la présence du modulateur quasi, dans l’expression quasi duo simus, qui atténue la rudesse de la partition dualiste, à propos de laquelle il faut tout de même rappeler que Chrysippe lui-même, pourtant foncièrement moniste, utilisait parfois alogos, en soulignant qu’il ne lui donnait pas le même sens que les autres.

Pour ce qui est du dernier livre, la fonction intégratrice que lui attribue Koch, après beaucoup d’autres, ne peut être contestée, puisque Cicéron y réconcilie dans une certaine mesure les différents systèmes dont il avait montré dans le De finibus combien ils différaient les uns des autres dans leur définition du souverain bien. Cela permet-il pour autant de dire, p. 191, que Cicéron s’est désintéressé en définitive de l’ontologie pour ne se sentir concerné par la question du comment vivre? Ce désir d’intégrer l’ontologie serait en contradiction avec le but que Koch lui-même assigne à ‘l’existentialisme’ cicéronien: revenir à sa propre nature. Or comment retrouver celle-ci si on ne cherche pas à la connaître? Disons plutôt qu’entre une exigence forte de bonheur et une conscience tout aussi aiguë des difficultés, et peut-être même de l’incapacité, de la raison à accéder à la vérité, Cicéron établit un continuum paradoxal. Le Lucullus avait mis en évidence les faiblesses de la raison, et c’est avec tout autant de force que les Tusculanes soulignent la puissance de l’aspiration à la perfection. Entre les deux, le De finibus pose la question de la définition de la nature et n’y répond pas, non que Cicéron s’en désintéresse, mais parce que cette partie centrale est comme surdéterminée, en amont, par l’incertitude de la quête et, en aval, par la clarté du but visé, ce bonheur que tous les êtres humains sont censés rechercher. La fonction thérapeutique des Tusculanes ne peut avoir de sens que parce qu’elle est comme un moment dans un processus dont tous les aspects sont profondément dépendants les uns des autres.

Carlos Lévy


This volume from the ‘Collection Latomus’ continues and develops a distinctive strand within Tacitean scholarship, namely the exploration of the creative and diverse ways in which the historian fuses aspects of his narrative with elements from tragedy, ‘un vast champ d’exploration’ (p.8). Central to this venture is Leo’s view from 1896 (cited on p.7) that in essence ‘Tacitus war ein Dichter’, and Galtier (henceforth G.) also highlights Santoro l’hoir’s important monograph, Tragedy, Rhetoric, and Historiography of Tacitus’Annales (Ann Arbor, Michigan 2006), which uses lexical clusters in Tacitus to investigate the interrelationship between tragedy and history. G., as we will see, by picking out thematic patterns uses a very different methodology from Santoro l’hoir.

What then does this study promise which is distinctively new? Perhaps the most significant contribution potentially is an analysis which traces in an integrated way the relationship between Tacitus’ historiography and tragedy as it evolves across his two major historical works, the Histories and the Annales. Previous studies of the topic (e.g. Santoro l’hoir) have tended to restrict themselves
to one work. Moreover, while scholars have previously analysed theatricality as a distinctive element of Tacitus’ Germanicus and (understandably) Nero, the Histories have generally been less well-served (although A. Pomeroy, ‘Theatricality in Tacitus’ Histories’, Arethusa 39 (2006), 171–91, not in G.’s bibliography, is a notable exception.). How then does Tacitus exploit tragedy throughout his corpus? Does he embed tragic elements in his narrative where one might not have expected to find them? How does the tragic element play out in the surviving books of the Histories, where the central setting of the imperial domus (with its potential for staging and cross-fertilisation with the tragic stage) is less prominent, at least in the surviving narrative? (G. poses this very question on p. 85, arguing cogently that the tragic element is equally expressive in the Histories, albeit in somewhat different ways from the Annals). These are some initial questions raised for this reader by G.’s project.

In part one (pp. 13–46), G. opens with two general chapters setting the study in context. In the first chapter (‘The Roman Conception of History’), G., acknowledging that the genre of historiography developed relatively late in Rome, underscores how it evolved through a creative dynamic triggered by combined forces of epic, funeral laudations, and fabulae praetextae as repositories of res gestae (though it was odd not to refer back to this discussion on p. 162 when considering Tacitus’ version of transferring power from Augustus to Tiberius and the echoes of the regal period highlighted there). Against this backdrop, G. stresses the importance of southern Italy as a crucible for Roman literary creativity. In addition, G. emphasises the central importance of oratory in the whole equation, in particular the contribution made by the rhetorical resource of euidentia/enargeia whereby a written description triggers the illusion of seeing a scene, and thus stirs emotions. G. suggests that euidentia as a rhetorical technique is the crucial ingredient par excellence for adding tragic colour to historical narratives. Significant too is the ‘ethocentric’ character of ancient historical narratives, where examining individuals and their idiosyncratic motivations is the crucial way to explain historical events. G. suggests that distinctive aspects of Roman culture – its tendency to celebrate prominent aristocratic individuals via funeral laudations and fabulae praetextae, and the opportunities provided by great conflicts such as the Punic wars for prominent individuals to dominate the political scene – made it particularly predisposed to favour this ethocentric mode of writing history. This technique of placing prominent individuals at the centre of the historical process lends itself conspicuously well to dramatisation, particularly through the depiction of interpersonal relationships as a causal force in driving events. More specifically, G. points to how an individual’s relationships with women, advisers, and family members so often dominate events presented on the tragic stage. When a historian had to treat historical events unfolding within an imperial domus, no wonder tragedies offered such a rich resource. Yet while nothing in this first chapter is unduly controversial in itself, the potential weakness here is that much of the material is eclectic, and it would have been useful for the author to anchor the discussion more explicitly with references to the distinctive aspects of Tacitean historiography. The opening chapter felt a little like a moveable feast which could potentially have preceded any discussion of Roman historiography.
The second chapter ("Tacitean Writing: Tradition and Influences") is better anchored. Here, G. stresses the importance of Livy and his dramatisation of historical events (e.g. the suicide of Sophoniba at 32.12–16) as a model for Tacitus, particularly in the depiction of exitus scenes with tragic color and in the vivid depiction of female characters. So too G. underscores the importance of Sallust for Tacitus, particularly in his formulation of digressions, in his shaping of individual characters (e.g. Sejanus ~ Catiline; Poppaea ~ Sempronia), and in his moralising voice. G. also emphasises the connection between tragic historiography of the Hellenistic era and pioneering Roman historians such as Coelius Antipater and Sisenna. The chapter ends with a brief overview of tragic theatre in Rome, stressing its centrality to Roman thought, and underscoring the impact of the fabula praetexta on the evolution of historical writing. G. speculates that fabula praetexta evolved under the principate to show a special interest in the stigmatisation of the figure of the tyrant. In this discussion, G. concedes that one potential methodological stumbling block (p.41) is how to distinguish between scenes which are inspired by direct engagement with the theatre and those which are mediated through a previous historian who was inspired by the theatre.

In part two (pp.50–141), G. begins by considering in detail Tacitus’ structuring of his narratives and how his creative choices in this sphere (e.g. through book-divisions) add tragic color to his representation of events. Although many of G.’s detailed remarks here about narrative structure are well-observed and perceptive (e.g. pp.56–7, the repetition of a tripartite structure for Histories 1–3, which is then broken in Histories 4; pp.59–61, the analysis of Histories 1.27–49 as a narrative unit), it takes some time before this discussion is meaningfully anchored in G.’s central concerns with drama and the genre of tragedy. In essence, G. presents here a considered narratological reading of Tacitus’ historical narratives from different angles, firstly episodic and secondly thematic, before moving on to consider specific examples in more detail. For G., the notion of conflict is at the heart of any dramatic situation, and he draws on the work of Ubersfeld (Lire le théâtre, 1982) for two simplified theoretical models of triangulated conflict which are then applied to Tacitus’ narratives. Another crucial aspect explored by G. is the commutatio fortunae which strikes protagonist after protagonist in Tacitus’ accounts, often articulated through ‘coup de théâtre’ which G. associates with the Aristotelian framework of the peripeteia and anagnorisis. In the Histories, G. suggests that such moments of anagnorisis are rare, citing as the most significant 3.25, the scene where a soldier kills an enemy on the other side, only to recognise belatedly that the man is his father. The Annals offers richer pickings: one particularly intriguing suggestion (p.94) is the possibility that the missing portion of Annals 5 recounting the downfall of Sejanus would plausibly have related in tragic terms Tiberius’ anagnorisis of his minister’s disloyalty. At one stage (p.103), G. cautions against pushing too far the connections between Tacitus’ historical narratives and Aristotle’s theoretical framework about tragedy. Although G. is sensibly cautious in this regard, what I missed from some of G.’s readings (here and elsewhere) was nuanced engagement with the details of Tacitus’ Latin and (where possible) judicious use of the parallel tradition (as on p.163 with Cassius Dio; and on p.178 and p.206, there is a missed opportunity
for this in the brief discussion of Otho’s suicide) to illustrate how Tacitus has added a distinctive slant or detail to his particular version of an event. Too often scenes from Tacitus are briefly paraphrased to highlight a particular point before rapidly moving on to the next example. The final part of this section, on details which contribute to *enargeia*, offers some useful remarks on reading the symbolism of costumes and accessories described by Tacitus (even if comparison with the use of stage-props in drama was curiously absent from the analysis).

In part three (pp. 145–224), G. brings into play the trope of the *persona* as a device particularly relevant to Tacitus, whose interrogation of the slippage between appearance and realist is central to his historical perspective. He sees terms such as *species*, *imago*, *simulatio*, *obtegere*, *praetendere*, and *praetexere* as central to this discourse of pretence and deception, and highlights scenes such as Tiberius’ elaborate efforts to disguise his deteriorating health even from his doctor, which are mirrored in Charicles’ reciprocal participation in this game (A.6.50). This analysis is certainly relevant to appreciating Tacitus’ historical techniques, but in the detailed discussion, the application of theatricality remains rather loose, and sometimes dips below the horizon altogether (e.g. in the discussion of rumours). G. then turns to consider certain stereotypical figures, the tyrant, minister or attendant, victim, and wise man, seeing Tacitus’ renderings as linked with archetypes from the tragic stage through a process of ‘transfiguration’. As G. suggests, Livy’s Tarquinius Superbus is an important model for this process of cross-fertilisation. Yet in delivering analysis, G. proceeds by identifying certain categories (e.g. greed) and gathering together instances manifested by particular protagonists. This technique is fair enough, but it tends to lead to fragmentation, and as a result, some of the nuances of Tacitus’ complex characterisation are lost through a failure to consider these traits in context. More satisfactory is the section on ministers and attendants, not least of all because G. works in comparisons with specific examples from Senecan tragedy.

In part four (pp. 227–305), G. explores how the tragic form deployed by Tacitus becomes a refraction of central moral and religious concepts. He begins by considering the recurrent focus in Tacitus on fratricidal strife, which is also a pervasive concern of Latin tragedians. Such cycles of violence are perpetuated by interrelated patterns of individuals in the imperial *domus* (and beyond) being driven on by rivalry and by pre-emptive strikes in anticipation of reprisals. G. deploys here to good effect the work of Girard, but some further anchoring of the discussion in specific tragedies would have been welcome (as on p. 246). G. then turns to consider the role played by the divine in Tacitus, arguing that the human protagonists have at best only a partial understanding of the angry gods who dominate their world. G. insists that for Tacitus the gods are not a literary device, but a reflection of his deeply held convictions. Pinning down Tacitus’ own beliefs, however, is a notoriously difficult business, as Luce reminds us (‘Tacitus’ Conception of Historical Change: The Problem of Discovering the Historian’s Opinions’, 143–57 in I.S. Moxon, J.D. Smart and A.J. Woodman (eds), *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, Cambridge 1986), whereas we are surely on much safer ground in analysing the literary impact of the gods on the moralising agenda of his historical accounts.
In conclusion, while this is an enjoyable and readable study, the overall presentation of arguments is rather atomised and paratactic, largely because G. gives priority to broad categories for analysis (e.g. *sonus*, *ultus*, *gestus*, pp.176–8), rather than opting to work through the narratives of Tacitus (or selected scenes) in a linear way. As a result, discussion of particularly dramatic scenes, such as *Histories* 3.38–9, is scattered throughout the book as a whole, and this also hampers the clear delivery of illustrating how ‘Tacitus’ techniques evolved between the *Histories* and the *Annals*. It might indeed have been constructive for G. to have offered as a grand finale some detailed readings of obviously theatrical scenes from Tacitus, rooted in the Latin and exploring and pulling together the whole range of dramatic techniques which G. analyses in the body of the study. It is also striking that engagement with specific moments from surviving Latin tragedies are surprisingly rare. So, the comparison (p.133) of Agrippina returning with Germanicus’ ashes with a moment from the *Hercules Oetaeus* of [Seneca], also discussed by Santoro l’hoir (not cited here), is a rare exception. This sort of expectation is raised by G.’s title (and sub-title), but in practice, the analysis is often delivered thematically without much recourse to specific examples from tragedy. So in the end, G.’s study is ambitious and bold, but still leaves some questions unanswered, at least for this reader.

Oxford

*Rhiannon Ash*

---


I volumi presentati in questa sede sono caratterizzati da una notevole estensione, peculiarità che li distingue dagli altri commenti apparsi nella stessa serie e che è pienamente giustificata sia dall’importanza della vita di Adriano nella HA che dalle sue esaustività e precisione. Il lavoro pubblicato nella serie diretta da K. Rosen all’interno della collezione sulla HA fondata da A. Alföldi, rappresenta il risultato di una tesi dottorale discussa nel 2005 nella Philosophische Fakultät della Friedrichs-Wilhelms-Universität di Bonn e diretta dallo stesso Prof. Rosen. Si tratta di una nuova ed eccellente puntata degli studi sviluppati dal Bonner Kreis della HA. Nell’introduzione è evidente il debito dell’autore con i membri di questo gruppo. Il lavoro, e non poteva essere diversamente, inizia con un elenco delle fonti antiche divise in: letterarie, epigrafiche, numismatiche, papirologiche, giuridiche, archeologiche ed iconografiche. Le fonti archeologiche, evidentemente per la loro natura e per quella del commento, sono le meno sviluppate. Segue una ricca bibliografia, praticamente completa, sugli studi dedicati alla vita di Adriano: a questo proposito, è necessario considerare che questa è forse una delle *vitae* che ha suscitato maggiore interesse, come già emerge dalla sola consultazione dei volumi della ‘Stellenbibliographie’ di E. Merten.

Il commento inizia con un’introduzione degna di nota, ben lontana dalle precedenti di grande complessità come ad esempio quella di J.-P. Callu, nella quale, con particolare chiarezza ed in modo sintetico, Fündling presenta i problemi