A. J. WOODMAN

Introduction

In the year 17 the Cheruscan chief Arminius, revered as a founding figure by Germans of later ages and commemorated in the nineteenth century by massive monuments in the Teutoburg Forest and Minnesota,[1] was engaged in exchanging insults with his rival, Maroboduus. This, at least, is what we are told by Tacitus, who says that Arminius called Maroboduus 'a fugitive and inexperienced in battle, one who had been protected by his lair in Hercynia … and was a betrayer of his fatherland and a satellite of the Roman emperor' (*A.* 2.45.3):

> fugacem Maroboduum appellans, proeliorum expertem, Hercyniae latebris defensum, … proditorem patriae, satellitem Caesaris.

Although Tacitus has told us earlier that Arminius had formerly been a soldier in the Roman army and could speak Latin (2.10.3), it seems unlikely that a German warrior would be so familiar with Virgil's *Georgics* that he was able to describe Maroboduus in the same terms as Virgil had used to describe a skulking snake (3.544–5 'frustra *defensa latebris* | uipera', 'the viper vainly protected by its lair'). Of course verisimilitude is not to be expected from the speeches of barbarians portrayed in Latin historical texts: when a chief of the Britons says 'where they make a desert, they call it peace' (*Agr.* 30.5 'ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant'), he alludes to a speech in Book 8 of Livy, an allusion no doubt undetected by the majority of the modern politicians whose repetition of Tacitus' statement has turned it into one of the most high-profile quotations of the age.[2] But Arminius'

For their comments on an earlier draft of this Introduction I am most grateful to A. Chahoud, C.S. Kraus, D.S. Levene, R.H. Martin and S.P. Oakley. All dates are AD unless stated otherwise.

[1] See Schama (1995) 100–20, Ash (2006a) 117–47.

[2] Cf. Liv. 8.13.14–15 'As far as the Latins are concerned, you can procure peace for yourselves in perpetuity either by savagery or by forgiveness … You may destroy the whole of Latium and make of it vast deserts [*solitudines facere*] …' (the speaker is L. Furius Camillus, cos. 338 BC). An internet search will reveal the popularity of the quotation

allusion to Virgil constitutes an interesting challenge to Tacitus' readers: on the assumption that readers recognise – and are intended to recognise – the allusion, which comes from the memorable description of the plague at the end of *Georgics* 3, they are invited to supply for themselves the information which Tacitus has omitted, namely, that the description is that of a viper. Now it is noteworthy that Velleius Paterculus, a historian contemporary with Arminius and Maroboduus, explicitly likens Maroboduus to a snake (129.3): 'Maroboduum inhaerentem occupati regni finibus ... uelut serpentem abstrusam terra' ('Maroboduus, clinging to the borders of his occupied kingdom ... like a snake concealed in the ground'). Since snakes are reasonably common as terms of abuse,[3] this may be simply coincidence; but it is worth asking whether the three texts illustrate some more complicated historiographical phenomenon.

It has often been stated that Tacitus, given his disaffected attitude towards the emperor Tiberius, will have taken no notice of a historian such as Velleius,[4] who had served as a soldier under Tiberius and whose admiration for his former general is considerable. A few chapters earlier in Book 2, however, Tacitus tells the story of a slave who in 16 tried to rescue his master – Agrippa Postumus, Augustus' grandson – from exile (2.39.1). The attempt was thwarted because Agrippa had already been killed two years before, so the slave 'turned to greater and more headlong schemes' (2.39.2 'ad maiora et magis praecipitia conuersus'): travelling to Etruria, he decided to impersonate his dead master. The expression with which Tacitus describes the false Agrippa Postumus is almost identical to that with which Velleius had described the *real* Agrippa Postumus at the time of his exile in 7 (112.7 'in *praecipitia conuersus*'). Since the expression is otherwise unparalleled, the almost inevitable conclusion seems to be that Tacitus, in describing the antics of the slave, has alluded to Velleius' description of the man whom the slave was impersonating.

with politicians, one of the most recent examples being Fouad Siniora, the prime minister of Lebanon (July 2006); for some others from the past forty years see Benario (2007) 66. After the Germans invaded Poland in 1939, the British dropped nearly 850,000 leaflets over Germany in the following spring that read, 'Sie verwüsten ganze Länder und nennen es Frieden' ('You lay waste whole countries and call it peace'). (Ironically, Tacitus' words are part of a longer and more complicated sentence and they become quotable only at the cost of being wrenched from their original context: see e.g. Ogilvie and Richmond (1967) on 30.5 *falsis nominibus*.)

[3] See e.g. *OLD uipera* b.
[4] Velleius was 'ignored by all subsequent historians' (Martin (1981) 202). His very existence was denied by Syme (1958a) 358 ('The Roman historians subsequent to Livy have perished utterly'), who omitted him from his survey of 'history at Rome' (140–1). Twenty years later Syme (1978b) attacked 'mendacity in Velleius' (= (1984) 1090–1104). See also below, pp. 24–6.

Introduction

If modern historians were to set about writing the history of (say) the Tudor age, they would be expected to include surviving contemporary accounts amongst their source material. But it is clear that Tacitus, though having read Velleius, has not used his work straightforwardly as a source: by alluding to Velleius' description of the real Agrippa he has either underlined the falsity of the fake Agrippa or he has 'colluded' in the construction of the man's false identity. However we interpret the allusion, Tacitus is involved in a literary procedure rather than one that we would categorise as 'historical'. Such involvement is endemic in the tradition of Latin historical writing. In the preface to his history of the Second Punic War, for example, L. Coelius Antipater (fl. 120–110 BC) evidently discussed the rhythm of his sentences (Cic. *Orat*. 229–30). It is inconceivable that such a discussion should be found in the preface to a modern work of history, but it gives some indication of the intellectual world in which Latin historians operated.[5]

When Tacitus returns to Maroboduus later in Book 2 of the *Annals*, the now worsted chief has been begging for aid from Tiberius himself (2.63.2–3):

> responsum a Caesare tutam ei honoratamque sedem in Italia fore, si maneret; sin rebus eius aliud conduceret, abiturum fide qua uenisset. ceterum apud senatum disseruit non Philippum Atheniensibus, non Pyrrhum aut Antiochum populo Romano perinde metuendos fuisse. extat oratio qua magnitudinem uiri, uiolentiam subiectarum ei gentium et quam propinquus Italiae hostis, suaque in destruendo eo consilia extulit.

> The reply from Caesar was that there would be a safe and honourable abode for him in Italy if he were to remain there; but, if something else suited his affairs, he could depart with the same trust as he had come. Yet before the senate he said that Philip had not been a source of such dread to the Athenians, nor Pyrrhus or Antiochus to the Roman people. There survives the speech in which he emphasised the greatness of the man, the violence of the races subject to him, how close to Italy he had been as an enemy, and his own plans in his destruction.

Maroboduus went into exile at Ravenna in accordance with the terms of Tiberius' offer, about which Velleius exclaims as follows (129.3): 'how he confines him, honourably yet securely!' ('quam illum ut *honorate* ita *secure* continet!'). *continet* continues the metaphor of Maroboduus as a snake,[6] but *honorate* and *secure* comprise exactly the same combination of ideas (in one case expressed by the very same word) as Tacitus' *tutam … honoratamque*.

---

[5] Similar issues arise with the *Germania*: see below, Chapter 4.
[6] For *continere* used of animals and the like cf. Cic. *Phil*. 13.5; Columella, *Rust*. 7.3.25; Sen. *Dial*. 5.40.2; Plin. *Ep*. 9.25.3; Amm. Marc. 24.5.2.

3

How is this similarity to be explained? It is possible that Tacitus is again alluding to Velleius, as in the earlier episode concerning Agrippa Postumus. Yet the two Tacitean passages are not quite of the same order, since at 2.63.2–3 Tacitus is representing a speech of Tiberius. An alternative possibility is therefore that Tacitus read in the senatorial archives (*acta senatus*) a speech that the contemporary Velleius, as a senator and former praetor, heard in the senate from Tiberius' own lips. The difficulty with this hypothesis is that, as is well known, there is only one reference in the whole of the *Annals* to Tacitus' consultation of the *acta*, and that in a very late book (15.74.3): he gives us no hint that he is using the *acta* here in Book 2. It will be noticed, however, that Tacitus discloses that Tiberius' speech on Maroboduus was extant. The natural inference from this disclosure is that the extant copy of the speech was different from the one in the senatorial archives: on the one hand, it would be superfluous to remark on the survival of an archival speech, since the preservation of the *acta senatus* was taken for granted; on the other hand, given that Tacitus evidently wanted to allude to his source at this point, it would be perverse of him not to refer to the *acta* explicitly if that were the basis of his information.[7] It thus seems that Tiberius' speech on Maroboduus had been published, and the strong implication is that Tacitus had read the speech.

The most likely conclusion is, therefore, that Velleius and Tacitus are alluding to the same imperial speech on Maroboduus: Velleius as a senator perhaps heard it being delivered in the senate, while Tacitus read the published version of it roughly a century later. And – to return to the question with which we began – it is clearly possible that the same Tiberian speech lies behind Maroboduus' metaphorical description as a snake by both Velleius and Tacitus; the difference between the two authors is that in Tacitus the metaphor has been transferred to the mouth of Maroboduus' rival, Arminius, and requires to be elicited from an allusion to Virgil's *Georgics*.[8] These three passages from Book 2 of the *Annals* give some idea of the textual complexity which lies behind the work but which is often irrecoverable for lack of evidence.

A further passage relating to Arminius raises a rather different issue. In a famous and evocative passage from *Annals* 1 Germanicus, nephew and adopted son of the emperor Tiberius, visits the site where Arminius had ambushed and destroyed three Roman legions six years earlier in AD 9 (1.61.2): 'medio

---

[7] Suetonius has a very similar statement (*Tib.* 28 *extat … sermo eius*) which, as remarked by Goodyear (1981) 185, 'seems a rather odd way of referring to the *acta*'.

[8] The examples of Tiberian vocabulary in the *Annals* proposed by Miller (1968) have been countered on largely methodological grounds by Wharton (1997), who nevertheless acknowledges that Tiberian vocabulary may exist.

4

Introduction

campi albentia ossa' ('in the middle of the plain there were whitening bones'). Here Tacitus has combined an allusion to Book 9 of the *Aeneid* (230 '*castrorum* et *campi medio*', 'in the middle of the camp and plain') with another to Book 12 (36 '*campi*que … *ossibus albent*', 'and the plains … were white with bones').[9] Now it is highly unlikely that Tacitus had any evidence for whitening bones discovered in the middle of a German field a century before he was writing; to give substance to his narrative, he has simply incorporated an apparently factual detail that in reality is taken from Virgil.[10] If we compare this example with that of the fake Agrippa Postumus in Book 2, we see that we are presented with a paradox. Velleius, whom Tacitus might have been expected to use as a historical source, is alluded to for seemingly literary purposes, whereas Virgil, to whom Tacitus might have been expected to allude for literary purposes, is instead used as a 'source' to provide factual detail. This is perhaps surprising if one has been accustomed to drawing a clear distinction between 'using *x* as a source' and 'making an allusion to *y*', the former being the kind of language traditionally associated with the scholarly approach to historical texts (*Quellenforschung* or source-research), the latter being usually reserved for the literary discussion of poetry.[11]

The subject of literary allusion is variously contentious. Regardless of the terminology used to refer to the phenomenon,[12] the scholarly reader's first task is to decide what constitutes an intertextual relationship. Though it may sometimes be possible to argue on the basis of a general similarity of thought that a relationship exists between given passages, the argument is considerably strengthened if one can point to similarities of language or expression. When Germanicus sets sail upon the Ocean in 16, he first encounters a calm sea, 'placidum aequor' (*A.* 2.23.2). This same phrase occurs twice in the *Aeneid* (8.96; 10.103) and, when hail starts to pour down a few moments later, 'effusa grando', we might begin to suspect a patterning of Virgilian allusion (cf. *Aen.* 10.803 'uelut *effusa* … *grandine* nimbi'); but, since the former phrase appears also in Propertius (1.8a.20) and Manilius (4.285), perhaps the most one can say is that it is 'poetic'.[13] Before setting off on his

---

[9] The former phrase was also reproduced by Sil. 9.271 'campi medio'; the latter was imitated also by Ovid, *Fast.* 1.558, 3.708 and Sen. *Oed.* 94, but none of the passages has *campi*.

[10] For such 'substantive imitation' see Woodman (1979) 148 (= (1998) 76–7). For another possible example, also German, see below (p. 60) on *G.* 17.1 ~ *Aen.* 3.594, with the note of Horsfall (2006) on the latter passage.

[11] Thus the subject of Hinds (1998) is exclusively poetry.

[12] Among the various related terms are echo, imitation, influence, intertextuality, parallel, reception, reference and reminiscence: for some of these see e.g. Russell (1979), Wills (1996) and Hinds (1998).

[13] *placidus* had been used of water since Ennius (*Ann.* 377 'placidum mare') but seems more common in verse than prose (*TLL* 10.1.2281.9–28).

journey, Germanicus had set up a victory trophy with an inscription which, says Tacitus, began as follows (2.22.1): 'debellatis inter Rhenum Albimque nationibus' ('the nations between Rhine and Elbe having been defeated'). The ablative absolute looks innocent enough at first glance, but Tacitus has described the inscription itself as 'haughty' ('superbo cum titulo'). The conjunction of terms will remind some readers of the famous mission urged upon Aeneas by his father Anchises (*Aen.* 6.853): 'parcere subiectis et *debellare superbos*' ('spare your subjects and defeat the haughty'). It would be typical of Tacitus to suggest that, while Germanicus is indeed inflicting defeats, the values incorporated in the Romans' destiny are being perverted; but is the conjunction of terms – which seem not to be conjoined by any other Latin author – sufficient to constitute an allusion?[14] When Germanicus is in the middle of his maritime journey, his encounter with the hailstorm takes place in what 'is believed to be the ultimate sea' (2.24.1). The Latin phrase is *nouissimum … mare*, the very same as that which, in its Greek equivalent (καινὴν☐θάλασσαν), Germanicus himself used in a speech in Egypt a couple of years later.[15] It would be remarkable (and extremely ironic) if Tacitus were here using Germanicus' own words, rather in the way that he alludes to Tiberius' speech on Maroboduus later in this same book, but he uses the expression *nou(issim)um mare* elsewhere (*Agr.* 10.4) and it had appeared earlier also in Catullus (4.23–4; 66.45) and Seneca (*Q Nat.* 3.29.7). In this short passage from Book 2 of the *Annals*, therefore, chosen more or less at random, we have considered four examples of verbal similarity: comparative evidence denies the status of allusion to two of them, and we are left with one probable and one possible allusion to the *Aeneid* (respectively 10.803 and 6.853).

The relationship between Tacitus and Virgil, which many scholars have explored, has proved controversial. To continue with Book 2 of the *Annals*, Tiberius at the start of the narrative is trying to extract Germanicus from his campaigns on the German frontier and to bring him back to Rome; but, 'the keener his soldiers' enthusiasm towards him, and his uncle's will opposed' ('et auersa patrui uoluntas'), the more determined was Germanicus to conclude a speedy victory (2.5.2). Goodyear in his commentary first acknowledges reluctantly that 'perhaps the closest precedent' is *Aen.* 12.647 'quoniam superis *auersa uoluntas*', but he then adds that 'obligation to Vergil is not certain'.[16] However, given that the expression occurs in no other text

---

[14] An allusion is implied by Baxter (1972) 263, though he makes no comment on the uniqueness of the terms.

[15] *P Oxy.* 2345 recto, line 16 (text conveniently available in Goodyear (1981) 458). Of course καινή is here equivalent to *nouus* in its sense of 'new'.

[16] Goodyear (1981) 200.

6

and that Tacitus undeniably imitates Virgilian phraseology on numerous
other occasions, perhaps Goodyear was being too sceptical. Nevertheless, if
we admit that the passages are related, what are we to make of the parallel?
Perhaps this is simply a case of linguistic enhancement, in the same way as
Agricola's early life, as described by his son-in-law, is embellished by a suc-
cession of Ciceronian phrases (*Agr.* 4.2–3): *bonam integramque* (*Mur.* 14,
79; *Clu.* 124; *Planc.* 15); *magnae excelsaeque* (*Mur.* 60; *Inv. rhet.* 2.163; *Off.*
1.81; 2.37; 3.24; *Fam.* 1.9.22; 12.25.5); *speciem gloriae* (*Fam.* 10.12.5);[17]
uehementius … caute (*Orat.* 228); *mitigauit … aetas* (*Mur.* 65; *Cael.* 77);
retinuit … modum (*Off.* 1.104). This would certainly be the position of
Goodyear, who elsewhere states it as a general rule that, 'when Tacitus quite
clearly uses phrases from Vergil, he does so primarily to enhance his expres-
sion, not to suggest the circumstances in which these phrases originally
occurred'.[18] In the present case Goodyear does indeed declare an allusion
to be 'highly improbable'; but other modern scholars have been tempted
to see more behind Tacitus' Virgilian phraseology than a simple parallel-
ism of language, and it would be in keeping with Tacitean cynicism if by
means of this parallel the *princeps*, famous for his rejection of divine hon-
ours, were being equated with the gods (*superis*). If Tiberius is equivalent to
the gods, however, it would follow that Germanicus is being equated with
Turnus, and this conclusion, though embraced by some, is difficult: for, if
Germanicus is to be identified with any Virgilian figure, that figure is usually
said to be Aeneas.[19]

   Tacitus' historical narratives can be as intertextually dense as the verses
of many a Latin poet and, no matter what side we take in the debate over
his deployment of Virgilian language, the very existence of that debate indi-
cates that 'literariness' is fundamental to the nature of his narrative. But,
just as Virgil derived narrative material from the texts to which he alluded,
so we have seen that the same is true of Tacitus; the problem in the latter
case is that we usually have difficulty in identifying the texts in question. In
the *Histories* Tacitus refers once to Sisenna (3.51.2), but a first-century BC
historian does not constitute authentic information for the events of 69: no
doubt Tacitus – on the assumption that he has not simply taken over a ref-
erence from his immediate source – was inquisitive for analogies with the
civil war about which he himself was writing; perhaps too he was attracted
to Sisenna's mannered word-order and unusual diction.[20] Elsewhere in the
Histories he refers to Vipstanus Messalla and the elder Pliny (3.25.2, 28),

[17] This example is mentioned by Heubner (1984) ad loc.
[18] Goodyear (1972) 325.
[19] Savage (1938–9) and (1942–3).
[20] His diction is usefully summarised by Briscoe (2005) 70–1.

but, apart from the conventional allusions to nameless *auctores* and the like, these are the only references in a narrative of roughly two hundred pages. He frequently shares similarities of expression with his contemporaries, Suetonius and Plutarch, when they are describing the same points of the same stories; these similarities have been used to support the argument that all three writers depended on a common source.[21] More sources are named in the *Annals*, as one might expect of a much longer work, and there is a flurry of names at 13.20.2: Fabius Rusticus, the elder Pliny and Cluvius Rufus.[22] Tacitus then continues: 'for myself, with my intention of following an authorial consensus, I shall transmit under their own names any diverging accounts they have handed on' ('nos consensum auctorum secuturi, quae diuersa prodiderint, sub nominibus ipsorum trademus'). Since Tacitus' reference to 'following an authorial consensus' constitutes a statement of intent (*secuturi*), it has been taken by scholars to apply to the *Annals* as a whole; but, if that is correct, his statement is at odds with the priority that scholars often assign to his use of the *acta senatus*.[23]

At the end of Book 2 of the *Annals* there is a tantalising passage in which Tacitus refers explicitly to his consultation of sources (2.88.1):

> reperio apud scriptores senatoresque eorundem temporum Adgandestrii principis Chattorum lectas in senatu litteras quibus mortem Arminii promittebat, si patrandae neci uenenum mitteretur ...

> I discover among writers and senators of those same times that a letter of Adgandestrius, princeps of the Chatti, was read out in the senate, in which he promised Arminius' death if poison for accomplishing the execution were sent to him.

Unfortunately the text and interpretation of this passage are uncertain.[24] Some readers think that *scriptores senatoresque* is a hendiadys, 'senatorial writers', but nowhere else in Latin literature are historians identified as senators. Others think that Tacitus is referring to two separate groups, but, if that is the case, *apud* combines oddly with *senatores*, since *apud senatores* should mean 'in the presence of the senators' (as Cic. *Verr.* 5.150, 171). Since an additional difficulty is that 'Adgandestrius' is said to be an implausible German name, various scholars have attempted to emend the text. Thus Goodyear in his commentary proposes: 'apud scriptores senatoriaque

---

[21] In the case of *H*. 1 the parallels are clearly set out by Damon (2003) 291–302.

[22] These three authors, along with the other first-century AD historians whose works have survived only in fragments, will be discussed fully in Cornell *et al.* (forthcoming). See also below, pp. 26–8.

[23] In support of the *acta senatus* see esp. Syme (1984) 1014–42; (1988) 199–222; Talbert (1984) 326–34. See also below, pp. 177–81.

[24] See Goodyear (1981) 445–6.

8

Introduction

eorundem temporum acta Gandestrii …' ('among the writers and senatorial records of those same times …'). This emendation, modifying an earlier suggestion by Mommsen, would, if correct, have the striking consequence of introducing into the text a second acknowledgement by Tacitus that he had consulted the senatorial archives. For that very reason the emendation deserves careful consideration;[25] but how likely is it to be correct? There are three main problems. Although *apud* regularly governs a personal noun to mean 'in the work of', it is not until later Latin that it is found governing a noun referring to the work itself as opposed to its author:[26] hence *apud senatoria acta* is unlikely Latinity. Second, although Tacitus characteristically varies or avoids technical or official expressions (including those for official publications), the phrase *senatoria acta* is itself unparalleled anywhere. Third, although Roman historians will draw attention to the fact that they are relying on a contemporary author,[27] the senatorial archives were by definition contemporary documents: hence *eorundem temporum* makes good sense with *scriptores* but is quite redundant with *senatoria … acta*. For these reasons it seems unlikely that Goodyear's proposal is correct: thus it remains the case that Tacitus' only reference to his consultation of the *acta senatus* is at 15.74.3.

The relationship between Tacitus and his sources has been much discussed in the wake of the discovery and publication of the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*.[28] Most scholars believe that Tacitus' account of Germanicus' last days and Piso's subsequent trial reveals a knowledge of the contents of the inscription, but how did he come by that knowledge? Despite the fact that the inscription gives an utterly different date for the trial (10 December 20) from that which scholars had inferred from Tacitus (before 28 May 20), the general belief is that Tacitus consulted the copy of the *senatus consultum* deposited with the *acta senatus* and that the *acta* provided him with some of the information which appears in his narrative but which is not to be found in the inscription itself.[29] Yet whether this is the case is uncertain. The sources he actually mentions in the course of his narrative of Germanicus and Piso are earlier historians, the *acta diurna*[30] and oral testimony: *A*. 3.3.2 'non apud auctores rerum,

[25] It has been supported recently by DeRousse (2007); interestingly, Syme (1988) 212–13 argued against it.

[26] See *TLL* 2.338.20–6 (first in Apuleius). Goodyear acknowledged 'the strain on *apud*'.

[27] So again at *A*. 5.9.2 'temporis eius auctores'; 12.67.1 'temporum illorum scriptores'; 13.17.2 'plerique eorum temporum scriptores'; see Marincola (1997) 281–2.

[28] Eck *et al.* (1996).

[29] See e.g. Griffin below (pp. 177–80).

[30] The *acta diurna* seems to have been a gazette that included stories of charioteers, dogs, miraculous events and the like (Baldwin (1979) 198).

non diurna actorum scriptura reperio' ('I do not find in the authors of affairs or in the daily account of events'); 3.16.1 'audire me memini ex senioribus' ('I remember hearing from my elders'). Why not mention the *acta senatus* if it was a crucial source of information? Again, when Tacitus was engaged in writing the *Histories* around 106 or 107, his friend Pliny wrote him a letter providing more information about a senatorial trial of 93 in which Pliny had been one of the prosecuting team. Pliny prefaces his account by acknowledging that Tacitus will already know something of the trial 'since it is in the public records' (*Ep.* 7.33.3 'cum sit in publicis actis'): it is surely significant that Tacitus' knowledge is assumed by Pliny to derive, not from the *acta senatus* (commonly supposed by scholars to be the source of his information for 'senatorial' matters in the *Histories*) but from the more mundane and widely disseminated *acta diurna*.[31] Pliny's letter tends to support the impression that any consultation of the *acta senatus* by Tacitus was exceptional rather than regular.

However that may be, Tacitus' account of Piso's trial (*A.* 3.7–19) has the dissenting character that typifies his narrative as a whole and makes his work so congenial to modern readers. We are instinctively attracted to a writer who appears determined to expose the crimes of autocrats and the corruption of a debased society. Those living comfortably in western democracies, where dissent has been cultivated as a way of life for at least the past half-century, find in the author of the *Histories* and *Annals* a fellow spirit; those crushed by one of the terrible tyrannies of our time can see in Tacitus' text, if they are permitted to read it,[32] a pale reflection of their own far worse and more desperate circumstances.

In an age which has seen ruthless totalitarian regimes annihilate countless millions of their own citizens, there is a natural urge amongst some of the survivors to recapture the identities, and to preserve the memory, of as many of the massacred as possible. One's identity is inseparable from one's name, and, just as our war memorials list movingly the names of the many thousands who have died in battle for their country, in the same way much effort is devoted to recording the names of those whose lives were taken away from them for reasons of politics or ideology or to secure the power of a few (there is usually not much difference).[33] Tacitus, while describing

[31] It is rightly inferred from Pliny's letter that Tacitus was away from Rome at the time of the trial (see Sherwin-White (1966) 444): compare the parallel circumstance of Julius Valerianus, who, when Pliny sent him news of a case, was out of Rome (*Ep.* 5.4.4) and is told that he will be able to read a relevant document of Trajan's because 'it is in the public records' (*Ep.* 5.13.8 'leges ipsum: est in publicis actis').

[32] Tacitus was banned in communist eastern Europe (Mellor (1995) liii).

[33] Thus e.g. S. Klarsfeld, *French Children of the Holocaust: A Memorial* (New York 1996). The victims of communism are beyond counting and, in most cases, beyond identifying.