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The Mytilenean and Aeduan revolts were separated by four hundred years and two thousand miles, but in the narratives of Thucydides and Caesar, they bear remarkable similarities. The Aedui have been the beneficiaries of unparalleled favor from Caesar and Rome, yet are enticed by Convictolitavis and Litaviccus to join the rebellion of Vercingetorix on the grounds that the Romans have become their oppressors rather than their allies. In Book 3 of Thucydides, the Mytileneans revolt from Athens, although they too have been favored allies; they claim in their entreaty to the Spartans that they are no longer bound to the Athenians by trust, but rather by fear. After the revolts are suppressed, both cities are spared. As I will demonstrate, the circumstances of the revolts as presented in this narratives share more similarities than may be attributed to mere historical coincidence. Caesar, I argue, actively evokes the Thucydidean passage in his work. But if Caesar is intentionally recalling the 5th century event, what is at stake in making such an allusion? What would Caesar stand to gain from a comparison between the revolt of the Aedui and the revolt of the Mytileneans? The answer to this is found in the response to each revolt. By contrasting his swift suppression of the Aedui with the Athenians’ divisive and clumsy handling of the Mytileneans, Caesar demonstrates a central principle of his approach as a commander: it is more effective to deal with a crisis by looking to what is beneficial in the long-term than by thinking only of present concerns.

It is now a commonplace of Caesarian scholarship to acknowledge that Caesar’s commentarii are more than bare lists of facts recorded as the raw materials for “real” historians. The conversation has evolved since publication of

---

1 Even Hirtius suspected that Caesar had set up these future authors for failure: constat enim inter omnes nihil tam operose ab aliis esse perfectum, quod non horum elegantia commentariorum superet: qui sunt editi, ne scientia tantarum rerum scriptoribus desesset, adeoque probantur omnium iudicio ut praerupta, non praebita, facultas scriptoribus videatur, “For everyone agrees that no work by anyone was ever completed so carefully that it is not surpassed in elegance by these commentaries; commentaries which were published lest knowledge of such achievements be unavailable to other writers, and which are appraised so highly in the opinion of all that the materials seems to have been snatched away from, not offered to, future writers (preface, Book 8).”
Rambaud's groundbreaking but somewhat accusatory work, but the gist is the same: Caesar skillfully crafted the narrative of the *commentarii* to create a specific image of himself as a commander. In this respect, the revolt of the Aedui confirms what has already been demonstrated in the earlier books of the *BG*: that Caesar often demonstrated *clementia* toward defeated enemies. What is far more interesting, however, is *how* Caesar the writer constructed that image in the case of the Aeduan revolt; he alludes intertextually to Thucydides's account of the Mytilenean revolt, demonstrating by contrast the efficiency of his command. While recent studies have embraced the idea that Caesar was a canny and creative author, scholars have not sufficiently explored the possibility that Caesar was as capable of literary intertextuality as, for example, the Augustan poets were.

The idea of (and indeed the very term) intertextuality continues to be debated energetically, and so it will be useful to outline here the sort of intertextuality in which I argue Caesar is engaged. Caesar's method of allusion in the passages discussed here is not what Stephen Hinds (following Conte) calls "exemplary modeling" or "modeling by particular source-passages." That is, we should not necessarily look for specific linguistic allusions, repetitions of particular phrases, or direct correspondences from one Thucydidean passage to one Caesarian passage. Instead, Caesar employs Thucydides as a Contean "code model," that is, a model which "allows the philologist to reconstruct, from analysis, a corresponding hermeneutic model - a simulacrum of the overall sense which could coherently represent a series of phenomena that could be otherwise registered only piecemeal, in uncoordinated, discrete details." In the present case, we observe not an assortment of specific linguistic references to Thucydides, but rather a more general invocation of the Thucydidean model.

Christopher Pelling has made a related argument to explain some otherwise perplexing Thucydidean references by Appian and Cassius Dio. He rightly notes that these references by the later historians are often awkward, ill-placed, or shallow. For example, Pelling points out Dio's nearly compulsive repetition of the Thucydidean theme of "human nature," invoking ὑμνημονείας as an explanation for a number of complaints: for men's predilection for blustering, empty threats (38.7.2), for the rapid shifting of political alliances (39.6.1), and for piracy (36.20.1-2). This important Thucydidean theme seems misplaced and even trivialized in Dio's work. Dio's point, Pelling argues, is not to imply a direct and specific

---

2 As articulated by Krebs 2006, 111-112: "While earlier investigations tried to prove Caesar wrong and convict him of manipulating his readers by falsification of facts, more recent work has focused on his artful representation and how he makes use of literary allusions and cultural assumptions to convey his message(s)."

3 At least when it was in his own interest to do so. More on this below.

4 Hinds 1998, 41-47.

5 Conte 1986, 31.

6 Pelling 2010, 105-118.

7 Pelling 2010, 106: "None of these contexts makes points on a Thucydidean level."
correspondence between each Thucydidean passage and his own, but rather to evoke a “resonance” of the Thucydidean world in general: “To be reminded of Thucydides is to be reminded of that whole hard-edged political and military world that Thucydides described, where words were often at odds with deeds, where decisions were so often reached on the basis of expediency and profit but also in anger and miscalculation, where morality suffered, and where ... stasis, civil conflict, provided the prism through which the most brutal and unsettling aspects of warfare became particularly visible and stark.”

This is the same mode of intertextuality and allusion in which I argue Caesar is engaged in the passages discussed here. Like Appian and Cassius Dio, Caesar does not suggest a one-to-one correspondence between Thucydides’s context and his own. Rather, he invokes the Thucydidean world as a backdrop against which his own actions will be read more favorably. I discuss this literary method in more detail below.

This is an opportune moment for an exploration of intertextuality in Caesar’s commentarii; the present inquiry is informed by both the recent interest in the study of intertextuality in historiography in general and by the increasing appreciation among Latinists for Caesar as a literary artist. Although intertextuality and allusion have long been the province of scholars of Augustan poetry, the last decade has at last seen their arrival in studies of ancient historiography. Recent years have also seen increasing, if not quite yet flourishing, interest in the literary qualities of Caesar’s commentarii.

Cynthia Damon demonstrated the fruits to be gained by taking an active approach to reading the Bellum Civile rather than inching through the text mechanically, clause by clause, sentence by sentence. The active approach is both challenging and rewarding, “because Caesar, writing for readers who wanted to understand and judge recent events and the actors in them, leaves a great deal for the responsibility of interpretation to his readers.”

---

8 Pelling 2010, 107.
9 On this trend in general, see O’Gorman 2009. For recent individual studies, see Damon 2010 on Tacitus; Meyer 2010 on Sallust and Thucydides; and Pelling 2010 on Appian, Cassius Dio, and Thucydides, as discussed above. Seminars on intertextuality and historiography were held at the 2011 and 2013 annual meetings of the American Philological Association, as well.
10 Two wide-ranging edited volumes on the commentaries have appeared in the last decade and a half; Anton Powell and Kathryn Welch’s Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter (1998) offers a variety of perspectives on Caesar’s literary qualities, self-presentation, and rhetorical techniques, as does Caesar Against Liberty? Perspectives on his Autocracy (2003). Several monographs on the commentarii have appeared in recent years, as well. On the BC: Andrew Riggsby, Caesar in Gaul and Rome discusses Caesar’s presentation of geography and ethnography, as well as Caesar’s self-presentation and the nature and perception of the commentarius as a genre. Batstone and Damon 2006 treat the BC as a literary “masterpiece,” focusing on Caesar’s style and structure. Most recently, Grillo 2012 examines the underlying ideology of the BC through a study of Caesarian rhetoric and style. Furthermore, the 2012 American Philological Association annual meeting panel “Caesar as litterator” was a good indication of current interest in Caesar’s literary qualities.
11 Damon 1993, 185.
Damon’s approach requires the reader to follow intricately woven threads, to fill in the blanks, to read between the lines: “The other method of reading the BC aims at fashioning a net of memory and understanding by tying the knots which link episodes and characters that are found on the long strands of narrative.” The rewards of this reader responsibility are multiplied when extended beyond the borders of the Caesarian corpus; there is a great deal to be gained by the reader’s careful attention to narrative strands and networks within Caesar’s works, and, as I demonstrate here, even more lies in store for the reader armed with a thorough knowledge of the literary works in which Caesar himself was steeped.

It is probable that at least some members of Caesar’s Roman audience in the 50s BCE would have recognized a Thucydidean allusion. Contemporary Romans were not only still reading Thucydides, but also engaging with him as a rhetorical model (badly, if we believe Cicero). In the Brutus, Cicero’s Atticus cautions that Thucydidean prose is ill-suited to oratory (287-288); in the Orator, Cicero refers derisively to imitators of Thucydides (ecce autem aliqui se Thucydidios esse profiuntur, nonum quodam imperiorem et inauditum genus, “And there are also those who call themselves ‘Thucydideans,’ a new and unheard-of group of idiots,” 30). These orators who so ambitiously mimicked the style of the Greek historian apparently did not share the judgment of the first-century literary critic Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who devoted a long treatise to criticism of Thucydides’ style. While he does not condemn Thucydides’s narrative technique wholesale, Dionysius is deeply critical of Thucydidean syntax and prose style:

[Thucydides’s] most conspicuous and characteristic traits are his attempt to say the largest number of things in the fewest words and his compression of many thoughts into one, and the fact that he leaves the listener expecting to hear something more. By all of these things, his

12 Damon 1993, 185.
13 The question of exactly who constituted Caesar’s audience is often debated; most argue that Caesar’s commentaries were primarily aimed at the senate (e.g., Rambaud 1966, Meier 1995, Marincola 1997. However, Wiseman 1998 argues that Caesar intended to reach a wider audience, which was achieved through public recitations. For the purposes of the present inquiry, I assume, obviously, that the greater part of Caesar’s intended audience was literate, and furthermore that at least some fraction was well-read enough that Caesar might reasonably expect them to recognize an allusion to a famous episode from Thucydides.
14 See Pritchett 1975 for a useful overview and commentary on the De Thucydide. In addition to the De Thucydide, Dionysius also composed a letter to one Ammaeus concerning Thucydides’s language.
15 The object of my work is not an attack on the undertaking or skill of Thucydides, nor a reckoning of his mistakes, nor a disparagement, nor any other effort of this sort, in which I placed no value on the successes and virtues of the work and dwell on the less-than-ideal remarks...” (3)
brevity is rendered obscure

For this reason, Dionysius explains, the style of Thucydides is wholly unsuitable for oratory. In addition to these explicit reflections on the rhetorical value of Thucydides for contemporary Romans, there is ample evidence for the literary use of Thucydides by late republican authors. Scholars have long recognized Sallust's close appreciation for both Thucydidean style and theme. T. F. Scanlon's *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust* is a comprehensive study of parallel themes, style, and passages; other scholarship has focused on particular Thucydidean moments in Sallust's works. Initiating his historical project toward the end of Sallust's life and career, Livy did not follow Sallust in adopting the confounding prose style of Thucydides, nor his bleak worldview, but echoes of the Greek historian made their way into his narrative nevertheless. Barbara Saylor Rodgers convincingly argues that Livy's account of the Second Punic War is especially Thucydidean. The Sicilian expedition, she argues, looms in the background of Livy's books 21-30; she focuses on allusions to the speeches of Nicias and Alcibiades in the orations of Fabius and Scipio to the senate in 205 BCE.

It is not, perhaps, too surprising to detect a bit of Thucydides in the works of Roman historians, given the shared genre; he can also be found lurking in less obvious places, as well. For example, Lucretius's debt to the Greek historian is evident in his account of the plague in Book 6 of *De Rerum Natura*; this description appears to have been heavily informed by Thucydides's account of the plague at Athens. The biographer Cornelius Nepos seems to have used Thucydides as a source for his Greek lives, and specifically cites him on several occasions (*Themistocles* 1.4, 9.1, 10.4; *Pausanias* 2.2; *Alcibiades* 11.1).

The relationship between Caesar and Thucydides has not been the subject of extensive discussion, but scholars have begun to entertain the idea. The editors of 1998's *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter* suggested an affinity of approach (if not a specific intertextual relationship) between the two authors with their titular allusion to Virginia Hunter's *Thucydides: The Artful Reporter*. John Carter, Christine Kraus, and Anton Powell have cited several examples of apparent parallels with *Thucydides in the BC.* When discussing Caesar's awareness of Thucydidean
narrative techniques more generally, Luca Grillo observes that Caesar’s method of “inferred motivation” for purposes of characterization seems to be modeled on Thucydide’s example.

Although the Aeduan and Mytilenean revolts occurred four centuries apart, under very different political circumstances in very different parts of the world, many of the details are similar enough to provide Caesar with a suitable framework for Thucydidean allusion. In 52 BCE, Vercingetorix of the Averni led a loose coalition of Gallic tribes in resistance against the Romans; the Aedui initially resisted Vercingetorix’s overtures and declined to join the revolt. The Aedui had long been allies of Rome (e.g., frates consanguineique, BG 1.33.2). They were particularly indebted to Caesar, who, early in his tenure in Gaul, had come to the aid of the Aedui against the invading Helvetii (BG 1.2-29); in the same year (58 BCE) Caesar had also intervened to defend the Aedui and Sequani from the forces of Ariovistus the German, who threatened to drive the Gauls from their territory (BG 1.31-53). At this point, the Aedui fade from the main narrative of the middle books of the BG, but return to center stage in Book 7 (52 BCE). At that time, Caesar and all his resources were focused on suppressing the revolt led by Vercingetorix, who had assembled a coalition of Gallic tribes with an eye toward driving Roman forces out of Gaul. Initially, the Aedui resisted Vercingetorix’s advances, but they did not hold out for long. Although the Aedui had promised to aid Caesar in the siege of Gergovia, persuaded by one Convictolitavis that the slavery or freedom of all the Gauls hinged on their participation in the revolt, the Aedui forces instead treacherously attacked Caesar’s baggage train (BG 7.42). Although Caesar forced the surrender of that particular band, the Aedui continued to contribute to Vercingetorix’s cause; the war was concluded and the revolt quashed with Caesar’s victory at Alesia. Considering his investment in the Aeduan state, and having endured their internal squabbles and slipping diligence, Caesar seems to have been particularly wounded by their participation in the rebellion.

(BC 3.32 and Thucy. 3.82.4); and their similar remarks on the “excessive trust in, or fear of, the unknown” (BC 2.4.4 and Thucy. 5.103.2, 7.50.4).

22 Grillo 2011.
23 One noteworthy exception is in Book 5, when Dumnorix briefly resurfaces. Caesar, preparing for his expedition to Britain, was uneasy at the prospect of leaving Dumnorix behind in Gaul, given his tendency to foment strife among the Gauls. Dumnorix, however, resisted Caesar’s demand that he accompany him to Britain and was executed by the Gallic cavalry at Caesar’s command.
24 Convictolitavis had recently been confirmed in his magistracy by Caesar himself, who had intervened in the disputed election at the request of the Aedui. Convictolitavis’ sudden eagerness to revolt against Caesar may have been the result of pecuniary persuasion by the Arverni (sollicitatus ab Arvernis pecunia, 7.57.1).
25 See, for example, 7.54 (Discedentibus his breviter sua in Aedus merita exuit, quos et quam humiles accepisset, compulsos in oppida, multatos aquis omnibus ereptis copiis, imposito stipendio, obsidibus summa cum contumelia extortis, et quam in fortunam quamque in amplitudinem deductisset, ut non solam in pristinum statum redissent, sed omnium temporum dignitatem et gratiam antecessisse viderentur, “As they are departing, he briefly [states] his services toward the Aedui: in what state and how lowly he found them, having been driven into their towns, robbed of their land with all their resources stripped away, a tribute imposed on them, hostages extorted from them with the greatest insult; and to what fortune and lofty height he had raised them, such that not only had they returned to their former position, but they seemed to have surpassed the dignity and influence of any time in the past,”).
The revolt of the Mytileneans during the Peloponnesian War was, like the Aeduan revolt, timed to take advantage of an entity whose resources were already heavily taxed. Close on the heels of the Spartan invasion of Attica in the summer of 428 BCE, the towns of Lesbos (save Methymna) revolted from Athens, with the Mytileneans intending to unite the island under their control. After initial hesitation, the Spartans and Peloponnesian League eventually lent their support to the Lesbians; however, the Mytileneans were unable to withstand the Athenian blockade of their city and in the summer of 427 they surrendered. Like the revolt of the Aedui, the Mytilenean revolt was particularly insulting in light of the recent history of cooperation between the Athenians and Mytileneans. The Mytileneans had been Athenian allies since the Persian Wars. In 440 BCE, Mytilene supplied a generous contingent of ships to Athens to aid in the suppression of the Samian Revolt (Thuc. 1.117.2). By the 430s, however, the cooperation between Athens and Mytilene was increasingly strained as the Mytileneans watched Athens’s other allies “become enslaved” (οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἑδούλωθον, 3.10.5); the revolt was not completely unexpected, perhaps, but it clearly signaled the increasing fragility of the allegiance of Athens’s nominal allies. Indeed, as did Caesar in the case of the Aedui, the Athenians took note of the fact that it was an especially favored ally who had revolted (ἐπικαλοῦντες τὴν τῇ ἄλλῃ ἀπόστασιν ὃτι οὐκ ἀρχόμενοι ἡσσαίοι οἱ ἄλλοι ἐπούργοι, “with [some] pointing out that they [the Mytileneans] revolted although, unlike the others, they were not being ruled over,” 3.36.2).

In the broad outlines, then, the Aeduan and Mytilenean revolts were similar: each state was a long-standing (if disgruntled) ally, and each state took advantage of the wartime context (the campaign of Vercingetorix, the invasion of Attica) to rebel against a distracted and vulnerable entity. One of the main challenges in the study of allusion and intertextuality in historiography is the need to distinguish between intentional reference and historical coincidence. Is the author citing an earlier text, or did the two events described simply happen to happen in the same way? In the present example, parallels between the account of the Aeduan revolt in the BG and Thucydides’s account of the Mytilenean revolt suggest that Caesar indeed intentionally evokes major themes of the Thucydidean narrative in his own account.

We see, for example, similarities in the rebelling cities’ self-justification, as attributed to them by Thucydides and Caesar. Their arguments are similar both in general argumentation and in specific claims. In terms of the overall rhetorical approach, C. W. Macleod and Simon Hornblower observed that the Mytileneans use a combination of moral and prudential arguments.26 The Mytilenean envoys first explain to the Spartans their moral justification for revolting (3.9-12, discussed below in more detail). Turning to arguments of expediency, the Mytileneans then assert that action must be taken now, while Athens is struggling to recover from their losses in the war and the plague. They also outline the strategic advantages to be gained by the Spartans should they aid the Mytileneans’ cause (3.13). Caesar’s Aedui also justify their revolt in terms of both of justice and necessity. Not only do the Aedui and the Gauls in general have the right to freedom and autonomy, they claim, but this is the time to act; the choice facing the Aedui is

---

rebellion against the Romans or slaughter at their hands, and they should take advantage of the distraction caused by Vercingetorix’s revolt (BG 7.37-38).

Several specific points of the arguments are similar, as well. According to Thucydides, the Mytileneans seek to unite the entire island under their own power (3.2.3).²⁷ Caesar’s Aedui also try to assume command of the rebelling forces once they join the revolt, perhaps with an eye to a future in which all Gaul is united under their sovereignty; they sulk publicly when Vercingetorix, one of the Arverni, is confirmed as sole commander of the rebels (BG 7.63.4-8). As was noted above, both the Aedui and Mytileneans had been the recipients of particular favor from Caesar and Athens, respectively. Thucydides’s rebels admit as much in their speech to the Spartans (3.10.5). Like Thucydides, Caesar also puts a concession of ingratitude in the mouth of a character (in *oratio obliqua* in this case): Convictolitavis, attempting to draw the Aedui to the side of Vercingetorix, admits that he had received particular attention from Caesar (BG 7.37.4).

Whatever favor Caesar’s Aedui and Thucydides’s Mytileneans received before, it is clear that each is convinced that the situation has changed. They both claim that, although they are nominally allies, they are increasingly being treated as subject states by Rome and Athens, respectively. The Mytileneans make this claim in an entreaty to the Spartans for support in their rebellion, while Convictolitavis makes a similar argument to his fellow Aedui and rallies them to revolt. The Mytileneans tell the Spartans that the other allies of Athens have been enslaved, and that they fear they will be subjected to the same treatment (3.10.5-6). Convictolitavis balks at the prospect of continuing to be treated as a Roman subject: why must the Aedui appeal to Caesar and the Romans for arbitration? Why not the other way around (BG 7.37.5)?

The parallels accumulate as the Mytileneans and Aedui reflect on their own positions in the broader political and military context; both conclude that victory in the larger conflict is contingent on the success of their respective rebellions, and represent their own states as the final boundary between freedom and slavery. The Mytileneans entreat the Spartans to receive them as allies by pointing on the strategic advantage they can offer in the war against Athens. If the Spartans support them, they will gain the Mytilenean navy; perhaps more importantly, they will encourage the rest of the Athenian allies to defect (3.13.7). Caesar’s Convictolitavis makes a similar case to the Aeduan youths. The Aedui are the only obstacle to Gallic victory, he argues. If the Aedui revolt from the Romans, the rest of the Gauls will follow, bound by no example of loyalty (BG 7.37.3).

It is worth noting that this is a recurring theme in the BG; Caesar often justifies his suppression of disturbances by citing the need to prevent others from following the example and staging their own revolt (e.g., the repression of the Belgae in Book 2, the Eburones in Book 5). A reader of the BG might here recall not only this argument by Thucydides’s Mytilenean embassy, but also Cleon’s argument that the Mytileneans must be destroyed in order to dissuade others

²⁷ ἔνωσαν τὴν Λέσβον ἐς τὴν Μυτιλήνην βίο, “They were forcibly uniting Lesbos around Mytilene,” 3.2.3. As Hornblower 1997 observes (*ad loc.*), this refers to political synoikism. It is unclear from Caesar’s narrative whether the Aedui imagined this sort of political power for themselves, but the idea of the Gallic tribes becoming more organized might have been a disturbing one, since their internal divisions usually discouraged wide-scale rebellion and often forced the tribes to rely on Caesar for adjudication (e.g., the Aeduan election conflict in Book 7).
from rebelling (3.37-40, discussed in more detail below). Caesar thus sows Thucydidean seeds in his reader’s imagination and evokes that Thucydidean “resonance” well before the revolt of the Aedui in Book 7, all without a direct or linguistic allusion.

The historical circumstances of the revolts were thus similar, and Caesar intensifies the similarities by crafting his Aeduan’s self-justification to echo that of the Mytileneans. The rhetoric of Caesar’s Aedui recalls that of Thucydides’s Mytileneans: once-favored allies suspect that they are becoming subject states, not allies, and so they align themselves with a larger force to whom they can offer a strategic advantage. Reporting to a Roman audience about private deliberations among the Gallic tribes, Caesar was free to frame the arguments of the Aedui in whatever way would best suit his own rhetorical purposes. Why invoke the context of Thucydides and the Mytileneans? The Mytilenean debate exemplifies the Thucydidean conflict (articulated by Pelling) between expediency and angry miscalculation. By setting this context in the background of his own narrative, Caesar portrays himself as a commander in a more positive light than the bare narrative would have.28

Caesar could simply tell us that he is an effective leader, but this would have little impact.29 It would be more convincing for Caesar to show us through his narrative that he is effective, and he does so in the commentaries by highlighting his successes and reframing his setbacks.30 Caesar’s strategy in the Aeduan narrative is more effective yet. Caesar the author uses the allusion to Thucydides to shape his portrayal of Caesar the commander by implicitly contrasting the efficient, successful way in which he deals with a crisis with the near-disaster of the Athenians. More specifically, Caesar is not concerned with avenging past wrongs, but rather with expediency; he sees that clementia at present can provide security in the future.31 Caesar’s effectiveness is thrown into stark relief when it is implicitly compared to the Athenians’ clumsy handling of the Mytilenean revolt. By evoking the Mytilenean episode, in which the Athenians are nearly persuaded to annihilate an entire population out of rage, Caesar demonstrates the danger of letting immediate concerns (satisfying one’s anger) outweigh long-term interests (preventing widespread insurrection). The immediate thirst for revenge is quenched, but then what? Caesar’s own

28 It is well-acknowledged that Caesar qua author is acutely concerned with constructing the image of Caesar qua commander, but, as Adrian Goldsworthy has remarked, “[t]he ways in which Caesar creates this impression, and the specific qualities of his skills as a commander that he emphasizes, have not really been analyzed.” (Goldsworthy 1998, 194). Grillo 2011 addresses Caesar’s self-presentation in the BC, a text in which much was at stake for Caesar in terms of public perception. However, past scholarship on this topic (especially scholarship on the BG) has tended to focus on the more technical aspects and content of Caesar’s self-presentation rather than his literary techniques. See, for example, Fuller 1965 and Campbell 1987.
29 In his letter to Lucceius, Cicero claims that one of the reasons he wished to avoid the weighty responsibility of writing about his own consulship was the skepticism with which audiences approach autobiographical narratives (ad Fam. 5.12.9).
30 On Caesar’s use of this literary technique in general, see Raumbaud 1966.
31 There is a wide-ranging body of scholarship on Caesar’s clementia. Coulter 1931 provides a fairly comprehensive overview of references to Caesar’s clemency in the commentaries and Cicero’s letters. More recently, see Barlow 1998, Powell 2003, Riggsby 2006 (especially 175-189), and Grillo 2012 (especially 78-105). Konstan 2005 challenges the idea that the clementia Caesaris was universally recognized by Caesar’s contemporaries as a manifestation of tyrannical ambitions.
handling of rebellious subjects seems all the more expedient by comparison. It
may feel unsatisfactory at present to not slaughter the Aedui, but preserving the
repressed rebels rather than slaughtering them will benefit Caesar in the future;
the spared will be bound in Caesar’s debt and thus more easily controlled.

Caesar employs this method of contrast-by-allusion elsewhere to great
effect; for example, Christopher Krebs has convincingly demonstrated Caesar’s
use of a similar technique in his depiction of the geography of Germany. Caesar,
Krebs argues, positions his Germans and Germania in such a way as to call to
mind Herodotus’s Scythians and Scythia: a nomadic, slippery people inhabiting
a trackless, unexplored space. Caesar the commander, then, is shown by
comparison to surpass Darius. Whereas Darius unwisely tries to match the
Scythians at their own nomadic game and his campaign ends in disaster and
defeat, Caesar withdraws from his pursuit of the German tribes before incurring
significant losses; Caesar’s failure to swiftly conquer the territory beyond the
Rhine is thus reframed as a canny and circumspect tactical choice.

In the present case, however, it is not Herodotus’s world against which Caesar
sets his own, but Thucydides’s. The Mytilenean debate has been discussed extensively
in modern scholarship and the general circumstances of the revolt are familiar.
Upon receiving word of Paches’s victory in Lesbos, the Athenians immediately
voted in anger (ὑπὸ ὀργῆς, 3.36.2) to put to death the entire adult male population of
Mytilene and to enslave the women and children; messengers were sent that day to
deliver these orders to Paches. The next day brought with it second thoughts (καὶ τῇ
ὕστερᾳ μετάνοιᾳ τῆς εὐθὺς Ἰη αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀναλογισμὸς ὡμοῦ τὸ βούλευμα καὶ μέγα
ἔγνωσαν, πόλιν ὅλην διαιμείραι μᾶλλον ἢ οὐ τοὺς αἰτίους, “The next day, there was
a change of heart, and reflection that it was a savage decree that had been passed, to
destroy the entire city rather than the guilty parties alone,” 3.36.4),34 and an assembly
was convened to revisit the matter. Cleon, who on the previous day had proposed
the successful motion to put the Mytileneans to death, made the first speech. He
argued that the Mytileneans should be thoroughly destroyed as an example for any
other wavering allies; their previous favored status was all the more reason for a swift
and devastating punishment (3.37-40). Cleon is opposed by one Diodotus, otherwise
unknown. Diodotus responds that the decision should be made in the interest of
expediency, not revenge; it might satisfy the Athenians’ present rage to annihilate the
Mytileneans, but it will not deter anyone in the future from revolting, and preserving
the defeated insurgents will allow the Athenians to maintain the favor of the people
in the tribute-paying states (3.42-48). A second vote was taken and the motion of
Diodotus won by a narrow margin; the message barely reached Paches in time, and
the Mytileneans were ultimately spared (3.49).

In the Mytilenean debate, the savage (ὁμοῦ) opinion loses out, but just
barely. The Athenians, an emotional mob, have come perilously close to committing
an atrocity for the sake of immediate revenge. It takes the Athenians two rounds
of debate to decide to spare the Mytileneans. Caesar, on the other hand, handles

32 Krebs 2006.
33 Recent studies include Fulkerson 2008 on the balance of reason and emotion in the
appeals of Cleon and Diodotus and Debnar 2000 on Diodotus’s paradoxical representation of
Athenian political discourse.
34 Hornblower 1997 notes (ad loc.) that ὡμοῦ and ὀργῆ are often linked; this connection
between high emotion (ὁργῆ) and disastrous result (ὁμοῦ) is Caesar’s point, as well.
the Aedui with two words: *civitatem recipit* ("He took back the city," *BG* 7.90.1). The Aedui are preserved as allies and order is restored in Gaul. Thucydides presents two speeches at the moment of decision; Caesar includes none. He simply tells us that he took back the city. If, indeed, Caesar intended to evoke Thucydides's account of the Mytilenean revolt, why would he avoid any allusion to that iconic exchange, the Mytilenean debate? Some kind of debate would have made the allusion more explicit. Although it is obviously unlikely that Caesar would have put the decision to a vote, he could have narrated an internal debate: "Caesar considered his options: whether to punish the treachery of the Aedui with death, or to spare them in the spirit of *clementia*." 35 Caesar, does not, however, compose anything resembling an "Aeduan debate," even an internal one. To do so would undermine the intent of the allusion (that is, to demonstrate by contrast Caesar's effectiveness as a commander) by suggesting a moment of indecision.

The solution may be to look for the "other half" of the debate elsewhere in the Aeduan narrative. I suggest that this may be the function of the speech of the Arvernian leader Critognatus to the besieged at Alesia. Critognatus's speech stands in for the other side of the debate; Critognatus, with his barbaric and cruel advice, plays the role of Cleon and represents the *μουθύ*. 36 *Oratio recta* is relatively rare in the *BG*, 37 but Caesar gives Critognatus, making his only appearance in the narrative, an extensive direct speech. Indeed, Caesar tells us that the speech of the Arvernian leader – on account of its singular and wicked cruelty – is not to be passed over (*non praeterreunda oratio Critognati videtur propter eius singularem et nefariam crudelitatem,* *BG* 7.77.2). 38 Caesar then reports Critognatus’s words in direct discourse. In this speech, Critognatus urges those trapped inside Alesia to resort to extreme measures to survive the siege: they should do what their ancestors did, and nourish themselves on the bodies of those who are physically unfit for military service.

It is obvious that Caesar’s choice was not between sparing the Aedui and eating them. Critognatus’s advice, however, does represent the short-sighted and extreme measures by those who are desperate and thinking only of their immediate concerns (measures which also include, for example, slaughtering entire cities of allies). These are the kinds of measures Caesar rejects in the case of the Aedui. Critognatus’s response, like Cleon’s, arises from overflowing emotion (desperation in the case of Critognatus, rage in the case of Cleon). Just as Cleon’s recommendation to destroy the Mytileneans would do much to satisfy his passion but little to bring the Athenian allies back under control, Critognatus’s proposal would have only temporarily solved

---

35 Although he avoids it in the Aedui episode, Caesar does describe his internal debate on other occasions: Caesar debates with himself how best to punish the rebelling Eburones (*BG* 6.34) and how to take Corfinium as quickly as possibly without his soldiers plundering the town (*BC* 1.21).

36 Scholars have generally focused on the formal oratorical structures, features, and figures of the speech (e.g., Rasmussen 1963, Schieffer 1972, Batstone 1990, Riggsby 2006).

37 The *BG* contains nine speeches in direct discourse, concentrated in the later books (no one speaks in OR until the anonymous *aquilifer* in Book Four); the *BC*, on the other hand, has ten utterances in OR. Rasmussen 1963.

38 To add to the verbal and thematic parallels described above: Caesar’s editorializing here recalls Thucydides’ characterization of Cleon as being a "most violent man" (πιστιτότατος, 3.36.6). Caesar also describes Critognatus as a "man of great influence (μεγας ἀδύνατος, 7.77.3)"; similarly, Thucydides notes that Cleon was, at that time, the man "most able to influence the *demos*" (τῷ τά δὴ μὲν παρὰ πολὺν τῷ τάτῳ πυκνώτατος, 3.36.6).
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the plight of the besieged Gauls: they would have a few more days of rations and then what?

Caesar’s Roman audience might have felt the same outrage at the betrayal of the Aedui as Cleon did at the betrayal of the Mytileneans; from a Roman perspective, Caesar would have been entirely justified in sacking the Aeduan territory and killing or enslaving the population. Instead, Caesar follows the sort of course advocated by Diodotus in his speech opposing Cleon. Diodotus argues that, rather than merely satisfying their passions, the Athenians must do what is in the best interest of the city; the decision must be made with an eye to the future, not the present.

\[\text{If I assert that they are all guilty, I will not therefore recommend that we put them to death for this, unless it is expedient, unless they have some case for pardon, unless it seems beneficial to the polis.}
\]

These things are both beneficial [to us] in the future and frightening to our enemies at present; for whoever strategizes well against enemies is stronger than the one attacking blindly with brute force.

This is consistent with the approach Caesar takes apropos of the troublemakers who surrender throughout the Bellum Gallicum. To be sure, as scholars have observed, Caesar’s contemporaries suspected that Caesar’s dementia was not extended for free. Cicero recounts to Atticus the report of Curio, who has told Cicero that Caesar has only refrained from executing the tribune Metellus (and probably others) due to his concern for his public image:

\[\text{ipsum autem non voluntate aut natura non esse crudelem, sed quod putaret popularem esse clementiam. Quod si populi studium amississet,}
\]

\[\text{Indeed, he is not opposed to doing so under certain circumstances; he enslaves the population of the Atuatuci for participating in the uprising of the Belgae in 57 BCE. Why does Caesar so harshly punish the Atuatuci, a minor Belgic tribe? The Atuatuci had originally surrendered to Caesar under terms similar to those of the surrender of the Nervii in the same revolt; they must yield up their arms, but Caesar will protect them against incursions by their neighbors. During the night, however, the Atuatuci attacked the Romans with weapons they had kept concealed. The Romans subdued them and Caesar’s response was merciless; clementia could not be extended to those who could not be trusted.}
\]

\[\text{As Hornblower 1997 notes (ad loc.), Diodotus’s kreisis here alludes back to Cleon at 3.37.3 (xeropo isoos akinhtos xroymen polis kreisou estin h kalos ezhousi akrois, “a city in which the laws are worse but firm is stronger than one in which the laws are excellent but without force”).}
\]

\[\text{Dowling 2006 neatly summarizes the remarks to this effect in Cicero’s letters.}
\]
crudelem fore (*Att. 10.4.8*)

Curio said that Caesar himself was neither by inclination nor nature unwilling to be cruel, but he thought that clemency would be popular; if he lost the affection of the people, though, he would be cruel.42

One way in which clemency was useful to Caesar, then, was that it appealed to the people. Furthermore, as Hirtius points out in *BG* 8.49 (quoted below), those who have been spared are indebted and thus easier to control and exploit. In Book 2, Caesar remarks that he desired to “preserve the safety” of the surrendering Nervii and exercise *clementia* toward them. He imposes no terms on them other than that they should keep to their own territories and warns their neighbors to do the same.

quos Caesar, ut in miseros ac supplices usus misericordia videretur, diligentissime conservavit suisque finibus atque iussit et finitimis imperavit ut ab iniuria et maleficio se suosque prohiberent (*BG* 2.28)

Caesar, in order that he might be recognized as demonstrating pity toward wretched, suppliant men, spared them [the Nervii] most responsibly, and ordered that they benefit only from their own lands and downs, and ordered that their neighbors check themselves and their allies from causing injury or harm to them.

Although Caesar’s stated motive for sparing the Nervii is that he wishes to be known for his humane treatment of the wretched (*ut in miseros ac supplices usus misericordia videretur*), by preserving the Nervii, he is binding them to himself and to Rome as clients. Caesar’s clemency is always practical, never a gesture of mere goodwill. Caesar’s *clementia* is highlighted again in Book 8, as he looks to solidify Gaul’s loyalty before the end of his proconsulate. Hirtius tells us that no new burdens were imposed on the Gauls, but that Caesar addressed the states with respect and gave rewards to their leaders:

Nihil enim minus volebat quam sub decessu suo necessitatem sibi aliquid imponi belli gerendi, ne, cum exercitum deducturus esset, bellum aliquid relinquetur quod omnis Gallia libenter sine praesenti periculo susciperet. Itaque honorifice civitates appellando, principes maximis praemis adficiendo, nulla onera inuungendo defessam tot adversis proeliiis Galliam condicione parendi meliore facile in pace continuat. (*BG* 8.49)

There was nothing he desired less than that, upon his departure, the need of waging another war be imposed upon him, lest, when he was going to lead away his army, another war remain, which Gaul would willingly undertake, since there was no present danger. For this reason, by addressing the states with respect, by influencing the

---

42 See also Caesar’s own remarks on his *clementia* at *Att. 9.16*, and Cicero’s tart reference to *insidiosa clementia* at *Att. 8.16.2.*
leading men with great gifts, by imposing no burdens, and by making
the condition of their subjection less severe, he easily kept Gaul,
drained by so many lost battles, quiet.

In particular, he does not inflict punishment on the Bellovaci, despite their
participation in the revolt; the damage they have inflicted upon themselves, he says,
is punishment enough (Sed tamen se contentum fore ea poena quam sibi ipsi contraxissent,
"But [he said that] he would be content with the punishment which they had brought
upon themselves," BG 8.22.2). As in the case of the Nervii, he spares the Bellovaci and
the others not out of kindness, but to put them under obligation to him and, hopefully,
leave them disinclined to revolt again.

Caesar’s treatment of the Aedui follows the same reasoning and recalls the
advice of Diodotus: spare them now rather than annihilate them and secure their
loyalty and obligation for the future. In this respect, then, the Aeduan example is somewhat unexceptional. What is exceptional, however, is the literary method
of Caesar’s presentation of his own clementia. Not only does he demonstrate his
expedient use of clemency as he does elsewhere in the BG, by using the speech
of Critognatus to evoke the memory of Cleon and the near-destruction of the
Mytileneans, he reminds us how dangerous the alternative could be. The Athenians
restrained themselves from inflicting mass destruction in the case of the Mytileneans,
but only barely. As Caesar’s reader would surely recall, however, the Athenians
finally capitulated to their savage instincts in the case of Melos thirteen years
later. In Thucydides’ account, the brutal oppression of the Melians, set as if on the
eve of the disastrous Sicilian expedition, seems to represent a turning point. The
Athenians’ fortunes rapidly deteriorated thereafter, and it is not unreasonable to see in
Thucydides’ version the implication of causality: the hubris in Melos led to the hubris
in Sicily, which reversed the momentum of the war in favor of the Spartans.43
The Romans need not fear such a disaster, Caesar seems to suggest; the Athenians
wavered at Mytilene, and committed an atrocity at Melos, but Caesar would never
risk Roman security in order to satisfy his own selfish passion for revenge.

In summary: I have here attempted to demonstrate the way in which Caesar
employs Thucydidean allusions to shape his portrayal of himself as a successful
commander. Through echoes of language and argument, Caesar exploits the
similarities between the revolts of the Aedui and Mytileneans to recall Thucydides’
narrative. Caesar advocates a position of clemency for the sake of expediency; by
looking out for future interests rather than satisfying immediate desires, he avoids the
catastrophe toward which the Athenians seemed aimed at Mytilene, and with which
they ultimately collided at Melos. The allusion portrays Caesar qua commander in an
even better light than merely mentioning his clementia, as he does elsewhere in the BG,
because it reminds his audience how disastrous the opposite can be.

43 As Thucydides observes in his digression on stasis in the context of the Mytilene-
an revolt, war’s negative effects on character are compounded as it progresses (ἐν μὲν γὰρ
eἰρήνῃ καὶ ἀγάθῳ πράξειν αἰτὶ τὰ πόλεις καὶ οἱ ἰδίωται ἄμεινοι τὰς γνώμας ἔχοισι διὰ τὸ
μὴ ἐξ ἀκουσίας ἀνάγκας πιπτεῖν· ὅ δὲ πόλεμος ὑφελών τὴν εὐπορίαν τοῦ καθ’ ἡμέραν βιαῖος
dιδάσκαλος καὶ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τὰς ἀρχῶς τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοίως, "In peace and fortunate
times, cities and men have better sentiments, because they do not fall into unwelcome need.
But war, that violent teacher, takes away the easy supply of daily necessity and matches men’s
characters to their circumstances,“ (3.82.2).
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FIGURING FEAR IN THE ROMAN HISTORIANS

Tyler T. Travilian
Pacific Lutheran University

For the Roman Historians, no passion is more prominent than fear. Fear for them is perhaps the single most important influence on the behavior of individuals and states.¹

The Latin fear vocabulary is rich, with some twelve roots related to the emotion,² but how genres and their authors deploy these words is not much studied.³ I take as my inspiration L. A. MacKay’s study of fear in Latin epic,⁴ in which he points toward a beginning of study by looking at the distribution and proportions of words for fear across Vergil, Lucan, Statius, and Ovid. My goal here is similar: to investigate how Roman historiography deploys fear terminology. For the purpose of this paper, I have limited my investigation to the historiographical works of the late Republic and early Empire that are reasonably complete and whose authorship is agreed upon: Caesar de Bello Gallico 1-7 and de Bello Civili, Sallust Bellum Iugurthinum and Coniuratio Catilinae, Livy Ab Urbe Condita 1-10 and 21-45, and Tacitus Annales 1-6, 11-16, Historiae 1-5, Agricola, and Germania. I have omitted Tacitus’s de Oratoribus as a philosophical rather than historiographical work.

A word on method: When counting the words for fear, I have grouped all instances of compound verbs under the simple verb for the following reasons: (1) in order to consider together all words that share the same root meaning; (2) in order to make the verb directly comparable with the noun, which as a rule does not have compound forms, and the adjective, which has fewer, for example, to compare timor, with timere, extimere, pertimere, etc.; (3) in order to prevent an already unwieldy chart from becoming unreadable. For similar reasons, I have grouped participles with their verbs: their root is primarily verbal and their use primarily predicative more often than attributive.⁵ Since I am aware, however, that some readers might prefer to group participles differently, I have included two appendices. The first replicates the chart twice: once with participles included under adjectives and again with participles under their own heading.⁶ The second appendix gives the citations for each instance of each fear word with sub-headings for the complex verb forms. This appendix is a substantial improvement on the concordances for Caesar, Tacitus, and Livy, which are computer-generated alphabetical lists and do not group words by root.

The work has, I think, been fruitful: clear patterns have emerged revealing both generic and personal preferences in the vocabularies of fear. The Roman historians figure fear in a genre-dependent way, preferring a particular vocabulary generally consistent across authors as well as a particular stylistic ratio of nouns to adjectives to verbs: nouns about five times as often as adjectives and twice as often as verbs.⁷ Strikingly, there is little change over time in the vocabulary, ratio, or average frequency of words for fear. The one departure is Caesar, who varies from the rest by employing a markedly smaller vocabulary and almost completely eschewing adjectives of fear, a practice that he uses to his advantage in the creation of his particular narrative style, as I explore below.
## I: DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns, Adjectives, Verbs (participles included)</th>
<th>Caesar</th>
<th>Sallust</th>
<th>Livy</th>
<th>Tacitus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Words in Corpus (nearest 1000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>506,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formido</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (0.38)</td>
<td>7 (0.013)</td>
<td>58 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (0.006)</td>
<td>1 (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metus</td>
<td>13 (0.15)</td>
<td>42 (1.31)</td>
<td>339 (0.670)</td>
<td>206 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (0.004)</td>
<td>2 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164 (0.324)</td>
<td>40 (0.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periculum</td>
<td>93 (1.11)</td>
<td>50 (1.56)</td>
<td>276 (0.545)</td>
<td>136 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror</td>
<td>22 (0.26)</td>
<td>4/5 (0.13)</td>
<td>314 (0.620)</td>
<td>49 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor</td>
<td>70 (0.83)</td>
<td>11 (0.34)</td>
<td>74 (0.146)</td>
<td>11 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.002)</td>
<td>0 (see citations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69 (0.136)</td>
<td>14 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verecundia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54 (0.107)</td>
<td>2 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOUNS</strong></td>
<td>198 (2.36)</td>
<td>119/20 (3.72)</td>
<td>1303 (2.575)</td>
<td>537 (3.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (0.013)</td>
<td>9 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidulosus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (0.13)</td>
<td>1 (0.002)</td>
<td>8 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horribilis</td>
<td>2 (0.02)</td>
<td>2 (0.06)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horridus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (0.011)</td>
<td>10 (0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavidus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (0.09)</td>
<td>55 (0.109)</td>
<td>26 (0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periculosus</td>
<td>3 (0.04)</td>
<td>3 (0.09)</td>
<td>23 (0.045)</td>
<td>9 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terribilis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.03)</td>
<td>29 (0.057)</td>
<td>3 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timidus</td>
<td>6 (0.07)</td>
<td>8 (0.25)</td>
<td>12 (0.024)</td>
<td>1 (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (0.13)</td>
<td>95 (0.188)</td>
<td>44 (0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verecundus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverentius</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJECTIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horrere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metuere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periclitari</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrere</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timere</td>
<td>40/41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vereri</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBS</td>
<td>179/80(2.13)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAR TOTAL</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>210/1</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:A:V</td>
<td>18:1:16.3</td>
<td>4.8:1:2.6</td>
<td>5.7:1:2.8</td>
<td>4.8:1:2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WORDS THAT NEVER OCCUR:
NOUNS: timiditas
ADJECTIVES: formidabilis, horrifer, horrificus, harrisonus, pallidus, pallens, terrificus, tremebundus, tremulus
VERBS: pallere, pavitare, tremefacere

II: LEGEND
Due to the wide variations in total corpus length among our authors (Caesar at 84,000 words, Sallust at 32,000, Livy at 506,000, and Tacitus at 153,000), the absolute count for each fear word is of small help: it can only show us which words are used. From this we learn that the vocabulary of fear seems to become broader and more colorful over time, but the numbers cannot be compared to reveal other trends between authors. So in addition to the absolute counts, I have included in parentheses a ratio of each fear word to each thousand total words in that author’s corpus. Tacitus, for example, uses metus on average 1.35 times in every thousand words. These ratios, then, can be compared across authors, allowing us to see how frequently a word appears, which words are characteristic of historiography generally, which reappear often in an individual author, and whether trends occur over time.

Next, in order to see what stylistic trends might emerge, I also include a ratio comparing the distribution of fear words across parts of speech (noun, adjective, and verb) within each author. As a control set, I surveyed for each author a random passage of 500 words and calculated the same ratio of all nouns to adjectives to verbs. This was to see whether the distribution of fear words was
actually significant, or merely representative of global trends in each author's work as a whole. We see immediately that the distribution of fear words by part of speech is markedly different from the general distributions, which tells us that our authors do in fact treat fear with a special awareness and deployment. The particular details and significance I treat below.

III: OBSERVATIONS

(1) Historiographical Preferences

The first observation that leaps out at us is a noticeable preference in the historians for particular words, which are different from the preferences McKay notes in epic. Among the nouns, metus occurs most frequently in Livy (0.670) and Tacitus (1.35), and second most in Sallust (1.31), while periculum is the most frequent in Caesar (1.11), Sallust (1.56), second most in Tacitus (0.89), and weakly-occurring but not infrequent for Livy (0.545), far-exceeding his next most frequent, pavor. These two nouns account for 54% of fear nouns in Caesar, 77% in Sallust, 47% in Livy, and 64% in Tacitus.

Among the adjectives, pavidus is second most frequent in Livy (0.109) and Tacitus (0.17), and weakly-occurring but still common in Sallust (0.9), while trepidus is the most frequent in Livy (0.188) and Tacitus (0.29) and second most in Sallust (0.13). These two adjectives account for 0% of fear adjectives in Caesar, 28% in Sallust, 65% in Livy, and 63% in Tacitus.

Among the verbs, terrere is the clear favorite, being the most common in Caesar (1.08), Livy (0.389), and Tacitus (0.61), and second most in Sallust (0.57), while timere ranks second in Caesar (0.48) and Livy (0.292), first in Sallust (0.66), and third in Tacitus (0.27). These two verbs account for 73% of fear verbs in Caesar, 55% in Sallust, 54% in Livy, and 48% in Tacitus.

We can represent these preferences somewhat more clearly with a chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>periculum, metus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>pavidus, trepidus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>terrere, timere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These ratios and percentages, I admit, appear at first rather bald and lifeless, but they reveal a clear set of vocabulary that these historians use to characterize fear. Dread (metus) and danger (periculum) frighten (terrere) people who, experiencing fear (timere), become agitated (trepidus) and panicky (pavidus). Variations from this pattern will reveal an author's personal vocabulary, perhaps even his preoccupations, and special concern or knowledge of the events he describes.

(2) Individual Preferences

The lexical preferences of each author also jump out quite apart from the jointly common words.

Among nouns, Caesar has a clear preference for timor (0.83) and Livy for terror (0.620). Among adjectives, Caesar may have preference for timidus. He uses so few fear adjectives (only 11 out of all 84,000 words) that it is difficult to tell, but of those 11 instances, 6 are forms of timidus. Sallust, however, clearly
prefers *timidus* (0.25), using it twice as often as any other fear adjective. Among verbs, Caesar prefers *vereri* (0.42), while *metuere* is preferred by Sallust (0.44) and Tacitus (0.33). Interestingly, Caesar tends to shun forms of the *metus/metuere* complex, with *metus* making up only 6.5% of his fear nouns, and *metuere* occurring only once (0.5%) of his fear verbs.

The picture becomes clearer, however, if we include not just the “strongly”-occurring top preferences of each author but also the “weakly”-occurring words, that is, those words which appear more frequently than the occasional mention but not often enough to show a strong preference. Sallust’s nouns, for example, have the following breakdown: *periculum* (1.56), *metus* (1.31), *formido* (0.38), *timor* (0.34), *terror* (0.13). *Periculum* and *metus* are strongly represented, *formido* and *timor* are weakly represented, and *terror* only occasionally represented, as the natural breaks in their frequency underscore. The following chart, including these data, reveals possible trends of influences alongside lexical preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Caesar</th>
<th>Sallust</th>
<th>Livy</th>
<th>Tacitus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>timor (weak) --</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>formido (weak) --</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>formido (weak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>terror</td>
<td>terror (weak)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>pavor (weak)</td>
<td>pavor (weak)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>timidus</th>
<th>timidus</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>formidulosus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>formidulosus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(weak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periculosus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>periculosus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(weak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(weak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>terribilis (weak) --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>vereri (weak)</th>
<th>vereri (weak)</th>
<th>vereri (weak)</th>
<th>vereri (weak)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metuere</td>
<td>metuere (weak)</td>
<td>metuere (weak)</td>
<td>trepidare (weak)</td>
<td>horrire (weak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>periclitari (weak)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among nouns and adjectives, which seem closely linked, Caesar prefers *timor* and *timidus*, which is perhaps unsurprising, since they are the bland, noun and adjective versions of *timere*, a verb which we have already established is generically common for fear. Sallust picks up these words but also introduces his own preferred *formido* and the rather mannered *formidulosus*. While *timor* and *timidus* fall off in frequency at this point, Tacitus picks up Sallust’s *formido* and *formidulosus*, as we might expect since he took Sallust as his model. *Formidulosus*, a word otherwise rather rare, will appear only once in all of Livy. Livy, however, prefers *terror* (again a nominalization of the generically common *terrere*) and, somewhat weakly, *pavor*, both of which Tacitus also picks up. Among verbs, Caesar prefers *vereri*, which Sallust and Livy both weakly continue, but which
Tacitus drops (perhaps as its meaning shifts away from “fear” and toward “reverence”). Sallust introduces *metuere* quite strongly, which Tacitus again adopts, also strongly, despite its appearing much less often in Livy. Livy has the broadest lexical variation by far, whether a function of the breadth of his text and the variety of situations he describes, or due to his own proclivities.

We see from this a clear chain in which Sallust responds to Caesar but introduces his own vocabulary as well, while Livy seems responsive but not beholden to both Caesar and Sallust. Tacitus, however, seems to continue both Livy and Sallust, with especial attention to the latter. Perhaps no particular detail of this is surprising in itself, but it is striking to see so clearly in the vocabulary of fear alone an indication of influences amongst the major historians. The epic poets do not seem to have had a similar influence on the historians. When we look at McKay’s figures on Vergil, Lucan, Statius, and Ovid, we see that Tacitus and Livy show no particular response to the vocabulary preferred by these poets, with the possible exception of Tacitus’s increased use of *pavere* compared the other historians.

### (3) Proportions of Fear

In proportion to the total narrative, we do not see any general trends in fear that correlate with chronology, although specific words may show change, as for example, *vereri*, which drops off in frequency as its meaning shifts toward “reverence.” Instead, we see that the lowest percentages of fear occur in Caesar (4.62) and Livy (4.292) while we find the highest levels of tension in Sallust (6.56) and Tacitus (6.09). That Sallust and Tacitus would share similar numbers is to be expected, or at least accepted, but how to explain Sallust’s having the larger percentages? A number of interpretive explanations suggest themselves: perhaps the repressive atmosphere of the early Empire bled into Tacitus’s style, prompting him to under-represent and under-report felt fear just as his coevals might have repressed the emotion from their faces; or perhaps Sallust, dramatizing his accounts of the Jugurthine War and Catilinarian Conspiracy, relied more heavily on the vocabulary of fear to evoke an atmosphere in which tension was palpable and open. A simpler explanation, however, might account also for what seems to be the low percentages of fear in Livy: Tacitus shows lower percentages than Sallust and Livy shows lower percentages than all three other authors because of the types of history they are writing. We are looking at Sallust’s monographs, works narrowly focused on particular events which happen by their nature to involve fear. But in the cases of Livy and Tacitus, we are looking at annalistic histories that due to their chronological breadth covered a variety of events, both those in which fear was a central factor and those in which it was not.

Because of the differences in these authors’ contents and approaches, we might profitably look not just at how often the authors use fear words (i.e., the percentages we have looked at so far), but also at their stylistic proportions of nouns, adjectives, and verbs. This leads us to a second set of charts: the ratios of nouns, adjectives, and verbs of fear within each author.
What we see here is striking. First, all four authors use nouns, adjectives, and verbs in basically the same ratio, which suggests that the distribution of nouns, adjectives, and verbs in Latin prose tends to fall in a common pattern. Second, fear words, however, occur in a proportion quite different from nouns, adjectives, and verbs generally, which tells us that the authors are deploying them in a marked fashion. Third, we see that nouns, adjectives, and verbs of fear, when they occur, occur in nearly identical proportions in Sallust, Tacitus, and Livy. Given the sheer size and variation of length in the three corpora and given that this is so different from the proportion we see in words generally, this pattern may represent a prose, or even historiographic convention: there is a particular way of talking, or perhaps thinking, about fear, a particular proportion which fear tends to follow. Fear is primarily nominal, a thing which exists or rises up (periculum, metus, timor, terror), and secondarily verbal, an action to be observed (terrere, timere, metuere, vereri), but rarely is it adjectival, describing or part of something else (pavidus, trepidus, timidus).

We can usefully compare these ratios to those McKay gives for Vergil, Lucan, Statius, and Ovid. He gives a rough percentage of total use of fear words for each author according to verb noun, and adjective, which, when converted to the same units I have used comes out as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Adjs.</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vergil</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucan</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers are much closer to the average distribution of nouns, adjectives, and verbs generally, although they show, as McKay notes, a greater reliance on verbs than on nouns and a small degree of avoidance of the adjective. These ratios are significantly different from each other and from those in the historians, from which we can conclude that the way the historians deploy fear is a particular, stylistic choice.

(4) Caesar, the Anomaly

This brings us to Caesar, from whom I have been holding aloof. Caesar’s figures show a number of anomalies. His vocabulary is significantly narrower than that of the other three authors, and he does not fit the theory that shorter, more focused narratives dealing with fear-centered events should show a greater lexical density of fear, since he has lower percentages of fear words than Tacitus, despite having a smaller vocabulary and half the total word count. Even more striking is Caesar’s extreme avoidance of adjectives for fear, using only eleven in his entire 84,000 words, though he does not avoid adjectives generally. But striking also is his relative frequency of verbs, more frequent than in any of the other authors. This leads to a noticeably lopsided ratio of nouns, adjectives, and verbs of fear in which, for every adjective, Caesar uses seventeen nouns and
sixteen verbs. Why should this be?

A lengthy examination of Caesar’s stylistic tendencies is beyond this paper, which aims merely to note the phenomena, but I will offer some possible avenues for exploration. Caesar was, of course, writing commentarii, that is, recollections or notes for a history, and not actually history proper. He exploited this distinction to create an unornamented style that by its very baldness gives an impression of verisimilitude. It may be, then, that he avoided the use of adjectives of fear as part of his rhetorical strategy. In fact, Caesar uses adjectives of fear exclusively to describe an object or person’s appearance, that is, to make an external judgment, not to relate a fact, which by its very nature draws attention to the interpretive faculty of the author. A few brief examples will underscore the point.

In BG 1.39, when Caesar’s troops are resupplying near Vesontio, they hear of the strength and stature of their German enemies. A sudden fearfulness (timor) grips them and upsets (perturbaret) their minds. This is bare fact: Caesar must now deal with frightened troops. As affairs progress, the fear spreads even to those who are hardened veterans, until finally:

qui se ex his minus timidos existimari volebant, non se hostem vereri, sed angustias itineris et magnitudinem silvarum, quae intercederent inter ipsos atque Ariovistum, aut rem frumentarium, ut satis commode supportari posset timere dicebant.

those of them who wished to be deemed less fearful, claimed that they did were not scared of the enemy, but that they feared the narrow passes and the breadth of the woods that lay between them and Ariovistus, or the grain supply, that it could support them comfortably enough.

Caesar uses his verbs to indicate the fact of fear (vereri, timere), which is undisputed, but he uses his adjective (timidos) to indicate the manipulation of the external appearance of fear: the adjective is a matter of judgment (existimari).

A similar juxtaposition of factual verb with judgmental adjective occurs at BG 5.33. When Ambiorix’s Gauls attack Sabinus and Cotta as they are breaking camp, Sabinus, surprised, does not acquit himself valiantly.

Tum demum Titurius, qui nihil ante providisset, trepidare et concursare cohortesque disponere, haec tamen ipsa timide atque ut eum omnia deficiere viderentur; quod plerumque eis accidere consuevit, qui in ipso negotio consilium capere coguntur.

And then Titurius Sabinus, who had taken no advance care at all, grew agitated and ran about arraying his cohorts; yet even this he did fearfully and in such a way that everything seemed to fail him, which quite often happens to those who are compelled to make plans in the midst of difficulty.

That Sabinus was agitated (trepidare) is objective: he could be seen running about (concursare). But that this action was done fearfully (timide) is a subjective
judgment which Caesar uses to portray Sabinus as ineffective and thus put the blame for the defeat squarely on him, implying by the brief aside that follows how he himself would have acted.

This distinction between factual description and judgment may also support reading the adjective timidiores in a textual crux at BG 3.24. The text in question reads "...cum sua cunctatione atque opinione timidiores/timoris hostes nostros milites alacriores ad pugnandum efficissent...": "since the enemy, by their own delay and being more fearful than expected (or more fearful in their appearance) (=opinione timidiores) / by the appearance of fear (=opinione timoris) had made our own soldiers more eager to fight...". The reading timidiores is that of the manuscripts and currently accepted, while timoris is Stephanus's. Otto Seel, in his apparatus to the BG, sees the arguments in favor of either reading basically equal, but he inclines toward keeping the comparative on the grounds that it balances alacriores and by reading heavily into the meaning of opinio. But if we read the passage through the fact/judgment lens, we perhaps have another argument. Here, the Gauls, about to engage the young Crassus, make themselves appear fearful in the opinio of the Romans by delaying battle. But what sort of fear do the Roman troops see: true fear or imagined fear? By using timoris, Caesar would indicate an objective appearance of fear—that is, by their delay the Gauls are showing real fear that they actually feel. Using timidiores, on the other hand, would indicate a subjective assessment made by the Roman troops. And in fact we find out in the very next section that the Gauls do not fight fearfully (timide, 3.25) at all: the Roman judgment was premature. This seems evidence that the manuscript reading opinione timidiores rather than opinione timoris is correct.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that the Roman historians did not describe fear merely on an ad hoc basis but rather followed generic conventions that governed not just common vocabulary but also, rather strictly, the relative frequency of nouns, adjectives, and verbs: nouns predominate, followed by verbs, with adjectives a distant third. This is not to say that there was a calculus of fear whereby each author kept a running tally but that there were strong stylistic tendencies internal to the genre. And while historiography as a genre prefers particular words over all, there remained room for personal expression and semantic range in a given author or a given episode.

Caesar, however, stands out from the other historiographical authors. While he does follow the generic vocabulary, he shows the least semantic range otherwise and he strays widely from the conventional ratio of nouns, adjectives, and verbs. This is a quite distinct divergence from historiographical conventions for deploying fear vocabulary and it seems intentional: Caesar has marked adjectives of fear as expressing external judgment or appearance rather than objective fact. In this way, he expands his rhetorical arsenal by carefully reserving the adjective for opportune moments and otherwise avoiding it. The explicitly judgmental quality of the adjective, then, combined with its rarity, strengthens the objective quality of the rest of the narrative and hence also its verisimilitude.
### APPENDIX I: ALTERNATE CHARTS

1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns, Adjectives, Participles, Verbs</th>
<th>Caesar</th>
<th>Sallust</th>
<th>Livy</th>
<th>Tacitus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Words in Corpus (nearest 1000)</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>506,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formido</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (0.38)</td>
<td>7 (0.013)</td>
<td>58 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (0.006)</td>
<td>1 (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metus</td>
<td>13 (0.15)</td>
<td>42 (1.31)</td>
<td>339 (0.670)</td>
<td>206 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (0.004)</td>
<td>2 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164 (0.324)</td>
<td>40 (0.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periculum</td>
<td>93 (1.11)</td>
<td>50 (1.56)</td>
<td>276 (0.545)</td>
<td>136 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror</td>
<td>22 (0.26)</td>
<td>4/5 (0.13)</td>
<td>314 (0.620)</td>
<td>49 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor</td>
<td>70 (0.83)</td>
<td>11 (0.34)</td>
<td>74 (0.146)</td>
<td>11 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.002)</td>
<td>0 (see citations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69 (0.136)</td>
<td>14 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verecundia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54 (0.107)</td>
<td>2 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.004)</td>
<td>18 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOUNS</td>
<td>198 (2.36)</td>
<td>119/20 (3.72)</td>
<td>1303 (2.575)</td>
<td>537 (3.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (0.013)</td>
<td>9 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidulosus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (0.13)</td>
<td>1 (0.002)</td>
<td>8 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horribilis</td>
<td>2 (0.02)</td>
<td>2 (0.06)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horridus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (0.011)</td>
<td>10 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavidus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (0.09)</td>
<td>55 (0.109)</td>
<td>26 (0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periculosus</td>
<td>3 (0.04)</td>
<td>3 (0.09)</td>
<td>23 (0.045)</td>
<td>9 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terribilis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.03)</td>
<td>29 (0.057)</td>
<td>3 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timidus</td>
<td>6 (0.07)</td>
<td>8 (0.25)</td>
<td>12 (0.024)</td>
<td>1 (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (0.13)</td>
<td>95 (0.188)</td>
<td>44 (0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verecundus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (0.004)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverentius</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.004)</td>
<td>2 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJECTIVES</td>
<td>11 (0.13)</td>
<td>25 (0.78)</td>
<td>230 (0.454)</td>
<td>112 (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidaturus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.002)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidatus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.007)</td>
<td>1 (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horrendous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (0.024)</td>
<td>1 (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horrens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (0.026)</td>
<td>2 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metuendus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1   (0.03)</td>
<td>8   (0.016)</td>
<td>3   (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metuens</td>
<td>1   (0.01)</td>
<td>5   (0.16)</td>
<td>24  (0.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavendus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1   (0.002)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1   (0.03)</td>
<td>26  (0.051)</td>
<td>13  (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periclitandus</td>
<td>1   (0.01)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1   (0.007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percitans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6   (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pericitatus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrendus</td>
<td>3   (0.04)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6   (0.012)</td>
<td>1   (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3   (0.006)</td>
<td>1   (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territandus</td>
<td>2   (0.02)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2   (0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territus</td>
<td>63  (0.75)</td>
<td>4   (0.13)</td>
<td>90  (0.178)</td>
<td>39  (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timendus</td>
<td>4   (0.05)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13  (0.026)</td>
<td>2   (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timens</td>
<td>11  (0.13)</td>
<td>5   (0.16)</td>
<td>35  (0.069)</td>
<td>2   (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2   (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidandus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1   (0.002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidans</td>
<td>1   (0.01)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35  (0.069)</td>
<td>4   (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidaturus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1   (0.002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidatus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8   (0.016)</td>
<td>4   (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verendus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3   (0.006)</td>
<td>1   (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1   (0.002)</td>
<td>1   (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veritus</td>
<td>26  (0.31)</td>
<td>5   (0.16)</td>
<td>21  (0.042)</td>
<td>3   (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPLES</td>
<td>112 (1.33)</td>
<td>21  (0.66)</td>
<td>306 (0.605)</td>
<td>111 (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidare</td>
<td>1   (0.01)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2   (0.004)</td>
<td>1   (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horrere</td>
<td>2   (0.02)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36  (0.071)</td>
<td>14  (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metuere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9   (0.28)</td>
<td>20  (0.040)</td>
<td>28  (0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2   (0.06)</td>
<td>6   (0.012)</td>
<td>20  (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pericitari</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6   (0.012)</td>
<td>1   (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrere</td>
<td>23  (0.27)</td>
<td>11  (0.34)</td>
<td>96  (0.190)</td>
<td>53  (0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timere</td>
<td>25/26 (0.30)</td>
<td>16  (0.50)</td>
<td>100 (0.198)</td>
<td>37  (0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1   (0.03)</td>
<td>1   (0.002)</td>
<td>3   (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidare</td>
<td>2   (0.02)</td>
<td>4   (0.13)</td>
<td>34  (0.067)</td>
<td>11  (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verei</td>
<td>9   (0.11)</td>
<td>2   (0.06)</td>
<td>32  (0.063)</td>
<td>4   (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBS</td>
<td>67/68 (0.80)</td>
<td>45  (1.41)</td>
<td>333 (0.658)</td>
<td>172 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAR TOTAL</td>
<td>388 (4.61)</td>
<td>210/1 (6.56)</td>
<td>2172 (4.292)</td>
<td>932 (6.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nouns, Adjectives (participles included), Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Sallust</td>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>Tacitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Words in Corpus (nearest 1000)</strong></td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>506,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formido</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periculum</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tremor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trepidatio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verecundia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reverentia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOUNS</strong></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>119/20</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*cf. to section III.3 above*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formidulosus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horribilis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horridus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavidosus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periculosus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terribilis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timidus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trepidus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(0.188)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verecundus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reverentius</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formidaturus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formidatus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horrendus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horrens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metuendus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metuens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periclitandus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perclitans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periclitatus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrendus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>territandus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>territans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>territus</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>(0.178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timendus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timens</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tremens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trepidandus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trepidans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trepidaturus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trepidatus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verendus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veritus</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJECTIVES</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(1.44)</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>172</th>
<th>112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formido</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metus</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periculum</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremidatio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verecundia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX II: CITATIONS OF FEAR IN SALLUST, CAESAR, LIVY, and TACITUS SALLUST**

Nouns = 119/120

Formido = 12:
- BJ 23.1; 37.3; 41.3; 53.7; 54.6; 55.7; 66.1; 66.2;
- 72.2; 74.1; 99.3
- CC 20.7

Horror = 0

Metus = 42:
- BJ 11.8; 13.1; 18.12; 25.6; 31.15; 35.2; 35.9; 36.2;
- 38.10; 39.1; 40.4; 41.2; 53.8; 56.5; 58.2; 67.1;
- 70.1; 70.5; 85.47; 87.2; 87.4; 89.1; 91.5;
- 91.7; 93.1; 97.5; 99.3; 105.4; 106.2; 106.6;
- 107.1; 109.1; 114.2
- CC 4.2; 6.4; 9.5; 31.2; 39.2; 51.18; 51.30; 52.16;
- 58.10

Pallor = 0

Pavor = 0

Periculum = 50:
- BJ 7.1; 7.4; 24.8; 28.6; 31.2; 38.5; 39.2; 40.2; 44.1;
- 51.1; 57.6; 74.1; 77.1; 83.1; 85.7; 85.18; 85.31;
- 85.47; 92.8; 92.9; 93.7
- CC 2.2; 4.1; 4.4; 6.4; 6.5; 10.2; 16.2; 20.9; 20.15;
- 21.4; 23.4; 23.6; 28.2; 30.5; 31.3; 33.1; 35.1;
- 42.2; 43.3; 46.2; 48.5; 48.7; 49.4; 52.2; 52.16;
- 52.29; 52.36; 58.2; 58.17; 59.1

Terror = 4/5:
- BJ 7.5; 20.8; 31.4; 37.3; 99.3 (?)

Timor = 11:
- BJ 7.5; 20.1; 35.4; 42.4; 57.6; 70.5; 105.4
- CC 31.3; 42.4; 51.19; 58.3

Tremor = 0

Trepidatio = 0

Verecundia = 0
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Reverentia = 0
Adjectives = 25
  Dirus = 0
  Formidulosus = 4:  
  Horridus = 0
  Horribilis = 2:
  Pavidus = 3:
  Periculosus = 3:
  Terribilis = 1:
  Timidus = 8:
    Trepidus = 4:
    veercundus = 0
Participles = 21
  Formidaturus = 0
  Formidatus = 0
  Horrendus = 0
  Horrens = 0
  Metuendus = 1:
  Metuens = 5:
  Pavendus = 0
  Pavens = 1:
  Periclitandus = 0
  Periclitans = 0
  Periclitatus = 0
  Terrendus = 0
  Terrens = 0
  Territandus = 0
  Territans = 0
  Territus = 4
  Perterritus
  Timendus = 0
  Timens = 5:
    Trepidandus = 0
    Trepidans = 0
    Trepidaturus = 0
    Trepidatus = 0
    Verendus = 0
    Verens = 0
    Veritus = 5
Verbs = 45
  Formidare = 0
  Horrene = 0
  Metuere = 9:
    BJJ 25.2; 25.10; 31.15; 72.2; 76.6; 79.7; 85.33; 111.2
    CC 52.16
  Pavere = 2:
    CC 31.3
  Pavescre  
    BJ 72.2
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Periclitari = 0
Terrere = 11:  BJ 6.3; 34.1; 54.8; 57.3; 94.4; 101.
               CC 39.2; 48.4; 51.31
Dettorre
Timere = 16:  BJ 13.5; 25.7; 27.3; 31.3; 39.1;
               62.8; 76.1; 88.5; 92.2
               CC 51.24; 52.16 (x2); 52.28; 58.17
Pertimescere
Tremere = 1:
Contremere
Trepidare = 4:
Vereri = 2:

Key: BJ = Bellum Jugurthinum; CC = Conjuriatio Catilinae

CAESAR
Nouns = 200
         Formido = 0
         Horror = 0
         Metus = 13:
               BC 1.4.3; 1.9.1; 1.9.5; 2.31.7;
               3.69.4
               BG 4.4.7; 4.19.4; 5.6.5; 5.19.2;
               5.41.6; 6.14.6; 6.29.2; 7.56.2
         Pallor = 0
         Favor = 0
         Periculum = 93
               BC 1.2.3; 1.5.1; 1.13.1; 1.17.2;
               1.19.4; 1.49.2; 1.64.2; 1.65.5;
               1.70.2; 1.74.7; 1.75.3; 1.79.2;
               2.6.1; 2.7.2; 2.9.9; 2.15.3;
               2.20.3; 2.35.2; 2.41.8;
               3.6.1; 3.9.2; 3.17.2; 3.17.5;
               3.17.6; 3.21.5; 3.26.1; 3.26.5;
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Terror = 22:

Timor = 70:

Tremor = 0
Trepidatio = 0
Verecundia = 0
Reverentia = 0

Adjectives = 11
Dirus = 0
Formidulosus = 0
Horridus = 0
Horribilis = 2:
Pavidus = 0
Periculosus = 3:
Terribilis = 0
Timidus = 6:
Trepidus = 0
verecundus = 0

Participles = 110
Formidaturus = 0
Formidatus = 0

3.27.1; 3.43.3; 3.53.4; 3.64.2; 3.66.6; 3.79.7; 3.82.4;
3.83.3; 3.86.4; 3.102.7; 3.110.5
BG 1.5.3; 1.10.2; 1.17.6; 1.25.1; 1.39.4;
1.40.5; 1.42.2; 1.44.13; 1.46.3; 1.47.3; 2.5.5; 2.11.5;
2.12.6; 2.26.5; 3.1.2; 3.3.2; 3.9.3; 4.12.5; 4.21.1;
4.25.3; 4.35.1; 5.16.2; 5.16.3; 5.19.2; 5.29.6;
5.29.7; 5.30.2; 5.31.2; 5.31.5; 5.45.5; 5.47.5;
5.48.2; 5.48.8; 5.49.6; 5.50.4; 5.51.3; 5.52.3;
5.57.1; 6.3.2; 6.3.4; 6.3.9.2; 7.1.6;
7.2.1; 7.8.1; 7.14.7; 7.14.9; 7.19.5; 7.26.4;
7.32.3; 7.41.2; 7.50.5; 7.74.2; 7.77.9; 7.8.4

BG
1.5.3; 1.10.2; 1.17.6; 1.25.1; 1.39.4;
1.40.5; 1.42.2; 1.44.13; 1.46.3; 1.47.3; 2.5.5; 2.11.5;
2.12.6; 2.26.5; 3.1.2; 3.3.2; 3.9.3; 4.12.5; 4.21.1;
4.25.3; 4.35.1; 5.16.2; 5.16.3; 5.19.2; 5.29.6;
5.29.7; 5.30.2; 5.31.2; 5.31.5; 5.45.5; 5.47.5;
5.48.2; 5.48.8; 5.49.6; 5.50.4; 5.51.3; 5.52.3;
5.57.1; 6.3.2; 6.3.4; 6.3.9.2; 7.1.6;
7.2.1; 7.8.1; 7.14.7; 7.14.9; 7.19.5; 7.26.4;
7.32.3; 7.41.2; 7.50.5; 7.74.2; 7.77.9; 7.8.4

BC
1.2.6; 1.14.1; 1.46.2; 1.76.5; 2.3.2; 2.35.6;
2.36.1; 2.43.2; 3.13.2; 3.23.2; 3.64.2; 3.65.1;
3.69.3; 3.71.2; 3.72.2; 3.72.4; 3.80.6

BG 2.12.1; 4.33.1; 6.41.2; 7.8.4; 7.66.6

BC 1.32.7; 1.32.8; 1.33.1; 1.51.2; 1.52.2; 1.55.1;
1.61.2; 1.65.5;
1.67.3; 1.71.3; 1.72.4; 1.73.4; 2.20.3; 2.25.3;
2.26.4; 2.29.1 (x2); 2.31.4; 2.31.8; 2.34.6;
2.35.6; 2.40.2; 2.41.8; 2.43.4; 3.1.3; 3.31.4;
3.36.5; 3.44.6; 3.45.5; 3.64.2; 3.65.2; 3.69.4;
3.98.2; 3.101.3; 3.101.4; 3.104.1

BG 1.22.4; 1.23.3; 1.27.4; 1.39.1; 1.39.4; 1.39.5;
1.39.7; 1.40.10; 1.40.15; 3.17.6; 3.18.1; 3.18.3;
4.14.3; 4.15.2; 4.15.3; 4.34.1; 5.33.5; 5.50.3;
5.50.5; 5.57.4; 6.7.8; 6.23.3; 6.35.4; 6.37.9;
6.41.3; 6.41.4; 7.26.4; 7.26.5; 7.43.3; 7.43.6;
7.54.2; 7.55.9; 7.77.11; 7.80.5

BC
1.32.7; 1.32.8; 1.33.1; 1.51.2; 1.52.2; 1.55.1;
1.61.2; 1.65.5;
1.67.3; 1.71.3; 1.72.4; 1.73.4; 2.20.3; 2.25.3;
2.26.4; 2.29.1 (x2); 2.31.4; 2.31.8; 2.34.6;
2.35.6; 2.40.2; 2.41.8; 2.43.4; 3.1.3; 3.31.4;
3.36.5; 3.44.6; 3.45.5; 3.64.2; 3.65.2; 3.69.4;
3.98.2; 3.101.3; 3.101.4; 3.104.1

BG 5.14.3; 7.36.3

BC 3.6.3

BG 1.33.4; 7.8.1

BC 1.19.3

BG 1.39.6; 3.24.5; 3.25.1; 5.33.1; 6.40.2
Horrendus = 0
Horrens = 0
Metuendus = 0
Metuens = 1:
Praemetuens
Pavendus = 0
Pavens = 0
Periclitandus = 1:
Periclitans = 0
Periclitatus = 0
Terrendus = 3:
Deterrendus
Terrens = 0
Territandus = 2:
Territans = 0
Territus = 63:
Perterritus

Exterritus

Timendus = 4:
Timens = 11:
Trepidandus = 0
Trepidans = 1:
Trepidatus = 0
Verendus = 0
Verens = 0
Veritus = 26:

Verbs = 67/68
Formidare = 1:
Reformidare
Horrere = 2:

BG 7.49.1
BG 7.56.1
BC 1.42.2
BG 5.7.1
BG 5.54.1; 5.57.3
BG 1.2.5; 1.22.6; 1.30.3; 1.45.1; 1.59.2; 1.61.1;
1.65.1; 1.67.3; 1.71.1; 1.74.2; 1.79.5; 2.11.1;
2.11.4; 2.18.4; 2.20.6; 2.22.4; 2.34.4; 2.36.3;
2.38.5; 2.39.6; 2.42.1; 2.43.2; 3.13.3; 3.28.4;
3.36.5; 3.74.3; 3.75.3; 3.94.5; 3.95.1; 3.95.4
BG 1.18.10; 1.22.4; 1.23.3; 1.27.4; 1.54.1; 2.24.3;
2.27.2; 3.6.2; 4.4.3; 4.12.2; 4.13.6; 4.14.2;
4.24.4; 5.3.5; 5.8.6; 5.15.4; 5.58.4; 6.8.1;
6.34.3; 6.35.3; 6.37.9; 6.39.2; 7.8.4; 7.13.2;
7.26.5; 7.28.1; 7.47.4; 7.58.4; 7.68.3; 7.70.6
BG 7.43.3; 7.77.11
BG 1.14.2; 3.3.1; 3.13.9; 5.29.7
BC 3.6.3; 3.13.1; 3.29.1; 3.46.1; 3.63.2; 3.69.3;
3.70.1; 3.78.2; 3.89.4
BG 4.12.1; 7.7.4
BC 1.21.2; 1.25.4; 1.66.2; 2.23.3; 3.21.5; 3.46.4;
3.69.4; 3.112.5
BG 2.11.2; 4.5.1; 4.15.5; 5.3.5; 5.9.1; 5.25.4;
5.44.5; 5.47.4; 5.48.8; 5.52.1; 6.29.1; 6.44.3;
7.5.5; 7.11.6; 7.28.2; 7.28.6; 7.67.6; 7.82.2
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>BG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhorreo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metuere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periclitari=5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrere=23:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterrere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perterrere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timere = 25/26:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidare=2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vereri = 9:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: BC = de Bello Civili; BG = de Bello Gallico

LIVY

Nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formido = 7:</th>
<th>7.37.16; 8.9.8; 10.14.20; 10.28.16; 10.29.5; 22.38.4; 30.28.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horror = 3:</td>
<td>1.16.6; 1.25.4; 35.35.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metus = 339:</td>
<td>1.5.6; 1.9.13; 1.16.2; 1.19.4; 1.19.5; 1.21.2; 1.25.13;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.28.8; 1.29.3; 1.44.1; 1.47.9; 1.49.4; 1.58.4 (x2);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.5; 2.2.7 (x2); 2.7.10; 2.9.5; 2.11.4; 2.18.3; 2.18.8;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.18.9; 2.20.5; 2.22.3; 2.23.12; 2.23.13;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.24.3; 2.24.4; 2.24.5; 2.27.9; 2.30.13;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.32.5; 2.33.6; 2.45.12; 2.57.4; 2.58.7; 2.65.5;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.5; 3.9.4; 3.12.9; 3.16.6; 3.22.2; 3.26.4; 3.29.6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.30.5; 3.35.2; 3.36.6; 3.39.10; 3.59.1; 3.59.4; 3.69.2; 3.70.11;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.21.6; 4.23.4; 4.39.8; 4.40.2; 4.46.5; 4.50.7; 4.53.8;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.7; 5.7.4; 5.11.11; 15.13.13; 5.15.7; 5.17.10; 5.28.12;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.46.3; 5.52.13; 6.4.5; 6.21.7; 6.24.2; 6.24.11; 6.25.2; 6.33.10;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1.7; 7.10.9; 7.12.4; 7.15.5; 7.25.7; 7.28.2; 7.34.5; 7.39.14;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3.1; 8.4.11; 8.7.20; 8.13.17; 8.15.4; 8.24.11; 8.29.3; 8.38.1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6.12; 9.16.19; 9.23.16; 9.37.11; 9.41.5; 9.41.11; 9.43.4; 9.44.8; 9.45.16;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.14.19; 10.18.5; 10.25.7; 10.33.5; 10.41.3; 10.41.4;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pallor = 2: 1.27.8; 2.23.3
Pavor = 164: 1.13.1; 1.14.9; 1.16.2; 1.16.5; 1.27.8; 1.27.10; 1.29.2; 1.47.8; 1.56.4; 1.59.6;
2.10.10; 2.25.4; 2.32.5; 2.37.9; 2.50.5; 2.50.6; 2.50.10; 2.54.9; 2.59.7; 2.65.6; 3.3.4; 3.8.9; 3.15.6; 3.26.5; 3.28.3; 3.38.6; 4.19.8; 4.33.11; 4.37.10; 4.39.6; 4.39.7; 4.61.8; 5.11.14; 5.18.11; 5.19.4; 5.26.7; 5.28.7; 5.28.11; 5.38.2; 5.38.5; 5.39.1; 5.39.5; 5.39.7; 5.45.3; 6.12.10; 6.28.6; 6.29.3; 6.42.8; 7.6.9; 7.10.12; 7.12.2; 7.13.5; 7.15.7; 7.17.5; 7.23.6; 7.35.12; 7.36.3; 7.36.10; 7.36.13; 8.9.11; 9.12.8; 9.24.10; 10.5.7; 10.28.10; 10.37.7; 10.41.13; 21.5.16; 21.8.12; 21.14.2; 21.25.12; 21.28.10; 21.29.3; 21.46.7; 21.57.8; 22.6.5; 22.6.6; 22.47.6; 22.48.5; 22.54.8; 22.59.8; 23.20.7; 23.25.1; 23.26.4; 23.26.8; 23.26.11; 23.37.7; 24.40.12; 24.42.2; 24.43.8; 25.6.13; 25.13.12; 25.22.1; 25.37.12; 25.39.11; 25.39.17; 26.2.12; 26.3.5 (x2); 26.4.8; 26.5.12; 26.6.9; 26.7.4; 26.10.8; 26.25.3; 26.37.4; 26.41.12; 26.44.5; 27.9.14; 27.13.2; 27.13.3; 27.14.7; 27.14.10; 27.27.5; 27.28.17; 27.42.5; 28.3.9; 28.13.9; 29.2.13; 29.3.9; 29.28.2; 29.28.7; 30.12.9; 30.18.12; 30.21.6; 31.2.9; 31.24.15; 31.33.6; 31.42.8; 33.7.5; 34.25.6; 34.38.7; 34.47.7; 35.2.3; 35.11.5; 35.29.8; 35.36.3; 35.40.8; 36.19.3; 37.5.1; 37.12.7; 37.21.3; 37.41.9; 37.41.11; 37.42.1; 37.43.3; 38.2.7; 38.2.14; 38.5.3; 38.5.7; 38.21.7; 38.21.14; 38.23.3 (x2); 39.12.5; 39.14.4; 40.8.3; 42.60.3; 42.60.7; 42.60.9; 43.4.1; 44.5.2; 44.10.1; 44.10.4; 44.13.3

Periculum = 276: 1.12.10; 1.19.4; 1.25.2; 1.25.3; 1.26.12; 1.52.5; 1.54.4; 2.2.5; 2.10.7; 2.12.12; 2.13.2; 2.16.2; 2.20.11; 2.23.9; 2.23.14; 2.24.2; 2.27.9; 2.34.4; 2.36.2; 2.41.2; 2.43.8; 2.45.2; 2.48.7; 2.52.7; 2.52.8; 2.54.2; 3.2.7; 3.2.11; 3.4.8; 3.5.8; 3.10.7; 3.10.14; 3.18.3; 3.19.12; 3.23.2; 3.23.6; 3.38.7; 3.44.12; 3.58.1; 3.61.4; 3.62.9; 4.12.6; 4.22.6; 4.23.6; 4.25.7; 4.27.11; 4.35.7; 4.35.8; 4.45.1; 4.58.9; 5.5.8; 5.17.9; 5.20.7; 5.21.5; 5.44.1; 5.46.8; 5.47.2;
5.47.7; 5.47.11; 5.54.4;
6.6.10; 6.17.1; 6.20.15; 6.21.7; 6.22.9; 6.24.7; 6.39.6;
7.1.7; 7.10.2; 7.10.10; 7.15.3; 7.23.5; 7.29.2; 7.36.7; 7.39.10;
8.1.5; 8.10.7; 8.16.8; 8.24.12; 8.25.12; 8.26.4; 8.35.9;
9.4.8; 9.7.7; 9.17.15; 9.18.6; 9.18.18; 9.19.15;
9.24.3; 9.27.4; 9.39.8; 9.40.1; 9.42.5;
10.5.5; 10.7.5; 10.10.12; 10.17.10; 10.24.14;
10.25.14; 10.26.2; 10.28.13;
21.1.3; 21.4.5 (x2); 21.7.7; 21.13.2; 21.25.8;
21.29.6; 21.30.9; 21.33.5; 21.33.9; 21.48.2; 21.42.1;
21.43.9; 21.46.7; 21.51.10; 21.57.3;
22.1.1; 22.5.2; 22.12.10; 22.50.5; 22.59.19;
23.2.8; 23.3.2; 23.15.12; 23.35.4; 23.49.3;
24.22.17; 24.26.8 (x2); 24.38.4; 24.38.5; 24.39.6;
25.3.10; 25.4.11; 25.6.19; 25.6.23; 25.14.8; 25.26.7;
25.28.9; 25.29.8; 25.31.7; 25.34.1; 25.38.20; 25.39.18;
26.5.11; 26.5.12; 26.9.6; 26.12.10; 26.13.8; 26.13.9;
26.13.10; 26.42.2; 26.46.2; 26.49.12;
27.15.14; 27.40.6; 27.49.3;
28.3.7; 28.5.6; 28.11.14; 28.15.13; 28.17.11;
28.19.15; 28.19.16; 28.19.17; 28.20.1; 28.32.10;
28.41.12; 28.42.9; 28.43.4; 28.43.9; 28.44.1; 28.44.3;
29.1.4; 29.4.2; 29.24.4;
30.12.2; 30.14.6; 30.18.3; 30.19.4; 30.28.2; 30.31.4;
30.32.2; 30.34.13; 30.36.11;
31.1.1; 31.1.6; 31.6.3; 31.31.16; 31.34.2; 31.37.9;
32.4.6; 32.6.3; 32.9.9; 32.12.3; 32.21.1; 32.21.36; 32.32.15;
33.1.8; 33.2.8; 33.5.2; 33.8.12; 33.33.2; 33.33.5;
33.38.3; 33.39.6;
34.2.4; 34.6.3; 34.6.9; 34.7.14; 34.11.4; 34.11.7;
34.12.2; 34.12.5; 34.22.13; 34.27.7; 34.34.3;
34.39.12; 34.61.9;
35.11.1; 35.14.3; 35.23.8; 35.27.2; 35.31.15;
35.44.6;
36.40.7 (x2); 36.43.3;
37.4.7; 37.5.1; 37.16.11; 37.28.11; 37.29.5; 37.30.7;
37.32.6; 37.53.15; 37.59.2;
38.6.9; 38.23.11; 38.25.13; 38.49.4; 38.50.12;
39.10.2; 39.14.4; 39.16.13; 39.27.4; 39.35.6; 39.40.11;
40.1.3; 40.5.11; 40.9.4; 40.9.11; 40.11.10; 40.12.5;
40.46.5; 40.54.7;
42.17.6; 42.18.5; 42.65.12;
43.16.15; 43.18.2;
44.4.7; 44.20.2; 44.20.5; 44.22.13; 44.32.6;
44.36.10; 44.41.1;
45.3.8; 45.23.5; 45.23.19; 45.31.10; 45.36.3; 45.41.7
1.2.4; 1.12.6; 1.14.9; 1.27.9; 1.28.6; 1.33.8; 1.37.2;
1.51.1; 1.56.4; 1.58.5;

Terror = 314:
37.11.13; 37.15.1; 37.15.9; 37.16.4; 37.18.7; 37.20.13; 37.21.6;
37.24.2; 37.30.3; 37.38.6; 37.40.4; 37.41.6; 37.42.4;
38.5.5; 38.5.7; 38.16.10; 38.16.13; 38.17.5; 38.25.15; 38.30.9;
38.37.3; 38.41.6; 38.41.14; 38.42.11; 38.43.3;
39.15.4; 39.17.4; 39.30.7; 39.34.5; 39.35.4; 39.36.1;
40.22.14; 40.32.2;
41.2.6; 41.5.2; 41.17.7; 41.20.11; 41.22.5; 41.23.12;
42.7.7; 42.60.8; 42.64.4; 42.65.8;
43.10.6; 43.19.5;
44.6.6; 44.6.17; 44.25.3; 44.28.5; 44.30.7; 44.31.6;
44.31.9; 44.32.5; 44.32.6; 44.35.1;
45.5.1

Timor = 74:
1.17.4; 2.27.10; 2.32.1; 2.36.3; 2.39.7; 2.40.2;
2.45.4; 2.52.1; 2.57.2; 2.63.4; 3.3.3; 3.3.5; 3.16.3;
4.46.8; 5.26.5; 5.39.8; 6.28.8; 6.32.11;
10.11.5; 10.12.8; 10.26.1; 10.41.4;
21.7.7; 21.28.12; 21.56.5;
22.1.4; 22.5.2; 22.17.6; 22.22.19; 22.59.3; 22.60.21;
23.7.10; 24.27.7; 24.39.7; 25.41.5;
26.3.6; 26.13.1; 26.17.12; 26.20.5; 26.26.7; 26.29.7;
26.38.2; 27.2.3; 28.3.10; 28.8.12; 28.41.9;
29.24.4; 29.34.10; 30.18.3; 31.41.4; 32.26.16;
33.28.11; 34.9.4; 34.40.1; 35.31.7;
36.16.6; 36.17.11; 37.13.7;
37.16.10; 37.43.4; 38.28.8; 39.16.7;
41.23.18; 42.60.4; 43.11.9;
45.10.7; 45.25.6; 45.26.7

Tremor = 1:
39.12.5

Trepidatio = 69:
1.14.5; 1.27.8; 2.46.3; 2.49.11; 2.53.1; 3.3.2; 3.26.5; 3.38.4;
3.50.4; 4.46.8; 5.18.8; 5.50.6; 6.13.3; 6.28.3; 6.31.4; 6.31.6;
7.11.10; 7.11.11; 7.33.8; 7.36.4; 8.9.4; 9.31.9;
10.2.13; 10.20.8; 10.34.8; 10.43.15;
21.5.16; 21.7.10; 21.14.2; 21.25.12; 21.28.11;
21.31.12; 21.33.3;
21.33.8; 22.19.10; 22.55.6; 23.20.10; 24.34.11;
25.13.10; 25.30.11; 26.44.5; 27.14.13; 27.18.20;
27.47.9; 28.14.10; 28.17.14; 29.2.13;
30.5.8; 30.6.2; 30.15.8; 31.27.7; 31.41.12; 32.17.17;
33.9.9; 37.11.9; 37.20.11; 37.24.7; 37.29.6;
38.2.7; 38.5.4; 39.30.5; 40.26.1; 40.39.8;
40.40.4; 42.58.3; 42.61.6; 42.66.8; 44.13.6;
44.28.10

Verecundia = 54:
1.3.10; 1.6.4; 1.21.2; 2.15.5; 2.36.3; 3.12.9; 3.40.5;
3.62.9; 3.70.15; 4.45.8; 4.56.13;
5.14.2; 5.25.3; 5.25.12; 5.28.1;
6.33.5; 6.36.2;
7.1.6; 7.1.6; 7.3.9; 7.11.6; 7.40.4;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reverentia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.28.17; 10.38.10; 10.41.3; 26.25.12; 28.22.11; 40.5.1; 40.56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidulosus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horridus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.30.1; 2.32.8; 9.40.4; 22.16.4; 38.17.13; 45.36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horribilis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavidus</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.48.6; 1.58.3; 2.25.4; 2.53.2; 3.3.3; 3.15.7; 3.22.7; 3.26.3; 3.44.7; 3.63.2; 4.14.3; 4.33.11; 4.40.2; 5.39.8; 5.43.8; 6.25.10; 7.5.6; 7.15.3; 8.16.6; 9.24.10; 9.24.13; 9.40.14; 10.43.14; 21.22.7; 22.33.13; 24.16.2; 24.31.11; 25.24.9; 26.10.7; 28.15.11; 28.42.11; 30.29.1; 30.33.11; 30.34.8; 31.34.5; 31.37.10; 31.41.11; 33.8.1; 33.28.14; 34.14.10; 35.38.1; 38.7.7; 38.25.14; 40.9.7; 41.11.6; 44.6.1; 44.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impavidus</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.30.2; 22.5.1; 22.28.13; 30.15.8; 37.20.12; 39.50.8; 42.15.10; 42.59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periculosus</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.28.4; 2.2.4; 2.3.4; 2.30.3; 2.41.3; 3.61.5; 10.42.1; 23.34.11; 25.37.14; 27.31.7; 27.35.5; 29.7.6; 38.4.10; 38.20.8; 38.53.11; 39.1.6; 39.41.2; 41.23.18; 42.18.4; 42.28.11; 42.55.4; 43.1.9; 44.26.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terribilis</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.56.4; 4.26.7; 6.8.5; 6.42.10; 7.12.6; 8.38.10; 9.29.2; 10.11.7; 10.20.12; 21.20.1; 21.28.3; 22.16.6; 22.30.9; 22.46.6; 25.24.9; 27.15.17; 27.37.3; 27.40.10; 28.43.16; 30.8.8; 30.34.1; 31.25.4; 33.21.3; 35.30.5; 38.5.3; 38.17.1; 38.46.4; 44.10.6; 45.29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timidus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.44.8; 22.12.12; 22.14.15; 22.39.20; 22.44.5; 22.52.5; 24.15.5; 33.29.5; 36.12.8; 42.1.12; 42.16.6; 45.23.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidus</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.27.7; 1.48.1; 1.60.1; 2.10.3; 2.12.8; 2.24.3; 2.47.8; 3.31.3; 3.60.7; 3.69.5; 4.13.14; 4.17.8; 4.19.8; 4.28.2; 4.32.1; 4.34.5; 4.41.6; 4.43.2; 4.46.9; 4.56.8; 5.11.4; 5.11.14; 5.36.3; 5.43.2; 5.44.1; 5.49.5; 5.50.4; 6.9.11; 6.31.3; 6.38.3; 7.8.7; 7.11.1; 7.17.4; 7.37.5; 8.1.5; 8.19.9; 8.37.6; 8.38.13; 9.24.11; 9.38.3; 10.12.6; 10.43.2; 21.28.4; 21.39.3; 21.46.10; 41.11.6; 44.6.1; 44.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5.1</td>
<td>22.20.2</td>
<td>22.31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.5.8</td>
<td>23.18.6</td>
<td>23.24.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.12.3</td>
<td>24.16.2</td>
<td>25.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.41.7</td>
<td>26.4.6</td>
<td>26.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.41.16</td>
<td>27.12.15</td>
<td>27.18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.36.10</td>
<td>29.1.22</td>
<td>29.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.33.14</td>
<td>31.24.6</td>
<td>31.36.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.42.6</td>
<td>32.7.7</td>
<td>34.11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.20.5</td>
<td>36.31.5</td>
<td>40.28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

verecundus = 2: 26.49.16; 35.16.7

Participles

| Formidaturus = 1: |
| Reformidaturus 6.28.6 |
| Formidatus = 0 |
| Horrendus = 12: 1.26.6 | 2.55.4 | 5.37.8 | 6.33.5 | 8.7.22 | 9.36.1 |
| 21.29.7 | 21.58.5 | 29.14.3 | 38.17.5 | 40.8.11 | 44.5.2 |
| Horrens = 13: 10.39.17 | 44.41.6 |
| Abhorrens 2.14.1 | 4.44.12 | 9.30.7 | 21.32.10 | 22.13.6 | 22.18.1 |
| 27.37.13 | 29.6.9 | 30.30.9 | 30.44.7 | 38.24.3 |
| 30.28.1 | 34.48.6 |
| Metuens = 25: 2.12.4 | 2.22.2 | 2.64.7 | 3.49.5 | 6.31.6 | 21.24.3 |
| 22.3.4 | 22.9.6 | 23.16.3 |
| 23.36.1 | 24.27.3 | 25.24.10 | 25.27.6 | 27.3.2 | 27.28.4 |
| 30.19.4 | 33.28.11 |
| 34.27.10 | 35.25.12 | 35.29.7 | 37.12.4 | 40.22.7 |
| 44.43.7 | 44.44.4 | 45.10.10 |
| Pavendus = 1: 21.25.13 |
| Pavens = 26: 2.55.1 | 3.60.7 | 5.21.11 | 5.26.8 | 5.42.4 | 7.17.4 | 7.34.8 | 7.36.12 |
| 10.42.2 | 21.28.3 | 21.53.5 | 22.5.5 | 22.29.1 | 23.5.8 | 25.24.6 |
| 25.38.17 | 27.14.12 | 29.23.1 | 30.18.7 | 34.37.8 | 34.38.5 | 35.30.5 |
| 37.42.7 | 37.46.8 | 39.13.3 | 40.48.7 |
| Periclitandus = 0 |
| Pericitans = 0 |
| Pericitatus = 1: 6.15.1 |
| Terrendus = 6: 25.24.4 | 36.6.10 | 39.13.2 |
| Absterrendus 2.35.4 |
| Deterrendus 22.42.7 | 24.32.5 |
| Terrens = 3: 3.46.7 | 5.21.11 | 29.34.10 |
| Territandus = 2: 4.1.6 | 21.25.13 |
| Territans = 0 |
| Territus = 90: 3.22.9 | 4.33.4 | 5.43.1 | 7.26.5 | 7.34.4 | 7.37.16 | 8.38.10 | 9.24.8 |
| 9.37.7 | 10.2.10 | 10.14.20 | 10.28.11 | 10.29.14 | 10.36.5 | 21.33.6 |
| 21.46.2 | 21.55.7 | 21.57.3 | 21.62.4 | 22.3.12 | 22.3.14 | 22.12.10 |
| 22.31.10 | 22.36.6 | 22.57.2 | 23.34.7 | 24.30.10 | 24.42.5 |
| 25.18.1 | 25.27.12 | 25.41.5 | 27.2.1 | 27.18.20 | 27.28.2 | 28.7.17 |
| 28.26.12 | 29.6.14 |
Verbs

29.7.6; 29.34.16; 30.18.7; 31.16.2; 31.17.10;
32.24.6; 32.31.5; 33.9.10; 33.20.2; 36.12.6;
37.20.11; 37.26.9; 37.31.1; 37.42.1; 38.3.7; 38.27.1;
38.39.3; 40.50.1; 41.2.5; 41.3.2; 41.15.3; 43.22.10; 45.22.13

Absterritus 5.41.6; 27.47.7

Conterritus 2.12.12; 2.34.6; 6.35.6; 10.21.3; 38.14.13; 45.11.2

Deterritus 2.19.10; 2.54.2; 2.54.8; 5.47.10; 6.38.10; 10.9.1;
10.17.7; 10.30.7; 24.39.7; 33.7.2; 38.4.10; 38.5.10; 42.3.4

Exterritus 1.56.5; 3.5.14; 4.23.4; 5.28.13; 5.35.4; 5.37.5; 7.39.15

Pererritus 1.37.5; 35.31.14

Timendus = 13: 1.56.7; 2.45.2; 3.37.1; 4.26.10; 5.19.4; 6.6.10;
10.43.12; 21.41.4; 23.2.6; 28.39.11; 38.49.4; 42.50.3; 45.42.10

Timens = 35: 2.2.10; 2.12.7; 2.25.6; 3.17.10; 4.25.4; 5.21.6;
5.38.3; 6.31.7; 6.37.1; 10.2.12; 10.41.4; 21.28.5;
22.24.13; 23.17.10; 23.19.4; 24.4.7; 24.22.14;
25.25.5; 25.27.8; 25.38.13; 27.35.8; 28.1.8; 28.34.9;
29.7.9; 29.34.10; 31.10.1; 31.35.1; 31.46.14; 32.5.2;
32.21.16; 33.28.11; 34.27.6; 36.19.4; 42.47.10;
45.6.6

Trepidandus = 1: 44.38.11
Trepidans = 35: 1.7.9; 1.12.10; 1.14.8; 3.18.8; 3.60.10; 4.19.2;
5.13.11; 5.47.5; 6.29.2; 9.37.10; 21.9.2; 21.56.1;
23.7.10; 25.21.9; 27.1.9; 27.14.11; 30.10.9;
31.24.7; 31.24.15; 32.16.14; 34.28.5; 34.39.8;
35.5.10; 35.5.11; 35.11.12; 36.12.5; 37.21.3;
37.23.11; 38.21.6; 39.30.10; 42.60.6; 42.61.7;
44.6.2; 44.10.1; 44.40.2

Trepidaturus = 1: 42.45.6
Trepidatus = 8: 1.36.2; 4.21.9; 4.23.4; 22.22.14; 28.36.11; 30.38.6;
35.29.7; 37.29.5
Verendus = 3: 4.10.9; 9.7.2; 35.10.6
Verens = 1: 44.40.1
Veritus = 21: 5.28.4; 5.39.3; 8.7.15; 10.19.13; 23.6.8; 23.7.8;
27.15.16; 28.7.18; 28.19.16; 29.23.7; 29.35.2;
33.36.10; 33.37.2; 33.48.4; 35.33.10; 36.14.9;
37.24.9; 39.49.11; 41.10.5; 42.17.8; 43.11.2

Verbs

Formidare = 2:
Reformidare 9.34.20; 28.41.13
Horrere = 36:
1.48.5; 2.9.8; 2.37.6; 2.42.6; 2.45.1; 3.40.5; 3.68.6;
7.26.15; 10.10.12; 21.53.3; 22.27.4; 23.9.7;
26.18.11; 28.25.3; 28.29.4; 29.1.5; 30.28.11;
32.19.7; 34.2.2; 38.40.5; 39.51.5
Abhorrere 2.57.2; 4.6.7; 9.26.4; 9.36.6; 10.3.7; 25.23.4;
29.12.10; 38.56.5; 40.57.7; 42.62.8; 44.25.4
Exhorrere 8.35.11
Inhorrere 8.8.11
Metuere = 20: 1.9.5; 3.39.10; 3.65.11; 5.26.3; 10.39.17; 10.41.11;
113
Pavere = 6: 21.29.7; 22.39.20; 22.39.21; 24.1.1; 25.38.15; 27.31.2; 30.30.11; 32.16.12; 37.7.2; 37.51.9; 38.23.1; 40.7.6; 40.17.5; 41.23.15
Expavere 6.33.10; 7.37.10; 8.9.12; 26.5.14; 33.47.3

Periclitari = 6: 1.42.4; 28.42.21; 29.7.2; 38.25.7; 40.15.12; 40.21.6
Terrere 96: 2.41.2; 2.45.1; 3.20.8; 4.26.6; 4.33.8; 2.61.6; 6.33.10; 7.32.6; 8.6.13; 8.39.4; 10.2.4; 10.14.19; 10.28.2; 10.44.4; 21.27.1; 21.28.2; 21.51.5; 22.36.8; 22.45.4; 23.27.6; 23.27.8; 26.8.3; 27.40.7; 27.44.5; 28.5.6; 28.11.2; 28.11.6; 28.26.14; 28.43.18; 30.30.17; 30.33.11; 31.45.5; 32.19.6; 33.12.12; 33.38.5; 33.38.4; 35.21.4; 35.48.5; 37.30.7; 38.30.8; 39.53.2; 40.31.9; 41.11.4; 44.5.10; 44.6.8; 44.19.9; 45.3.8; 45.29.3

Absterrere 3.61.10; 23.1.10; 27.9.8; 27.28.13; 30.11.9
Conterrere 2.39.9; 3.11.9; 10.28.10; 24.12.1; 34.30.1; 35.27.12; 40.39.2
Derrere 3.42.7; 4.6.10; 4.24.9; 6.27.11; 7.34.12; 10.11.4; 23.9.8; 26.48.4; 31.12.3; 36.14.13; 36.34.4; 37.13.10; 37.42.5; 37.51.6; 37.52.9; 38.47.5; 38.54.12; 40.8.16; 40.47.8; 42.10.11; 42.23.4; 44.16.6
Exterrere 2.50.7; 4.33.3; 9.41.14; 37.24.3; 39.15.9; 40.12.5
Territare 2.26.1; 3.24.1; 3.28.5; 6.11.9; 6.25.5; 8.28.3; 28.33.5; 34.40.1

Timere = 100: 2.3.1; 2.7.9; 2.9.5; 2.12.12; 2.16.6; 2.30.6; 2.32.5; (2x); 2.46.6; 2.61.6; 2.61.7; 3.2.10; 3.3.3; 3.3.5; 3.3.6; 3.15.4; 3.15.7; 3.16.2; 3.16.4; 3.47.2; 3.61.4; 4.32.2; 4.43.3; 5.3.5; 5.6.8; 6.11.2; 6.28.6; 6.40.19; 7.5.6; 7.35.8; 8.2.12; 8.29.3; 8.35.11; 9.19.16; 10.5.6; 10.35.18; 10.36.3; 10.43.6; 21.3.5; 21.29.7; 22.7.11; 22.12.6; 22.25.3; 22.28.6; 22.29.2; 22.32.3; 23.14.6; 23.15.7; 23.37.7; 23.42.5; 24.26.8; 24.31.5; 24.32.2; 24.38.8; 24.38.9; 25.38.14; 25.41.5; 27.18.20; 27.41.6; 27.48.6; 28.19.6; 28.22.12; 28.41.7; 30.12.16; 31.21.5; 32.7.6; 32.9.10; 32.32.13; 32.32.14; 32.39.10; 36.9.10; 36.9.12; 36.29.7; 37.4.9; 37.60.6; 38.17.5; 38.28.8; 39.16.4; 39.16.5; 39.34.9; 39.35.6; 39.37.17; 39.37.18; 39.41.4; 40.8.8; 40.11.8; 40.12.20; 40.46.6; 41.24.20; 42.50.4; 42.62.14; 44.26.14; 44.27.1; 45.25.7; 45.25.10; 45.41.7

Pertimescere 3.56.11; 33.20.7; 34.14.5; 40.39.5
Tremere = 1: 22.27.4
Trepidare = 34: 2.28.1; 3.18.8; 3.49.6; 3.51.1; 4.37.10; 5.47.4; 6.35.6; 9.45.11; 21.16.2; 21.28.10; 21.33.6; 21.63.14; 23.16.12; 25.34.5; 27.28.10; 28.2.3; 28.19.16; 28.30.7; 31.41.11; 32.15.9; 33.7.9; 33.8.11; 33.9.3; 33.15.7; 34.14.6; 34.28.4; 34.34.5
Vereri = 32:
37.29.4; 37.30.6; 38.22.5; 39.17.5; 40.28.4; 40.40.8; 41.3.1
3.17.3; 5.6.17; 5.39.1; 6.15.13; 7.10.1; 10.13.6;
21.10.7; 21.40.10; 21.41.1; 22.14.10; 23.12.12;
26.20.3; 26.41.7; 27.47.7; 30.44.11; 32.8.10;
34.4.12; 34.6.8; 34.6.10; 34.12.5; 38.17.14; 39.15.4;
39.37.17 (x2); 39.55.3; 40.8.10; 40.17.5; 40.46.4;
42.12.1; 42.12.2; 42.40.2; 44.36.10

Key: All citations to Ab Urbe Condita

TACITUS
Nouns
Formido = 58:
AG 5.1; 11.3; 22.1; 24.1; 32.3; 36.3; 41.3
AN 1.4; 1.7; 1.30; 1.56; 1.66; 1.69; 2.29; 2.41; 2.79;
3.38; 4.18; 4.48; 4.51; 6.32; 11.28; 12.57; 15.6; 15.45
GE 6.6; 30.3; 39.2; 43.5
HI 1.20; 1.29; 1.42; 1.64 (x2); 1.71; 1.76; 1.81;
1.83; 1.85; 2.15; 2.26; 2.41; 2.44; 2.46; 2.48;
2.54; 2.63; 2.65; 3.10; 3.16; 3.55; 3.61; 3.77;
4.46; 4.67; 4.76; 4.83; 5.21

Horror = 1:
HI 1.37

Metus = 206:
AG 15.1; 25.3; 32.2; 34.3; 43.4
AN 1.1; 1.6; 1.11 (x2); 1.21; 1.28; 1.29; 1.36; 1.39
(x2); 1.40; 1.50; 1.60; 1.65; 1.68; 1.76; 2.1;
2.12; 2.22; 2.24; 2.29; 2.38; 2.44; 2.52;
2.57; 2.66; 2.68; 2.70; 2.72; 3.26; 3.40; 3.46;
3.47; 3.53; 3.54; 3.55; 3.65; 3.67; 3.69; 4.2; 4.2;
4.8; 4.10; 4.50; 4.53; 4.59; 4.62; 4.69; 4.71;
5(6).6; 5(6).8; 6.4; 6.8; 6.18; 6.19; 6.21; 6.26;
6.29; 6.31; 6.32; 6.36 (x2); 6.38; 6.43; 6.51;
11.8; 11.10; 11.20; 11.28; 11.29; 11.32;
11.33; 12.17; 12.28; 12.31; 12.34; 12.36; 12.51;
12.54; 12.65; 13.9; 13.21; 13.26; 13.29; 13.40;
13.47 (x2); 13.56; 14.4; 14.9; 14.22; 14.23;
14.31; 14.32; 14.34; 14.43; 14.44; 14.56; 14.57
(x2); 14.59; 14.61; 14.62; 15.4; 15.5; 15.11;
15.21; 15.27; 15.40; 15.45; 15.50; 15.51;
15.52; 15.54; 15.69; 15.73; 16.3; 16.5; 16.8;
16.15; 16.26
GE 1.1; 2.3; 46.3/HI 1.8; 1.12; 1.19; 1.20; 1.21; 1.25; 1.34; 1.40;
1.42; 1.49; 1.51; 1.62; 1.64; 1.70; 1.75; 1.76;
1.78; 1.86; 1.88; 1.90; 2.2; 2.12; 2.15; 2.16;
2.19; 2.23; 2.27; 2.42; 2.49; 2.52; 2.54; 2.58;
2.64; 2.65; 2.66; 2.67; 2.72; 2.80; 2.85; 2.87;
2.96; 3.10; 3.12; 3.16; 3.38; 3.39; 3.41; 3.42;
3.46; 3.58 (x2); 3.69; 3.79; 4.2; 4.3; 4.8; 4.33;
Pallor = 2:  
AG 45.2  
AN 15.64

Pavor = 40:  
AN 1.66; 2.38; 4.73; 4.74; 5.3; 6.18; 6.24; 6.50; 11.31; 12.64; 13.5; 13.16; 14.7; 14.10; 14.64; 15.25; 15.61; 15.66; 15.69; 16.4; 16.29  
HI 1.63; 1.82; 1.86; 1.88; 2.26; 2.37; 2.44; 2.76; 3.6; 3.10; 3.25; 3.73; 3.77; 3.84; 3.86; 4.30; 4.34; 4.38; 4.77

Periculum = 136:  
AG 5.4; 11.4; 12.2; 18.3; 18.7; 29.3; 41.1  
AN 1.8; 1.13; 1.17; 1.24; 1.27; 1.40; 1.74; 1.80; 2.11; 2.21; 2.29; 2.33 (x2); 2.40; 3.44; 3.48; 3.50; 4.13; 4.15; 4.20; 4.28; 4.38; 4.47; 4.48; 4.52; 4.59; 5.6; 6.7; 6.10; 6.18; 6.21; 6.29; 6.30; 6.34; 6.44; 6.48; 11.12; 11.26 (x2); 12.20; 12.26; 12.67; 13.33; 13.42; 13.56; 14.1; 14.2; 14.6; 14.8; 14.11; 14.12; 14.22; 14.23; 14.24; 14.28; 14.43; 14.50; 14.55; 14.58; 14.60; 15.6; 15.10; 15.12; 15.17; 15.23; 15.50; 15.53; 15.55; 16.10; 16.13; 16.19; 16.29; 16.30; 16.34

GE 2.1; 18.3  
HI 1.35; 1.38; 1.40; 1.51; 1.54; 1.59; 1.68; 1.73; 1.83 (x2); 1.86; 1.88; 2.33; 2.47; 2.54; 2.63; 2.69; 2.75; 2.76; 2.77; 2.86 (x2); 2.93; 3.26; 3.41; 3.45; 3.53 (x2); 3.60; 3.66; 3.69 (x2); 3.76; 3.84; 4.20; 4.29; 4.32; 4.40; 4.42 (x2); 4.43; 4.49; 4.69 (x2); 4.71; 4.72; 4.76; 4.85; 5.11; 5.19; 5.21

Terror = 49:  
AG 17.2; 18.4; 29.2; 32.2; 35.3; 36.3; 38.4  
AN 1.21; 1.29; 1.63; 2.6; 2.52; 3.28; 4.24; 4.69; 11.2; 11.19; 12.29; 13.14; 13.25; 13.39; 13.48; 14.8; 14.23; 14.59; 15.27  
GE 38.2; 40.4; 43.3  
HI 1.2; 1.63; 2.8; 2.10; 2.13; 2.14; 2.20; 2.31; 2.42; 2.88; 3.21; 3.59; 3.61; 4.11; 4.25; 4.33; 4.58; 4.76; 5.22; 5.23

Timor = 11:  
AG 16.2  
AN 1.50; 12.51; 14.65; 15.36 (x2); 15.52; 16.9; 16.19  
HI 2.80; 4.46

Tremor = 0  
Trepidatio = 14:  
AG 26.1  
AN 11.38; 12.43; 12.57; 15.16  
HI 1.41; 1.69; 1.85; 2.22; 2.26; 2.41; 2.55; 3.17; 5.15
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verecundia = 2</td>
<td>AG 8.3</td>
<td>AN 16.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverentia = 18</td>
<td>AN 1.47; 6.37; 12.10; 12.23; 13.9; 14.13; 15.1</td>
<td>GE 9.2; 29.2; 39.2</td>
<td>HI 1.12; 1.55; 2.78; 3.41; 4.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inreverentia</td>
<td>AN 3.31; 13.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirus = 9:</td>
<td>AN 1.65; 6.24; 12.43; 14.30; 16.8</td>
<td>HI 2.70; 3.56; 4.62; 5.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidulosus = 8:</td>
<td>AG 7.5; 39.3</td>
<td>AN 1.62; 1.76; 11.19; 13.53</td>
<td>HI 1.6; 3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horridus = 10:</td>
<td>AN 1.17; 2.23; 4.7; 4.16; 6.34</td>
<td>GE 2.2; 5.12</td>
<td>HI 1.82; 2.11; 2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horribilis = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavidus = 26:</td>
<td>AG 34.2</td>
<td>AN 1.39; 1.57; 2.14; 2.23; 3.9; 4.38; 14.49; 15.15; 15.46; 15.57; 15.73; 16.14; 16.25</td>
<td>HI 1.56; 1.68; 1.88; 2.41; 2.44; 2.68; 3.16; 3.41; 3.59; 4.2; 4.37; 5.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periculosus = 9:</td>
<td>AG 15.6; 33.5</td>
<td>AN 1.2; 1.6; 1.36; 3.67</td>
<td>GE 21.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terribilos = 3:</td>
<td>AN 13.42; 14.39</td>
<td>HI 1.8; 1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timidus = 1:</td>
<td>HI 2.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidus = 44:</td>
<td>AG 22.3; 32.3</td>
<td>AN 1.31; 1.46; 4.27; 4.70; 4.74; 6.16; 6.21; 13.20; 13.36; 14.32; 14.59; 15.10</td>
<td>HI 1.27; 1.39; 1.50; 1.81; 2.8; 2.14; 2.17; 2.46; 2.48; 2.52; 3.29; 3.42; 3.56; 3.64; 3.69; 3.70; 3.73; 4.18 (x2); 4.19; 4.20; 4.41; 4.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrepidus</td>
<td>AN 2.8; 5(6).7; 6.50; 14.13</td>
<td>HI 1.35; 2.48; 4.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verecundus = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverentius = 2:</td>
<td>GE 34.2</td>
<td>HI 2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidaturus = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>AN 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formidatus = 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>GE 39.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horrendus = 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>GE 38.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horrens = 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td>HI 2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metuendus = 3:</td>
<td>AN 1.74; 2.40; 2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metuens = 24:</td>
<td>AG 34.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verbs

Pavendus = 0
Pavens = 13:
Periclitandus = 1:
Periclitans = 6:
Periclitatus = 0
Terrendus = 1:
Deterrendus
Terrens = 1:
Exterrens
Territandus = 0
Territans = 0
Territus = 39:
Conterritus
Derterritus
Exterritus
Interritus
Timendus = 2:
Pertimescendus
Timens = 2:
Tremens = 2:
Trepidandus = 0
Trepidans = 4:
Trepidaturus = 0
Trepidatus = 4:
Trepidaturus = 1:
Verendus = 0
Verens = 1:
Reverens
Veritus = 3:

AN 1.6; 2.42; 3.10; 4.23; 4.41; 6.4; 11.26; 12.44; 12.64; 13.25; 13.44; 15.36; 15.69
HI 1.28; 1.90; 2.8; 2.23; 3.2; 3.15; 3.84; 4.39; 4.48; 4.74

AN 2.25; 4.69; 4.70; 15.38
HI 1.50; 1.72; 2.29; 2.52; 2.63; 3.17; 3.35; 3.56; 4.62

GE 40.1

AN 1.39; 3.12; 3.25; 3.67; 5(6).8; 6.16

AN 13.53

AN 15.36

AG 22.1; 26.3
AN 1.66; 4.29; 4.48; 6.43; 12.45
HI 1.81; 2.50; 4.78

AN 6.29

HI 2.89

AG 36.3
AN 1.38; 1.45; 2.55; 3.49; 4.28; 11.8; 12.57; 12.63; 12.67; 13.36; 13.56; 14.6; 14.8; 15.26; 16.15; 16.24
HI 1.39; 2.8; 2.16; 2.99; 4.27

AN 1.64; 12.21; 15.12; 15.62
HI 1.62

AN 16.26

AN 2.76

HI 2.76; 3.9

AN 15.36; 15.67

HI 2.35; 2.96; 3.39; 3.58

AN 12.27; 13.40
HI 2.15; 2.88

HI 1.33

AG 35.4; 37.1
HI 3.49

Horrere = 14:

HI 1.50; 4.58; 4.62
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Abhorrere
Exhorrere
Inhorrere
Metuere 28:
Pavere 20:
Expavere
Pavescere
Periclitari = 1:
Terrere 53:
Absterrere
Deterre
Exterrere
Perterrere
Timere = 37:
Extimere:
Extimescere
Tremere = 3:
Contremere
Trepidare = 11:
Vereri = 4:

KEY: AG: Agricola; HI: Historiae; AN: Annales; GE Germania
Note to Tacitus: the one instance of "tremor," at AN 14.27, refers to an earthquake, not fear.

Note to all: Gerunds included under gerundives/participles

(Endnotes)

2 The roots dir-, formid-, horr-, met-, pall-, paw-, pericl-, terr-, trem-, trepid-, tim-, and vere- give dirus, formidabilis, formidare, formido, formidulous, horrere, horribilis, horridus, horrifer, horrificus, horrisomus, horror, metuere, metus, pallere, pallidus, pallor, pavere, pavidus, pavitare, pavor, pericilliari, periculosus, reverentia, reverentiari, terrere, terribilis, terrificus, territare, terror, timere, timiditas, timidus, timidus, tremor, tremens, tremens, tremens, tremens, terrere, trepidare, trepidia, trepidia, verecundus, verecundia, vereri.

3 For an overview of the intellectual nature of fear and of the Greek understanding of it in modern psychological terms, see David Konstan, The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 129-155. For some attempt to sort the Greek terms for fear, see especially pp. 150-155, an attempt particularly successful with his discussion of panic (150-151). For a look at the lexical field using cognitive approaches, see Ana Isabel Magallón García, "El campo léxico de los sustantivos de <<temor>> en los Anales de Tácito", HABIS 25 (1994) 151-172 and Jean-François Thomas, "Le vocabulaire de la crainte en latin: problèmes de synonymie nominale", RÉL 77 (1999) 216-233.


5 In this I also follow McKay, 315.

6 It is worth noting that my observations on the data remain almost unchanged whether participles are included with verbs or under their own heading. Removing participles from the verb count strengthens the case for the most common generic verbs (terrere and timere) and among individual preferences removes vereri from Sallust; pericilliari from Livy, and adds pavere to Tacitus.

Among participles, Caesar has a strong preference for territus (0.75) and a weak preference for veritus (0.31); Sallust has no strong preferences, using metuens, timens, and veritus equally (0.16); Livy has a strong preference for territus (0.178) and weak preferences for metuens (0.049), pavens (0.051), trepida (0.069), and veritus (0.042), and Tacitus has a strong preference for territus (0.25) and a weak preference for metuens (0.16). This would seem to indicate a generic preference for territus, with a secondary emphasis on metuens and veritus.

7 To calculate my figures, I began with the Packard Humanities Institute Latin database and checked the results against published concordances: Cordelia Margaret Birch, Concordantia et Index Caesaris, (Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann) 1989; Jürgen Rapsch and Dietmar Najock, Concordantia in Corpus Sallustianum, (Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann)

8 McKay, 310-311.

9 For these, most instances are clear-cut, but in cases of uncertainty I considered a word weakly occurring if it occurred at least twice as often as the least frequent words and usually at least half as often as the most frequent words.

10 McKay, 310-315.

11 Much has been written on attitudes in the early Empire. A good starting place is Shadi Bartsch, *Actors in the Audience*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press) 1998.

12 McKay, 315.

13 The eleven instances of adjectives of fear are BG 1.33 (periculosum), 1.39 (timidus), 3.24 (timidos), 3.25 (timide), 5.14 (horribiliores), 5.33 (timide), 6.40 (timidos), 7.8 (periculosum), 7.36 (horribilem), and BC 1.19 (timidius), 3.6 (periculosum).

14 Otto Seel, *C. Iulius Caesar: Bellum Gallicum* (Leipzig: Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 1961) 94. “invenitur quidem opinio timoris (III 17.6, V 57,4), sed e contrario correlationem timidiorem - alacriorem non nisi coactus amittere velis; interpretationis amplioris loco addam, quo fere modo locus intelligi possit: vox opinio duplici quodam sensu posita est, sc.: cum sua cunctatione et opinione (=specte cf. p.95,9), se opinione (=expectatione) timidiorem esse, nostros alacriorem (sc. item: op. sive exsp.) fecissent…”
The Speeches of Boudicca and Calgacus: Tacitus’s Unified Text of Imperial Critique

Thomas J. Santa Maria Jr. ’14
College of the Holy Cross

I. Introduction

The Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus often fashioned speeches by a systematic ordering, where one speech repudiates the other. In this paper I will look closely at two sets of juxtaposed speeches. The first set, from the Agricola, includes speeches by Calgacus, the chieftain of the Caledonians in Britain, and Gnaeus Julius Agricola, Roman governor of Britain from 78 to 87 A.D. (Agr. 30-34). The second set, from the Annales, consists of those by Boudicca, the widowed queen of the Iceni in Britain, and Suetonius Paulinus, the Roman governor of Britain from 58 to 61 A.D. (Ann.14.35-36). The two British leaders have a common cause: overthrowing the Roman rule embodied by these governors. Scholars devote much of their attention to the relationship of the speech of Boudicca against Paulinus’, and even more, to the speech of Calgacus against Agricola’s; what has received less treatment is the relationship between the lamentations, pleas, and exhortations of the two Britons. I will argue here that Tacitus meant for their speeches to be read together. In this reading, the speech of Boudicca in the Annales, written roughly twenty years after the speech of Calgacus in the Agricola, completes Tacitus’ presentation of Roman injustice by placing the argument in a woman’s voice.

In the Agricola, a biographical panegyric published in 98 A.D., Tacitus’ primary objective is to extol the virtues of his father-in-law, whom he reveres and respects as a testament that “great men can live even under evil emperors” (posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse, Agr. 42.4). Many of Agricola’s accolades rely on his military prowess. Accordingly, the majority of the historical narrative discusses Agricola’s achievements as a commander in Britain. In 78 A.D., Agricola became the governor of Britain, and assumed the role of a conquering commander. From chapters eighteen to thirty, Tacitus diverts some attention from his subject, Agricola, to focus on a larger topic, Roman dominion over Britain. The climax of this is in the year 84 A.D., when Agricola plans to strike at the Caledonians (Agr. 29.2-3). The battle commences at Mons Graupius, a place where Calgacus describes his people as, “situated in the innermost parts,” of Britain (in ipsis penetralibus siti. Agr. 30.2). Tacitus devotes more attention to this one battle than to the prior six years of Agricola’s governorship. The ultimate outcome of the battle is the defeat of...
Calgacus and the Caledonians. This is the context in which Tacitus places the speech of Calgacus.

Agricola’s early career is also interesting for the argument I am making, because he plays a pivotal role in suppressing the Boudiccan Rebellion of the year 60 A.D., as an apprentice to Suetonius Paulinus (Agr. 5.3). Tacitus discusses the plight of Boudicca and the Iceni in greater detail in Annales XIV, published roughly twenty years after the Agricola. The narrative of Annales XIV covers the Neronian years. Agricola is not the protagonist, and does not figure at all in the Boudiccan account of the Annales. Tacitus discusses the rebellion between chapters twenty-nine and thirty-nine. During these chapters he describes the Iceni and their king, Prasutagus, as a people deceived by the Romans. Prasutagus names Nero as his heir, assuming that his kingdom will benefit from the arrangement. Instead, the Romans break their promise and turn on Prasutagus, “His kingdom was devastated by centurions, and his house was devastated by slaves, as if they were spoils” (ideo ut regnum per centuriones, domus per servos velut capita vastarentur, Ann. 14.31.1). Tacitus introduces Prasutagus’ wife, Boudicca, and her misery: “Boudicca was broken by scourging, and her daughters were violated by rape” (Boudicca affecta et filiae stupro violatae sunt, Ann. 14.31.1).

Subsequently, Boudicca incites a rebellion that is at first successful, but ultimately faces defeat at the hands of Suetonius Paulinus at the Battle of London. Her speech, like Calgacus’, comes before the fall.

Any analysis of either of these speeches necessitates an understanding of the constructs of Roman historiography. One of the controversies in scholarship that pertains to the study of Calgacus’ speech, with respect to Boudicca’s, regards the employment of oratio obliqua instead of oratio recta. In this case, the speech of Boudicca is in oratio obliqua, indirect speech, whereas the speech of Calgacus is in oratio recta, direct speech. According to Eric Adler, this has no bearing on the veracity of the speeches. Moreover, the speeches themselves are most likely fabrications of Tacitus, which is in keeping with a larger tradition of ancient historiographical speech writing. All things considered, this conclusion is probably accurate. For one, it is hard to imagine an immense and motivating pre-battle harangue in an era without sound amplification. Second, Tacitus was devoid of sources for either of these speeches. It is highly unlikely that either speaker delivered an address in Latin, or that a Roman who understood languages indigenous to Britain was present at either speech. Another purpose behind the inclusion of the speeches might have to do with some vanity on the part of Tacitus, the orator “It seems clear that many – if not all – ancient historians used their orations to some extent as opportunities to demonstrate their rhetorical prowess.” This is one logical explanation for the eloquence of Calgacus’ speech.

Another point that influenced the style of the speeches was the expectation on the part of the Roman audiences. That it was conventional to include such paired speeches in ancient historiography is not in doubt. Yet, they may have served an even greater purpose, “in history as in other branches of literature, monotony was to be
avoided at all costs." The orator Quintillian emphasizes this point while discussing the importance of vivid writing through description of disaster scenes in his handbook (Quintillian, *Institutio Oratoria*. 8.3.67-70). If the ancient authors and audiences lauded detailed accounts, then Boudicca’s speech, though not as oratorically and stylistically embellished as Calgacus’, was still its natural successor for its more graphic retelling of horrors. With the context of the speeches established, I will move now to a discussion of the language and themes that link the speeches of Boudicca and Calgacus together.

II. The Speech of Calgacus

Calgacus’ speech acts as an appeal to his people to fight, and to win, for the sake of liberty over the horror of servility. The contrast between his free people and the Roman conquerors is stark. For Calgacus the Romans represent an evil and greedy people motivated by domination: “now that all the lands are left to devastation, they scrutinize the sea: if their enemy is rich, they are avaricious, if poor, they are ambitious,” (postquam cuncta vastantibus defuere terrae, iam mare scrutantur: si locuples hostes est, acari, si pauper, ambitiosi, quos, Agr. 30.4). The Romans, he concludes, only know how to “make desolation, and they call it peace” (solitudinem faciunt, pacem appelant, Agr. 30.5). To attain their goals Calgacus presents the Caledonians with two options: war, and leadership, or chains and slavery. “Here the leader, here the army, there the tributes and metals and other penalties for slaves” (hic dux, hic exercitus: ibi tribute et metalla et ceterae servientium poenae, Agr. 32.4). Though they meet with defeat, Tacitus respects the Caledonians and says that some exhibited “courage” (virtus, Agr. 37.3). This reading of the speech, as anti-imperialist is accurate, but incomplete. Indeed, Birley calls this, “a set of standard criticisms, similar to those put in the mouth of Critognatus (Caesar, *De Bello Gall.* 7.77) or in Mithradates’ Letter (Sallust. *Historiae*. 4.69).” Ergo, Calgacus becomes the mighty champion of libertas. This standard view naturally links Calgacus’ speech and Agricola’s, where Tacitus lionizes Calgacus’ plea for liberty over Agricola’s response. In fact, Calgacus’ speech is far longer than Agricola’s, Suetonius Paulinus’, and Boudicca’s, and his eloquence in the Latin language surpasses his Roman counterparts.

Another theme from Calgacus’ speech on which I would like to concentrate is the sexual misconduct of the Romans. If the Romans desire to dominate the world, then the speech of Calgacus manifests this using language that is sexual in nature. Indeed, when he discusses the Roman faults such as avarice (Agr. 30.4), he accompanies the discussion with language of the sexual, calling the Romans the “Ravagers of the world,” (raptores orbis, Agr. 30.4). The use of the word raptor by Tacitus indicates special significance because it is an extraordinary word in the Tacitean lexicon. Its only other occurrence is in *Historiae* 2.86.1. To conclude this statement, Tacitus writes: “Neither the East nor the West has satisfied

---

8 Roberts (1988) 118.
11 Birley (2009) 98.
[them]: alone of all they covet wealth and depravation with equal passion,” (non Orien, non Occidens satiaverit: soli omnium opes atque inopiam pari affectu concupiscunt, Agr. 30.4). Here, Oakley regards that the words concupisco, raptor, and satio as erotic, but this explanation is not bold enough. In fact, it is hard to read affectus without sexual connotation. Though affectus signifies feeling and emotion, its meaning can relate to passion. Further, the concept of ‘desiring’ (concupisco) is particularly rich in this passage, where Tacitus intensifies the verb cupio with both the con- prefix and the inceptive suffix -sco. Furthermore, the famous aphorism of Calgacus’ speech continues this point, “Abduction, slaughter, rape they call empire under false names,” (auferre trucidare rapere falsis nominibus imperium…appellant, Agr. 30.5). Tacitus emphasizes the word rapere by its placement as last in the triad of infinitives. The picture Tacitus paints of the Romans is of insatiable ravagers of the world. Extrapolating this image of Roman soldiers as insatiable ravagers to the notion of the empire; perhaps Tacitus is questioning Roman expansion as a prolonged series of sexual crimes.

Tacitus has Calgacus persist in his excoriation of Roman sexual malpractice in the second and third chapters of his address in more concrete terms: “Even if our wives and sisters escape the enemy’s libido, they are defiled by illicit intercourse by the name of friends and guests,” (coniuges sororesque etiam si hostilem libidinem effugerint, nomine amicorum atque hospitum polluantur, Agr. 31.1). Whereas Calgacus earlier described the Romans in metaphorical terms, here he appeals to his troops, many of whose wives and sisters could have experienced violation at the hands of the Romans. Even in his final chapter he belabors this motif: “Or do you believe that the Romans have the same courage in war as lasciviousness in peace?” (An eandem Romanis in bello virtutem quam in pace lasciviam adesse creditis, Agr. 32.1).

Though lascivia can have a positive or playful meaning in Latin, Tacitus tends to give it a negative definition such as “wantonness,” or “lack of restraint, indiscipline.” This final meaning not only discredits the Roman fighting ability, but also acts as a reminder for the Britons about why they go to war. The Romans are lustful men, and not necessarily disciplined soldiers.

If we are reading Calgacus’ argument as an assertion of liberty, then Tacitus imbues this element of the speech with sexual imagery as well. When Tacitus explains how well situated the Caledonians’ lands are, he says, “We even held our eyes away from contact and the violation of domination,” (oculos quoque a contactu dominationis involatos habebamus, Agr. 30.2).

---

16 I am not suggesting that Tacitus was not a loyal Roman, or that he was unhappy to see Roman military victory; however, suggesting that Tacitus saw the dangers of expanding an empire too rapidly is not out of the question. After all, Agricola’s recall from Britain outraged Tacitus, yet a possible explanation for his removal by Domitian was that the British lands were not valuable enough to expend resources on, particularly Roman legions.
17 The second part of this clause, entailing the deceit of the Romans, might also be a precursor to the deceit of Prasutagus (Annales 14.31.1)
19 Once again, it is difficult not to recall the plight of Boudicca’s daughters who were violated by rape, (filiae stupro violatae sunt, Annales, 14.31.1)
and hence implies a physical handling, and not just a metaphorical one. When Calgacus contrasts the Caledonians' cause with that of the failed Brigantes (Agr. 31.4), Tacitus reiterates this notion of freedom from harm: "We are untouched and undominated," (vos integri et indomiti, Agr. 31.4). Calgacus' comparison is obvious; the Romans sexually mistreated the Brigantes, and so the Brigantes could not succeed, but the Caledonians remain a whole and unviolated nation so, conversely, a victory is plausible. Calgacus' argument separates the Caledonians, to some extent, from the personalized horror of rape and sexual misconduct.

III. The Speech of Boudicca, Advancing Calgacus

Tacitus uses the same language of sexual misconduct in the more personal speech of Boudicca, to render his earlier arguments more potent. In the role of a narrator of historical events Tacitus immediately emphasizes the femininity of Boudicca: "Under the leadership of Boudicca a woman of noble descent (for truly they did not distinguish sex among rulers)," (Boudicca generis regii femina duce (neque enim sexum in imperiis discernunt), Agr. 16.1). Here, as a historian, Tacitus defines Boudicca's role not only as a leader, but also as a woman. His speech of Calgacus furthers this point. "With a woman leader, the Brigantes burned the colony," (Brigantes femina duce exurere coloniam, Agr. 31.4). Here, through the voice of Calgacus, the reference to Boudicca as a femina duce stresses the femininity of Boudicca. Consequently, Boudicca and the Iceni by association are feminized before their formal treatment in the Annales.

In the Annales, Tacitus takes the opportunity to feminize Boudicca again, this time through her own voice: "She testified that it was indeed customary for the Britons to wage war under the leadership of women" (solitum quidem Britannis feminarum ductu bellare testabatur, Ann. 14.35.1). This familiar trope connects the speech of Boudicca with the Agricola, and specifically with Calgacus' speech. Needless to say, any audience of Britons would know about the customs of their own people. Since Tacitus' intention was to reach out to Roman audiences, he desired a certain effect on those audiences; he wanted to underscore Boudicca's position as a female monarch.

Tacitus pursues the feminine portrayal of Boudicca and her Iceni throughout the chapters on the rebellion. For one, Tacitus describes the Iceni in the following way: "the forces of the Britons were prancing through the crowds and gatherings," (Britannorum copiae passim per cateras et turmas exultabant, Ann. 14.34.2). Here is the sole instance where Tacitus uses exulto in the Annales.21 Certainly, an army of prancing Britains would not intimidate the more stoic, and organized Roman soldiers. Even through the speech of Boudicca Tacitus asserts the disorderliness of the Iceni: "Not even were they about to bear the noise and clamor of so many thousands," (ne strepitum quidem clamorem tot milium, Ann. 14.35.2). As Shumate discusses, the Romans thought that displays of unorganized and disorderly behavior was feminine. They preferred the stoic displays of emotionlessness.22

---

In line with the characterization of the Iceni as a clamorous and shrieking horde, Boudicca’s speech follows a course more focused on revenge for defilement. This theme would have excited Roman audiences for its graphic and violent nature. Boudicca “seeks revenge for her lost liberty, her body abused by scourging, the chastity of her daughters being tred upon,” (libertatem amissam, confectum verberibus corpus, contrectatam filiarum pudicitiam ulcisci, Ann. 14.35.1). Unlike Calgacus, she does not solicit aid from her people as something better for their society, but, “as one of the people,” (ut unam e vulgo, Ann. 14.35.1); she beseeches her compatriots for aid in her personal vendetta. Boudicca’s plea strikes a different tone than Calgacus’ exhortation to fight for libertas, yet she has many of the same complaints about the Romans. Reminiscent of Calgacus’ speech Tacitus also chastises the Roman lustful desires: “The desires of the Romans up to this point left behind not even the bodies, old age, or maidenhood undefiled,” (eo proiectas Romanorum cupidines, ut non corpora, ne senectam quidem aut virginitatem impollutam relinquant, Ann. 14.35.1). In this case the virginitas impolluta could be a reference to the defilement of her own daughters, mentioned twice in the Annales. Tacitus employs the verb, “polluuntur” in a similar way in Agricola 31.1-2, “even if our wives and sister have fled the desires of the enemy, they are defiled under the name of friends and guests,” (coniuges sororesque etiam si hostilem libidinem effugerunt, nomine amicorum atque hospitum polluuntur, Agr. 31.1-2). In this way, Boudicca’s speech is more graphic because it is more personal. Her assault on the Roman offenses has the intimate touch that Calgacus can only vaguely allude to (Agr. 31.1). Furthermore, Boudicca and the Iceni are better suited to respond to the injustice of rape because Tacitus characterizes them with typically feminine traits. Tacitus’ readership could more poignantly respond with the horrible offenses of rape when committed against female subjects.

IV. Conclusion

In the two sets of juxtaposed speeches, Tacitus had a definite purpose: to a critique on the Roman Empire through the barbarians, Boudicca and Calgacus. He reveals this link to posterity in the themes and language he uses. In the Agricola, he makes allusions to Boudicca, and in Boudicca’s speech he uses language that is similar to, if not identical to, Calgacus’. Reading them together is imperative, because with Boudicca’s injured feminine voice Tacitus more vividly appeals to the Roman audience. Only together do the speeches of Boudicca and Calgacus complete Tacitus’ critique on Roman imperial abuses.

The conclusion from my interpretation and the evidence suggesting its veracity demand a new inquiry into Tacitus and his works. Was Tacitus an imperialist, or was he an anti-imperialist? This question is not particularly easy to answer, and has troubled the greatest of Tacitean scholars. One approach to answering it is to avoid the question altogether, and conjecture that Tacitus, in his denunciation of imperial abuses was not making an argument either for or against

---

24 It is interesting that among this list of grievances she does not include the betrayal and murder of her husband Prasutagus.
empire, but simply acting as a moralist.\textsuperscript{27} This answer certainly has some validity. Tacitus does show strong moral disgust at the Roman actions in the speeches of Boudicca and Calgacus. Furthermore, it is fitting that Tacitus should condemn the Roman soldiers for being rapists, because rape and sexual misconduct were certainly considered vile in Roman culture, law, and historiography. The most outstanding example of a detestable rape is that of Lucretia by Sextus Tarquinius narrated most memorably by Livy in Book 1.57-58 in his \textit{Ab Urbe Condita Libri}. Livy portrays the rape scene as personal and graphic. He vilifies Sextus Tarquinius, and he asserts Lucretia’s femininity just as Tacitus would later emphasize Boudicca’s. Lucretia displays a vivid sense of honor that leads to her tragic death, and like Tacitus’ Boudicca, she calls for revenge against her rapist, Sextus Tarqunius. Tacitus’ Roman audience knew Lucretia’s story well, and from it undoubtedly abhorred rape, which makes Tacitus’ moralistic stance an acceptable part of the historiographical tradition.

The second explanation, which is more common, belongs chiefly to Ronald Syme. His interpretation emphasizes the difficulty in understanding Tacitus and suggests that Tacitus’ view on Empire was multi-faceted:

\textit{Did he desire and argue that Rome should revert to a policy of aggrandizement? No unequivocal answer can be given. If warfare (some might hope) dispelled the torpor and inertia of the times, conquest could disturb the equilibrium of the Empire, especially if it went beyond Euphrates and Tigris. Dominion produced evil and paradoxical consequences. The victors were vanquished by peace. Empire abroad engendered despotism at home. Marcus Brutus saw that dilemma long ago. Better forfeit empire than forfeit liberty—such was the answer of the Republican.}\textsuperscript{28}

How Syme reached this conclusion is easily understandable: it seems that Tacitus simply shows two different opinions. On the one hand, his speeches through the voices of the conquered such as Boudicca and Calgacus are blatant indications of the horror of Roman conquest. He almost equates Roman military presence with violence, rape, and robbery.\textsuperscript{29} Yet, Tacitus understood that, “Roman power was something more than a product of craft and violence.”\textsuperscript{30} What is more, as Syme reminds us, “Tacitus looks back with longing on the martial Republic, and he extols the more recent conquerors.”\textsuperscript{31} In a certain sense, this ambiguity left to posterity by Tacitus might suggest that the best interpretation is not that Tacitus’ view was multi-faceted, but that he was a moralist. In other words, Tacitus could have rectified the two seemingly opposing positions by claiming that Empire was right and just so long as its implementation was morally sound.

The final explanation, which is most logical, especially given the notion that Tacitus intended for the speeches of Calgacus and Boudicca to read as a unified whole, is that Tacitus’ opinion on empire evolved. The work of Ettore Paratore champions this position. He notes that in the \textit{Agricola} 14-16, Tacitus’...
earlier work, “when there is mention of the attack on the island of Mona in AD 61 (Agr. 14), there is silence about the excesses committed by the Romans.” For a specific example Paratore offers the introduction of Boudicca, as a female leader, where in the Agricola Tacitus writes, “for they do not discern sex in rulers,” (neque enim sexum in imperiis discernunt, Agr. 16.1). Whereas in the Annales Tacitus not only writes that Boudicca testified to the custom of having female leaders but also that she “seeks revenge for her lost liberty, her body abused by scourging, the chastity of her daughters being tred upon,” (libertatem amissam, contractatam filiarum pudicitiam ulcisci, Ann. 14.35.1). His claim is that the discrepancies in the Boudiccan accounts between the Agricola and the Annales are the result of a shift in mindset where in the former account, “Tacitus still has confidence in the goodness and validity of Roman rule, while in the Annals...his pessimism undermines even his trust in the legitimacy and capability of Rome’s administration over the barbarians.” The accounts are different, because Tacitus’ opinion evolved in the time between the writing of the two speeches. If Tacitus’ position on empire did metamorphose, then the joint reading of the two barbarian speeches is more logical. Tacitus’ growing pessimism explains why he used and needed the speech of Boudicca to develop themes from Calgacus’ speech. The speech of Boudicca, written after that of Calgacus, and reflecting Tacitus’ evolved opinion, helps develop Tacitus’ unified attempt at an imperial critique.
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I fear for this important book. In it, David Elmer moves what is to my biased mind the most important strand of modern Homeric scholarship forward significantly, delivering on the promise of the work especially of Gregory Nagy and Richard Martin in a narrow but extraordinarily important semantic domain of the *Iliad*: the thematics of ἔρως, which Elmer convincingly renders as "consensus." If *The Poetics of Consent* were to find a broad readership, it could, as I believe it should, transform the face of Homeric scholarship. I can however see hurdles in its path. They should not really discourage any reader from reading it with great profit, from the advanced undergraduate to (above all) the specialist. They may nonetheless, I fear, keep the book from attaining its rightful, prominent place on the everyday-more-imaginary ideal bookshelf of the amateur classicist. The virtues of the book are very many. Three stand out as signal achievements, to my mind: Elmer's analysis of what he terms the grammar of reception, his convincing demonstration of the vital importance of that grammar, and his extremely tantalizing, if not quite dispositive, case for that grammar's metapoetic dimension carrying over into the realm of the historical, real-world reception of the *Iliad*.

Building on the work especially of Louis Gernet and Egon Flaig, Elmer gracefully establishes that contrary to some received critical notions, the politics of the three communities who meet in assembly in the *Iliad*, the Achaeans, the Trojans, and the Olympian gods, are fundamentally grounded in consensus. Unlike Flaig ("Das Konsen­sprinzip im homerischen Olymp: Überlegungen zum göttlichen Entscheidungsprozess Ilias 4.1–72," *Hermes* 122 (1994) 13–31), Elmer is laudably very careful to distinguish the politics of the *Iliad* from what we can, and more importantly what we cannot, recover of the politics of bronze-age and archaic Greece. In this caution he adheres to the school of Homeric scholarship that regards synchronic and diachronic pressures on the Homeric poems as shaping their depictions of social institutions in such a way as to make those institutions as depicted a function not of any attempt on the part of the bards at realistic portrayal of their world, but of the specific poetic needs of the system of oral poetics and the songs composed within that system.

Elmer's most important advance on Flaig, however, is in tying the thematics of consensus to the formulas used by the *Iliad* to articulate varying degrees of efficiency of decisions taken in the several crucial assemblies of the poem. In a masterful chapter called "The Grammar of Reception," he lays out five such degrees, ranging from the actual expression of ἔρως (which Elmer demonstrates, in Homeric diction, and, later, in post-Homeric diction that describes the reception of Homer, to mean "consensus," especially when invoked in the derived verb ἔρωσιν) to a silence that expresses the lack of consensus.

That grammar would on its own be an extremely useful hermeneutic tool, and in the succeeding chapters Elmer applies it to wonderful effect, demonstrating its importance for the Achaeans, the Trojans, and the gods. The consensus of the Achaeans...
is shown to be truly determinative of the epic’s mainspring theme of disruption and conservation, which Elmer argues convincingly should be understood in close relation to the interplay in the epic’s composition between received versions of the story of the Trojan War and of the wrath of Achilles and innovations on the part of the composer(s) of the epic as we have it. Likewise, the politics of the Trojans are shown by the same standard to be dysfunctional, above all at the one crucial moment in book 18 when they attain ἔπαινος, but in the wrong way and for the wrong reasons. The politics of the gods, on the other hand, are read very fruitfully as metapoetic, and reflective of the contest among different versions of the story we know as the Ἰλιάδ.

The ramifications of the importance of ἔπαινος just on the level of the plot of the epic are staggering, and Elmer teases them out patiently and cogently. The basic aesthetic impulse noted by Joseph Russo in the Ἰλιάδ, to reimpose regularity after permitting disorder, finds in the politics of consensus an analogue that, even without the metapoetic implications of performance and audience, would give us important new insights into the state of exception, so called by Elmer in an analogy with the political theory of the Weimar Republic, that exists after Agamemnon refuses the ransom offered by Chryses despite the Achaeans’ expressing ἔπαινος for it.

All of this would be well worth the reading even without the metapoetic dimension, as I have said, but that metapoetic dimension, though the sheer exiguousness of our evidence for the early reception of the Ἰλιάδ makes it nearly impossible to pose a truly convincing argument, should be in my judgment the most important contribution of this book. Using Herodotus, Plato, and the Contest of Hesiod and Homer, Elmer makes a very strong case that ἔπαινος was a crucial element in the consensual reception of the Ἰλιάδ itself. That case begins, really, in Elmer’s internal arguments concerning the politics of Olympus and the responses of the internal Trojan audience to the laments over Hector, above all in the extremely striking phrase δήμος ἀπείρων, “boundless people,” for the audience who mourn in response to Helen’s final lament. Elmer argues that the curious lack of resolution, in terms of the politics of consensus, to the wrath of Achilles either in the council of book 20 or in the games of book 23, signals to the epic’s audience that it is their own consensus about the epic that can resolve it.

Elmer writes in a fluid style that becomes jargon-laden only on occasion. He uses some theory, anthropological, political, and literary, which could make the book heavy going for some audiences, in particular undergraduates, though I think the book would be read with great profit in courses on Homeric epic. My principal fear for the book, though, is more fundamental: its argument seems (only, I think, seems) to depend on our Ἰλιάδ’s being a through-composed work. For readers who take this view of the epic, that may prove extremely congenial. For those with a more diachronic view, who see in our text a fungible jigsaw-puzzle of songs placed in a marvelous, but in important ways necessarily arbitrary, arrangement, the suspicion that the meticulously plotted trajectory of the grammar of reception adumbrated by Elmer might be a massive instance of confirmation bias is difficult to escape entirely. What, for example, if the reason that there is no ἔπαινος in the assembly in which Achilles and Agamemnon are reconciled in book 20 is not a tissue of tensions held over all the way from book 1, but rather the adventitious product of a bard’s inclination to show that Achilles and Agamemnon just can’t get along?

As I indicated, though, this concern is really to my mind only one of appearance. Every instance of the grammar of reception read by Elmer can stand as such an instance, legible within the grammar as a whole in relation, if not to the epic as we have

This book examines letters and correspondence as a type of gift exchange and social transaction. Drawing on established theoretical and ethnographic studies, largely of Marcel Mauss and Pierre Bourdieu, Wilcox examines certain letters of Cicero’s *Ad Familiares* and Seneca’s *Moral Epistles*, providing welcome insight into the influence of epistolary rhetoric in the formation and maintenance of Roman *amicitia*. Wilcox demonstrates how Cicero utilizes epistolary strategies to facilitate the reciprocal, and often utilitarian, gifts expected of republican friendships, and how Seneca reinvents these inherited epistolary conventions in developing a new kind of correspondence that asserts Stoic ethics and the primacy of philosophical friendship.

The book is divided into two parts of four chapters each. Part 1 examines selections from Cicero’s *Ad Familiares*, while part 2 deals with Seneca and his *Moral Epistles*. The introduction summarizes the book’s objectives and methodologies, addresses the relevant theories, provides brief synopses on the epistolary genre and Roman friendship, and closes with a succinct overview of developments in letter writing and delivery in the period between Cicero and Seneca’s lifetimes.

Chapter 1 establishes Cicero’s use of “epistolary euphemism” (25), the strategies he and his correspondents consciously employed to disguise the self-interestedness accompanying the exchange of favors and letters during the late republic. Such tactics, Wilcox shows, not only illustrate the importance of rhetorical self-fashioning as a significant feature of letter writing for Cicero and his contemporaries, but also reflect the challenges in navigating the tricky waters of republican *amicitia*, in which friendships and reciprocity were not always equally balanced.

Wilcox next considers the social and symbolic significance of consolation letters, gifts that, broadly speaking, allay the grief associated with both human loss (death) and political loss. Especially notable is Wilcox’s insightful examination of so-called “eristic consolations” (51). Such letters adopt the conventional rhetorical language and philosophical topoi of epistolary consolations, but also incorporate strategies that create competition between the consoler and the consoled. In so doing, the gift of consolation, while on the surface altruistic, can actually function as a vehicle for asserting one’s superior status and power within a friendship.

Chapter 3 considers a different genre of consolation letters, namely those related to the absence of friends, i.e., an epistolary substitution for in-person conversation. Selecting Cicero’s letters to Trebonius (15.21, 15.20) and Lentulus (1.9) as representative examples, Wilcox illustrates how Cicero employs the topos
of absence and longing as a thematic structuring device. Yet Cicero’s belief that letters are insufficient to bridge the gaps created by physical separation poses an analytical problem. Wilcox’s argument is that viewing epistolary correspondence as an exchange of gifts helps to explain the form and content of the letters. Moreover, such gift giving reaffirms the nature of the correspondents’ friendship and at times increases the fame of both letter writers.

Chapter 4 extends this line of thought, albeit switching focus to the recommendation letter, a common epistolary type, as a specialized form of gift exchange. After outlining the rhetoric typical of these letters, Wilcox explores the dynamic, triangular interaction among writer (recommender), recipient, and subject (recommendee). While the subject, often the writer’s protégé, functions as a kind of gift, such exchange is often complicated by the roles of power and status in writing, receiving, and acting upon recommendation letters. Wilcox notes that a simple binary model of dominance and subordination is too simplistic for letters involving complex systems of networking, and her examples of failed recommendations reinforce the degree to which epistolary requests could maintain and define Roman amicitia.

Part 2 of the monograph interrogates Seneca’s Moral Epistles to consider how he adapts inherited epistolary conventions to promote a new type of friendship distinct from the more utilitarian one portrayed in Cicero’s correspondence. Chapter 5 introduces a novel kind of gift exchange, suggesting that Seneca’s metaphorical use of fiscal terminology promotes the value of ethical philosophy and introspection. For example, Seneca presents his disciple Lucilius with philosophical maxims, dubbed as a payment or debt which he owes his recipient; yet Lucilius’ reciprocal payment need not be in the form of a response letter, rather it might comprise his gratitude and intellectual progress. Moreover, such non-material exchange invites and encourages the external reader’s participation in giving meaning to and evaluating Seneca’s letters. This chapter thus establishes Seneca’s methodology, illustrating how he repackages Cicero’s use of epistolary euphemism as a negative exemplum, thereby affirming the primacy of philosophical friendship over the more utilitarian and egocentric type.

Chapter 6 explores Seneca’s definition of philosophical friendship. Wilcox includes several key letters to illustrate Seneca’s thoughts on how to select and treat friends, as well as the necessity of having friends. Wilcox argues that while Ciceronian friendship existed beyond the confines of letter writing, for Seneca letters alone can suffice to maintain friendship. Moreover, this philosophical friendship represents a retreat from political life and its associated self-interested epistolary practices.

The penultimate chapter focuses on book 4 of the Moral Epistles, demonstrating how Seneca alters the definition of friendship that he established in the preceding three books. Wilcox shows how Seneca’s many deliberate epistolary inconsistencies tease the reader, undercutting expectations only to then reassert them. She further examines the tactics by which Seneca encourages the external reader to participate in the correspondence and consider her own identity vis-à-vis the epistolary roles of Seneca and Lucilius. Seneca meticulously crafts his own self-portrait and those of others in the correspondence to create exempla for both Lucilius and the reader. Such “exemplary discourse” (134) Wilcox argues, benefits Seneca as writer with an opportunity to exercise self-
reflection, and it benefits the recipient-reader by providing a written model to follow when needed.

Finally, Wilcox studies Seneca’s divergence from conventional epistolary consolations, such as those found in Cicero’s correspondence. While the latter’s consolations frequently represent mere courtesy, Seneca’s are genuine. He rejects conventional advice, which evokes the public eye as rhetorical admonition against excessive grief, instead appealing to a more intimate, philosophical community of friends as a sincere network within which to share grief. Lastly, Wilcox illustrates how Seneca reinvents consolatory convention by creating an “inversion of the gift exchange” (172). Seneca does so by eschewing the role of the consoler and adopting that of the bereaved, thereby displaying an act of self-consolation that aligns more generally with his promotion of introspection and philosophical meditation.

Wilcox’s readings are nuanced and her conclusions philologically sound, yet a few minor matters are worth noting. An expanded introduction would greatly assist readers less familiar with gift-exchange theory, Bourdieu, and Mauss, as well as epistolarity more generally. This would be particularly helpful given that the theoretical approach occasionally recedes into the background, as in the discussion of friendship that is central to chapter 7. Such background might better replace her introductory discussion concerning letter delivery and the *cursus publicus*, which, although informative, ultimately has little bearing on the subsequent chapters. Moreover, the term *cursus publicus* is used anachronistically; it was not coined until Diocletian (see Anne Kolb, *Transport und Nachrichtentransfer im Römische Reich*. Berlin 2000).

These minor issues aside, Wilcox’s book makes a significant contribution to epistology: not only does she provide original observations on the dynamic relationship between friendship and (rhetorical) letter writing, but she heightens our appreciation for the epistolary interconnections between Cicero and Seneca, who are all too often read in isolation, if not complete opposition. Moreover, Wilcox’s comparative approach strengthens her readings since Seneca’s divergences reinforce our appreciation for Cicero’s strategic epistolary maneuvering. Wilcox’s intimate knowledge of both authors’ corpora is impressive, and specialist readers will find her discussions engaging. At the same time, her analyses and selected translations are clear enough to make this book accessible to a broader audience of interested readers. One caveat: Wilcox herself acknowledges this is not a comprehensive treatment of epistolary gift exchange in Cicero and Seneca’s letters, so some readers may find themselves wishing for additional textual examples and expanded discussion. Nonetheless, this concise volume stands as a theoretical exemplum, a gift to readers, who may adopt Wilcox’s approach to further their own personal engagement with the Roman epistolary genre.

Noelle Zeiner-Carmichael
College of Charleston, SC
Seneca's *Natural Questions* deals with what in antiquity was called *meteorologica*, the study of natural phenomena that were thought to occupy, or be governed by, the middle space between the earth and the heavens: rain, winds, and the weather, but also comets and earthquakes. For us, the *Natural Questions* presents a strange mixture of what looks like science, such as theories about phenomena like rainbows and hail, and highly rhetorical diatribes against the immorality of contemporary life at Rome. For Seneca, physics and ethics seem inseparable, but the relationship between the work's moralizing discussions and technical content has been an important concern in recent work on the text. (See, in particular, F. R. Berno, *Lo specchio, il vizio e la virtù: studio sulle Naturales Quaestiones di Seneca*. Bologna 2003; B. M. Gauly, *Senecas Naturales Quaestiones: Naturphilosophie für die römische Kaiserzeit*. Munich 2004; B. Inwood, *Reading Seneca: Stoic Philosophy at Rome*. Oxford 2005; D. D. Leitão, “Senecan Catoptrics and the Passion of Hostius Quadra (Sen. Nat. 1).” *Materiali e Discussioni* 41 (1998) 127–60.) Williams engages carefully and generously with recent scholarship on the *Natural Questions* in addressing this relationship; he argues that the *Natural Questions* induces its readers to investigate the workings of nature, not as an end in itself, but as a means of elevating their minds above the sordidness of ordinary life. Seneca's writing encourages his readers towards a “cosmic viewpoint,” a liberating perspective that brings them into closer contact with god, who is identified with nature itself, or Herself. Through a series of deft close readings of Seneca's text, Williams builds a convincing case for the *Natural Questions* as a creative and thoughtful work, an important part of Seneca's literary legacy, as well as an innovative contribution to the study of meteorology in antiquity.

The book is divided into eight chapters, several of which are based on articles previously published in journals, but are fully integrated here into a sustained argument. The first two chapters are thematic and introductory. The first situates Seneca’s worldview in the context of Cicero and Pliny the Elder’s approaches to the study of nature, and explores Seneca’s emphasis on the self within the sociopolitical context of Neronian Rome. A key concern of this book is the ways in which Seneca’s literary strategies work to produce active readers who engage with nature as a means of liberating themselves from a partial, earth-bound perspective on life, although, Williams argues, the process of self-liberation is far from straightforward in Seneca’s account. The *Natural Questions* focuses on meteorology, which is concerned with the intermediary zone between the earth and the heavens; figuratively, Williams suggests, the study of meteorology marks an intermediate step on the reader’s journey towards a detached, cosmic viewpoint on themselves and the world. The second chapter on “Seneca’s Moralizing Interludes” examines key episodes from across the *Natural Questions* where Seneca presents vivid, tour-de-force diatribes against various vices, the most discussed of which is the notorious description of Hostius Quadra’s sexual escapades with mirrors which livens up Seneca’s account of mirror effects in nature in book 1. The narrative pull of these episodes stages in
the text the struggle that the reader-philosopher undergoes in trying to escape from the potentially pleasurable constraints of ordinary life. It is the struggle itself, Williams argues, that Seneca emphasizes in his work.

The remaining six chapters each focus on a particular section of the *Natural Questions*, following the revised book order that was established by Carmen Codoñer (*L. Annaei Senecae Naturales Quaestiones*. 2 vols. Madrid 1979) and by Harry Hine (*An Edition with Commentary of Seneca, Natural Questions*, Book 2. New York 1981): book 3 (seas), 4a (the Nile), 4b (hail and snow), 5 (winds), 6 (earthquakes), 7 (comets), 1 (rainbows and other lights in the sky), 2 (thunder and lightning). Throughout, the technical content of the meteorology is discussed where it is important to Seneca’s broader point, but the focus here is on the ways in which that content serves a larger ethical goal. So chapter 3 explores the relationship between the cataclysmic flood Seneca describes at the end of book 3 with the more mundane miracle of the Nile’s summer flooding in book 4. Chapter 4 probes Seneca’s rhetoric and practice of scientific inquiry by examining the dense argumentation in book 4’s discussion of theories about hail. In chapter 5, we find human concerns, and the contrast between nature’s consistency and human aberrations, at the center of Seneca’s treatment of winds in book 5.

The earthquakes of book 6 are explored in chapter 6, a key chapter for Williams’s elaboration of Seneca’s project and what he calls the Senecan sublime: Seneca is influenced by Lucretius, and employs the techniques of consolatory literature, in asserting a literary and rational control over nature, partly in response to the recent disaster of the Campanian earthquake of AD 62. Chapter 7 returns to the idea of the reader’s journey and the impact of book ordering in the *Natural Questions*. In ancient writing, comets occupied an ambiguous position between meteorological and astronomical phenomena, and the comets of book 7 are here seen as the high point in the structure of Seneca’s work, where Seneca encourages a higher, intuitive form of knowledge in his readers in contrast to the less elevated vision that dominates Roman life, of which book 1’s Hostius Quadra is an extreme exponent. The final chapter reads book 2’s treatment of Etruscan divinatory and Stoic rational explanations for lightning in the context of the cultural revolution that Andrew Wallace-Hadrill (*Rome’s Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge 2008) has traced in the late republic and early empire, when experts in specialist fields were seen to usurp the authority of the elite’s traditional knowledge.

This is a richly textured book, and this summary does not do justice to the fine detail of Williams’s arguments or the many passing insights on particular passages. It is an important contribution to our understanding of Seneca’s *Natural Questions*, and, more broadly, the rhetoric of technical literature in antiquity and the place of scientific knowledge at Rome.

Aude Doody
University College Dublin
For late antique Christians, piety and wealth made awkward companions. For Jesus taught his disciples: “it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of the needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of Heaven” (Matthew 19:24). Peter Brown’s study aims to illustrate “the rationale for the pious use of wealth” in the Christian West, from roughly 350 to 550 CE (464). He does so through his characteristic sympathy for the available sources and a sense of a long late antiquity. The age of Pope Damasus, Jerome, and Symmachus in the late fourth century was an “age of gold” (3), when Christian aristocrats like Melania the Younger could rid themselves of vast wealth through spending on churches and monasteries while a pagan like Q. Aurelius Symmachus could likewise put on dazzling consular games for his son. By comparison, Brown urges us not to imagine a church with a “capital C” (xxii). Lay Christians could be wealthy as could bishops and their own churches. But there was no worldwide organization or indeed a polity centered on Rome that had wealth at its disposal. Moreover, lay spending on churches (titular churches) was not only an urban phenomenon in the age of gold, but also a suburban one, when the wealthy built churches and martyr memorials on private estates. With tongue in cheek, Brown points out that the late fourth century was in this sense an “Age of the Camel,” when the fabulously wealthy were “very large camels” trying to pass through the “eye of the needle” by getting rid of their wealth to ensure their place in heaven (xxiv). Brown also stresses that the state, state rituals, and even culture more generally were largely secular and persisted as such. All of this would change drastically within two generations. By the end of the fifth century, the Roman world was falling apart. Taxation and warfare were ruining fortunes and fragmenting Roman territory. Some benefitted from the less secure times in which they lived, but there were far fewer “very large camels” around. This book is mostly about them, those wealthy individuals who were sliding dangerously close to various forms of dependency while churches and monasteries came to be repositories of wealth. Key to this shift was the circulation of ideas, such as those of Augustine, that sanctified the notion that God placed wealth on earth for the rich to “manage” (464). Unloading wealth on Christian projects transformed the inherently deteriorating effect of riches into “treasure in Heaven,” thus marrying the seemingly opposed categories of piety and wealth (88).

This much is known. But what makes this book a truly exhilarating read is typical of the author; his ability to conjure up and make palpable the sheer complexity of what seems established fact. Rather than being treated to a generalizing synthesis of Christian uses of wealth or attempts at statistical assessments, we instead encounter a series of portraits, each focused on an individual and his writings and each deeply rooted in the environments in which they lived. After four background chapters, we see, roughly chronologically, the Rome of Symmachus, Jerome, and Pope Leo; Ambrose’s Milan; Augustine’s North Africa; Paulinus’ Campania; the Gaul of Cassian, Salvian, and Gregory of Tours. As Brown puts it, he is interested in “an unremitting sense of place” (xxii), how each of these figures was rooted to a distinct location, and most
importantly how issues of wealth and relative forms of poverty differed by region. To this end, Brown puts archaeology, inscriptions, architecture, and much else in dialogue with the literary sources. Most of us strive to do the same, but hardly with the same ability and breadth of reading. What results is a new history of the West in these two centuries, a critical time that saw, in quite real terms, the fall of Rome. It is a portrait of a fragmented, diverse empire, in which the fate of churches and the formulation of a theology of wealth had much to do with local economic and social pressures. In this, Brown's massive study is the perfect analogue to Evelyne Patlagean's equally massive *Pauvrete économique et pauvrete sociale à Byzance 4e–7e siècles* (Paris 1977). While Patlagean was focused on Byzantium and the issue of poverty, she and Brown agree that the study of wealth or poverty must of necessity be a study of all of society. Patlagean: "la pauvrete ne pouvait en fin de compte se définir sinon par référence à toute la société" (2). Brown: "The issue of wealth flowed like a great braided river through the churches and through Roman society as a whole" (xxiv). Both books likewise share the assumption that an analysis of the terms and categories that societies use to define social realities lie at the heart of a historian's work. In Patlagean's case, she explicitly uses Lévi-Strauss's structuralist approach. Though less explicit in this regard, Brown investigates changing definitions for key terms like *plebs*, *pauper*, *res publica*, *populus Romanus*, and concepts related to the familiar terminology of patronage. Most importantly, we find an ever-expanding definition of the poor, from the "shame-faced poor" to all the "poor" in society (467). Brown reminds us that *pauper* was a relational term, like recent political discourse on the "middle class" (343). Now the *populus Romanus*, in all its economic diversity, were redefined and united as the poor in need of church charity. Indeed, Brown's book was clearly written to engage our present, perhaps even distinctly U.S., sensibilities. He scatters colloquialisms throughout; however, these always illuminate rather than distract. Pope Damasus was a "Q-Tip" (254); the fate of the *annona* was like a "nuclear reactor" (111); the fourth century was full of "grassroots religious organizations" (170); Augustine and his friends were involved in "countercultural experiments" (171); there were "buzzwords" and periods of "boom and bust" (175); Trier was the "Pentagon of the West" (187); Jerome was "fundraising" in Rome and the "superego" of his patrons there (215, 267); monks were "extremists" whose challenge to the rich represented to some the "m-word" (214, 302); slaves joining Alaric's Visigothic army were walking a "freedom trail" (297); there was a "roundabout of regime changes" in the late fourth century (208); even a "Spice Girl" emerges (511).

If there is one area in which this book is lacking it is an analysis of hagiography. Brown of course knows the potential of this body of writing, and he has mined it elsewhere. Here, Brown only gestures in this direction: "Hagiographic narratives of this period stressed the miraculous abundance of wealth used for the poor" (512). These hagiographical narratives often include discourses on the shedding of wealth to attain entry into the kingdom of heaven, and often do so in terms that explicitly contrast the Hellenistic model of civic munificence and an emerging Christian model of pious giving, not for the enjoyment of the *plebs* at large, but for the poor. One example will suffice. In the so-called *Acts of the Greek Martyrs* (BHL 3970), an anonymous set of martyr acts dating perhaps from the latter half of the fifth century, we follow the fate
of a family of wealthy Greek peregrini in Rome at the time of the persecution of Decius (249–50 ce). They are urged by church officials to give up their vast wealth. They are told: “worldly wealth is an impediment to eternal life,” facultates istae terrenae impedimenta sunt vitae aeternae. The Roman authorities react to this use of wealth as a threat to political order. For the Christians, their wealth is for the poor, pauperes, and their remaining “treasures are their souls,” thesauri nostri animae nostrae sunt. Indeed, in contrast to the city of Rome and its manmade monuments, the text reiterates the claim that the kingdom of heaven is full of real treasures, perfectly laid out streets of gold, and no more destitution. It is like Rome but better, because in this heavenly kingdom it seems that everyone is rich. It remains for others to systematically study such difficult, but rich materials (difficult because of issues of dating and intended audience) for the emergence of Christian heroes of pious giving in the West. Brown’s book will serve as a guide to interpreting these materials and much else. Through the Eye of a Needle deserves the widest possible readership. It is a remarkable achievement.

Jason Moralee
University of Massachusetts Amherst


In a previous work (Alexander the Great and the Mystery of the Elephant Medallions. Berkeley 2003), Holt demonstrated the capacity to make numismatics an adventure, or in that case an almost Sherlock Holmes style mystery. This book goes much further than that, both in terms of the substance, which deals in depth with the historiography of the subject, and the development of the methodologies involved in the search for ancient Afghanistan (Bactria). This is set in a lively narrative of adventure and discovery caught up in the beginnings of the Great Game between the Russian and British Empires over the region, taking it down to the modern wars and tragedies that still beset Afghanistan. Throughout the work Holt takes the subject very seriously, and displays a magisterial command of the scholarship involved.

Lost World opens in chapter 1, “The Adventure Begins,” with the first Western European discovery of Bactrian coins in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the first type of numismatic collection and method, “Checklist Numismatics.” This simply identified the names of what one had to presume were monarchs on the coins and the coin types, but with little interpretation. In chapter 2, “A Dangerous Game,” Holt covers the growth of numismatic material, collections, and the expansion of method in the nineteenth century into what is called “Framework Numismatics.” As the chapter title implies, this is the period of the Great Game, filled with colorful characters and marked by what Holt calls “a torrent” of coins from the ancient period (27). The methodology now advances by trying to connect the dots of the names and types of coins found. In chapter 3, “The Gold Colossus,” Holt concentrates on the Eucratidion, a giant twenty-stater gold coin of the Bactrian king Eucratides the Great, the largest gold coin known
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from all antiquity. Indeed, this is the piece from which “the Golden King” in the title of this book is drawn, and Holt uses it to introduce the next phase of the methodology: “Novelty Numismatics,” arguably also the subject of his book on the elephant medallions.

With the number of coin types and examples now markedly significant, chapter 4, “Telling Tales,” takes the methodology into the twentieth century and what is termed “Narrative Numismatics.” Here Holt covers the attempt of historians, such as W. W. Tarn and A. K. Narain, to draft the coin types into historical narratives, caught up in trying to establish the Greekness of the Bactrian civilization on the one hand, or emphasizing the role of native cultures on the other. The desire to answer that question in turn enlists a major effort in more archaeology, beyond the coins themselves. In chapter 5, “One Greek City,” this ultimately leads to the discovery of the remarkable Ai Khanoum site on the ancient Oxus River, the modern Amu Darya, in 1960. In fact, archaeologists had been anxiously searching for a “Greek City,” i.e., the remains of a site that were indisputably Greek, since the early nineteenth century. Alexander the Great had founded or re-founded some two dozen such cities, many of which were known, and continuously occupied, since that time, such as Alexandria Eschate, modern Khojent, or Alexandria Maracanda, modern Samarkand. Excavations began on the Ai Khanoum site in 1965 and continued until 1978. Indeed, excavations spread to other sites and produced significant coin hoards. But Ai Khanoum does not represent simply a Greek city. As Holt states: “Some features of Ai Khanoum appear quintessentially Greek, such as the theater and the gymnasium; other structures bear the hallmarks of unmistakable Mesopotamian influence, such as the palace and the temple” (112).

This archaeological process also provided both formal inscriptions and fragments, equally important because they were not intended for public consumption, that add to the narrative. So in chapter 6, “Letters Here and There,” epigraphy is added to the mix. In some cases, these are Greek inscriptions, but there are also inscriptions in native dialects, and in particular from Indian rulers such as Chandragupta, Bindosura, and Ashoka. Holt notes that this was “Extensive epigraphical material from their Mauryan Empire, and particularly from the reign of Ashoka (ca. 269-232 B.C.E.)” (120). Ashoka’s monuments are numerous and multilingual, representing Brahmi, Kharoshthi, Aramaic, and Greek.

The politics of empires and wars have always marked this region, and that unfortunately includes the last thirty years. In chapter 7, “A Perfect Storm,” Holt states that “Hand in hand with the despoliation of archaeological remains... vast troves of numismatic evidence have been destroyed by a perfect storm of poverty and lawlessness in league with supply and demand” (135). In what is probably the most technical part of book, Holt points out that this led to what he calls “Rescue and Revisionist Numismatics.” Holt mentions that over the thirty years since the initial Soviet invasion, some 10,000 Bactrian coins have appeared in auction catalogues around the world, but representing only the tip of the iceberg of what has been lost. Holt also points out that 92% of all numismatic evidence acquired originally was undocumented or not scientifically excavated in the first place. So the techniques used in Rescue Numismatics for looking more systematically at what does exist, looking, for instance, at mint marks more
closely, has also led to new analysis. In turn, this has led to revisionist theories in the twenty-first century that get beyond the old debates of the "Narrative Numismatics" in the twentieth century.

In the concluding chapters, Holt introduces what he calls "Cognitive Numismatics." By pulling together all of the previous disciplines, and taking a New Archaeology approach into what he hopes will be the New Numismatics, Holt goes beyond the kings who ordered the coins’ production to look at the process of production itself and the people who operated the mint. The analysis of chapter 8, "A New Beginning," points to the fact that both Greek and native workers figured in the design and minting, and that over time the quality of the Greek elements diminished or were diluted, evidenced by misspellings, for instance. In chapter 9, "Coins and the Collapse of Civilization," Holt discusses how the coins circulated, the fiduciary purposes to which they were put, and the intrinsic values of the coins, and argues that in this theater the images or sentiments on the coins were not really considerations but were secondary to the practical usage by all elements of society in terms of both class and ethnicity. The picture is of a multicultural society operating on a practical level.

Lost World is a tour de force in terms of its scholarship, marked, incidentally, by some excellent plates, and charming illustrations by the author’s daughter. It takes a complicated subject, and some esoteric methodologies, and makes them accessible to the general reader and the specialist alike. One might call it, mirroring Holt’s terminology, “Cognitive Narrative.” Holts blends the historiography of the subject, with its necessary disciplines, literature, epigraphy, archaeology, and above all numismatics, into an eminently readable monograph and an excellent introduction to the field and ancient Afghanistan.

Winthrop Lindsay Adams
University of Utah


The inhabitant of any given city in the eastern Roman empire in the second century CE stood a good chance of seeing a larger-than-life marble portrait of an adult woman with a classicizing body and an individualized head as he walked through his city’s prominent venues. At the same time halfway across the Mediterranean, an inhabitant of Rome was likely encountering a statue that was virtually identical to its eastern counterpart in gesture, stance, size, and dress, with the only two differentiating aspects being the inscription and the head, maybe. This sameness of the so-called Large Herculaneum Woman statues was deliberate, and shared by well over one hundred examples of the type from the cities and sanctuaries of the Roman empire, mostly in the East, in the second century CE. This replication in no way diminished the value of this portraiture; to the contrary: these were high-status portraits made for elite women in response to their public beneficence to their cities. Jennifer Trimble eloquently argues for
the significance of this replicated statue type, leaving aside the simplistic model of emulation of the Greeks in favor of an explanation of the type's popularity that is rooted in the interconnected processes at work in marble production and civic euergetism in the second century CE. These interconnections are considered in detail in seven different chapters, addressing origins, production, replication, portraiture, space, differences, and endings. Trimble also includes a catalogue of every known Large Herculaneum Woman statue (202 examples) and a useful appendix on the dating of these statues.

In the first chapter, Trimble looks both at the history of the scholarship on the Large Herculaneum Woman and at the evidence for the precursor of this type of statuary. The origins for the type probably do date back to the fourth century BCE in the Greek world, according to Trimble, but the reasons for its popularity and replication in the Roman period are likely not connected to these origins. The Large Herculaneum Woman type surfaced in the Augustan period as a means of representing female members of the imperial family. This model for female statuary was then taken up by some local elite families in order to establish a connection to the imperial family. It was not until the second century CE that the proliferation of this type would be seen (133 of the 202 examples date to the second century), largely in the civic centers of the eastern empire where the Large Herculaneum Woman statue type would be used to represent members of local and regional elite families in connection to their benefactions to a particular city or sanctuary. This type of statuary became an “authoritative cliché to represent high-status femininity, public beneficence, and financial generosity” (34).

Certainly, the significance of these statues was connected to their essential sameness, and Trimble explores the roots of this phenomenon in the next several chapters. She looks first at the expansion of the marble trade in the second century CE and the effects of the mass production, standardization, and pre-fabrication during this period, and next at the proficiency of the local workshops where replicas of the Large Herculaneum Woman portrait type were produced with remarkable faithfulness to their model. These replicated bodies were sometimes paired with individualized heads, as is often seen in Roman portraiture, or with equally classicizing, and therefore generic, heads. The apparent paradox of portraiture which strives for uniformity is explored in the fourth chapter, where Trimble looks closely at the various components of the portrait: head, body, and inscription. In an interesting discussion of the interplay between the individual and the generic in all of these components, Trimble argues that the power behind this type of portraiture rested in its incorporation of formulaic building blocks, the type of body, the addition of the head, and the order of words in the inscription, that were immediately recognizable to the viewer. All of the elements were combined in predictable ways in order to create a public and honorific portrait of a woman from a prominent family who had contributed generously to the well-being of the city. Plancia Magna from Perge is a well-explained example.

In addition to the recurring elements in the portrait itself, the Large Herculaneum Woman was routinely paired with other types of honorific statuary in predictable, high-profile venues in the city. In the fifth chapter, Trimble describes several of these venues, including the various installations in Perge and the Nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus in Olympia, in order to highlight the widely
shared practices of display and the implications for reception. What stands out above all in this chapter is the intensely urban and public setting of this type of statuary (only seven statues were found in funerary contexts) and the resultant visibility for the elite families in the various cities. These families, with their adroit display of the visual koine of the empire, represent cultural competence and connections to the larger world. The proficiency with which the elite families of the (largely) eastern empire in second century CE displayed their cultural competence is further highlighted by non-canonical usages of this honorific portraiture in places as far-flung as southern Spain and the lower Danube, discussed in chapter 6. Even in these locales, however, the value of the Large Herculaneum Woman as a signifier of supra-local connections and participation in the visual koine of the empire is still clear, though the significance of this connotation, and expectations of fidelity, could vary greatly at the local level.

As striking as the number of Large Herculaneum Woman portraits produced in the second century CE is, even more surprising is their precipitous decline in the early third century. In the final chapter, Trimble explores the reasons for this abrupt halt in production. Moving beyond the exaggerated accounts of chaos in the third century as an explanation, Trimble focuses instead on the fragile nature of the interconnected network created in the previous century for the production and consumption of honorific portraiture, and also on changes in the societal prejudices towards the “prestige body” (318), which resulted in different expectations for elite identity in the third and fourth centuries.

This monograph is well worth reading, even if the Large Herculaneum Woman portrait type is not one’s primary interest. The volume considers much more than this particular type of statuary: there are interesting discussions of the quarrying, production, and carving of a variety of marble objects, including column capitals, garland sarcophagi, and Roman-style stage buildings, in the second century CE, as well as of the meaning and function of honorific portraiture in the Roman imperial city. Trimble’s research is thorough, and she actively engages with previous scholarship, some of it very recent, on the topic. She explains the issues in clear language, leads the reader through the argument with interesting and thought-provoking questions, and provides plenty of helpful explanatory footnotes and bibliography.

Maura Heyn
University of North Carolina, Greensboro


In matters touching on sexuality, the Western world has developed over the last half-century or so into what at least feels like a relatively frank and open place. We still have taboos, e.g., on pederasty and bestiality, and prejudices (only in 2013 did the first professional American basketball player come out as gay; the first transgender American president is unlikely to be elected for a generation or
two), and a number of personal behaviors remain widely, sometimes even legally prohibited, e.g., extra-marital affairs, polygamy, prostitution. But adults, at least, are more or less free today to read, discuss, and look at what they want, and to live as they please. It is accordingly fascinating to look back on a recent time, still within living memory in some cases, and easily accessible in printed texts, when action and expression were both far more restricted than they are now.

This self-consciously scattershot collection is concerned with the practice of expurgation, defined on page 1 as “the deliberate removal (purging) of offensive material from texts,” in this case Greek and Latin texts, with particular attention to the English-speaking academic and semi-academic world of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The challenge is to make the topic interesting, for there seems on the surface little of note to be said about the phenomenon itself. Words, lines, or even whole poems were frequently cut from school-commentaries or translations of ancient texts, or their meaning was carefully obscured. The fact that such excisions were made is not in dispute; the motivations for the cuts (protection of the innocent, however defined) are rarely in doubt, and are on occasion explicitly spelled out by those who made them; and the identity of individual expurgators is clear from the title pages of the volumes in question. One obvious approach to the question, not entirely eschewed in this collection, is to record the history of the treatment of individual texts, noting who eliminated or obscured what, and when, while speculating on why one translator or editor allowed an arguably offensive word, line, or poem to slip through the censor’s net to a wider public, while another did not. But this is a dreary business, which amounts to creating long variants on lists of which early modern or modern classicists thought the words “fuck” and “penis” were too offensive for the gentle reader; which thought “fuck” was offensive but “penis” was not; and so forth. The best essays in this volume therefore adopt alternative approaches to the material, showing that expurgation is a more complicated and ambiguous phenomenon than it might at first appear to be—put another way, that straightforward excision is less interesting than other strategies editors and translators have adopted for dealing with troublesome original material; reading the expurgation of texts as an index of larger and less obvious cultural and social changes; or bringing individual, today generally obscure, expurgators and their presses and series vividly to life.

T. J. Leary, “Modifying Martial in nineteenth-century Britain,” is a nice example of the utility of the first approach, in that the author explicitly concedes that “When dealing with collections of epigrams, selection (or deselection) is the obvious method of censorship” (130). “Expurgation,” in other words, is not really at issue in this case, nor is explicit reference to sexuality the sole criterion that determines inclusion or exclusion of individual poems in an edited collection. So too David Butterfield, “Contempta relinquas: anxiety and expurgation in the publication of Lucretius’ De rerum natura,” shows that troubling sections of the poem could be “cut” but still printed, e.g., in small type or in an appendix, or obscured in other ways rather than simply being ejected from the text. Philip Lawton, “For the gentlemen and the scholar: sexual and scatological references in the Loeb Classical Library,” nicely illustrates a plethora of similar strategies in a wide range of early twentieth-century translations intended for the middlebrow reader.
But Daniel Orrells's "Headlam's Herodas: the art of suggestion," makes clear that the real interest and value in the sort of issues this volume as a whole attempts to take on are in the second and third approaches noted above. Orrells's reading of Herodas is often overheated, and his glosses on Headlam's own archaizing poetry occasionally miss the point. The fundamental intertext for the poem in impassioned Sapphics addressed to a girl named Mary, age nine—passioned enough that any modern American parent would certainly call the police when Headlam's composition arrived in the mail (a point to which I return below)—for example, is patently Odysseus' interaction with Nausicaa in *Odyssey* 6–8. But Orrells's real subject is how commenting on Herodas allowed Headlam to take up larger contemporary social questions involving women's passions and women's education, the simultaneously threatening and alluring "New Woman." This is fascinating stuff, and to the extent that the other essays in the volume fail to meet the standard Orrells sets, it is in part because the contributors are classicists first and foremost, and are thus intimately familiar with the ancient material but less conversant with the early modern and modern cultures that received, or declined to receive, it.

If this volume raises a more general question, however, it has to do with the tone of moral triumphalism apparent in a number of the essays. On the one hand, it is obvious in retrospect that systematic excision and obfuscation in the modern handling of ancient texts was a stupid response to what can reasonably be regarded as a non-existent problem: Does anyone actually read Lucretius or the *Greek Anthology* for titillation? And if they do or did, why should anyone else care, given that sexuality is a secret everyone is in on, or will soon be in on? But treating the Victorians in particular as fools, from whose blinkered view of the world we are now mercifully at last free, also misses the point. In a century or two, someone will probably produce a volume of collected essays in which the pervasive irony and cynicism of early twenty-first-century America—a society in which Headlam's love poem to Mary would almost inevitably have landed him in serious hot water, however innocent and chaste everyone in his own understood it to be—is exposed as an odd, even self-defeating cultural trap. The best essays in this volume are thus sympathetic attempts to read expurgation and similar acts as meaningful and productive cultural practices in their own right; the others merely remind us that we are in some ways lucky to live when we do.

Additional contributions to the volume are: Ewen Bowie, on the extent to which the elegiac, lyric, and elegiac poetry we have may have been purged of obscene content in antiquity; Ian Ruffell, on nineteenth and twentieth-century editions of Aristophanes; Gideon Nisbet, on the nineteenth and twentieth-century reception of Greek epigram; Stephen Harrison, on the early modern reception of Horace; Gail Trimble, on the reception of Catullus before Fordyce; James Morwood, on the Latin Delphin Classics (very brief); and Robert Crowe, on Penguins, with particular attention to Paul Turner's 1956 *Daphnis and Chloe*. Deborah Roberts offers an afterword.

S. Douglas Olson
University of Minnesota/University of Freiburg

In her study of Julius Caesar’s reception in the U.S.A., Maria Wyke ably shows the power the ancient dictator has exerted in this country over the shifting ideologies of the past century. Her book is a meticulously documented history of the uses to which he has been put in the areas of education, political theory and commentary, and entertainment. The picture of Caesar that emerges is fractured and complex. Wyke’s interweaving of multiple sources draws out a Caesar who can be a good and bad guy not only alternately, in successive generations, but simultaneously in a single one. Particularly striking is her analysis in the chapter entitled “Totalitarianism” of Caesar’s significance in the Cold War era, when different representations of his life and death made the analogy not only between him and Stalin (warning also of totalitarian aspirations in U.S. leaders), but also between the conspirators and Communist uprisings. Thus Caesar becomes both the leader of a hated regime and the old-regime victim whom the new rule deposes. Similarly in “Presidential Politics” she demonstrates the ways in which the detrimental analogy between the end of the Roman Republic and contemporary U.S. politics in the mid-twentieth century was co-opted by both the Left and the Right. The latter interpreted leaders such as Roosevelt and Kennedy as charismatic demagogues who gain power by corrupting the masses, the former as principled leaders challenged or overthrown by tyrannical ideologues like McCarthy or treacherous assassins blind to the genius and moral good of a strong leader.

Wyke arranges her wealth of material accessibly, using a straightforward chronological narrative. She partitions the book between accounts of the educational grounding of American culture in the story of Caesar (part 1: Education) and the ways in which that foundation informs its vision of politics (part 2: Political Culture). Finally, her chapter titles succinctly convey the ideological thrust of successive eras’ interpretive stance toward Caesar. The progression of these titles encapsulates a narrative of a fledgling nation asserting independence and the moral parameters of human freedom and dignity within which it will live. As the U.S. grows in strength and global influence, so too does its struggle to define the nature of its own power within its borders and abroad. Thus the first three chapters, “Maturation,” “Americanization,” “Militarism,” follow a double trajectory of Caesar’s influence over American consciousness: that of the schoolchild’s (read mostly “schoolboy’s”) education into good citizenship, and that of the nation’s emerging awareness of its identity vis-à-vis both the Old World from which it rebelled and the contemporary one in which it quickly established its power. The following four chapters, “Dictatorship,” “Totalitarianism,” “Presidential Politics,” and “Empire,” move through the important roles assigned to Caesar in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries’ considerations of the causes and effects of war on a global scale and the parameters of U.S. leadership in domestic and foreign relations.

Caesar’s rise and fall has invited compelling comparisons with the social and political events of nearly every generation, both because of the ease with which it fits into narrative and dramatic archetypes and the importance of
Roman republican political structures in the shaping of our own. In each chapter Wyke chooses examples from a wide variety of both highbrow and lowbrow media, literary, journalistic, historical, and popular, to illuminate the malleability of Caesar’s image, which has been made to authorize an array of perspectives on the uses and abuses of power. Of particular importance in the shaping of America’s vision of itself as or against Caesar are Caesar’s own accounts of his military activities in Gaul (De Bello Gallico) and Shakespeare’s eponymous play. These texts have been splintered, transformed, and co-opted by media ranging from Latin textbooks to comic books that often redact or excise significant portions of their originals better to emphasize certain political or moral points. The results are texts far less ambiguous than the originals. The famous crossing of the Rubicon is a case in point: Wyke’s final chapter, “Empire,” draws out the numerous analogies made during the first and second Bush administrations between the two presidents’ decisions to go to war with Iraq and the ancient dictator’s decision to march against his own people. All three to varying degrees pushed the boundaries of legality and good faith among allies and compatriots, but Wyke is quick to point out the major differences between the two political situations that were elided in these comparisons, as well as the contradictory tangles created by some of these interpretive efforts. She might also have pointed out that Caesar’s own text is far more cagey about this major maneuver, never mentioning any river crossing and simply turning up in Ariminum without remarking on the fact that he has just committed the illegal act of marching into Italy with a legion (BC 1.8.1). Ambiguity, however, is not on modern agendas that wish to authorize or decry political action by recalling famous ancient precedents.

Though she does not explicitly say so, Wyke’s account implies that the rich possibilities for reconstructing Caesar derive from the realness of his existence on the one hand, reinforced by his own accounts of the history that he made, and on the other the compelling fantasy created by Shakespeare. As primary chosen texts for schoolchildren De Bello Gallico and Julius Caesar introduce a figure whose reality invites fiction, and whose fictional representations carry the frisson of reality. He lodges so vividly in the American imagination because his story and history merge more seamlessly than those of perhaps any other historical figure. He can satisfy our desire both for the real and the fantastical. This satisfaction is the captivatingly achieved mission of the HBO series Rome. As Wyke points out, reviews of the series show that its interest lay not so much in the kinds of groundbreaking topics, narratives, and characters that HBO had previously introduced in series such as The Sopranos and Deadwood as in the look and feeling of reality with which it infused its ancient subject. This was its primary claim to success with its audience.

Wyke presents the materials of a fascinating study. Her discourse remains firmly that of a classical scholar, which serves well the purpose of convincingly packing together so many sources. Sometimes it lacks a deftness that would help the reader unpack the many instances of analogy she brings up, but that will perhaps be another book. Such rich and carefully documented material certainly calls for more interpretive study. In the meantime Wyke has done a masterful job of confronting the American public with the contradictions and antagonisms inherent in its own Caesarean self-image.

Holly Haynes
The College of New Jersey
Message from the Outgoing President
NECJ, May 2013

Where can you find up-to-date CANE announcements? Links to useful pedagogical tools for Latin teachers like the Epic Mythology Project? A Google calendar with important CANE events and deadlines? Why the new CANEns blog, that’s where! CANEns vivit, indeed! This new blog gives our organization an even more visible online presence. Lydia Haile Fassett, Emily Lewis, TJ Howell, and Ben Revkin are sharing the duties of editing and posting to the blog. If you haven’t done so yet or recently, please visit the site! (http://caneweb.net/canens/)

I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome Deborah Davies of the Brooks School as the new editor of this journal. We also will have a new book review editor: Jennifer Clarke Kosak, Professor of Classics at Bowdoin College, will be taking the reins from Brian Breed, Professor of Classics, UMass-Amherst. You will begin seeing Jennifer’s name on the masthead in this issue. Many thanks to Brian for his successful stewardship of the book reviews section of NECJ.

My presidential duties have now concluded, and this president’s message is already my last. It has been a great honor to serve CANE in this capacity for the past year, and my admiration for this organization has only grown. The year culminated, as it always does, at the annual meeting in March. This year’s meeting at UConn was a great success, thanks to Sara Johnson and the staff in Storrs for so ably organizing, arranging, and running the show on the ground, and to all the presenters at the workshops and paper sessions. The membership of this organization was well represented in a rich and varied program that included presentations from undergraduate and graduate students, middle and high school teachers, and college and university faculty.

The CANE Summer Institute 2013 was held for the first time at Brown University in what turned out to be the hottest week of the year. There was a nice mix of veterans of past Summer Institutes and first-timers, with some participants hailing from outside New England. We owe a great debt of gratitude to the CSI Steering Committee and above all to this year’s Director, Jeri Debroux, Professor and Chair of Classics at Brown, for arranging such a stimulating program of courses and lectures and making this year’s Institute such a resounding success. Jeri has already generously agreed to direct next year’s Summer Institute at Brown.

I would like to thank the members of the executive committee for their hard work and dedication this past year as well as their sage advice and guidance. I look forward to the presidency of my successor, Michael Deschenes, who received the gavel at the annual meeting and has taken over presidential duties. Curate ut valeatis!

Geoffrey Sumi
President, 2012–2013
Message from the Incoming President
NECJ, August 2013

For the special commemorative publication celebrating the One Hundredth Anniversary of the First Annual Meeting in 2006 (caneweb.org/CANEhist.pdf), I recalled how Blaise Nagy and Bill Ziobro drove several undergrads, including me, to our first CANE Annual Meeting, a gift I have always looked back on fondly. I wrote, “The beauty of CANE is not only that the association provides opportunities for members to share ideas and learn from each other, but it also bears testimony to the zeal of established professionals to bring students and new teachers into the community.” I believed that assertion then, and I continue to believe it now. We as classicists truly stand on the shoulders of giants, and I am especially grateful to Jacqui Carlon, John McVey, Ellen Perry, Jere Mead, Mark Pearsall, and Geoff Sumi, recent past presidents with whom I have been privileged to serve, and all who have stepped up to benefit this organization over the more than a hundred years CANE has existed.

I continue to be amazed by the multitude of offerings from CANE; membership absolutely has its privileges! From JStor access to scholarships and discretionary grants applications to info on the Annual Meeting and the Summer Institute, the website is a valuable resource. Geoff remarked about the outstanding work done by the CANEns crew: Lydia, Emily, TJ and Ben keep us informed on the latest trends and professional development opportunities available to classicists. Years ago former CANEns editor Ed DeHoratius envisioned an evolution of that publication from print to an online, dynamic version, and the CANEns crew have gone beyond expectations.

This past July I attended a superb CANE Summer Institute at Brown. The instructors and lecturers were simply amazing, a spirited assemblage eager to share their thoughts and research with participants. Reading selections from Polybius, Tacitus, Livy, Plutarch, Sallust, Cicero, Machiavelli, and letters from Jefferson and Adams, within the span of one week, left me exhausted yet also intrigued, reflecting on the courses and presentations, eager to explore the week’s discussions further. Much deserved kudos to Jeri, who has agreed to continue as Director for 2014. She organized the Institute so well and communicated frequently with participants, presenters and the executive committee during the year leading up to our time together. Being able to commute, especially with a young family, was a necessity for me, as the last time I was able to attend the Institute was 2007, and I had missed the conversations and the excitement that transpire at this great gathering.

I of course look forward to our 108th Annual Meeting, to be held 7-8 March, 2014, at St. Anselm’s in Manchester, NH. Please see in this issue, and on the CANE website, the Call for Papers, with a deadline of December 1 to submit an abstract for a paper or workshop.
Echoing Geoff’s Message, I also welcome and thank NECJ editor-in-chief Deb Davies, book review editor Jennifer Kosak, and at-large member Tim Joseph of the College of the Holy Cross. They join an active and enthusiastic board who continue to seek new ways to serve the membership. Geoff and I know firsthand the number of hours and the amount of sweat that goes into the responsibilities of the NECJ editors, so I am particularly pleased to have Deb and Jennifer at the helm. And Tim was one of those Summer Institute instructors I mentioned earlier, who worked diligently to prepare for the Tacitus course and was ever eager to continue conversations long after the class period concluded.

While I was writing this Message, a colleague forwarded me an article from the June 29 The Economist, noting the “comeback” of Latin through the papal Twitter account, Latin Wikipedia, a Latin version of Facebook, and Google Translate for Latin, in addition to radio programs and online newspapers that promote the study of Latin. I thought about the popular Conventiculum Bostoniense offered each summer by UMass Boston, where participants speak fully in Latin for one week, and the Prandium Latinum, a popular event at recent Annual Meetings. The increase in Latin is interesting, at a time when middle schools, high schools and even universities are looking to cut their Latin programs. In recent years CANE members have advocated for the continued study of Latin at such institutions, sometimes successfully. As an organization we must promote the relevance of classical studies, while also encouraging our future teachers, the next wave of scholars who will be responsible for continuing the mission of the Classical Association of New England, as it was adopted at the First Annual Meeting on April 7, 1906: “The objects of the Association shall be to promote the interests of Classical studies and especially (a) to improve Classical teaching in school and in college by free discussion of its scope and methods and (b) to provide opportunities for better acquaintance and cooperation among classical teachers through meetings and discussions.” The Annual Meeting in March and the Summer Institute in July are wonderful opportunities to engage in professional development and enjoy time together. However, we should seek additional avenues for discourse and collegiality, whether virtually or in person.

During the coming year please let me know of any ideas you may have on how we can best serve the needs of both current and future members, while also keeping in our hearts and minds the toils of our past members, who have given of themselves for more than a century.

Michael Deschenes
President, 2013–2014
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Other CANE News

Call for Papers: The 2014 Annual Meeting of Classical Association of New England will be held at St. Anselm’s College, Manchester, New Hampshire on Friday and Saturday, 7 and 8 March 2014. All interested scholars are invited to submit abstracts (300 word maximum) no later than 1 December 2013 for papers to: CANE President, Michael Deschenes, St. Sebastian’s School, 1191 Greendale Avenue, Needham, MA 02492; (H) 978-957-5445; (W) 781-449-5200 X275; MICHAEL_DESCHENES@stsebs.org

Barlow-Beach Distinguished Service Award
The Barlow-Beach Distinguished Service Award recognizes a member of CANE whose service to the organization and to Classics in New England has marked the recipient’s career. Annually, the President serves as Chair of the Barlow­Beach Award Committee, and invites the CANE members to submit nominees to Michael Deschenes, St. Sebastian’s School, 1191 Greendale Ave, Needham, MA 02492; (H) 978-957-5445; (W) 781-449-5200 X275; MICHAEL_DESCHENES@stsebs.org
Matthew Wiencke Teaching Prize
The Matthew I. Wiencke award recognizes excellence in teaching at the primary, middle and secondary school levels. Nominations are invited for this year’s award. A nominee must be:
1. a member of CANE,
2. currently teaching Classics in a New England primary, middle, or secondary school, and
3. nominated by a professional colleague (fellow teacher or administrator at the nominee’s school, or a classicist from another school who knows the nominee well in a professional capacity.)
Letters of nomination should contain evidence of the nominee’s qualifications, particularly those qualities exemplified by Matthew Wiencke in his personal life and professional career; among them “his infectious wit, his boundless enthusiasm, his optimism, and his loyalty,” as expressed by Norman Doenges in his memorial published in the November 1996 issue of the New England Classical Journal.
Letters of nomination should be sent to the senior At-Large Member of the Executive Committee, Amanda Drew Loud, PO Box 724, Holderness, NH 03245; 603-968-9427; ALOUD@roadrunner.com. Only those nominations postmarked by December 31, 2013 will be considered for this year’s award, which will be presented at the CANE Annual Meeting in March, 2014. Current members of the CANE Executive Committee are not eligible for nomination.

Phyllis B. Katz Prize for Excellence in Undergraduate Research was established in honor of Dartmouth College teacher and CANE member, Phyllis B. Katz. College professors are invited to submit exemplary undergraduate papers for consideration to: Geoffrey Sumi, Department of Classics, Mt. Holyoke College, 500 College St., S. Hadley, MA 01075; GSUMI@mtholyoke.edu
The winner of the prize will read his/her paper at the Annual Meeting, and will receive a small monetary award in recognition of excellence.

Certification Scholarship
CANE will provide up to $1500 to an outstanding junior or senior undergraduate in New England who is preparing for secondary-school certification as a teacher of Latin or Greek or both in one or more of the New England states, or to the holder of a Master’s degree to cover the cost of tuition and other fees required to obtain such certification. Full-time, part-time, and summer programs will qualify.
Deadline for application is 1 January 2014. Please send the following to: Katy Ganino Reddick, 50 Cherry Lane, Durham, CT 06422; 860 349-1768; KATYGANINO@yahoo.com

1. Two letters of recommendation from college classicists who know your proficiency in Latin and/or Greek.

2. A letter from someone (e.g., former or current teacher, supervisor, counselor, clergyman) who can speak to your ability to communicate and work with young people
and inspire them to high levels of achievement.

3. A personal statement of NO MORE THAN 1000 words in which you explain why you want to pursue a career as a secondary-school classicist.

4. High School and College transcripts.

5. A description of your program and the expenses involved.

**Funding Opportunities:**

Two sources of funding are open to CANE members:

**Educational Programs** funding is awarded to any group or sub-group of the membership to promote a program of interest designed to promote understanding of the Classics, pedagogy, or topics within ancient history. To apply for funds, a letter outlining the program and its goals, including the intended audience may be submitted to: Stephany Pascetta, 60 Wagon Rd, Glastonbury, CT 06033; PASCETTAS@glastonburyus.org

**Discretionary Funds** are awarded four times each year for supplies, ancillary materials, or enrichment materials that will enhance a particular project or curriculum, and for which other funding is unavailable. Applications (1 October 2013 deadline) may be made to: Geoffrey Sumi, Department of Classics, Mt. Holyoke College, 500 College St., S. Hadley, MA 01075; GSUMI@mtholyoke.edu

**CANE Annual Writing Contest**

Students are invited to participate in the annual writing contest of the Classical Association of New England. The topic this year is: "What Mighty Contests Rise from Trivial Things: Consequence in the Ancient World". This contest, or written project on a classical subject, is open to all students taking Latin, Greek or Classics in New England middle and secondary schools. The project may be an essay, short story, poem, or drama. The three top winners in each state will receive certificates and prizes; the New-England-wide winner will receive a certificate and a gift card at the 108th Annual Meeting of CANE to be held on 7 and 8 March 2014 at St. Anselm's College in Manchester, NH. Projects will be judged on their content, originality, style and clarity. The regional judges will score the projects anonymously, using a point system with equal points for these four categories: (1) the overall application to the topic, with cogent evidence to support its thesis; (2) the coherence and focus of the argument; (3) the organization of the project and logical flow of ideas; and (4) the style, with emphasis on clarity of expression and
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mechanics of good writing. We want all students to have an equal chance to win this contest, each project must be the student’s own work, written independently without any help from other students, teachers or parents. Therefore, we ask that students follow these guidelines:

Guidelines for Students

(1) You may discuss the general topic with your teacher to be sure you understand it. Be creative, but support your thesis with quotations from classical authors; cite references to works of art or examples of classical culture such as social traditions, religious rites, or customs of family life; or compare classical and modern works or practices. (2) You should follow general guidelines for good writing, as practiced and taught by your teachers. Compose a rough draft, revise it for content and style, and proofread the final draft carefully and correct it neatly. The final project should be submitted to your teacher on a date (your teacher will specify the date) early enough for your writing to be judged and submitted to the State Representative by December 15, 2013. (3) Your project must be accompanied by a statement that the writing is your own work. (See writing guideline statements below.) Note that the project is invalid without this statement.

Additional Writing Guidelines for Students: (a) The written project should be 700 words maximum. There is no minimum length. (b) The project should be typed or word-processed using double-spacing. If someone else types the final draft, be sure to give that person a clear copy and ask him or her not to edit or revise your writing in any way. (c) Your name should not appear on the project itself. Instead, you should submit a cover page, giving your name, grade, home address, telephone number, current level of your Latin, Greek, or Classics course, your teacher’s name, and the name and address of your school. (d) You may use library resources, audio-visual materials, or personal interviews for this project; if you do use any source materials, you must provide documentation (i.e. footnotes) and a bibliography. (e) With your project you must also enclose a separate page on which you type the following statement and sign your name:

This project represents my own original work. No outside help has been provided for this project.

Signed ___________________________ Date ___________________
Guidelines for Teachers

The CANE Writing Contest is a regional competition open to students of Latin, Greek, or Classics in New England middle and secondary schools. We believe that the goals of the contest can best be served by requesting that the written project be the student's own work. Hence, the student should not ask for any help in writing or correcting the project before submitting the final copy. To ensure that all entrants have an equal chance to win this contest, we urge all teachers to follow these guidelines: (1) Present the topic to your students and answer any questions they may have about it. (2) Give your students a copy of the Guidelines for Students, supplementing these with any additional suggestions you may have about revising the rough draft and proofreading the final copy. (3) Explain that the projects must be original works on the given topic and that students may not seek help from others, whether students, teachers, or parent, although they may arrange to have the final draft typed or word-processed by someone else. (4) Give your students a deadline early enough to allow you to judge your students' projects and submit the three best projects to your State Representative by December 15, 2013. (5) Make sure your students sign and enclose the statement that their projects are their own work. The intent of this pledge is to emphasize that all students are expected to follow the same guidelines, so that all entrants will have an equal chance for success. Unless this signed statement is enclosed, the project will be marked invalid. We have, unfortunately, had to disqualify excellent projects in the past because the required statement was not enclosed. (6) Remind your students that this is a contest, with certificates and prizes given to the three finalists in each of the New England states, and that the New England-wide winner will receive a certificate and a gift card, to be presented at the 108th Annual Meeting of CANE, 7 and 8 March 2014 at St. Anselm’s College in Manchester, NH. (7) You may find it helpful to provide your students with copies of past winning projects, published in the Annual Bulletin and CAN-Ens. For copies write to: Elizabeth Keitel, Chair, CANE Writing Contest (address below). Please enclose a stamped, self-addressed envelope with this request. (8) Mail the best three projects from your school to your CANE State Representative by December 15, 2013, making sure that you enclose each student's signed statement that the project is his or her own work. For names and addresses of the State Representatives see the listing under the CANE Executive Committee on the CANE website, and elsewhere in the News in this issue. Students may not submit their projects directly to the Chair of the Writing Contest. To do so will invalidate the project. (9) Please do not rank the three projects that you submit from your school to your state representative. If you wish, you may recognize the authors of all three projects in some appropriate way, but at this preliminary level students' projects are not to be ranked first, second, or third place. The State Representatives will submit the entries to the president-elect.

and Activities as a regional program for participation by students in middle and secondary schools in Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Students from other states who are enrolled in independent or parochial schools in New England are eligible to enter the CANE Writing Contest. Each year we have many inquiries about the CANE Writing Contest from students in schools outside the area served by the Classical Association of New England. We are happy to answer these inquiries with information about the contest, but we regret that students enrolled in schools located outside New England are not eligible to participate.

Attention State Representatives: After you have read your assigned entries, please advise Elizabeth Keitel, President-Elect, of your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place choices by the agreed upon date. Please also include a ranked list of the three top winners in the state, including the students' teachers and the name of their school.

Elizabeth Keitel
President's Drive
Amherst, MA 01003
413-772-0795
EEK@classics.umass.edu
BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers are invited to send new books for this list to Prof. Jennifer Clarke Kosak, NECJ Book Reviews Editor, Department of Classics, Bowdoin College, 7600 College Station, Brunswick, ME 04011; jkosak@bowdoin.edu.


