the usual placement. Two Livian obituaries do not appear in end chapters, namely those of Valerius Publicola and Scipio Africanus. Livy inserts the obituary of Valerius Publicola near the beginning of the narrative year 503 B.C.[21] The obituary follows the narrative of the deceased's consulship. It was while he and Titus Lucretius were consuls, Livy says, that the Romans inflicted such a defeat against the Sabines that there was no fear for a long time of any outbreak of hostility from this region. This obituary further departs from Livy's usual practice since it precedes even the names of the new consuls, Agrippa Menenius and Publius Postumius. The obituary of Scipio Africanus appears midway through the narrative year 187 B.C.[22] Its placement perhaps is due to narrative demands. Scipio's death needed to be included at this moment since it becomes a factor in subsequent events of that year. Thus the annalistic structure holds but can be adapted to circumstances.

Clearly, the obituary was a feature of the annalistic tradition. The Livian narrative is proof of the association. Nevertheless, its position in the narrative sequence is not firmly entrenched. Although there are a few exceptions, Livy usually places obituaries at the end of the narrative year. Ginsburg provides an explanation for this position. To place an obituary at the end of a year could have arisen simply from the practice of listing

---

[21]Liv. 2. 16.

[22]Ibid, 38. 53.

the recently deceased priests in an "end chapter".[23]

Tacitus, the Annalistic Structure, and the Obituary

Scholars often contrast Tacitus to Livy. The reason for this is twofold: they are two great Roman historians, and, sadly, little has survived of the historical works which were written during the interval.[24] This gap presents us with an obstacle in evaluating Tacitus' handling of the annalistic structure.[25] We are unsure how much of Tacitus' originality, if at all, is in fact a result of other earlier imperial historians whose work is no longer extant. Nevertheless, Tacitus differs from Livy in his approach to the annalistic tradition. This section will analyse the arrangement of the Tacitean narrative, with special consideration paid to the obituary, in light of our preceding discussion.

In keeping with tradition, Tacitus often starts a narrative year with the names of the new consuls. The narrative year of A.D. 27 illustrates this feature when Tacitus writes:

> In the consulship of Marcus Licinius Crassus Frugi and Lucius Calpurnius Piso, an unforeseen disaster which now occurred was as destructive as a major war. It began and ended in a moment. Atilius, a man of freed

status,

---

[23]Ginsburg, 39.

[24]Pomeroy (1991), 169.

[25]Sage (1990), 975.

started building an amphitheatre at Fidenae for a gladiatorial show.[26]

Tacitus, however, will make an exception to this annalistic convention. In the narrative year A.D. 20, he delays recording the names of the new consuls for that year until the end of the second chapter of book three.[27] When he does name them, Marcus Valerius and Marcus Aurelius, he does so briefly noting their attendance at Agrippina's arrival at Brundisium. This delay minimizes any discontinuity between the events at the end of book two and at the beginning of book three.[28] Thus, Tacitus will toy with this annalistic convention for narrative purposes.

When he does include the consuls' names, Tacitus chooses a different opening formula than Livy. Tacitus regularly selects the ablative absolute construction (x, y consulibus).[29] Indeed, Livy does occasionally use this construction, but he usually qualifies it with a specific temporal setting.[30] Ginsburg further remarks that Tacitus uses the least specific of all the opening formulae available within the annalistic tradition, which in turn gives him more flexibility in the choice of material to begin the narrative

---

[26]Tac. 4. 62: M. Licinio L. Calpurnio consulibus ingentium bellorum cladem aequavit malum improvisum: eius initium simul et finis extitit. nam coepto apud Fidenam amphitheatro Atilius quidam libertini generis, quo spectaculum gladiatorum celebraret...

[27]Tac. 3. 2. 3.

[28]Gingras, 243.

[29]Ginsburg, 11. She calculates that Tacitus opens fourteen out of twenty-one years (70 %) in Annals I-VI with this construction. Whereas Livy, in Books XXI-XLV, only uses the ablative absolute twelve out of forty-eight years (25 %).

[30]An example is Liv. 27. 7. 7.

year. Contrary to tradition, Tacitus shows little interest in chronicling the magisterial events of the new year. Instead, he often singles out one particular event which he deems important and begins with that, which the Tacitean example given above illustrates.[31]

By a slight modification in the introduction, the narrative as a whole is changed. The ablative absolute construction only provides a date for the year.[32] The reader has no idea in what order the events of that year occurred. The example provided above exemplifies this characteristic of the Tacitean narrative. The collapse of the amphitheatre at Fidenae, which is likened to a military disaster, is only dated to A.D. 27.[33] Tacitus does not specify at what point in the year the catastrophe occurred. Generally, however, when Tacitus departs from strict chronology, he arranges each set of events in a chronological sequence.[34] Therefore, it is seen that Tacitus is quite liberal with the annalistic framework, in particular its chronological element.

If thematic demands can be satisfied, Tacitus does obey annalistic conventions. Indeed, the Tiberian books show a strict adherence to the annalistic tradition. Tacitus

---

[31]Ginsburg, 11.

[32]Ibid, 14.

[33]A. Woodman, "Remarks on Tacitus, Annals 4. 57-67," CQ 22 (1972), 155. Moreover, Woodman (153) notes that the reactions of the leading Romans to this accident have thematic importance. Tacitus writes (Ann. 4. 63) that immediately after the catastrophe, they threw open their homes, providing medical attention and supplies all round. Tacitus admires their reactions since they recall the practice of their ancestors, who after great battles lavished gifts and attentions on the wounded. See also R. Garson's article "Observations on the Death Scenes in Tacitus' Annals," Prudentia 4 (1974), 23-32, esp. 23-24, for further analysis of this disaster.

[34]Ibid, 78.

repeats the consular formula many times to emphasize stages in Tiberius' reign. He also attaches to these introductions early events which continue the succession theme by focusing on the central characters of the drama: Germanicus, his family, and his friends.[35] The annalistic tradition is crucial in the Tiberian hexad as it promotes a major theme. It recalled the writers of the vanished Republic and thus it provided an allusion to what had been lost with the Principate.[36]

While Livy arranged his material by the three "clusters", Tacitus does not. There is no comparable single pattern of arrangement which can be drawn of the Tacitean narrative.[37] In the first hexad of the Annals, Tacitus shows originality in his organisation of the material. Out of the eighteen narrative years of Annals I-VI, Ginsburg notes that only eight comply with the Livian pattern (res internae - res externae - res internae). Seven narrative years actually reverse this order and follow a res externae - res internae- res externae pattern. Three narrative years describe just res internae, while one year records only res externae.

The question arises, then, why Tacitus departed from the traditional annalistic arrangement of this material. Perhaps the nature of imperial politics and military affairs forced it. The narration of important provincial affairs, taking the reader away from

---

[35]Examples of Tacitus' preoccupation with Germanicus can be found at 2. 41, 2. 59, and 4. 1.

[36]Sage, 974.

[37]Ginsburg, 54.

Rome, would cause Tacitus to employ these alternative arrangements. These changes aside, Tacitus does retain the "clusters". These divisions of affairs are useful not only for narrative ease but for thematic purposes as well. The clusters appear since they are articulating devices used by republican historians.[38]

On the other hand, Tacitus treats the end of a narrative year with a certain degree of consistency. In the Tiberian hexad the obituary is the most common item to appear in an "end chapter". Eight of the narrated years in Annals I-VI are completed with an obituary.[39] Often they are inserted into the narrative like the following:

> In the last days of the year, Gaius Poppaeus Sabinus passed away. Of modest origin, he obtained his consulship and honorary triumph thanks to the friendship of the emperor. He had been assigned important provinces as the imperial governor for twenty-four years, not for any outstanding talent, but because he was competent and no more.[40]

Like Livy, Tacitus inserts obituaries throughout his history. The Tiberian hexad contains most of these necrologies, in particular book three. In the extant Claudian and Neronian books, however, they are less common. Instead, Tacitus peppers the latter narrative with reports of omens and prodigies. McCulloch believes that Tacitus made this

---

[38]Martin (1990), 1504.

[39]These obituaries appear at 1. 53 (A.D. 14), 2. 88 (A.D. 19), 3. 30 (A.D. 20), 3. 75-76 (A.D. 22), 4. 44 (A.D. 25), 4. 61 (A.D. 26), 6. 27. 2, 4 (A.D. 33), and 6. 39. 3 (A.D. 35).

[40]Tac. Ann. 6. 39: fine anni Poppaeus Sabinus concessit vita, modicus originis, principum amicitia consulatum ac triumphale decus adeptus maximisque provinciis per quattuor et viginti annos impositus, nullam ob eximiam artem sed quod par negotiis neque supra erat.

change in order to reflect the personalities of the emperors.[41] Tiberius disliked superstition, while Nero not only tolerated it but was even fascinated by prodigies.

Nevertheless, Tacitus introduced the formal obituary relatively late to the narrative.[42] Although Livy used the obituary infrequently, he did introduce this device early into his narrative recording the death of Romulus. Syme considered some of the possible reasons for Tacitus' delay.[43] He doubted that no person of consequence had yet died, but believed rather that Tacitus was slow to see the value of the device. Martin however disagrees. He states that the obituary notice in the Tacitean narrative has a function that can begin to operate only after the large-scale articulating function of Germanicus has disappeared.[44] Nonetheless, Tacitus was well aware of the obituary since it appears frequently in his earlier work known as The Histories.[45]

We must acknowledge therefore that not only are the obituary notices themselves products of will and choice,[46] but their placement within the narrative is too. Many scholars believe that the obituary of Arminius illustrates this point well. Tacitus inserts

---

[41]H. McCulloch Jr., Narrative Cause in the Annals of Tacitus (Konigstein, 1984), 158.

[42]See Appendix B: The Tacitean Obituaries.

[43]Syme (1970), 81.

[44]Martin (1990), 1533-34.

[45]Tacitus records the deaths of Piso Licinianus and Titus Vinius (1. 48), Galba (1. 49), Sophonius Tigellinus (1. 72), Otho (2. 50), Junius Blaesus (3. 39), Fabius Valens (3. 62), Flavius Sabinus (3. 75), Vitellius (3. 86), and Lucius Vitellius (4. 2).

[46]Syme (1970), 79.

this obituary near the end of the narrative year A.D. 19.[47] The obituary states that Arminius, who died at the age of thirty-seven, had held power for twelve years. Scholars like von Rohden and Ginsburg calculate that if the potentia of Arminius began with the clades Variana in A.D. 9, then Arminius would have died in A.D. 21.[48] On the other hand, McCulloch defends Tacitus' adherence to the annalistic tradition with some success. He argues that there is no compelling reason to assume Arminius had taken power in A.D. 9, since it is possible that he held power before that year.[49] Whether or not Tacitus would so boldly defy annalistic tradition and distort the date of Arminius' death remains debatable. Although there is no agreement among scholars on the year of Arminius' death, the prevailing opinion leans toward the year A.D. 21.[50]

The question arises, then, why Tacitus includes this obituary with the narrative of A.D. 19. The obituary of Arminius, Germanicus' German rival, should be compared to the death of Germanicus which is recorded earlier that year. It is no coincidence that these deaths are presented so close together. The obituary provides a balanced conclusion to the theme of Germanicus, reinforced by references to libertas and to the fact that

---

[47]Tac. Ann. 2. 88.

[48]P. von Rohden, RE 2. 1 (1895), 1190-1200, esp. 1199-1200; Ginsburg, 39.

[49]McCulloch Jr., 91n.16.

[50]Ginsburg, 113 n. 27. See also Syme (1958), 266; D. Timpe, Arminius-Studien (Heidelberg, 1970), 25 and n. 41; D. Flach, "Tacitus in der Tradition der antiken Geschichtsschreibung," Hypomnemeta 39 (Gottingen, 1973), 50; F. Goodyear, The Annals of Tacitus II (Cambridge, 1981), 447.

Arminius, like Germanicus, had perished dolo propinquorum.[51] Again, Tacitus freely manipulates the annalistic framework through chronology to suit his narrative and thematic objectives.

As found with the Livian obituaries, there are exceptions to the usual placement in the Annals as well. The obituaries of Vipsania, Lucius Piso, and Livia do not appear in the end chapters of their respective narrative years.[52] Their placement further illustrates how Tacitus treats annalistic elements since it would appear that Tacitus is willing to break the shackles of this genre. The reader must consider, therefore, any narrative or thematic reasons which could have necessitated these changes.

The obituary of Vipsania is further proof that Tacitus will manipulate elements of the annalistic structure for narrative purposes. This obituary appears in the middle of A.D. 20.[53] By placing it here, Tacitus creates a false annalistic closure.[54] He makes this change to satisfy narrative demands. This is the second instance where Tacitus modifies his approach to the annalistic structure for this particular year. Therefore, the reader must consider the delay in naming the consuls and the special placement of this obituary together. The reader must also recognise that any violation of annalistic practices is

---

[51]Sage (1990), 979-80.

[52]The obituary of Germanicus (2. 73) can also be included in this list. The significance of this obituary, however, will be discussed in a later chapter on thematic use of obituaries in The Annals.

[53]Tac. Ann. 3. 19.

[54]Gingras, 244.

usually related to Tacitus' concern for the liber, the transition between books, and the thematic grouping of books.[55] Tacitus delays naming the consuls and places the obituary at that moment in the narrative in order to minimize discontinuity from the end of the second book to the beginning of the third. The obituary of Vipsania marks the end of the Piso trial and, finally, the Germanicus episode. Tacitus overrides the episodic nature of the annalistic structure and creates a smooth, continuous narrative for the events which in fact span two calendar years.[56]

Likewise, the obituary of Lucius Piso is pivotal to its narrative year. Tacitus places it in the middle of A.D. 32.[57] He states that the deceased had been a member of the pontifical order and had won an honorary triumph in Thrace. Finally, the reader learns that Piso was also a city prefect. For Tacitus, this last office held by Piso is the most significant since it allows a digression. This obituary appears in the narrative at this moment so that Tacitus can pass to a historical survey of the prefectura urbis.[58] Moreover, Syme argued that Tacitus adopts a style of writing in this obituary which has thematic relevance.[59] While recording the deceased's cursus honorum, Tacitus tries to reproduce the old annalistic manner with the sequence of bare disconnected phrases.

---

[55]McCulloch Jr., 139.

[56]Gingras, 244.

[57]Tac. Ann. 6. 10.

[58]Martin (1990), 1549.

[59]Syme (1970), 86.

The placement of the obituary of Livia shows that Tacitus defies tradition for thematic demands. Indeed, he does begin the year (A.D. 29) with the names of the consuls, C. Fufius Geminus and L. Rubellius Geminus, but they are subordinated and over-shadowed by the lengthy obituary of Livia which immediately follows them.[60] The placement of this obituary is significant. Tacitus opens not only a narrative year with it, but also the fifth book of the history. By recording the death there Tacitus gives it a prominent place.[61] Naturally, the death of a person with such aristocratic lineage would be emphasized. Tacitus, however, has another reason for placing the obituary at the beginning of book five. Having drawn enough attention to Livia's death, he can easily recall it later in Tiberius' obituary at the end of book six. Thereby, the reader will interpret the death of Livia as a stage in Tiberius' reign.

Tacitus seems to challenge annalistic traditions. He treats the obituaries much like other elements of the annalistic framework. Indeed, Tacitus does usually place obituaries at the end of the narrative year. Nonetheless, he made exceptions. Thus, we may conclude that Tacitus is less influenced by annalistic traditional content or practice than by the use he might make of them for his own purposes.[62]

Multiple Obituary Entries in Tacitus

Unlike Livy, Tacitus frequently groups obituaries. Certainly, the majority of the

---

[60]Tac. Ann. 5. 1.

[61]McCulloch, 151-52.

[62]Ginsburg, 39.

obituary notices do appear as single entries in the narrative much like their Livian counterparts. On seven occasions, however, Tacitus varies this distribution by either inserting double or triple obituary entries.[63] These grouped obituaries occur throughout the history. They also account for sixteen of the Tacitean obituaries (twelve in the Tiberian hexad alone). Moreover, these double and triple obituary entries appear regularly in the "end chapter" material for their respective narrative years. Therefore, this section will examine the placement of these obituaries separately since there is nothing comparable found in Livy's history. It will analyse the paired obituary of L. Volusius Saturninus and C. Sallustius Crispus and then the triple obituary of Asinius Saloninus, Ateius Capito, and Junia Tertulla to interpret their significance in the narrative. Whether these multiple obituary entries are Tacitean innovations we cannot say with any certainty. Regardless, these alternative arrangements show further aspects of Tacitus' style. By juxtaposing the lives of deceased men, Tacitus implies comparisons and invites the reader to render judgments.[64] In the first formal obituary, Tacitus commemorates both L. Volusius Saturninus (*suff.* 12 B.C.) and C. Sallustius Crispus, the grand-nephew of Sallust. This is the first of four paired obituaries in the Annals.[65] It reads as follows:

> In the last days of the year two notable Romans passed away, Lucius Volusius Saturninus and Gaius Sallustius Crispus. Volusius' family, though ancient, had never before advanced beyond the praetorship, but

---

[63]These are: 3. 30, 3. 75, 4. 44, 4. 61, 6. 27, 13. 30, and 14. 19.

[64]McCulloch Jr., 91 n. 16.

[65]See Appendix B: The Tacitean Obituaries.

> he added a consulship and held censorial functions for the selection of knights as members of the judicature. He was also the first to amass the wealth of which his family became so greatly reputed. Crispus was born a knight. He took his name from his grandmother's brother, the most eminent historian Sallust, who had adopted him. But he, although he had easy access to an official career, followed the example of Maecenas. Moreover, without holding senatorial rank, he exceeded many ex-consuls and winners of triumphs in power. Elegant and refined, contrary to traditional habit, he verged on decadence in his elaborate opulence. There was underneath, however, a vigorous mind fit for great affairs, all the keener for its indolent, sleepy mask. Therefore, as a repository of imperial secrets, he was second only to Maecenas during the latter's lifetime, and afterwards he was the principal. Sallustius was privy to the murder of Agrippa Postumus. In his later years, however, his friendship with Tiberius was impressive rather than active. The same had occurred to Maecenas. Influence is rarely lasting. Such is its fate. Or perhaps both parties become satiated, when the ruler has nothing more to give, the collaborator nothing more to ask.[66]

Tacitus does more than just simply chronicle the lives of these men. Indeed, the reader learns much about the careers of Volusius and Crispus. Nevertheless, the reader also senses that Tacitus has a purpose in presenting these obituaries side-by-side. The reader is guided by Tacitus in drawing a comparison between the two men. As Syme stated,

---

[66]Tac. Ann. 3. 30: Fine anni concessere vita insignes viri L. Volusius et Sallustius Crispus. Volusio vetus familia neque tamen praeturam egressa: ipse consulatum intulit, censoria etiam potestate legendis equitum decuriis functus, opumque quis domus illa immensum viguit primus adcumulator. Crispum equestri ortum loco C. Sallustius, rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor, sororis nepotem in nomen adscivit. atque ille, quamquam prompto ad capessendos honores aditu, Maecenatem aemulatus sine dignitate senatoria multos triumphalium consulariumque potentia anteiit, diversus a veterum instituto per cultum et munditias copiaque et affluentia luxu propior. suberat tamen vigor animi ingentibus negotiis par, eo acrior quo somnum et inertiam magis ostentabat. igitur incolumi Maecenate proximus, mox praecipuus, cui secreta imperatorum inniterentur, et interficiendi Postumi Agrippae conscius, aetate provecta speciem magis in amicitia principis quam vim tenuit. idque et Maecenati acciderat, fato potentiae raro sempiternae, an satias capit aut illos cum omnia tribuerunt aut hos cum iam nihil reliquum est quod cupiant.

good and bad stand in contrasted pairs.[67]

Volusius and Crispus, for the purposes of this obituary, represent two different types of politician. Volusius is a prime model of old Roman virtues. As such, Tacitus writes a standard annalistic obituary, briefly stating the deceased's name, status of his family, his cursus honorum, and his improvements to his family's fortune.[68]

By contrast, Tacitus presents Crispus as a one-dimensional figure, a particeps secretorum, an unofficial advisor to the imperial court with no public authority. [69] By no means does Crispus receive a standard annalistic obituary. It records not only the offices held by the deceased, but also attempts to analyse him psychologically. Crispus is a paradox of great ability under the show of indolence.[70] We are told that he was prepared for the duties of Roman public life, having been adopted by Sallust. This adoption gave him easy access to an official career. Next, the reader learns that Crispus, a knight, outstripped in influence more prominent men who had won triumphs or consulships.

For Tacitus, Crispus represents the new order under the Principate. Thereby, Tacitus intends for the reader to interpret the obituary of Volusius as the death of the old type of politician who achieved auctoritas in public office through personal merit and noble service to the state, while the obituary of Crispus represents the rise of the new

---

[67]Syme (1970), 88.

[68]Gingras, 247.

[69]D. Kehoe, "Tacitus and Sallustius Crispus," CJ 80 (1985), 247.

[70]Syme (1970), 81.

politician, who gains prestige through service and friendship to the emperor.[71] Moreover, the role played by Crispus has a purpose for Tacitus' portrayal of the Tiberian principate. It allows Tacitus to illustrate how an emperor rules through agents who have no public accountability.[72]

How Tacitus arranges the triple obituary of Asinius Saloninus, Ateius Capito, and Junia Tertulla also reveals the historian's style. At the end of book three, these obituaries are arranged in a triadic plan. First, the obituary entries for the two men will be examined. They read as follows:

> In this year, prominent men died. One was Asinius Saloninus, distinguished as grandson of Marcus Agrippa and Gaius Asinius Pollio, half-brother of Drusus, and intended husband of one of Tiberius' granddaughters. The other death that occurred was of Gaius Ateius Capito, whom I have already mentioned. By his distinction as a jurist he had achieved national eminence even though his grandfather had only been a centurion of Sulla, and his father a praetor. Augustus had made him consul before age so that he would have precedence over another distinguished lawyer, Marcus Antistius Labeo. For these two paragons of the arts of peace were the simultaneous products of a single generation. On the one hand, Labeo's incorruptible independence gave him the finer reputation with the public, while Capito's obedience won him the greater imperial favour. Labeo stopped short at the praetorship. This seemed unfair and increased his popularity. Capito's consulship, on the other hand, earned him jealousy and dislike.[73]

---

[71]Gingras, 250.

[72]Kehoe, 250. According to Kehoe, Tacitus devised a special role for Sallustius Crispus. Tacitus is the only ancient source to mention him in any connection with Tiberius rather than Augustus (251 and n. 15).

[73]Tac. Ann. 3. 75: Obiere eo anno viri inlustres Asinius Saloninus, Marco Agrippa et Pollione Asinio avis, fratre Druso insignis Caesarique progener destinatus, et Capito Ateius, de quo memoravi, principem in civitate locum studiis civilibus adsecutus, sed avo centurione

First, Tacitus briefly records the short life of Asinius Saloninus. He is remembered for his prestigious family lineage. He was the son of Vipsania, Tiberius' first wife, and Asinius Gallus (cos. 8 B.C.). He was even betrothed to a daughter of Germanicus Caesar. Gingras brings up a noteworthy point which adds to the interpretation of this obituary. If Asinius had died too young to have made a mark in Roman public life, then we might ask why Tacitus chose to include him at all.[74] Asinius Saloninus does not appear as an appropriate recipient of an obituary since he is distinguished only through his family relations and not by any public offices he had held. Again, the words of Syme come to mind about the subjective choice of obituary recipients.[75]

The second obituary, as expected, is longer. The first obituary acts as a foil to this one. The obituary of C. Ateius Capito (*suff.* A.D. 5) describes the deceased's genealogy, cursus honorum, and ingenium. A well-known figure in Roman law, Capito wrote at least two works on public law (De officio senatorio and De iudiciis publicis).[76]

Sullano, patre praetorio. consulatum ei adceleraverat Augustus ut Labeonem Antistium isdem artibus praecellentem dignatione eius magistratus anteiret. namque illa aetas duo pacis decora simul tulit: sed Labeo incorrupta libertate et ob id fama celebratior, Capitonis obsequium dominantibus magis probabatur. illi quod praeturam intra stetit commendatio ex iniuria, huic quod consulatum adeptus est odium ex invidia oriebatur.

[74]Gingras, 254 n. 28. Much the same point was made earlier by J. Oliver in his article "The descendants of Asinius Pollio," AJP 68 (1947), 148.

[75]Syme (1970), 79.

[76]R. Bauman, Lawyers and Politics in the early Roman Empire: a study of relations between the Roman jurists and the emperors from Augustus to Hadrian, Munchener Beitrage zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 82 (Munich, 1989), 29.

Nevertheless, Tacitus regards Capito as one of the new breed. Thus, the obituary highlights aspects which advance this belief such as humble origins, imperial favour, and undeserved advancement.[77] Moreover, this obituary includes an anachronistic synkrisis whereby the theme of freedom is introduced.[78] By his servility, Capito gained the consulship, while Labeo, his rival, had to be content with retaining his freedom of speech and the praetorship.[79]

These opinions, however, which Tacitus expresses about Capito and Labeo may be untrue and even misleading. Indeed, Pomponius says that Augustus offered a suffect consulship to Labeo as well. Labeo, however, refused it because he wanted to devote himself to his profession.[80] Nevertheless, Capito's focus on public law gave him an effective counterweight to Labeo's liberal arts.[81] According to Bauman, it also fortified Capito's already strong ties to the regime and marked him out as a future consul.

Again, the second obituary stands as a foil to the third. The last obituary of book three commemorates Junia Tertulla as it states:

> Junia too died, born with Cato as her uncle, wife of Gaius Cassius, sister of Brutus. She lived sixty-three years after Philippi. Her will caused

---

[77]Gingras, 254 n. 29.

[78]A. Woodman and R. Martin, The Annals of Tacitus Book Three (Cambridge, 1996), 489.

[79]Pomeroy (1991), 201.

[80]Pomponius, D. 1. 2. 2. 47.

[81]Bauman, 49.

> much gossip, because although she was very rich and included complimentary references to almost every prominent Roman she omitted the emperor. He took it, however, hospitably and did not refuse her a funeral nor other observances, including a eulogy from the rostra. The effigies of twenty highly distinguished families, Manlii, Quinctii, and others equally aristocratic, headed the procession. But Cassius and Brutus shone greatly, precisely because their statues were not to be seen.[82]

It is slightly longer than the obituary of Capito. Junia was the third daughter of D. Iunius Silanus (cos. 62 B.C.). The obituary records her age, genealogy, and a description of her funeral. In particular, Tacitus records the relationships which illustrate and emphasize her republican connections rather than render a simple listing of her parentage.[83] Similar to the preceding obituary, it also continues the theme of lost Republican freedom. Her death is dated, unnecessarily, in relation to the battle of Philippi, where Octavian and Antony defeated the Republican forces of Brutus and Cassius. The reference to Philippi is significant for two reasons. First, Tacitus only refers to it twice elsewhere in the Annals (1. 2. 1; 4. 34-35). Second, Junia's death is the only one dated to a historical event.[84]

In this obituary, how Tiberius reacts is also note worthy. Despite being snubbed,

---

[82]Tac. Ann. 3. 76: Et Iunia sexagesimo quarto post Philippensem aciem anno supremum diem explevit, Catone avunculo genita, C. Cassii uxor, M. Bruti soror. testamentum eius multo apud vulgum rumore fuit, quia in magnis opibus cum ferme cunctos proceres cum honore nominavisset Caesarem omisit. quod civiliter acceptum' neque prohibuit quo minus laudatione pro rostris ceterisque sollemnibus funus cohonestaretur. viginti clarissimarum familiarum imagines antelatae sunt, Manlii, Quinctii aliaque eiusdem nobilitatis nomina. sed praefulgebant Cassius atque Brutus eo ipso quod effigies eorum non visebantur.

[83]Woodman and Martin, 495.

[84]Gingras, 248.

Tiberius did not refuse her a funeral nor the usual observances such as a eulogy. Although Tiberius had no claim to an inheritance from Junia's estate, he did have the authority to prohibit a ceremonial funeral.[85] Woodman and Martin make a further interesting point. It is possible that Tacitus includes this comment because it stands in contrast to how Tiberius curtailed the burial honours of Germanicus (Ann. 5. 1-2).[86]

Thus, Tacitus arranges these three obituaries for effect. The reader could hardly have anticipated the obituary of Junia after the formal introduction to the section as a whole.[87] In fact, one could even say that Tacitus tries to surprise his reader by such an arrangement. Nevertheless, this tricolon crescendo concludes the narrative year of A.D. 22 with heightened drama. The reader is left to draw conclusions from the first two obituaries, namely that a noble background no longer meant power under the Principate.[88] The obituary of Junia is awarded a prominent position, not only in relation to the two preceding obituaries but also in the structure of the book as a whole. Book three is framed with two thematically significant funerals, those of Germanicus and Junia. The reader should also consider how these funerals stand in sharp contrast to one another. There was no procession of family busts at the funeral of Germanicus. Moreover, the

---

[85]E. Champlin, Final Judgments: duty and emotion in Roman wills (Berkley, 1991), 14; Woodman and Martin, 496.

[86]Ibid, 490.

[87]Ibid, 489.

[88]Gingras, 254.

reader should appreciate the irony that Germanicus' funeral, the man who many had hoped would restore the Republic, occurred in Antioch far from the rostra of Rome. This obituary of Junia Tertulla, therefore, concludes the third book with the flourishing exit of Republican tradition envisioned with the procession of the deceased's funeral.[89]

Our discussion in this section has further shown Tacitus' approach to the annalistic tradition. While honouring the practice of placing obituaries near or at the end of their narrative years, Tacitus has expanded this device. Tacitus arranged multiple obituary entries to heighten the drama of his history. Moreover, Tacitus has manipulated them in order to convey political judgement by placing them side-by-side.[90]

Conclusion

It has been worthwhile to study how Tacitus arranges the obituaries in his Annals. Only through a comparison with Livy can we appreciate Tacitus' approach. Indeed, Tacitus usually obeys annalistic tenets and places these obituaries near or at the end of the narrative year. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the exceptions. Although Livy also allowed them, in the Ab urbe condita they were warranted by annalistic demands. The same cannot be said for their Tacitean counterparts. Thereby, we recognise that the

---

[89]An interesting similarity has been drawn between the end of book six of The Aeneid and the end of book three of The Annals. Virgil chose to close that book with a parade of heroes, a device which has much the same appearance as a funeral procession. When Tacitus concluded the first half of the Tiberian hexad, he opted to describe an actual funeral procession, in which the busts of noble Republican heroes were shown. Both parades are to have the same inspiring effect. See Woodman and Martin, 489.

[90]Martin (1990), 1536.

Tacitean exceptions are part of a larger phenomenon. Tacitus treats obituaries like any other element of the annalistic tradition. They are arranged in the narrative to suit his own agenda. The multiple obituary entries also reveal the historian's intent. Tacitus expanded this genre to incorporate political judgement. Therefore, we can rightfully conclude that these obituary notices are not merely decorative and evocative of a past tradition; they also allow Tacitus the chance for detached and focussed assessment of prominent individuals and of the Principate as a system.[91]

[91]Ibid, 1577.

CHAPTER 3

COMPOSITION OF THE OBITUARY

As the title states, this chapter will focus on the composition of the obituaries in the Annals. First, it will identify the topics which commonly appear in them by analysing three obituaries. By examining the comments made about P. Sulpicius Quirinius, L. Calpurnius Piso, and the emperor Tiberius it will determine the usual Tacitean comments made about an individual's life and career. Then it will be possible to form a plan for the typical Tacitean obituary. Second, the chapter will note the similar topics found in obituaries and laudatory oratory by consulting Quintilian's advice on that subject in the De Institutione Oratoria. It will be argued that Tacitus may have relied upon his rhetorical training to write the obituaries. True, what Tacitus wrote about a deceased individual is dictated partly by common sense but it is also influenced by thematic demands since Tacitus selects an individual who represents a social type.[1] Indeed the obituaries help Tacitus to accomplish his task as a historian to celebrate noble deeds and frighten people away from evil words and acts by the fear of ill repute in the future.[2] Finally, this chapter will also consider reasons which could explain why the obituaries

---

[1]Sinclair, 9.

[2]Tac. Ann. 3. 65. 1.

differ from each other in length and detail.

Deconstruction of Three Obituaries

The obituaries are intriguing snapshots. They deliver a sharp impression (perhaps on occasion crude and rather unfair) of the individuals they commemorate. How Tacitus achieves this task will be discussed in this section by examining the comments made in the obituaries of P. Sulpicius Quirinius, L. Calpurnius Piso, and Tiberius. Moreover, it will also note how, if at all, comments differ between men of various social ranks since these obituaries honour a knight, an aristocrat, and a member of the imperial family respectively. Finally, a plan for the typical Tacitean obituary will be suggested based upon these earlier findings.

The obituary of P. Sulpicius Quirinius (cos. 12 B.C.) is one of five which commemorates a novus homo.[3] This particular obituary, which appears in the narrative year A.D. 21, reads as follows:

> Quirinius was in no way connected with the ancient patrician family of the Sulpicii, having come from the town of Lanuvium. But through his sturdy service in the army and his active accomplishment of his duties, he gained a consulate under the emperor Augustus and after storming the forts of the Homonadenses in Cilicia, he gained triumphal decorations. Given the task of advising Gaius Caesar who had been entrusted with Armenia, he nevertheless also cultivated good relations with Tiberius who was at the time on Rhodes. That was revealed in the senate by Tiberius, who praised

[3]The others are: Lucilius Longus (4. 15), Poppaeus Sabinus (6. 39), Curtius Rufus (11. 20). Although Sallustius Crispus was adopted by his great-uncle, he was born a knight and was given an obituary by Tacitus as well (3. 30).

> Quirinius' services to himself and attacked M. Lollius, whom he accused of being responsible for Gaius' ill conduct and hostility towards himself. Others remembered Quirinius less kindly because of the danger into which he tried to put Lepida, which I have recorded, and his excessive influence and pettiness in his old age.[4]

Tacitus begins the obituary with a reference to the deceased's family. Quirinius' origins are defined in negative terms, leading the reader to expect the reason why Tiberius held him in high regard would be found in his career.[5] Next Tacitus records the deceased's cursus honorum. His military service had led to a consulship and triumphal decorations for his efforts in Cilicia. Moreover, Quirinius acted as advisor to Gaius Caesar. The reader believes that P. Sulpicius Quirinius so far has made honourable use of his talents, his power, and his influence. His military exploits may have given him some recognition, but it was Quirinius' companionship with Tiberius while on Rhodes which won him ultimate approval.[6] Indeed, it was Tiberius' regard for him which secured Quirinius a public funeral and praise from the emperor himself.[7]

---

[4]Tac. Ann. 3. 48: nihil ad veterem et patriciam Sulpiciorum familiam Quirinius pertinuit, ortus apud municipium Lanuvium, sed impiger militiae et acribus ministeriis consulatum sub divo Augusto, mox expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadensium castellis insignia triumphali adeptus; datusque rector C. Caesari Armeniam obtinenti Tiberium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat. quod tunc patefecit in senatu, laudatis in se officiis et incusato M. Lollio quem auctorem C. Caesari pravitatis et discordiam arguebat. sed ceteris haud laeta memoria Quirini erat on intenta, ut memoravi, Lepidae pericula sordidamque et praepotentem senectam.

[5]Pomeroy (1991), 197.

[6]Ibid.

[7]As noted by A. Woodman and R. Martin in The Annals of Tacitus Book Three (Cambridge, 1996), 360, Quirinius is the first of four individuals for whom Tiberius requested a public funeral. The others are Lucilius Longus (4. 15), L. Calpurnius Piso (6. 10), and Aelius Lamia (6. 27). They argue that these requests reinforce the image of Tiberius as a man who

The reader appreciates that this obituary flows in a smooth sequence.[8] The order of information is crucial for the flow of the argument. Comment on a man's lineage leads to consideration of his personality. The individual's character then instigates contemplation of his acts. Finally, the reader may question or consider the deceased's motives in performing the deeds. Since the reader may not be acquainted with the reputation of Quirinius, it is indeed better for Tacitus to state the arguments first and then introduce his conclusion.[9] Moreover, the obituary is organised by a chronological plan. Tacitus begins with the deceased's origins. Next he discusses his training and public career. The obituary lastly summarises Quirinius' reputation in his final years. Tacitus selects this plan in order to adequately emphasize the different phases in the deceased's life and reputation.

Nonetheless, Tacitus has a purpose with this portrayal of Quirinius. Like many which commemorate novi homines, he uses this obituary for derogatory comment.[10] Despite imperial favour, the reader learns that the public did not admire the deceased. They remembered how Quirinius had attacked his wife, Aemilia Lepida, in the courts.[11]

---

despite his constant solitariness desired companionship and who rewarded loyalty with loyalty.

[8]Daitz, 40.

[9]R. Whately, Elements of Rhetoric (Oxford, 1832), 116.

[10]Syme (1970), 83.

[11]Tac. Ann. 3. 22. The grand-daughter of Sulla and Pompey, she was accused of falsely claiming to bear a son to P. Sulpicius Quirinius.

Moreover, his greed and influence-peddling were also still fresh in their minds. Indeed, Tacitus himself is disappointed that Quirinius would eventually prostitute and abuse his advantages.

The obituary of L. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 15 B.C) also mentions many of the same 'topoi' we found in the first example. The obituary, which appears in the narrative year A.D. 32, reads as follows:

> Around the same time L. Piso the pontifex died naturally, a rare event for someone so distinguished. He had never sponsored any sycophantic motion in the Senate and, whenever the need arose, he wisely directed his fellow senators. As I have recorded, his father had been censor; he himself lived to be eighty and earned triumphal distinctions in Thrace. But his particular source of glory was that, having become urban prefect, he brilliantly limited his power which had only recently been made permanent, but which was unpopular because the people had for long been unaccustomed to obedience.[12]

The obituary records many aspects of Piso's life. Tacitus provides a cursus honorum of the deceased. The reader learns that Piso was a member of the pontifical order and the urban prefect. Moreover, the deceased also had earned triumphal awards in Thrace. Next Tacitus comments on Piso's death. He died of natural causes at eighty years of age. Perhaps the reader is baffled by such a remark, but Tacitus soon explains its inclusion. Apparently, it was rare for someone with Piso's authority to co-exist unharmed alongside

---

[12]Tac. Ann. 6. 10: per idem tempus L. Piso pontifex, rarum in tanta claritudine, fato obiit, nullius servilis sententiae sponte auctor et quotiens necessitas ingrueret sapienter moderans. patrem ei censorium fuisse memoravi; aetas ad octogesimum annum processit; decus triumphale in Thraecia meruerat. sed praecipua ex eo gloria quod praefectus urbi recens continuam potestatem et insolentia parendi graviorem mire temperavit.

the emperor.[13] Tacitus then discusses Piso's reputation. Tacitus admires Piso because he never moved a servile motion in the senate. He is equally impressed that Piso remained steadfast and at times provided wise direction to this peers. Finally, Tacitus offers a brief word about Piso's family, stating that his father was a censor.

Unlike our earlier example, the 'topoi' do not follow a chronological sequence in this obituary. Instead, Tacitus seems to organise this obituary on an expansion of one topic alone. He focuses on Piso's personality. What appears to be a series of anecdotes is in fact a disguised summary of the individual.[14] Tacitus uses the other 'topoi' of achievements, awards, and offices held by the deceased in order to convey his praise for Piso, a man who showed honourable use of his power and influence.

On the other hand, similar to the first example Tacitus also uses this obituary for thematic purposes. Tradition and the Republic are suggested to the reader in Piso's obituary.[15] As Syme further noted, L. Calpurnius Piso is a memorial to history. Tacitus states in the obituary that Piso's father was a censor. In fact, his father (Caesoninus) was also consul in 58 B.C. Moreover, the language of the obituary further recalls the Republic in the Annals. Tacitus records Piso's achievements in a sequence of bare

---

[13]The obituary of Vipsania (3. 19) is another instance where Tacitus makes much the same comment. Her death is memorable simply because she was the only child of Agrippa to die of natural causes.

[14]Pomeroy (1991), 195.

[15]Syme (1970), 86.

disconnected phrases, which Syme believed reproduced the old annalistic manner.[16]

Tacitus' comments regarding Tiberius are also similar to the two previous obituaries. This obituary, which appears in the narrative year A.D. 37, is noteworthy for two other reasons. First, it is the last obituary in the extant Annals commemorating a member of the imperial family. Second, Tacitus composes it with much energy, which Pomeroy believes is missing in the other imperial notices.[17] It reads as follows:

> Claudius Nero was Tiberius' father and so he was descended from the Claudian family on both sides although his mother had become a member of the Livian clan and later one of the Julians through adoption. His fortunes were mixed from his infancy. He followed his father, who was one of the proscribed, into exile. When he joined the household of Augustus as his stepson, he was confronted by rivals. While they lived they were Marcellus and Agrippa, then Gaius and Lucius Caesar. Even his brother Nero Drusus was a more popular favourite. But particularly hazardous was his marriage to Julia, whether he endured or avoided her infidelity. Then returning from Rhodes, he took over the household of the emperor, now bereft of heirs, for twelve years and then ruled the Roman world for nearly twenty-three years.
>
> His character, too, had its different stages. His life and reputation were blameless while he remained a private citizen or was in power under Augustus. While Germanicus and Drusus still lived, he was cunning and secretive in feigning virtue. Until his mother died, he was a mixture of good and bad characteristics. While he still favoured or feared Sejanus, his cruelty was detestable, but his lusts were hidden. Finally he openly engaged both in crime and disgraceful activities, when, after shame and fear had gone, he could follow his own bent.[18]

---

[16]Ibid.

[17]Pomeroy, 217.

[18]Tac. Ann. 6. 51: pater ei Nero et utrimque origo gentis Claudiae, quamquam mater in Liviam et mox Iuliam familiam adoptionibus transierit. casus prima ab infantia ancipites; nam

First, Tacitus states the emperor's origins. The reader is reminded that Tiberius, as the son of Livia and Tiberius Claudius Nero, was a member of the Claudian family on both sides. Next Tacitus provides a rather untraditional cursus honorum of the deceased. Tacitus outlines the chain of events which eventually led Tiberius to be Augustus' heir. As a child, Tiberius was an unlikely candidate as he lived in exile with his father. Once he was associated with Augustus, Tiberius apparently had to jostle for position with Marcellus and Agrippa, Gaius and Lucius Caesar, and even his own brother Nero Drusus. Tacitus then summarizes Tiberius' later years. His marriage to Julia, Augustus' only child, proved disasterous by her infidelities. Tacitus also recalls Tiberius' withdrawal to Rhodes and his triumphal return to take over Augustus' household and the Roman empire.

Moreover, Tacitus analyses the deceased's personality and reputation. While Tiberius was a private citizen or was under Augustus' potestas, he led a blameless existence. In fact, the reader sympathizes with Tiberius slightly since he either endured or ignored his wife's adultery. Tacitus, however, attempts to delve into Tiberius' psyche

---

proscriptum patrem exul secutus, ubi domum Augusti privignus introiit, multis aemulis conflictatus est, dum Marcellus et Agrippa, mox Gaius Luciusque Caesares viguere; etiam frater eius Drusus prosperiore civium amore erat. sed maxime in lubrico egit accepta in matrimonium Iulia, impudicitiam uxoris tolerans aut declinans. dein Rhodo regressus vacuos principis penatis duodecim annis, mox rei Romanae arbitrium tribus ferme et viginti obtinuit. morum quoque tempora illi diversa: egregium vita famaque, quoad privatus vel in imperiis sub Augusto fuit; occultum ac subdolum fingendis virtutibus, donec Germanicus ac Drusus superfuere; idem inter bona malaque mixtus incolumi matre; intestabilis saevitia, sed obtectis libidinibus dum Seianum dilexit timuitve: postremo in scelera simul ac dedecora prorupit postquam remoto pudore et metu suo tantum ingenio utebatur.

to divulge his inner state.[19] Indeed Tacitus shows Tiberius' hypocritical and tyrannical nature.[20] Tiberius feigned virtue while Germanicus and Drusus were still alive, according to Tacitus.[21] Progressively, Tiberius acted more licentiously as external restraints were removed.[22] Finally, without Livia and Sejanus keeping him in check, Tiberius could satisfy any cruel and lustful desire. Tacitus presents a man who becomes increasingly isolated until he is old and alone.[23]

The obituary of Tiberius is also organised like the first example. It traces Tiberius' life chronologically. He begins with Tiberius' family and origins. Then he itemises the events which contributed to his succession such as his association with Augustus, his withdrawal, and the deaths of other rivals. Furthermore, Tacitus dates the progressive deterioration of Tiberius' character by the successive deaths of his partners.[24]

---

[19]Daitz, 39.

[20]M. Griffin, "Tacitus, Tiberius and the Principate," in Leaders and Masses in the Roman World in honour of Zvi Yavetz, ed. I. Malkin and Z. Rubinsohn (New York, 1995), 43.

[21]Gill, 484. Gill cites many instances of Tiberius' concealed cruelty and capacity for hatred. Some examples can be found at: Ann. 1. 7. 7; 1. 10. 7; 1. 11. 2; 1. 24. 1; 1. 33. 2; 2. 28. 2; 2. 42; 3. 44. 4; 4. 57; 4. 71. 3; 6. 24. 3; 6. 50. 1.

[22]R. Martin, Tacitus (London, 1981), 105; McCulloch Jr., 64. McCulloch also notes the influence of Sallust in this description of Tiberius' behaviour. He states that Sallust viewed the removal of fear as the first stage of aprocess of moral degeneration leading to civil war. McCulloch further argues that Tacitus, in using this Sallustiam mode of thought, drew a link between the moral corruption of the emperor and the moral corruption of the body politic (66).

[23]A. Woodman, "Tacitus' Obituary of Tiberius," CQ 39 (1989), 200. See also Suet. Tib. 65.

[24]Ibid, 202; Martin, 105.

Germanicus, Drusus, Livia, and Sejanus are used in the obituary to designate different periods of Tiberius' principate.[25] It is not that Tiberius' personality (ingenium) changed, but that over time Tiberius concealed his true nature less.[26]

Nevertheless, this obituary of Tiberius has long been regarded as a most complex and cunning portrayal.[27] The structure of the obituary has much to do with its success. The obituary is composed of two paragraphs which are deliberately juxtaposed and structurally complementary.[28] The obituary consists of five casus ancipites which then parallel the following five tempora diversa.[29] Woodman further suggests that Tacitus intends for the reader to see one paragraph in terms of the other.[30] The fifth casus comprises all but the first tempora, and the first tempora comprises all but the last casus.[31] Indeed, the image presented in the first paragraph is significant for the reader to understand the second, and vice versa. Moreover, the casus explain the diffidence with which Tiberius succeeded Augustus and which led him to find fellowship with the

---

[25]Woodman, 199.

[26]Gill, 485; McCulloch, 200.

[27]Pomeroy, 218.

[28]Woodman, 200.

[29]Ibid, 200 n. 20 and 197 n. 1. The five casus are: (1) proscriptum...secutus, (2) ubi domum...amore erat, (3) sed maxime...declinans, (4) dein...annis, and (5) mox...obtiniut. The five tempora are: (1) up to A.D. 14, (2) to early A.D. 23, (3) to early A.D. 29, (4) to late A.D. 31, and (5) to March 37.

[30]Ibid, 201.

[31]Ibid, 200-201.

individuals named in the second paragraph.

Thus, a plan for the typical Tacitean obituary would include comments on the deceased's family, training and education, public career, honours, and reputation. Moreover, the obituary could be written according to a chronological or topical plan. This study also has shown that Tacitus writes all the obituaries, regardless of the social status of the deceased, with these same basic 'topoi'. There are some minor exceptions however. Occasionally he will comment on an individual's age, marriage, death and also funeral. Tacitus' own interests might explain these inconsistencies. Nevertheless, Tacitus applies these 'topoi' with the intention of creating vivid characterisations and relating the commemorated individuals to the narrative.

Rhetorical elements in the Tacitean obituaries

And so, with such a list of possible remarks the 'topoi' found in laudatory oratory are recalled. It is an understandable association since Tacitus was well aware of this branch of rhetoric. Indeed, like many other adult Roman males Tacitus continued to practice ceremonial oratory beyond his childhood lessons. In A.D. 97, while consul suffectus, Tacitus gave the laudatio funebris at the public funeral of Verginius Rufus (cos. A.D. 63), who had died at the age of eighty-three after a lengthy illness.[32] Since the ancients applied their rhetorical methods to narrative histories,[33] it is then plausible that

---

[32]Pliny, Epist. 2. 1.

[33]A. Woodman, Rhetoric in Classical Historiography (Portland, 1988), 88.

epideictic oratory influenced the obituaries in the Annals. By first noting Quintilian's advice in the De Institutio Oratoria on that aspect of oratory, it will then be possible to show what topics are shared by laudatory oratory and obituaries. Due consideration will also be paid in this section to the relevant opinions of Cicero, since Quintilian so admired his style.

Discussion will begin by noting Quintilian's comments on laudatory oratory. Like Aristotle had done before him, Quintilian named and defined three kinds of rhetoric (deliberative, judicial, and epideictic).[34] Laudatory oratory was composed of basic elements. Quintilian outlines for his audience the following topics which ought to be mentioned in a speech,

> The praise of the individual himself will be based upon his character, his physical endowments, and external circumstances. Physical and accidental advantages provide a comparatively unimportant theme, which requires variety of treatment.[35]

Quintilian adds to this list other 'topoi' relevant to treating people.[36] Birth was a necessary topic since people usually have a resemblance to parents and ancestors. Nationality and country should be included since races have their own character, laws, and institutions. The gender of the individual was also a factor since men were more

---

[34]Arist. Rhet. 1. 3. 2-3.

[35]Quint. Inst. 3. 7. 12: Ipsius vero laus hominis ex animo et corpore et extra positis peti debet. et corporis quidem fortuitorumque cum levior tum non uno modo tractanda est.

[36]Ibid, 5. 10. 24-27.

family, reputation, and public career. In this case, the comments emphasize the stages of the emperor's reign. In the Annals, Tacitus not only evaluates the deceased individuals by these 'topoi', but he also uses these comments (for example the reference to Piso's old age sparks a remark upon the political atmosphere in Tiberius' reign) for thematic purposes.

Differences amongst the obituaries

What constitutes an obituary has been debated. Some scholars have argued over their identification. Syme remarked that the Annals present twelve obituary entries, which embrace twenty men.[43] For some reason, however, he deliberately excluded Tacitus' remarks on Tiberius, Livia, Julia Maior, Julia Minor, and Junia Tertulla (to name a few) from his discussion.[44] Gingras notes that Syme restricted his list of obituaries to the deaths of politically prominent men.[45] Gingras agrees with Ginsburg in broadening the definition of an obituary to include a report at the year's end of the death of any prominent person. Widening the definition only seems appropriate. It should also extend, however, to obituary entries which appear in the course of the narrative year as well. Regardless, this debate may have arisen simply from the differences between the obituaries in the Annals. The length of detail varies from obituary to obituary. This

---

[43]Syme (1970), 79. They are found at: Ann. 3. 30; 3. 48; 3. 75; 4.15; 4. 44; 4. 61; 6. 10; 6. 27; 6. 39; 13. 30; 14. 19; 14. 47.

[44]Ibid, 79 n. 2.

[45]Gingras, 244 n. 9.

section will analyse these differences as a further aspect of Tacitean style. To accomplish this task, the obituaries of Julia Minor and Vipsania will be examined and later compared to the obituary of Tiberius.

Obituaries differ one from another in their composition. Although the diversity amongst the obituaries may have been apparent through earlier examples, the obituaries of Julia Minor and Vipsania illustrate this point well. Let us first consider the obituary of Julia Minor which Tacitus includes in the narrative year A.D. 28. It reads as follows:

> Around this same time, Julia Minor died. Convicted of adultery, she was condemned by her grandfather Augustus and exiled to the island of Trimerum, near the Apulian coast. There she endured twenty years of exile, being sustained by the charity of the Augusta, who destroyed her step-children in the shadows while they flourished, and publicly showed compassion to them when destroyed. [46]

First Tacitus highlights her public career through referring to her exile (of twenty years) on Trimerum. Next he reminds the reader of her family and status as she is the grand-child of Augustus. Perhaps unexpectedly, the obituary ends by commenting on Livia's reputation not that of the deceased. As Pomeroy notes the relationship between Julia Minor and Livia is stressed to characterise the latter.[47] Indeed, Tacitus pays little attention to Julia Minor in this obituary and even in the

---

[46]Tac. Ann. 4. 71: Per idem tempus Iulia mortem obiit, quam neptem Augustus convictam, adulterii damnaverat, proieceratque in insulam Trimerum, haud procul Apulis litoribus. Illic viginti annis exilium toleravit Augustae ope sustentata, quae florentis privignos cum per occultum subvertisset, misericordiam erga adflictos palam ostentabat.

[47]Pomeroy (1991), 222.

entire narrative.[48]

The record of Vipsania's death is even shorter in length and detail. Tacitus includes this notice in the narrative year A.D. 20. It reads as follows:

> A few days later [Drusus'] mother, Vispania, died. Of Agrippa's children, she alone died peacefully. The rest were either killed in battle or allegedly poisoned or starved to death.[49]

Tacitus begins by highlighting her genealogy. She is the daugher of M. Vipsanius Agrippa (cos. 37 B.C.) and the mother of Drusus. Next Tacitus comments on her death. Vipsania is the only child of Agrippa to die naturally. Like Julia Minor, Tacitus only pays the deceased slight consideration overall. In fact, he only alludes to her marriage with the emperor Tiberius which was terminated at Augustus' instigation. Nor does he mention her second marriage to C. Asinius Gallus. The reader may be surprised by this omission since their son, Asinius Agrippa, is awarded an obituary later on in the Annals.[50] Indeed, Tacitus does not scrutinise her life much. Yet, as the first wife of Tiberius her death certainly is noteworthy in this hexad.

Categories are needed to explain the differences between obituaries. This

---

[48]Julia Minor is mentioned in connection to Decimus Silanus at Ann. 3. 24.

[49]Tac. Ann. 3. 19: paucosque post dies Vipsania mater eius excessit, una omnium Agrippae liberorum miti obitu: nam ceteros manifestum ferro vel creditum est veneno aut fame extinctos.

[50]R. Syme, The Augustan Aristocracy (Oxford, 1986), 146. The obituary of Asinius Agrippa appears at Ann. 4. 61.

need becomes apparent when the obituaries of Julia Minor, Vipsania, and Tiberius are compared. The obituary of Julia Minor discusses typical aspects of her life in some detail. Tacitus mentions her public career and family. The notice which honours Vipsania briefly refers to her family and her death. On the other hand, the obituary of Tiberius provides a detailed summary of the man's private and public life. Viden's comments about female portraits in the Annals can be extended to explain this diversity. Some individuals get full characterisations of their lives and habits, while others receive shorter descriptions and some only brief mentions.[51] Bowman likewise tackles this issue by identifying obituaries as either "full" or "partial".[52] The obituary of Tiberius exemplifies those named "full" since it renders a summary of his genealogy, achievements, and innate character.[53] Likewise, Julia Minor is awarded a "partial" obituary because it is missing one or more of the standard elements.[54] Bowman also recognises brief obituaries, like that of Vipsania, which can best be described as "death notices". Although missing several of the usual elements, the notice still provides

---

[51]G. Viden, Women in roman literature: attitudes of authors under the early empire (Vastervik, 1993), 60.

[52]R. Bowman, "Obituaries in Tacitus" in "The Significance of caedes in Tacitus' Annals and Histories," (M.A. diss., Queen's University, 1996), 114.

[53]Bowman also identifies the following as "full" obituaries of Germanicus (2. 72-73), Arminius (2. 88), and Livia (5. 1).

[54]Bowman, 116.

interesting details of the deceased's life.

Regardless of differences, it is crucial in our understanding of Tacitus' style that all obituaries are considered. Each obituary exists to satisfy a narrative or thematic demand. For whatever reason, Tacitus varies the information. No doubt he does so in order to entertain his readers. Or rather, he chooses to provide full obituaries only to significant characters in the narrative to punctuate their deaths.

Conclusion

This chapter intended to analyse the structure of the Tacitean obituaries. First, it noted some standard elements of them through examining the obituaries of P. Sulpicius Quirinius, L. Calpurnius Piso, and the emperor Tiberius. Tacitus regularly mentions the deceased's family, training and education, public career, and reputation regardless of the deceased's status. Second, the rhetorical nature of the obituaries was discussed. The influence of rhetoric, as seen through consulting Quintilian and Cicero, is seen in two ways. Tacitus uses standard rhetorical topics to summarise an individual's life. Moreover, Tacitus organises the obituaries chronologically or topically, which were both common rhetorical methods in laudatory oratory. Scholars often remark that Tacitus' rhetorical training left lasting marks on his historical writings. Dunkle and Mellor note its influence in his characterisations of tyrants, victims, and martyrs, which often rely

on stock characters.[55] D'Alton believes that Tacitus' epigrammatic terseness also was a legacy from his earlier studies.[56] Clearly, Tacitean obituaries should also be given as further examples of rhetoric's influence.

By studying the structure of the obituary, we begin to understand a possible function it serves in the narrative of the Annals. By commemorating the deaths of these illustrious figures of Roman society, Tacitus evaluates their lives and assigns praise or blame. (Again, a further aspect of the obituary which shows the influence of rhetoric.) As Syme noted Tacitus unobtrusively suggests lessons of conduct.[57] Although we have presently limited the discussion to Tacitean obituaries, these same remarks could have implications on the study of other ancient historians and the obituaries in their narratives.

---

[55]J. Dunkle, "The Rhetorical Tyrant in Roman Historiography: Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus," CW 65 (1971), 12; R. Mellor, ed. The Historians of Ancient Rome (New York, 1998), 394.

[56]J. D'Alton, Roman Literary Theory and Criticism: a study in tendencies (New York, 1962), 522-23.

[57]Syme (1958), 313.

CHAPTER 4

OBITUARIES AND THEMES IN TACITUS

The Annals is an intriguing chronicle of the events which occurred between A.D. 14 and A.D. 68. The reader's enjoyment is partly due to the work's narrative flow, which is attained through its use of themes. References to Tiberius' character, the conflict of succession, and the maiestas law recur throughout the Tiberian hexad.[1] In the Claudian and Neronian books, Tacitus repeatedly alludes to court intrigues, the decline of political liberty, and the demoralisation of Roman society as Walker further notes. Other scholars also identify lost Republican libertas and senatorial adulatio as two themes which are significant to the work as a whole.[2] Tacitus advances these themes in many instances through obituaries. This chapter will examine how three obituaries interplay with the text in order to highlight certain key themes. Indeed the chapter will demonstrate how the obituaries of Germanicus Caesar, Lucilius Longus, and Memmius Regulus communicate the themes of nostalgia for the Republic, senatorial sycophancy, and threatened personal liberty in the empire, respectively.

---

[1]Walker, 17-32.

[2]Ginsburg, 114 n. 40; Sinclair, 11; Martin (1990), 126.

The obituary of Germanicus and nostalgia for the Republic

Early in his narrative, Tacitus links Germanicus with the Republic.[3] First, Germanicus recalls Republican literary and rhetorical traditions. As Sinclair notes, Tiberius formulated a sententia that revealed the princeps' political anxiety about the public persona which Germanicus' oratory created.[4] Second, Germanicus reminds Tacitus of the Republic through his efforts in Germany. Germanicus' fighting evokes memories of that expansive epoch.[5] Third, Germanicus is associated with the politics of the past. Popular opinion held that Germanicus, like his father, would bring back the hopes and goodwill of the free Republic.[6] It is no surprise then that his death at Antioch causes universal silence and sorrow and is bewailed as the end of the Republic.[7]

The obituary of Germanicus conveys the impression that he did indeed belong to a simpler and older time.[8] Many standard elements are found in this obituary. Tacitus comments on Germanicus' reputation, while summarizing his life and career. The

---

[3]C. Mendell, Tacitus: the man and his work (London, 1957), 130.

[4]Sinclair, 118; At Tac. Ann. 2. 83. 3, Tiberius declares that he will dedicate a gold medallion among the portraits of the classic orators for Germanicus in order to restrain the honours being showered on Germanicus.

[5]Tac. Ann. 1. 3.

[6]Ibid, 1. 33.

[7]Ibid, 2. 82, 3. 4.

[8]C. Pelling, "Tacitus and Gemanicus," in Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition, ed. T. Luce and a. Woodman (Princeton, 1993), 73.

obituary appears in the narrative year A.D. 19, but not in the end chapter. Its unusual placement perhaps is due to narrative demands. Comment on Germanicus' death is needed at this time since it is a factor in the subsequent events such as Piso's trial. Tacitus writes,

> The province and surrounding peoples grieved greatly. Foreign countries and kings mourned his friendliness to allies and forgiveness to enemies. Both his looks and his words had inspired respect. Yet this dignity and grandeur, befitting his lofty rank, had been unaccompanied by any arrogance or jealousy. At his funeral there was no procession of statues. But there were abundant eulogies and reminiscences of his fine character. Some felt that his appearance, short life, and manner of death (like its locality) recalled Alexander the Great. Both were handsome, both died soon after thirty, both succumbed to the treachery of compatriots in a foreign land. But Germanicus, it was added, was kind to his friends, modest in his pleasures, a man with one wife and legitimate children. Though not so rash as Alexander, he was no less of a warrior. Only, after defeating the Germans many times, he had not been allowed to complete their subjection. If he had been in sole control, with royal power and title, he would have equalled Alexander in military renown as easily as he outdid him in clemency, self-control, and every other good quality.[9]

We learn first about the public's reaction to Germanicus' death. Those at Antioch mourned the loss of a man who had extended friendship and mercy to foreign kings and

---

[9]Tac. Ann. 2. 72-73: neque multo post extinguitur, ingenti luctu provinciae et circumiacentium populorum. indoluere exterae nationes regesque: tanta illi comitas in socios, mansuetudo in hostis; visuque et auditu iuxta venerabilis, cum magnitudinem et gravitatem summae fortunae retineret, invidiam et adrogantiam effugerat.

Funus sine imaginibus et pompa per laudes ac memoriam virtutum eius celebre fuit. et erant qui formam, aetatem, genus mortis ob propinquitatem etiam locorum in quibus interiit, magni Alexandri fatis adaequarent. nam utrumque corpore decoro, genere insigni, haud multum triginta annos egressum, suorum insidiis externas inter gentis occidisse: sed hunc mitem erga amicos, modicum voluptatum, uno matrimonio, certis liberis egisse, neque minus proeliatorem, etiam si temeritas afuerit praepeditusque sit perculsas tot victoriis Germanias servitio premere. quod si solus arbiter rerum, si iure et nomine regio fuisset, tanto promptius adsecuturum gloriam militiae quantum clementia, temperantia, ceteris bonis artibus praestitisset.

countries. Later Tacitus would write that at Rome all business was suspended, courts were emptied, and houses were shut.[10] The ramifications of this event are not to be underestimated as implied by the outpouring of grief. It ends any hopes of restoring the Republic and thereby a return of an active and efficient senate.[11]

This introduction leads into a summary of Germanicus' reputation and career. He is remembered as being kind to friends and modest in his pleasures. Tacitus also comments on his family as Germanicus left behind a wife with young children. On the other hand, Tacitus emphasizes Germanicus' military career while describing his public persona. Kind and forgiving, his outward appearance commanded respect from all. The comparison to Alexander the Great implies further aspects of Germanicus' military prowess. According to Tacitus, Germanicus had the potential to equal the fame of Alexander. Indeed, Germanicus would have completed the subjection of the Germans if Tiberius had allowed it. Again, Germanicus reminds us of the expansive epoch of the Republic, which is a sentiment captured in the obituary.

Yet Tacitus does not idealise his career. In the first two books of the narrative Tacitus includes moments which show Germanicus in a poor light.[12] Indeed, Tacitus

---

[10]Ibid, 2. 82.

[11]Mendell, 64.

[12]These are Germanicus' suicide threat (1. 35) and the forged letter (1. 36).

even criticizes Germanicus' actions on one occasion.[13] Nevertheless, Germanicus did attain some success militarily. As Rutland notes he showed care and foresight, yet it was his naive enthusiasm which was his downfall.[14]

Germanicus is viewed as the essence of moral perfection.[15] He is praised for his traditional characteristics of modesty, clemency, and self-control. Indeed, Tacitus refers to his gentleness twice in the obituary alone.[16] Tacitus concentrates on Germanicus' nature and virtues, which enables Tacitus to avoid criticism of the deceased's deeds.[17] Reference to Germanicus' actions could also cause the reader to question the belief that Germanicus intended to restore the Republic since he had sworn loyalty to Tiberius.[18] Rutland also provides an explanation as to why Tacitus emphasizes Germanicus' gentleness. She argues that his gentleness (clementia) and clemency (mansuetudo) quite possibly manifested themselves as softness and that together with his naivete made him an inappropriate contender for power in the principate.[19] Regardless, Tacitus praises

---

[13]At Ann. 2. 8 Tacitus calls an action of Germanicus an error. Tacitus believes that Germanicus was mistaken in not transporting the troops upstream or landing them further south along the Ems. Moreover, he fears that days were wasted in bridge building.

[14]L. Rutland, "The Tacitean Germanicus," RhM 130 (1987), 163.

[15]Walker, 118.

[16]Elsewhere Tacitus mentions this trait of Germanicus at 1. 58 and 2. 57.

[17]Pomeroy (1991), 230-231.

[18]Tac. Ann. 1. 34.

[19]Rutland, 161.

Germanicus for being unencumbered by any arrogance and envy, which acts as another contrast between Germancius and Tiberius as well.[20]

Nevertheless the reader should not regard Germanicus as a foil to Tiberius. Instead, Pelling encourages us to interpret the world in which Germanicus moves, his style of fighting, leadership and politics, as a contrast to the world and atmosphere of the principate.[21] The obituary suggests that a man like Germanicus could not survive in imperial Rome.[22] All public affairs and even Germanicus' campaigns are hampered by the devious and complex realities of imperial politics under Tiberius.[23]

Tacitus devoted his narrative to the lost cause of the Republic.[24] This obituary successfully records the vanishing vestiges of republican standards and values.[25] As much as Tacitus regretted the loss of the Republic and all it represented, he did recognise the necessity of the principate.[26] The last of the Republican dynasts had monopolized the

---

[20]At Ann. 1. 4 Tacitus writes that Tiberius possessed the ancient ingrained arrogance of the Claudian family.

[21]Pelling, 67-68.

[22]Walker, 232.

[23]Mendell, 66.

[24]Ibid, 108.

[25]C. Classen, "Tacitus - Historian between Republic and Principate," Mnemosyne 41 (1988), 102.

[26]M. Morford, "How Tacitus Defined Liberty," ANRW 33. 5 (1991), 3442.

power under the pretence that the Republic still existed.[27] Indeed, Tacitus admits that the end of the Republic was characterised by a climax in corruption through legislation for personal rather than national issues.[28]

Two obituaries which illustrate senatorial sycophancy and lost liberty

Tacitus criticizes the Principate in his Annals as well. Indeed, he blames the policy of Tiberius for creating a servile nature in the leading Romans which was to remain with them throughout subsequent reigns.[29] It was imperial Rome which reached the depths of servitude, in which hedonism and self-interest went unrestrained.[30] Tacitus registers these complaints in the obituaries of Lucilius Longus and P. Memmius Regulus. These obituaries are yet further instances when Tacitus illustrates the change in attaining political success under the new system. The obituary of Lucilius Longus highlights the success a senator could gain through sycophancy, while the obituary of Memmius Regulus emphasizes the threat of the emperor to personal liberty.

The unusual honours bestowed upon Lucilius Longus (suff. A.D. 7) after his death

---

[27]M. Sage, "The Treatment in Tacitus of Roman Republican History and Antiquarian Matters," ANRW 33. 5 (1991), 3404. He also cites Ann. 1.2, 3. 7, and 4.1 as evidence.

[28]Tac. Ann. 3. 27.

[29]Leake, "Tacitus' Teaching and the decline of liberty at Rome," Interpretation 15 (1987), 198.

[30]R. Boesche, "The Politics of Pretence: Tacitus and the Political Theory of Despotism," HPTh 8 (1987), 200.

causes Tacitus to consider his life.[31] The obituary, which appears in the narrative year A.D. 23, reads as follows:

> The same year brought still another bereavement to the emperor by the death of one of Drusus' twins and an equally dear friend. This was Lucilius Longus, Tiberius' comrade in evil days and good, and the only senator to share his isolation at Rhodes. Hence, in spite of his modest origins, a censorian funeral and a statue erected in the Forum of Augustus at the public expense were decreed to him by the Fathers.[32]

Tacitus provides vague information about the deceased in this obituary. We learn that despite humble origins Lucilius Longus became a senator. Tacitus also records that the senate awarded him a public funeral and later erected a statue in his honour. Nonetheless, he offers no explanation for such praises since no superior public offices or provincial commands are mentioned.[33] The reader is then left to assume that Lucilius Longus only attained prominence through his friendship with Tiberius. Tacitus even implies that Lucilius was also being thanked for aiding Tiberius in committing wrong-doings.

Tacitus presents Lucilius as one of the undeserving new men of power under the Principate. What respect he enjoyed at Rome was not gained through public service, but through private service to Tiberius. Lucilius is representative of a time when hypocrisy

---

[31]Syme (1970), 87.

[32]Tac. Ann. 4. 15: idem annus alio quoque luctu Caesarem adficit, alterum ex geminis Drusi liberis extinguendo, neque minus morte amici. is fuit Lucilius Longus, omnium illi tristium laetorumque socius unusque e senatoribus Rhodii secessus comes. ita quamquam novo homini censorium funus, effigiem apud forum Augusti publica pecunia patres decrevere

[33]Syme (1970), 87.

and flattery became a way of life.[34] Indeed Tacitus abhors the rising tide of flattery in the reigns of Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and Nero, where consuls, senators, and knights all rushed to servitude.[35] Nevertheless, Tacitus does consider possible reasons for their newly adopted behaviour, the most prevalent being the reinstitution of the maiestas law. Distinguished men were quick to protect themselves against this vague law which could see them tried for alleged seditious speeches, writings, and actions. As Levick remarks this law acted as a flexible weapon in the political game with its very wide scope.[36] In this obituary one sees that an individual can survive in this political climate only through forging an alliance with the emperor.

The obituary of P. Memmius Regulus (suff. A.D. 31) comments on the state of personal liberty under the empire. This obituary, which appears in the narrative year A.D. 62, occurs in the first year after the last digression in the narrative. It also precedes what appears to be the major turning point in Tacitus' conception of Nero's reign.[37] It reads as follows,

> Memmius Regulus died that year, renowned for his prestige, firmness, rank (to the degree that is possible when the emperor overshadows all by

---

[34]Leake, 200.

[35]Tac. Ann. 1. 1, 1. 7.

[36]B. Levick, Tiberius the Politician (London, 1976), 183. For further information of this matter see the following works of R.S. Rogers, Studies in the reign of Tiberius (Westport, 1943), Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius (Middletown, 1935), and "A Tacitean Pattern in Narrating Treason-Trials," TAPA 83 (1952), 279-311.

[37]Sage (1991), 3408.

> his status), reputation. So, when Nero was ill and the flatterers around him were declaring that the empire would be finished if anything happened to him, he replied that the state had someone who could support it. When they then asked, who in particular, he added that it was Memmius Regulus. For all that, Regulus lived on after this, defended by inactivity and because his family's fame was only recent and his wealth insufficient to attract jealousy.[38]

Tacitus includes a few of the standard 'topoi' in this obituary. The deceased's family, which was recently ennobled, was moderately wealthy. Tacitus also comments on Memmius' reputation. He was known in Roman society for his influence, dignity, and general good name. These qualities cause Tacitus to admire Memmius, a man whom he had earlier in the narrative called unassuming until provoked.[39] Moreover, Memmius enjoyed moderate success in his career and was even recognised by Nero as a benefit to Rome. This obituary, the last one which survives, marks the end of a time when a man possessing such qualities could survive in public life.[40]

Nevertheless, Tacitus alludes to the imposition on Memmius' personal liberty in the obituary as well. The greatness of his glory was restrained by the shadow of the emperor. Moreover, Tacitus notes that the admiration of Nero even poses a threat to the

---

[38]Tac. Ann. 14. 47. 1: eo anno mortem obiit Memmius Regulus, auctoritate constantia fama, in quantum praeumbrante imperatoris fastigio datur, clarus, adeo ut Nero aeger valetudine, et adulantibus circum, qui finem imperio adesse dicebant, si quid fato pateretur, responderit habere subsidium rem publicam. rogantibus dehinc in quo potissimum, addiderat in Memmio Regulo. vixit tamen post haec Regulus quiete defensus et quia nova generis claritudine neque invidiosis opibus erat.

[39]Tac. Ann. 5. 11.

[40]Martin (1981), 176.

individual's well-being. As Pomeroy remarks to have the ability to lead Rome would give an individual a sense of pride in the Republic. This is not the case in the empire where an individual is more likely to suffer imperial hostility and meet a violent end.[41] Memmius survived only because Nero was not threatened by him. Memmius was inactive. Moreover, his family and resources were too insignificant to attract envy. The obituary highlights a change where individuals decline a public career and concentrate on a private lifestyle.[42]

Conclusion

The obituary serves a useful function in the narrative. Not only is it a natural way to impose closure on events,[43] it also can emphasize important themes. Usually it appears in the end chapter of a narrative year, a position which Tacitus used to look backward to themes and episodes already narrated or to reinforce previous characterisation of individuals.[44] Indeed, the obituaries in the Annals are linked to major themes in the work. In the obituary of Germanicus, Tacitus recalls Republican sentiments. Likewise, the

---

[41]Pomeroy (1991), 202. Pomeroy interprets this comment in light of Ann. 1. 13 and the fates of the capaces imperii (Asinius Gallus, L. Arruntius, Cn. Piso, and M. Lepidus) where only one of the four men identified (Lepidus) survived to meet a natural end.

[42]Ibid, 206.

[43]Woodman and Martin, 269.

[44]Ginsburg, 46.

obituaries of Lucilius Longus and Memmius Regulus emphasize the change amongst the leading Romans under the empire. Tacitus views these individuals as representing social types and as illustrating the work's themes.[45]

---

[45]Sinclair, 9; Gingras, 256.

CHAPTER 5

TACITUS AND WOMEN: THE OBITUARIES OF JULIA MAIOR AND LIVIA

Scholars have long been fascinated by the women in Tacitus' narrative.[1] Indeed, the Annals is littered with provocative characterisations of women like Julia Maior, daughter of Augustus and his first wife Scribonia, and Livia, third wife of Augustus and mother of the emperor Tiberius. These two women are also granted obituaries by Tacitus.[2] This chapter will examine the obituaries of Julia Maior and Livia in order to broaden our understanding of Tacitus' treatment of women. The results of this study will be twofold. First, it will reveal how Tacitus overcomes the apparent obstacles in writing obituaries for women in a society where they, as MacMullen has noted, had no direct part in politics.[3] Second, it will examine how these obituaries relate to the characterisations of these women in the rest of the narrative.

An obituary for a woman presents a problem to the historian. As seen in a previous chapter, Tacitus refers to the family, age, education, public career, merits, and reputation when summarising the life of a deceased man. Indeed, Tacitus usually

---

[1]See K. Wallace, "Women in Tacitus 1903-1986," ANRW 33. 5 (1991), 3556-3574.

[2]Tacitus also gives obituaries to Vipsania (3. 19), Junia Tertulla (3. 76), and Julia Minor (4. 71).

[3]R. MacMullen, "Women's Power in the Principate," Klio 68 (1986), 436.

emphasizes deeds and reputation in particular as they can have thematic significance to the narrative as a whole. The same cannot be easily done for a Roman woman for obvious reasons and as a result the obituaries of Julia Maior and Livia show a slight adaption of this plan. The obituary of Julia Maior, which appears in the narrative year A.D. 14, reads as follows:

> In the same year Julia died, who on account of her licentiousness had long ago was driven by her father Augustus to the island Pandateria, then to the town Rhegium, which is on the Sicilian strait. She was married to Tiberius while Gaius and Lucius Caesar prospered. She regarded him as her inferior; for Tiberius this was also the real reason why he retired to Rhodes. Having obtained the throne, he left her, disgraced, and after the death of Agrippa Postumus, destitute of all hope. She died by want of means and by a slow decay, since he judged the length of her exile would obscure her death. [4]

Tacitus includes some of the traditional elements of an obituary. Julia's family is mentioned as the reader is reminded that she was the daughter of Augustus, mother of Gaius and Lucius Caesar and Agrippa Postumus, and wife of Tiberius. Her reputation in Roman society (fama) as a woman who pursued her own hedonistic life, with no regard for her obligations to her husband, children, or even father is also reported.[5] Julia Maior's scandalous behaviour is indeed most important to her portrait since Tacitus begins the

---

[4]Tac. Ann. 1. 53: Eodem anno Iulia supremum diem obiit, ob impudicitiam olim a patre Augusto Pandateria insula, mox oppido Reginorum, qui Siculum fretum accolunt, clausa. Fuerat in matrimonio Tiberii florentibus Gaio et Lucio Caesaribus spreveratque ut inparem; nec alia tam intima Tiberio causa cur Rhodum abscederet. Imperium adeptus extorrem, infamem et post interfectum Postumum Agrippam omnis spei egenam inopia ac tabe longa peremit, obscuram fore necem longinquitate exilii ratus.

[5]E. Leon, "Scribonia and her Daughters," TAPA 82 (1951), 175.

obituary with it. Her personality is even alluded to as Tacitus recalls that she snubbed Tiberius. Likewise, Tacitus provides a pseudo-record of her public career in the obituary by referring to her exile (to Pandateria and later to Rhegium), her children, and her marriage to Tiberius. Although references to marriages were common in funeral orations for women and so should not be viewed as unusual in an obituary, nonetheless they should be recognised as detailing a woman's public life.

The obituary of Livia also shows the same ingenuity. It appears at the beginning of the narrative year A.D. 29 and reads as follows:

> In the consulship of Rubellius and Fufius, both surnamed Geminus, Julia Augusta died, in extreme old age. Through the Claudian family and by adoption into the Livian and Julian families, she was a member of the most distinguished nobility. Her first marriage and children were to Tiberius Nero, who was banished in the Perusian war and who returned to the city for the peace between Sextus Pompeius and the triumvirate. Octavian, longing for her beauty, took her from her husband. Her unwillingness is unknown. His haste was so much that giving no interval for her pregnancy, he introduced her to his home. After this, she had no further children, but she had a blood connection of shared great-grandchildren with Augustus through the union of Agrippina and Germanicus. In domestic virtues she was of the old school, her courteousness went beyond that which the older women approved. An imperious mother, she was an accommodating wife and a good match to the character of her husband and the pretence of her son. Her funeral was modest, her will was long unexecuted. Her eulogy at the rostra was delivered by Gaius Caesar, her great-grandson, who was soon to occupy the throne.[6]

---

[6]Tac. Ann. 5. 1: Rubellio et Fufio consulibus, quorum utrique Geminus cognomentum erat, Iulia Augusta mortem obiit, aetate extrema, nobilitatis per Claudiam familiam et adoptione Liviorum Iuliorumque clarissimae. Primum ei matrimonium et liberi fuere cum Tiberio Nerone, qui bello Perusino profugus pace inter Sex. Pompeium ac triumviros pacta in urbem rediit. Exim Caesar cupidine formae aufert marito, incertum an invitam, adeo properus, ut ne spatio quidem ad enitendum dato penatibus suis gravidam induxerit. Nulla posthac subolem edidit, sed sanguini

Many of the standard 'topoi' are also found within this obituary. Tacitus mentions Livia's connections with the Claudian, Livian, and Julian families. He also recalls her marriages to Tiberius Claudius Nero and Augustus, which along with her family connections serve as reminders of her public persona. Tacitus also refers to her age and children. He even praises her domestic virtues as being of the old school. He further comments on her nature (ingenium) and reputation, stating that although she was an accommodating wife, she was also a domineering mother. As Pomeroy notes her domestic conduct is expected for a Roman matrona, but the description of her power and influence as mother and wife, and her interest in the future bloodline raises concerns and doubts.[7]

Women are easily included amongst the other recipients of obituaries in the Annals. Tacitus mentions such standard 'topoi' as family, age, and reputation in obituaries for women. Likewise, references to marriages and children also appear as summarizing women's public lives or careers. This interpretation is viable particularly since women like Julia Maior were used to form political alliances through their marriages. By granting these women obituaries perhaps Tacitus is recognising their importance in Roman society and is revealing that they are central to the issues of the

---

Augusti per coniunctionem Agrippinae et Germanici adnexa communis pronepotes habuit. Sanctitate domus priscum ad morem, comis ultra quam antiquis feminis probatum, mater impotens, uxor facilis et cum artibus mariti, simulatione filii bene composita. Funus eius modicum, testamentum diu inritum fuit. Laudata est pro rostris a Gaio Caesare pronepote, qui mox rerum potitus est.

[7]Pomeroy (1991), 222-23.

Annals.[8]

The obituaries of Julia Maior and Livia are also significant in understanding the roles and characterisations of these two imperial ladies in the Annals as a whole. As Viden notes these portraits intend to reveal aspects of the men in leading functions.[9] She argues also that Tacitus does not blindly include members of the imperial family but chooses them by design since Antonia Minor for example is hardly mentioned at all in the narrative. This section, therefore, will examine the contributions which the obituaries of Julia Maior and Livia make to the characterisations of Augustus and Tiberius. It will then suggest possible reasons why Livia is granted the only formal obituary to a woman in the Annals.

The obituary of Julia Maior characterises Augustus and Tiberius along similar lines. Indeed, the obituary is significant for its portrayals of both men as being stern and unwavering. Augustus appears as a strict pater familias, who (Tacitus later charges) overstepped both the mild penalties of earlier legislation and even his own legislation

---

[8]A. Marshall argues this point in his article "Women on Trial Before the Roman Senate," EMC 34 (1990), 336. He believes that women's involvement in such trials makes them more central to the interests of major literary sources. I believe the same can be said about Tacitus' obituaries of women in which he draws attention to women and reveals their important connections to the leading men of the narrative.

[9]G. Viden, "Portraits of Women in Tacitus' Annals," in Roman portraits: artistic and literary: Acts of the Third International Conference on the Roman Portraits Held in Prague and in the Bechyne Castle 25-29 September 1989, ed. J. Bouzek and I. Ondrejova, 108.

when punishing his daughter and her lovers in 2 B.C.[10] Indeed, Suetonius supports this image of Augustus. He states that Augustus was unrelenting and even ordered that his daughter was not to be buried in the family mausoleum.[11] Likewise, Tiberius is characterised negatively in Julia Maior's obituary. Tacitus stirs up the reader's sympathy for Julia by describing Tiberius' cruelty.[12] References to Gaius and Lucius Caesar and Agrippa Postumus allow Tacitus to allege that Julia Maior's death also was a result of Tiberius.[13]

The obituary of Livia also adds to the characterisations of Augustus and Tiberius. Although her obituary is traditional in its content, Tacitus adds an unusual detail.[14] Augustus appears as lustful and hasty by rushing a marriage between himself and a pregnant Livia. Nevertheless, the obituary shows Augustus content in a marriage with a very accomodating wife. Perhaps Tacitus is alluding to the rumours that Livia pandered to her husband's passion by gathering young virgins for him to deflower.[15] Tiberius'

---

[10]Tac. Ann. 3. 24. See A. Ferrill, "Augustus and his Daughter," Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II (1980), 332-346 and W. Lacey, "2 B.C. and Julia's Adultery," Antichthon 14 (1980), 127-142 for explanations of Augustus' reactions.

[11]Suet. Aug. 101.

[12]Viden (1993), 55.

[13]Suetonius (Tib. 11) gives a kinder picture of Tiberius' behaviour at this time. He states that Tiberius felt obliged to send letters to Augustus urging a reconciliation between father and daughter. Moreover, Tiberius allowed Julia to keep whatever presents she had received from him.

[14]Pomeroy (1991), 223.

[15]Suet. Aug. 71.

pretence was also well matched by Livia. Indeed, Tiberius is a man and an emperor dominated by his mother, whose cruel nature is freed from restraint after her death.[16] Moreover, the obituary touches upon Tiberius' nature. The modesty of her funeral and his absence from the funeral rites should perhaps be seen in light of Tiberius' apparent jealousy of women being given honours.[17]

Although the obituary of Livia adds to our images of Augustus and Tiberius, it also deserves consideration as a fascinating study of the woman herself. Unlike Julia Maior, Livia is introduced early to the narrative and remains a fixture in palace intrigues for the first four books of the Annals. The obituary is the sole occasion when Tacitus makes a coherent picture of Livia.[18] This section will examine how this obituary interplays with her portrayal in the preceding narrative. It will then argue that Livia is granted a formal obituary based upon her portrayal as being active and influential in imperial Rome.

The image of Livia as Augustus' wife in the obituary differs from earlier episodes. In the obituary Tacitus declares that she was an accommodating wife who was well-suited to her husband. Yet, we are told earlier that Livia had the aged Augustus firmly under control and even had urged Augustus to exile Agrippa Postumus.[19] Moreover, Tacitus

---

[16]Tac. Ann. 5. 3.

[17]Ibid, 1. 14.

[18]Viden, 106.

[19]Ibid, 1. 3.

includes the rumour that Livia forced her husband's death for fear of a reconciliation between Augustus and Agrippa Postumus.[20]

On the other hand, Tacitus is consistent with his portrait of Livia as Tiberius' mother. The obituary calls her a domineering mother (mater inpotens). On two earlier occasions Tacitus refers to Livia using the same language.[21] Indeed, when Livia is unrestrained and uncontrolled it is in order to achieve power for herself or her son.[22] Tacitus implicates her in the deaths of Gaius and Lucius Caesar (1. 3) and Agrippa Postumus (1. 6) in order to secure Tiberius' succession. Likewise, the obituary states that Livia equalled Tiberius' pretence. We are told earlier that mother and son both abstained from attending Germanicus' funeral either because they considered public mourning beneath their dignity or they feared that the public gaze would detect insincerity on their faces.[23] Tacitus again mentions Livia's pretence when recording the death of Julia Minor. Tacitus claims that Livia had laboured in the shadows to destroy her step-children while they flourished, and then showed publicly her compassion when they fell.[24]

Nevertheless the characterisation of Livia as a powerful and influential woman is consistent throughout the narrative. By calling her Julia Augusta, the solemn title which

---

[20]Ibid, 1. 5.

[21]Tac. Ann. 1. 4; 4. 57.

[22]Viden (1993), 24.

[23]Tac. Ann. 3. 3.

[24]Ibid, 4. 71.

she received in Augustus' will, and by mentioning her connections to the Claudian, Livian, and Julian families in the obituary, Tacitus emphasizes her authority and clout. Indeed, Livia's authority in Rome is shown in the text on numerous occasions as she is described as both patron and mediator.[25] Tacitus tells us that she instituted games in Augustus' honour.[26] We are even told that on the statute which she dedicated to divine Augustus her name was inscribed first followed by that of Tiberius.[27] Knights also honoured Livia by promising a gift to Equestrian Fortune for her recovery from an illness.[28] It is obvious therefore that Livia played a role in the network which bound the knights of Roman society to the elite surrounding Augustus.[29] Livia also played an important role as mediator in the Annals. Friendship with Livia can provide an individual protection or help.[30] Quintus Haterius, having appealed to Livia, was saved by her urgent entreaty.[31] We are told that Urgulania's friendship with Livia had placed her above the

---

[25]N. Purcell, "Livia and the Womanhood of Rome," PCPS (1986), 87.

[26]Tac. Ann. 1. 73.

[27]Ibid, 3. 64. Purcell (88) identifies CIL 6. 883 as further evidence of Livia's independence and self-importance as she uses her filiation before the name of her husband.

[28]Tac. Ann. 3. 71.

[29]Purcell, 87.

[30]Viden (1993), 15.

[31]Ibid, 1. 13.

law.[32] Again, Livia's private entreaties had secured Plancina a pardon in Piso's trial.[33]

There are many possible reasons why Tacitus awards Livia a formal obituary. Such an obituary amply recognises her status in Roman society as the wife of Augustus, the mother of Tiberius, and the first woman given the title "Augusta". It also adequately emphasizes her death since Tacitus regards it as the last restraint on Tiberius' cruelty. It is also appropriate in light of her characterisation as a woman who was active publicly and politically in the full male sense.[34] The portrayal of Livia as patron and mediator places her on a level with the influential men of the empire.[35] As Purcell notes, "Livia crossed the frontier which existed between the domestic and public worlds, between the affairs of state and of the family, between politics and household management, between the forum and the atrium."[36]

Tacitus uses the obituaries of Julia Maior and Livia to develop their characterisations in the Annals. Indeed, Tacitus gives the reader glimpses of their personalities. The obituaries also highlight the contributions of these imperial ladies to the narrated events by summarizing their public careers and reputations. Moreover, these portraits balance our impressions of Augustus and Tiberius since their behaviour in

---

[32]Ibid, 2. 34.

[33]Ibid, 3. 15; 3. 17.

[34]Purcell, 96.

[35]Viden (1993), 15.

[36]Purcell, 80.

private matters is also described. The obituaries of Julia Maior and Livia are indeed significant to our understanding of women in the Annals. Within a system of government which gave no woman a direct role, the underlying influence of a few women is clearly understood.

CONCLUSION

Obituaries offer a moment of reflection. At the end of an individual's life, Tacitus weighs his character and deeds; perhaps, even inserts a brief comment. This thesis has presented a multi-dimensional study specifically on the obituaries in Tacitus' Annals. Indeed, the discussion has attempted to answer five questions which would help to clarify their role as a literary device and how they are used in the narrative.

One such question is the origins or the influences of the annalistic obituary. This chapter introduced the reader to the topic of the obituary as a literary device in ancient historiography. Although the obituary is closely associated with the annalistic tradition, it is also a common feature of the historical style. Having considered how the obituary came to exist in form, content, and purpose as seen in the narratives of Livy and Tacitus, three possible influences were discussed. It was shown that the annales maximi had little impact on shaping the obituary. Instead, it was argued that the laudatio funebris and the character sketch were greater influences. Like the obituary, they both emphasize and present the individual as an example from whom the audience or reader could learn moral lessons. By discussing the nature of the obituary, it was then used as a stepping stone to examining specific aspects of the Tacitean obituaries in the Annals.

Where the obituary is placed in the Tacitean narrative was considered next. It was determined that Tacitus usually places an obituary at or near the end of a year, which

follows the traditional practice. The placement of the obituary at the end of a narrative year permits a dramatic conclusion to events by a grave sense of finality. Nonetheless, there were notable exceptions which can be justified by narrative or thematic demands. The death notice of Vipsania, for example, appears in the middle of A.D. 20 in order to create a false annalistic closure of the Germanicus episode.[1] Tacitus' approach to the placement of the obituary was also compared to other elements of the annalistic framework. It was concluded that Tacitus is less influenced by annalistic traditional content or practice than by the use he might make of them for this own purposes.[2] Indeed, the obituary allows Tacitus to be selective in choosing what material to record.

The composition of the obituaries was then queried. By comparing Tacitus' comments regarding P. Sulpicius Quirinius, L. Calpurnius Piso, and the emperor Tiberius it was found that typically the deceased's family, training and education, public career, achievements, and reputation are mentioned. These findings then led us to consider rhetoric's influence over the obituary's composition. These Tacitean comments are strikingly similar to those 'topoi' found on the lists of Quintilian and Cicero for laudatory oratory. It is possible that Tacitus relied on his rhetorical training (however slightly) in writing these obituaries since they do serve thematic and narrative purposes in the Annals. It was also found that Tacitus varies the length and detail of the obituaries. This scheme affords Tacitus a level of flexibility and discretion in emphasizing the death of

---

[1]Gingras, 244.

[2]Ginsburg, 39.

key individuals while also noting the deaths of secondary figures to great effect.

How Tacitus uses the obituaries to advance themes in the Annals was the fourth question. As Syme noted Tacitus wanted to reflect on the period in Roman history when matters were not as dynastic and monarchic.[3] Indeed, this chapter determined that Tacitus uses some obituaries to convey specific political beliefs. The obituary of Germanicus is an obvious example. Here, Tacitus' nostalgia for the Republic and his portrayal of Germanicus culminate to form an obituary which marks not only the death of the man but also the end of the Republic. Likewise, Tacitus uses the obituaries of Lucilius Longus and Memmius Regulus to criticise the political atmosphere in Imperial Rome where men rise in authority through friendship with the emperor and where men avoid a public career for fear of attracting the emperor's jealousy.

Lastly, the obituaries of women were considered. First, these obituaries were compared to those of men and it was discovered that Tacitus uses the same 'topoi' in both cases. However, he replaces references to marriages and children for lists of offices held and achievements of the deceased. This change presented an alternative cursus honorum for a lady. This chapter also showed that the obituaries of Julia Maior and Livia are related to their own characterisations in the rest of the narrative and those of Augustus and Tiberius. Julia Maior is remembered foremost as the adulterous child of Augustus. The obituary of Livia, however, re-affirms her portrayal as a politically active and

---

[3]Syme (1970), 81.

powerful woman. It was suggested that it is for this reason that Livia is given an obituary, which is similar to those received by some men. Tacitus also uses these obituaries to complement his portraits of Augustus and Tiberius. Moreover, the portraits of these imperial ladies acknowledge their contributions to the narrated events.

This thesis has clarified the obituary's use as a literary device, and has analysed its prosopographic and thematic elements in the Annals. The obituary is a valuable device which can unite the annalistic narrative into a collective whole. This thesis also has wider implications for our understanding, perhaps of the modern-day obituaries which appear in newspapers, but definitely of the historian's style at its most developed, most individualistic, most concentrated, and most Tacitean.[4] First, Tacitus' approach and adherence to the annalistic framework is better understood by examining how he treats these obituaries. Second, it shows Tacitus to be a keen observer of the human psyche.

---

[4]Lofstedt, 158.

APPPENDIX A: THE LIVIAN OBITUARIES

Ref.	Year (B.C.)	Position in Narrative Yr.	Deceased	Details
1. 15	c. 750	end	Romulus	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
1. 48	c. 530	end	Servius Tullius	length of reign, ingenium, political intentions of deceased.
2. 16	503	beginning	Publius Valerius	ingenium, financial resources.
2. 33	493	end	Menenius Agrippa	ingenium, cursus honorum, financial resources.
6. 20	384	near end	Manlius Capitolinus ingenium,	manner of death, punishments.
7. 1	366-365	end	Marcus Furius	age, ingenium, brief cursus honorum.
30. 26	202	penultimate	Fabius Cunctator	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
33. 21	197	end	King Attalus	age, length of reign, ingenium, brief cursus honorum.
38. 53	187	middle	Scipio Africanus honorum.	ingenium, cursus

APPENDIX B: THE TACITEAN OBITUARIES

Ref.	Year (A.D.)	Position in Narrative Yr.	Deceased	Details
1. 53	14	penultimate	Julia Maior	genealogy, cursus honorum
2. 73	19	middle	Germanicus	age, genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
2. 88	19	end	Arminius	age, cursus honorum, ingenium.
3. 19	20	middle	Vipsania	genealogy, brief note on death.
3. 30	20	end	L.Volusius Saturninus	genealogy, cursus honorum.
			Sallustius Crispus	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
3. 48	21	penultimate	P. Sulpicius Quirinus	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
3. 75	22	penultimate	Asinius Saloninus	genealogy, ingenium.
			C. Ateius Capito	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
3. 76	22	end	Junia Tertulla	age, genealogy.
4. 15	23	penultimate	Lucilius Longus	cursus honorum, genealogy.

Ref.	Year (A.D.)	Position in Narrative Yr.	Deceased	Details
4. 44	25	penultimate	C. Cornelius Lentulus	genealogy, cursus honorum.
			Domitius Ahenobarbus	genealogy, cursus honorum.
			Lucius Antoninus	genealogy.
4. 61	26	end	Asinius Agrippa	family history (brief).
			Quintus Haterius	comment on career.
4. 71	28	near end	Julia Minor	genealogy, cursus honorum.
5.1	29	beginning	Julia Augusta (Livia)	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
6. 10	32	near end	Lucius Piso	age, cursus honorum.
6. 27	33	penultimate	Aelius Lamia	genealogy, cursus honorum.
			Flaccus Pomponius	cursus honorum.
			Manius Lepidus	genealogy.
6. 39	35	end	Poppaeus Sabinus	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
6. 51	37	end	Tiberius	age, genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
11. 21	47	near end	Curtius Rufus	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
13. 30	56	end	Caninius Rebilus	cursus honorum, means of death.

Ref.	Year (A.D.)	Position in Narrative Yr.	Deceased	Details
			L. Volusius Saturninus	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.
14. 19	59	end	Cn. Domitius Afer	cursus honorum, ingenium.
			M. Servilius Nonianus	cursus honorum, ingenium.
14. 47	61	near end	P. Memmius Regulus	genealogy, cursus honorum, ingenium.

explanatory notes (Cambridge, 1928).

Fairweather, J., Seneca the Elder (Cambridge, 1981).

Fisher,W., "Rationality and the Logic of Good Reason," Philosophy and Rhetoric 13 (1980), 121-129.

Galletier, E., Etude sur la poesie funeraire Romaine d'apres les inscriptions (Paris, 1922).

Garson, R., "Observations on the Death scenes in Tacitus' Annals," Prudentia 4 (1974), 23-32.

Gill, C., "The Question of Character-Development: Plutarch and Tacitus," CQ 33 (1983), 469-487.

Gingras, M-T., "Annalistic Format, Tacitean Themes and the obituaries of Annals 3," CJ 87 (1992), 241-256.

Ginsburg, J., Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus (New York, 1981).

Griffin, M., "Tacitus, Tiberius and the Principate," in Leaders and Masses in the Roman World in honour of Zvi Yavetz, ed. I. Malkin and Z. Rubinsohn (New York, 1995), 33-57.

Helm, R., ed. Eusebius Werke: Chronik des Hieronymus (Berlin, 1984).

Hine, H., "Livy's Judgement on Marius (Seneca, Natural Questions 5. 18. 4; Livy, Periocha 80)," LCM 3 (1978), 83-88.

Kaplan, M., "Agrippina semper atrox: a study in Tacitus' characterisation of Women," in Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History, ed. Carl Deroux (Brussels, 1979), 410-417.

Kehoe, D., "Tacitus and Sallustius Crispus," CJ 80 (1985), 247-54.

Keitel, E., "Tacitus on the Deaths of Tiberius and Claudius," Hermes 109 (1981), 206-14.

Kennedy, G., Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times (North Carolina, 1980).

--------, Quintilian (New York, 1969).

Leake, S., "Tacitus' Teaching and the Decline of Liberty at Rome," Interpretation 15 (1987), 195-308.

Leeman, A., Orationis Ratio 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1963).

Leon, E., "Scribonia and her Daughters," TAPA 82 (1951), 168-175.

Levick, B., "Atrox Fortuna," CR 309-311.

Lofstedt, E., Roman Literary Portraits (Oxford, 1958).

MacCormack, S., "Latin Prose Panegyrics," in Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II, ed. T.A. Dorey (London, 1975), 143-205.

MacMullen, R., "Women's Power in the Principate," Klio 68 (1986), 434-443.

Marshall, A., "Tacitus and the Governor's Lady: a note on Annals 3. 33-4," GandR 22 (1975), 11-18.

Martin, R., "Structure and Interpretation in the Annals of Tacitus," ANRW 33. 2 (1990), 1500-1581.

--------, Tacitus (London, 1989).

Martha, C., Etudes Morale sur l'Antiquite (Paris, 1883).

McCulloch Jr., H., Narrative Cause in the Annals of Tacitus (Konigstein, 1984).

McDonald, A., "The Style of Livy," JRS 47 (1957), 155-172.

Mellor, R., ed. The Historians of Ancient Rome (New York, 1998).

Mendell, C., Tacitus: the man and his work (London, 1957).

Moore, F., "Annalistic Method as Related to the Books Divisions in Tacitus," Transactions of the APA (1923), 5-20.

Ochs, D., Consolatory Rhetoric (South Carolina, 1993).

Pelling, C., "Tacitus and Germanicus," in Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition, ed. T. Luce and A.Woodman (Princeton, 1993), 59-85.

Pelling, C., "Tacitus and Germanicus," in Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition, ed. T. Luce and A.Woodman (Princeton, 1993), 59-85.

Pomeroy, A., The Appropriate Comment (New York, 1991).

--------, "Seneca on Death Notices," Mnemosyne 42 (1989),102-107.

Purcell, N., "Livia and the Womanhood of Rome," PCPS (1986), 78-105.

Rawson, E., "The First Latin Annalists," Latomus 35 (1976), 689-717.

Rogers, R., "The Deaths of Julia and Gracchus A.D. 14," TAPhA 98 (1967), 383-390.

Rutland, L., "The Tacitean Germanicus: suggestions for a re-evaluation," RhM 130 (1987), 153-164.

--------, "Women as Makers of Kings in Tacitus' Annals," CW 72 (1978-79), 15-29.

Sage, M., "The Treatment in Tacitus of Roman Republican History and Antiquarian Matters," ANRW 33.5 (1991), 3385-3419.

--------, "Tacitus' Historical Works: a survey and appraisal," ANRW 33. 2 (1990), 851-1030.

Scanlon, T., The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust (Heidelberg, 1980).

Schwabe, L., Teuffel's History of Roman literature (London, 1891).

Stuart, D., Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography (Berkeley, 1928).

Swan, P., "Cassius Dio on Augustus: a poverty of annalistic sources?" Phoenix 41 (1987), 272-291.

Syme, R., The Augustan Aristocracy (Oxford, 1986).

--------, Ten studies in Tacitus (Oxford, 1970).

--------, The Roman Revolution (Oxford, 1960).

--------, Tacitus (Oxford, 1958).

Tanner, R., "Tacitus and the Principate," GandR 16 (1969), 95-99.

Viden, G., "Portraits of Women in Tacitus' Annals," in Roman Portraits: artistic and literary: Acts of the Third International Conference on the Roman Portraits Held in Prague and in the Bechyne Castle 25-29 September 1989, edited by J. Bouzek and I. Ondrejova, 106-108. Mainz, 1997.

--------, Women in roman literature: attitudes of authors under the early empire (Vastervik, 1993).

von Rohden, P., "Arminius," RE 2.1 (1895), 1190-1200.

Walker, B., The Annals of Tacitus: a study in the writing of history (Manchester, 1952).

Whately, R., Elements of Rhetoric (Oxford, 1832).

Williams, B., "Reading Tacitus' Tiberian Annals," Ramus 18 (1989), 140-163.

Woodman, A., "Tacitus' Obituary of Tiberius," CQ 39 (1989), 197-205.

--------, Rhetoric in Classical Historiography (Portland, 1988).

--------, "Remarks on Tacitus, Annals 4. 57-67," CQ 22 (1972), 57-67.

Woodman, A., and R. Martin, The Annals of Tacitus Book Three (Cambridge, 1996).