Writing and Empire in Tacitus examines how Tacitus’ historiographical career serves as an argument about his personal autonomy and social value under the peculiar political conditions of the early Roman empire. Following the arc of his career from Agricola through Histories to Annals, this book focuses on ways in which Tacitus’ writing makes implicit claims about his relationship to Roman society and about the political consequentiality of historical writing. In a sense, this book suggests, his literary career and the sense of alienation his works project form the ideal complement to his very successful political career, which, while desirable, might nonetheless give the impression of degrading submission to emperors. The discussion combines careful attention to the historian’s explicit programmatic discussion of his work with larger-scale analysis of stretches of narrative that have unspoken but significant implications for how we view the function and importance of Tacitus’ work.
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Abbreviations and editions used

For the text of Tacitus’ minor works I have followed the Oxford Classical Text of Ogilvie and Winterbottom; for Histories and Annals, Heubner’s Teubner editions. For the following authors who appear often in the book, I have used these editions: for Sallust, Reynolds’ OCT; for the elder Seneca, Håkanson’s Teubner; for the younger Seneca’s Dialogues, Reynolds’ OCT; for the younger Pliny’s Letters and “Panegyricus,” the OCTs of Mynors; for Suetonius’ Lives, Ihm’s Teubner. For abbreviations of ancient authors and works, I follow LSJ and the OLD; for modern periodicals, I use those of L’Année Philologique. Here is a list of other abbreviations I use:

CIL Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (1863–) Berlin.
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