

WARPED INTERTEXTUALITIES: NAEVIUS AND SALLUST AT TACITUS *HISTORIES* 2.12.2

Abstract: This paper argues that *Hist.* 2.12.2 alludes to Naeuius, *Bell. Pun.* fr. 32 and to Sall. *Bj* 41.2 and 5, and that these allusions greatly enrich the inversions characteristic of Tacitus' analysis of civil war.

Introduction

When Tacitus narrates the Othonian invasion of Northern Italy in the run-up to the first battle of Cremona, he offers the following description of the army's march through the Maritime Alps (*Tac. Hist.* 2.12.2):

non Italia adiri nec loca sedesque patriae videbantur: tamquam externa litora et urbes hostium *urere vastare rapere*, eo atrocius, quod nihil usquam provisum adversum metus.

Before examining Tacitus' web of specific intertextualities in this sentence, let us outline some of the wider themes at work in the surrounding text. The idea that the Roman Othonians, though fighting a civil war, have become foreign invaders in turning against Italy reflects a familiar literary topos.¹ Even the preceding description of Otho himself at *Histories* 2.11.3 as 'horridus, incomptus famaеque dissimilis' is double-edged. At first sight Otho has cast off his previous decadent identity and now appears shaggy, virile and antique. Compare Cornelius Scipio, whom Livy at 28.35.7 describes as having 'caesaries habitusque corporis non cultus munditiis, sed virilis vere ac militaris'.² Yet it was also a topos that northern barbarians were bristling and hairy, as when Horace at *Odes* 4.5.26 refers to 'Germania...horrida'.³ The description of Otho at 2.11.3 thus simultaneously evokes two conflicting

¹ For example, Lucan exploits the notion once Caesar has crossed the Rubicon in 49 BC. Reports spread that '...qua Nar Tiberino inlabitur amni / *barbaricas* saevi discurrere Caesaris alas' (*Pharsalia* 1.475-6) and men think of Caesar as 'victo...immanior hoste' (*Pharsalia* 1.480).

² Livy 9.40.1-6 says that legionaries learned from their generals that a Roman soldier ought to be 'horridus', and Virgil *Aeneid* 7.746 calls Ufens' Italian soldiers a 'horrida gens'. On this catalogue, see R. D. Williams, 'The Function of Virgil's Catalogue in *Aeneid* 7', *CQ* 11 (1961) 146-153.

³ Cf. Tacitus *Germania* 38 on the 'horrens capillus' of the Suebi. Hairiness may be implicit in the 'barbarians as wild animals' topos, for which see V.A. Dauge, *Le Barbare* (Brussels 1981) 604-9. On 459 he categorises 'horridus' as an aspect of 'feritas'.

images, but the old Roman is gradually superseded by the northern barbarian as Tacitus brings into play more conspicuous markers of foreignness which put Otho in context. The fact that part of the Othonian force consists of the ‘deforme...auxilium’ (2.11.2) of two thousand gladiators also contributes to the invading battle column’s foreign identity.⁴ Note too that Tacitus carefully exaggerates the peaceful country atmosphere and the idyllic landscape dominated by farmers: ‘pleni agri, apertae domus’ (2.12.2).⁵ The simple farmer who was also a fierce soldier was an important figure in idealised Roman views of their ancestors.⁶ The initial response of the country people hardly lives up to such patriotic images, but perhaps Marius Maturus’ retaliation force, pointedly described as ‘iuventus’ (2.12.3), will coalesce better with this stereotype. Yet Tacitus quickly reinforces his initial paradoxical subversion of the farmer-soldier category when these young men are cut down at the first charge by the ruthless ‘foreign’ invaders.

Tacitus’ device of civil war being conducted as if it were a foreign campaign is central to the *Histories*.⁷ For example at 1.84.3 Otho derisively claimed that most of Vitellius’ supporters were ‘Germani’, or at 2.87.2, Vitellius’ soldiers strip the fields bare ‘ut hostile solum’, or again at 2.90.1, Vitellius makes a speech in Rome ‘tamquam apud alterius civitatis senatum populumque’.⁸ Tacitus adds similar *color* at *Annals* 15.58.1-2: after the failed

⁴ Cf. T. Wiedemann, *Emperors and Gladiators* (London and New York 1992) 102: ‘Whatever numerical proportion of free man, including Roman citizens, who chose to make a career as professional gladiators, they were assimilated in status to the other categories of persons from whom gladiators were drawn: defeated enemies, and condemned criminals of servile status’. Appian *BC* 1.116 says that Spartacus himself was Thracian and Cicero *In Catilinam* 2.7, 2.9 and 2.24 accuses Catiline of associating with gladiators. On gladiators and Gauls, see A. J. Woodman and R. H. Martin, *The Annals of Tacitus Book 3* (Cambridge 1996) 339. On the gladiatorial arena as an apt metaphor for civil war, see C. Barton, *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans* (Princeton 1993) 36-39.

⁵ Cf. Sallust *Histories* fragment 1.14 (B. Maurenbrecher). On peaceful agricultural scenes and their interruption by war, see C. S. Kraus, *Livy Ab Urbe Condita Book VI* (Cambridge 1994) 238-9.

⁶ Cf. Horace *Odes* 3.6.37-44, Caeculus’ ‘legio...agrestis’ at Virgil *Aeneid* 7.681, Cato *De Agricultura* Preface 2, Livy 2.26.9 and Cicero *De Officiis* 1.150-151 and 2.89. See further R. F. Moorton, ‘The Innocence of Italy in Virgil’s *Aeneid*’, *AJP* 110 (1989) 105-130 and E. Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men* (Oxford 1995) 113. The motif is also Greek, as at Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 5.7-8 and 5.14-16. Cf. B. D. Shaw, ‘Eaters of Flesh, Drinkers of Milk’, *Ancient Society* 13-14 (1982-3) 5-31 esp. 19-20.

⁷ See R. E. Ash, ‘Individual and Collective Identities in Tacitus’ *Histories*’, D. Phil. thesis (Oxford 1996), especially 59-134.

⁸ This may be an extension of the ‘altera Roma’ topos, in which a disloyal citizen tries to transfer the capital elsewhere and treats the mother city as alien. See P. Ceausescu, ‘Alteria Roma: Histoire d’une Folie Politique’, *Historia* 25 (1976) 79-107, who notes how

Pisonian conspiracy against Nero, Rome is dominated by ‘pedites equitesque, permixti Germanis, quibus fidebat princeps quasi externis’. Nero, despite being *princeps*, is virtually putting his capital city under siege.⁹ In the *Histories* especially, this literary stratagem may reflect a pervasive desire amongst Roman writers and their audience to rationalise civil war and to make it easier to process emotionally: if the enemy was ‘foreign’, then the internal conflict did not seem so self-destructive.¹⁰ Moreover, it made it much easier to rally people together against the common foe. Cicero knew this when he chose to characterise Catiline as an enemy in the senate’s midst, perniciously allied with an alien force hovering outside the gates of Rome, as at *In Catilinam* 1.5: ‘Castra sunt in Italia contra populum Romanum in Etruriae faucibus conlocata; crescit in dies singulos hostium numerus’.¹¹

Two literary allusions

It is worth dwelling on the way in which Tacitus expresses himself at *Histories* 2.12.2. I intend to argue as a possible reading of the text that Tacitus is here alluding to a fragment from Naevius’ *Bellum Punicum*. There is always a danger in cases such as this that the proposed allusion is either accidental or meaningless, but let us turn to the fragment itself to assess the credibility of the connection (Naev. *Bellum Punicum* Fr. 32):

transit Melitam
exercitus Romanus. insulam integram

Vespasian self-consciously aligned himself with Rome by means of the coin types *Roma resurgens*, *Roma victrix*, and *Roma perpetuus*.

⁹ See A. J. Woodman, ‘Nero’s Alien Capital. Tacitus as a Paradoxographer: *Annals* 15.36-37’ 173-188 in *Author and Audience in Latin Literature* (Cambridge 1992) edited by A. J. Woodman and J. Powell. Cf. A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London and Sydney 1988) 186-190 on Tacitus’ metahistorical portrayal of Tiberius in *Annals* 4-6 as a foreign monarch making war on his own people.

¹⁰ Cf. M. Bell, *In Harm’s Way* (London 1995) 128, quoting the words of a Bosnian woman who is trying to explain the war to her daughter: ‘It would have been a hundred times easier if we had been attacked by some foreign power. It is very hard to fight against people with whom you sat to drink coffee only yesterday’. Notice too Appian *BC* 4.32-3 where Hortensia claims that the *matronae* will gladly contribute their jewellery to war against the Gauls or the Parthians, but not to civil war.

¹¹ For further discussion of this formula, which Cicero applies to many of his enemies, see E. Keitel, ‘Principate and Civil War in the *Annals* of Tacitus’, *AJP* 105 (1984) 306-325.

urit populatur vastat, rem hostium concinnat.¹²

Naevius is describing an incident from 257 BC which took place during the first Punic War, but which is mentioned only once elsewhere in the extant sources.¹³ The Roman consul M. Atilius Regulus, who had command of the fleet, made a lightning attack on Carthaginian-held Malta, devastating the island and winning much booty. The raid served as useful practice for a more serious assault in the same year against the Carthaginian fleet off the coast of Sicily at Tyndaris: on this occasion Regulus managed to destroy seventeen enemy ships and succeeded in winning a triumph.¹⁴

One useful criterion for assessing the credibility of a possible allusion is relevance. If the echo fails to add interesting layers of meaning to the text under consideration, then there is limited mileage in asserting a connection between two passages in different authors. Naevius' powerful fusion of epic form and historical narrative in the *Bellum Punicum* resulted in a patriotic national epic celebrating communal Roman achievements. If Tacitus *did* have this particular Naevian passage in mind at *Histories* 2.12.2, then it points to some suggestive contrasts. Where Regulus had been attacking Carthaginian territory in a foreign war, the Othonian commander Suedius Clemens was sending his soldiers against Italy in a civil war. The victims of the Othonian attack are innocent farmers in the Maritime Alps who provide little booty

¹² This is fragment 32 in L. Strzelecki, *Cn. Naevii Belli Punici Carmen* (Leipzig 1964). For full analysis see M. Barchiesi, *Nevio Epico: Storia Interpretazione Edizione Critica dei Frammenti del Primo Epos Latino* (Padua 1962) 337-348 and S. Mariotti, 'Concinnat in Naevio *Bellum Punicum* Fr. 39.3 M', 1-5 in *Kontinuität und Wandel: Lateinische Poesie von Naevius bis Baudelaire* (Hildesheim 1986) edited by F. Wagner, W. Maaz and U. Von Strache. In some manuscripts the reading is 'urit vastat populatur', which is favoured by C. Thulin, *Italische sakrale Poesie und Prosa* (Berlin 1906) 32-33 n.7. Cf. S. Mariotti, *Il Bellum Poenicum e l'Arte di Nevio* (Rome 1955) 77 note 46, who prefers 'urit populatur vastat'.

¹³ Note Orosius *Adversum Paganos* 4.8.5: 'Atilius consul Liparam Melitamque insulas Siciliae nobiles pervagatus evertit'. See further G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* Volume 3.1 2nd edition (Florence 1967) 134.

¹⁴ For this incident at Tyndaris see Polybius 1.25.1-4 with F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius Volume I* (Cambridge 1957) 82. There is a tantalising fragmentary reference in Festus, *De Verborum Significatu* (Leipzig 1913) edited by W.M. Lindsay, 156 on the 'navalis corona': '<M.> Atilius bel< lo>... < scrip>tum est in car< mine>...'. The victory at Tyndaris is probably the reference point, but could the *carmen* be Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*? Festus cites Naevius' epic as *carmen* on 306 (Lindsay); no other form of full reference is certainly visible. One might also consider the possibility that with *carmen* here Festus is referring to an *elogium* in verse of Atilius Regulus; cf. Cicero *De Senectute* 61, quoting from the *elogium* of A. Atilius Caiatinus (cos. 258, 254) and adding 'notum est id totum carmen incisum in sepulcro' (cf. *De finibus* 2.116).

for the raiders, whereas Regulus' army targets Carthaginian troops on Malta and reaps rich rewards. Moreover, the Malta campaign was a prelude to a further Roman success against the Carthaginians, but the Othonians will only kill other Romans, including Agricola's mother at Albintimilium. Therefore echoes of the Naevian passage, which outlined a Roman victory against a foreign enemy, heighten the pointless self-destruction of the AD 68-9 civil war. The allusion may also obliquely recall the literary topos whereby an author laments how much foreign territory the Romans *could* have gained had they not turned against themselves so catastrophically in civil war.¹⁵ Moreover, if, as one critic has argued, the paratactic format of this *Bellum Punicum* fragment evokes the bald style of triumphal military inscriptions, Tacitus *Histories* 2.12.2 offers further ironic undercurrents given the civil war context.¹⁶

Another useful factor in assessing the credibility of a possible allusion is the extent to which the later author knew the work of the earlier writer. In Naevius' case this question is especially challenging because of the fragmentary nature of the *Bellum Punicum*. Yet there do seem to be other cases of Tacitean allusion to Naevius. Barchiesi suggests two instances: firstly Tacitus *Histories* 1.40.1, 'non tumultus, non quies, quale magni metus et magnae irae silentium est', may recall Naevius *Bellum Punicum* Fragment 57, 'magnae metus tumultus pectora possidit', and secondly Tacitus *Histories* 3.74.1, 'aramque posuit casus suos in marmore expressam', may recall Naevius *Bellum Punicum* Fragment 4, 'inerant signa expressa...'.¹⁷ The first of these examples seems more conclusive than the second, but if one accepts that Tacitus used Naevian allusion anywhere else in the *Histories*, then the proposed echo at 2.12.2 becomes more credible.

One possible objection to this suggestion is that the concepts of burning and laying waste tend to go together naturally: either we must search for Naevian intertextuality everywhere or we must assume that in Tacitus' time 'urere vastare rapere' was a neutral expression, perhaps even a cliché. Yet

¹⁵ See Horace *Epode* 7.3-10 with D. Mankin, *Horace: Epodes* (Cambridge 1995) 145-146, Horace *Odes* 1.2.21-24, Tacitus *Agricola* 13.2 and Lucan *Pharsalia* 1.13-23.

¹⁶ See S. M. Goldberg, *Epic in Republican Rome* (Oxford 1995) 78-79. Cf. Cicero *Fam.* 2.10.3, a parody of the military bulletin, and Julius Caesar's famous 'veni, vidi, vici', uttered in 47 BC after his victory over Pharnaces. The aphorism was inscribed on stone and carried in the triumphal procession: see Suetonius *Divus Julius* 37.2, Appian *BC* 2.91, and Cassius Dio 42.48.1. Note the plain style of Scipio's *elogium* in A. Degraffi (ed.) *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae* (Florence 1965) 178: 'Taurasia, Cisauna / Samnio cepit, subigit omne Loucanam opsidesque abducit'.

¹⁷ See M. Barchiesi, *Nevio Epico: Storia Interpretazione Edizione Critica dei Frammenti del Primo Epos Latino* (Padua 1962) 389-399 and 276. The fragments are in L. Strzelecki, *Cn. Naevii Belli Punici Carmen* (Leipzig 1964).

although pairs are fairly common, triads are less frequent.¹⁸ Seneca the Elder at *Controversiae* 1.6.12 offers ‘*vastari omnia ac rapi, conburi incendiis villas*’, and Livy at 32.31.3 says that Minucius Thermus and his legionaries ‘...rursus *populari* agros et *urere*¹⁹ tecta vicosque *expugnare* coepit’.²⁰ Yet both these examples avoid Naevius’ distinctive juxtaposition of verbs in asyndeton. Once this is introduced as a criterion, the parallels in other authors become less pervasive. At *Att.* 9.7.4 Cicero says of Pompey, ‘*primum consilium est suffocare urbem et Italiam fame, deinde agros vastare, urere, pecuniis locupletum <non> abstinere*’. Cicero certainly drew on Naevius elsewhere,²¹ so he may also have been alluding to *Bellum Punicum* Fragment 32 here. There is another example which supports this suggestion: at *Philippics* 12.4.9 the orator offers the collocation, ‘[Gallia] *exhauritur, vastatur, uritur*’.²² In each case Cicero evokes Naevius’ choice of verbs and asyndeton. Nor was he the only prose writer to do so. At *Bellum Africum* 26.5 the author says of Caesar, ‘*animadvertibat enim villas exuri, agros vastari, pecus diripi...*’. Whilst these examples suggest that both Cicero and the author of the *Bellum Africum* had read their Naevius, there are hardly a sufficient number of echoes to think that by Tacitus’ time the phrase had become a cliché.

Several factors therefore support the argument that Tacitus was alluding to Naevius at *Histories* 2.12.2. firstly, the fact that Naevius’ *Bellum Punicum* was used by Tacitus and by others elsewhere points towards deliberate manipulation of the epic fragment: it is a specific example of a wider phenomenon. Secondly, Tacitus employs two out of three of the same verbs as Naevius does. Thirdly, Tacitus casts these verbs in a triadic arrangement and ex-

¹⁸ For pairings of *uro* and *populor*, see Livy 8.29.11, 7.22.4, 28.32.9, 28.44.2, 3.3.10, and Curtius Rufus 9.10.7, 4.9.8, 4.10.13 and 4.1.11. For pairings of *uro* and *vasto* see Livy 34.9.13 and Curtius Rufus 8.1.26. On triads see C. S. Kraus, *Livy: Ab Urbe Condita Book VI* (Cambridge 1994) 21–24. Tacitus uses a similar asyndetic triad about some Thracian auxiliaries at *Annals* 4.48.1: ‘*iisque permissum vastare, urere, trahere praedas*’, and at *Agricola* 30.5, he uses as substantives ‘*aufferre trucidare rapere*’.

¹⁹ There may be a pun here because Minucius *Thermus* is responsible for this burning. Cf. Tacitus *Histories* 3.32.3, where Antonius Primus complains that his bath is lukewarm, but quips that it will soon heat up. People linked this with the subsequent conflagration of Cremona and concluded that the joke was in poor taste.

²⁰ Livy refers to a campaign in 197BC against the Boii, a Gaulish tribe who lived between the Po and the Appennines. Though subdued by Telamon in 225BC they were encouraged by Hannibal to rebel again until they were eventually crushed in 191BC. On the Boii, see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius Volume 1* (Oxford 1957) 183.

²¹ See P. Cugusi, ‘Una Citazione Neviana in Cicerone (Cicero *Sest.* 97)’, *Athenaeum* 65 (1987) 234–237.

²² Cf. *Philippics* 10.6.12, ‘*ut...omnia vastaret diriperet auferret*’

exploits a paratactic style for full impact, just as Naevius did in the fragment. Fourthly, there are rich interpretative consequences which are highly appropriate to Tacitus' general inversion of the *civilis* / *hostis* categories here and elsewhere in the *Histories*. Cumulatively, these points suggest that Tacitus' allusion to Naevius was deliberate, pointed and pertinent to his wider narrative themes.

Yet there are further allusive layers to unravel. Tacitus' use of the word 'metus' at *Histories* 2.12.2 triggers another relevant association. Heraeus' edition suggests that it means 'Schrecknisse, Veranlassungen zur Furcht' and offers as a parallel *Histories* 4.5.2.²³ The word in this context seems to mean a 'cause of fear' or 'terror': this is rather a poetical expression, and thus one which follows on neatly from Tacitus' allusion to Naevius' poetry.²⁴ Why then did Tacitus choose 'metus' rather than 'irruptio' or 'incursio'? One reason is that the word contains a *second* oblique but suggestive reference to the Carthaginian enemy. The most well-known 'metus' occurs in the phrase 'metus hostilis', used by Sallust at *Jugurtha* 41.2.²⁵ Here Sallust refers to the notion that the destruction of Carthage was a turning-point in Roman history. The removal of this foreign enemy created a vacuum which led to internal strife and significantly contributed to Rome's decline. Therefore the AD68-9 civil war can be seen in a wider context as another manifestation of these self-destructive tendencies which developed in the absence of a decent external foe. Yet although the Othonians are being temporarily characterised through a foreign filter, the irony is that they are a *Roman* force.

There is also a stylistic point which reinforces the argument that Tacitus was alluding to Sallustian 'metus hostilis' at *Histories* 2.12.2. In the context of

²³ See C. Heraeus, *Cornelii Taciti Historiarum Libri* (Leipzig 1885) 150. H. Heubner, *P. Cornelius Tacitus. Die Historien* Volume 2 (Heidelberg 1968) 65, agrees and offers as a parallel Virgil *Aeneid* 7.438 'ne tantos mihi finge metus'. Cf. Statius *Thebaid* 12.606.

²⁴ See *TLL* VIII 910.77-911.22 for 'metus' used in this sense by Silius Italicus, Lucan, Propertius, Ovid, Statius, Seneca and Valerius Flaccus.

²⁵ See A. Lintott, 'Imperial Expansion and Moral Decline in the Roman Republic', *Historia* 21 (1972) 626-638 (on Sallust's intermingling of two separate traditions), W-R. Heinz, *Die Furcht als politisches Phänomen bei Tacitus* (Amsterdam 1975) 45-48, K. Vretska, *Sallust De Catilinae Coniuratione* (Heidelberg 1976) 200-206, D.F. Conley, 'The Stages of Rome's Decline in Sallust's Historical Theory', *Hermes* 109 (1981) 379-382, B.M. Levick, 'Morals, Politics and the Fall of the Roman Republic', *G&R* 29 (1982) 53-62 and T. Wiedemann, 'Sallust's *Jugurtha*: Concord, Discord and the Digressions', *G&R* 40 (1993) 48-57. The general concept that a 'metus hostilis' was useful for a state predates Sallust. Cf. Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 3.1.26, Plato *Laws* 3.698b, Aristotle *Politics* 5.1308a-b and 7.1334a, and Polybius 6.18 and 6.57.5. G.M. Paul, *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum* (Liverpool 1984) 124, suggests that Sallust's focus was probably sharpened by the original debate between Cato the Censor and Scipio Nasica about whether Carthage should be destroyed.

the discussion of ‘metus hostilis’, Sallust observes at *Jugurtha* 41.5 that in its absence ‘sibi quisque ducere trahere rapere’. Structurally, Tacitus’ ‘urere vastare rapere’ at *Histories* 2.12.2 recalls this asyndetic triad of Sallustian infinitives, even if only one infinitive, ‘rapere’, verbally links the two passages. Moreover, the fact that both the Naevius *Bellum Punicum* Fragment 32 and Sallust *Jugurtha* 41.5 refer to Carthage means that Tacitus can bind together the two allusions and play them off against one another.²⁶ Sallust’s triad is referring to internal fragmentation in the Roman state, which is a particularly apt parallel for the Othonian civil war invasion. Thus, where the Naevian echo offers us a positive model of Rome beating Carthage, the Sallustian echo presents a negative model of Rome self-destructing in Carthage’s absence.²⁷ In one obvious sense these allusions conflict, but in another way they work together to point towards a progressive deterioration in the Roman national character since the third century BC.

To examine an ancient historical text from a literary point of view can significantly enhance our historical understanding of a passage, even if one of the intertexts has not survived intact.²⁸ In the context of a discussion on the *Dialogus*, R. Syme observed that ‘History in the view of the Romans was a form of literature closely allied to poetry. They might look back to the beginnings, to the *Bellum Punicum* of Naevius and the *Annales* of Q. Ennius. Those writers had left a deep impact on the early annalists’.²⁹ And not just

²⁶ Cf. R.F. Thomas, ‘Virgil’s *Georgics* and the Art of Reference’, *HSCP* 90 (1986) 171-198, who establishes a number of categories to describe the art of reference, including the most sophisticated form, ‘conflation’ or ‘multiple reference’. This ‘...allows the poet to refer to a number of antecedents and thereby to subsume their versions, and the tradition along with them, into his own’ (193).

²⁷ On combined echoes, note R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 727: ‘Prose or poetry, Tacitus had a subtle ear and a memory for words that never failed. He can blend echoes of different writers without danger of incongruity’.

²⁸ The divorce between literature and history is not constructive. Cf. L. Gossman, *Between History and Literature* (London 1990) 227: ‘For a long time the relation of history to literature was not notably problematic. History was a branch of literature. It was not until the meaning of the word literature, or the institution of literature itself, began to change, towards the end of the eighteenth century, that history came to appear as something distinct from literature’. Naturally this change influenced the way that historical texts were read, as well as written.

²⁹ R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 110. See further F. Bömer, ‘Naevius und Fabius Pictor’, *Symbolae Osloenses* 29 (1952) 34-53 and W. Strzelecki, ‘Naevius and the Roman Annalists’, *Rivista di filologia Classica* 91 (1963) 440-458. Both argue that Naevius did not draw on Fabius Pictor. V. Lündström, ‘Nya Enniusfragment’, *Eranos* 15 (1915) 1-24 and D.C.A. Shotton, ‘Tacitea’, *CP* 63 (1968) 288-290 discuss possible echoes of Ennius in the first sentence of Tacitus’ *Annals*, though R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 357 is sceptical. J. Moles,

on the early annalists. For Tacitus too, the appropriation of a familiar phrase in a new civil war context could point to the way in which traditional warfare had become perverted. In all civil wars the categories of friend and enemy tend to get blurred or misappropriated; and Tacitus knew how to hint as much to an audience sensitive to the suggestive remoulding of literary models.³⁰

St Hilda's College, Oxford

RHIANNON ASH

'Livy's Preface', *PCPS* 39 (1993) 141-168 notes the tendency for Livy and Tacitus to imitate Ennius at precisely the point when each historian is talking about early Rome.

³⁰ I thank Chris Pelling, Tony Woodman and John Moles for their helpful criticisms of a first draft of this paper.