

92-9-11

RHETORICAL COLOR IN THE ANNALS OF TACITUS,  
BOOKS I - VI.

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate School  
of the  
University of Minnesota

by

Harold Omer Burgess

In Partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
Master of Arts, 1913.

UNIVERSITY OF  
MINNESOTA  
LIBRARY

a

Bibliography.

Merivale; The Romans Under the Empire.

Gould; The Tragedy of the Caesars.

Cruttwell; History of Roman Literature.

Ferrero; Characters and Events of Roman History.

Jerome; The Tacitean Tiberius; Classical Philology,

Vol. VII, No. 3.

Fuérneaux; Annals of Tacitus.

UNIVERSITY OF  
MINNESOTA  
LIBRARY

JUL 24 1913 B 70

OUTLINE.

I. Introduction

1. General statement.

II. Body

I. Division of subject

- (a) Difference between real Tiberius and Tacitean Tiberius.
- (b) Motives of Tacitus in misrepresenting Tiberius
- (c) Rhetorical methods used.

1. Hints, innuendos, Sneers.
- 11- Motives ascribed for actions.
- 111- Manipulation of Stress and Reticence.
- 1V- Use of the Gossip of the capital.
- V- Facial Expressions.
- VI- Invented Episodes.
- VII- Mere assertions.
- VIII- Generalizations unsupported by facts.

III. Conclusion.

Concrete example of how Tacitus applied rhetorical color in attributing the death of Germanicus to Tiberius.

UNIVERSITY OF  
MINNESOTA  
LIBRARY

Rhetorical Color in the Annals of Tacitus, Books I-VI.

"Color," as a technical term in rhetoric, means the particular aspect given to a case, either by the accuser or defender, by a skillful representation of facts in themselves undisputed.

Until modern times the accuracy of the Annals of Tacitus was accepted without the least hesitation. The cursory reader, - nay, more than cursory reader, as is evidenced by the credit given to the writings for centuries and the fact that the glamour of the genius of Tacitus still dazzles his readers,-the casual reader, then, if not cautioned against the seductive influence of this most eloquent of historians admires the elaborate paintings of Tacitus without the least doubt as to the veracity of the picture of the times, there presented, entering his mind. So great is the verisimilitude of the work.

A more careful study of the Annals, however, leaves the student dissatisfied with the picture. It pre-

sents evidences, to the keen eye, of having been retouched. Despite the great skill of the artist, flaws appear. An adroit painter can take a beautiful portrait and, by expert touches here and there, is able to change the picture into a hideous caricature of the original. Upon the skill and carefulness of the artist does it depend, whether it is possible to discern the true lineaments of the original portrait beneath the disfiguring marks of the retouching. If the work has not been done too thoroughly it may be possible to reconstruct the picture. So the Tiberius of Tacitus bears strong evidence that it is only a caricature of the true Tiberius. Also, the work of retouching has not been done so thoroughly but that the careful student may perceive in what it consists and to a certain extent erase it and discover beneath the false pigments the real Tiberius. To do this shall be the purpose of this paper, since Books 1-VI of the Annals are practically a biography of this princeps, and we have reason to believe that the facts narrated by Tacitus, which form the groundwork of the picture, may, in the main, be taken at their face

value, with such exceptions as will be noted below. The personal coloring of Tacitus is expended upon the prince and where it is used upon others, as in his portrayal of Germanicus, it has, even then, Tiberius in view that his character may be shown in darker hue by contrast with others whose virtues are purposely magnified. From the same motive the picture of Sejanus has been darkened to show that such a character was the only one congenial to the emperor. The remaining extant books of the Annals, XI to XVI, in like manner group themselves into biographies of Claudius and Nero, and there is reason to believe that the descriptions of these emperors, particularly Claudius, might be reconstructed and even that of Nero to a certain extent. But this is beyond the scope of the present discussion.

As the statement, that Tacitus has, more or less deliberately, misrepresented to posterity the character of Tiberius, is rather a serious one, and one that could not be made without substantial proof, these questions naturally arise in our minds,

First: What was the character of the real Tiberius described in the Annals?

Second: What motive could have influenced Tacitus in portraying to posterity the hideous character of the Tacitean Tiberius? Was the reason personal, social, political, or a combination of all these?

Third: Exactly in what does the misrepresentation consist and what were the technical methods; the strokes of the brush of the artist in retouching; in changing the portrait into a caricature? How may we erase them and discover the features of the original?

The province of the present article will be chiefly the third of these questions, dwelling upon the others as briefly as may be compatible with clearness.

Tacitus describes the character of Tiberius thus: "Tiberius Nero had gained renown in war, but possessed the ancient and inbred haughtiness of the Claudian family. Many signs of cruelty, although he tried to disguise it, escaped him. He had been brought up from infancy in the palace of the emperor; consulships and tri-

umphs had been heaped upon him in his youth; not even in those years which he passed in exile at Rhodes under the appearance of retirement, did he meditate anything other than vengeance, the art of simulation and secret debaucheries." (1.,4.)

And again, "His character varied with his fortune. His life and reputation were excellent as long as he was in private life or in charge of Armies under Augustus. As long as Germanicus and Drusus lived, he was reserved, crafty in feigning virtues, he did not possess. Also while his mother lived his character was a mixture of good and evil; while he loved or feared Sejanus his cruelty was detested but his lustful excesses concealed. At last, after all shame and fear were removed and he was left to follow the bend of his genius, alone, he broke forth into crimes and debauchery alike." In addition to these detailed characterizations at the beginning and end of his account of the reign of Tiberius, the following invectives are found scattered throughout the body in the order given.

"It was afterwards learned that he feigned hesitation in order that he might perceive the wishes of the nobles; for distorting their utterances and expressions into accusations he stored them up in his heart." (1.7)

"Augustus chose Tiberius as his successor not out of love for him or care for the state, but since he had perceived his haughtiness and cruelty, that he might acquire glory in contrast with such a base character." (1.10)

"Augustus in an oration before the senate under pretence of apologizing for the personal peculiarities, manners and habits of Tiberius, had really reproached him for them." (1.10)

"The speech of Tiberius even in things which he did not attempt to conceal were always, either by nature or habit, halting and obscure." (1.11)

"Cepio charged Marcellus with speaking evil of Tiberius, an irrefutable charge, since the accuser selected all the most foul of the habits of the emperor and charged Marcellus with having uttered them. And because they

were true, they were believed to have been spoken."

(1.74)

Tiberius rejoices at an excuse of war in the East to separate Germanicus from the legions that were attached to him and expose him to new dangers and the efforts of treachery in the hope of his being killed."

(11.5.)

"All knew that the death of Germanicus was most pleasing to Tiberius and that he took small pains to conceal it." (111.2.)

"Neither Tiberius nor the informers wearied in their shameful business." (111.38)

"Tiberius protected Catus from just punishment because he had been useful to him as an informer."  
(1V.31)

"I am inclined to think that his retirement to Capreae may, with more truth, be ascribed to his desire to indulge his cruelty and lustful debaucheries more unrestrainedly in secrecy. When he was in retirement at

Rhodes he was wont to avoid the public and conceal his sensualities." (IV, 57)

"The more he had devoted himself to public cares before, the more unrestrainedly did he give himself over to secret debaucheries and evils at Capreae. For there still remained his tendency to suspicion and credulity. (IV,67)

A further description in detail of his abominable lusts at Capreae is given in VI, I.

"His crimes and evil deeds had recoiled in just retribution upon himself and neither his great fortune nor his retirement prevented him from confessing the torments of his breast." (VI,6)

A detailed story of his cruelty and superstitious belief in astrologers is given in VI,21.

"Although three years had passed since the death of Sejanus, neither time, prayers, satiety of blood, things which are wont to soften others, prevented him from punishing, as serious and recent crimes vague and half forgotten charges." (VI,38)

No discussion of these passages is necessary

to make clear the Tiberius which Tacitus would present to our view. Tacitus is never at a loss to state clearly and vividly the ideas he wishes to express. This is the caricature that has come down through the centuries as the authentic likeness of the third Caesar.

The true picture of Tiberius, found from a careful study of the Annals, themselves, for the artist Tacitus has by no means covered up all the features with his rhetorical coloring, from Suetonius, although Suetonius and Dio Cassius follow Tacitus servily, from Philo, the Jew, from Pliny the Elder, from Tertullian, from Velleius Paterculus, from Josephus, and from the many excellent busts that have been preserved to us, is far different.

The character of Tiberius Claudius Nero exhibits a combination of strength and weakness; he possessed keen penetration, but weak resolution; great intellectual capacity but feebleness of purpose; he was an able general and executive but timid, nervous and over-sensitive; refined and kind but proud; not a man of affectation and

the governmental administration there was strict economy. Largesses to the soldiers were rare. The sports of the theatre and circus declined; the salaries of the mimes were reduced as were also the number of gladiators. No more treasures were lavished on the decoration of the city. Yet he could upon proper occasions exhibit munificence worthy of an emperor, as in the case of the ruined cities of Asia. Also in times of scarcity the rise in the price of grain was checked and the grain dealers compensated from his own means. Citizens who lost their houses in a great fire were indemnified from the same source. Officials were well paid so there was no need of extortion, as were also the armies. The emperor himself had a rare personal indifference to money. He showed great deference to the senate, and was always a stickler for legal form. He checked excessive adulation. He was, in a word, a good sovereign but not an amiable man. He was a Cato, the Censor of the Empire.

These two characterizations of Tiberius, seemingly as widely separated as the antipodes, require ex-

he hated all dissimulation. His relations with women had not been happy, and he was, probably, what we would term a woman-hater. At least he avoided their society and was absolutely lacking in the social graces, being of an awkward bearing and address, caring more for war than for social life and being at ease only in the camp or among students and scholars. He possessed no personal magnetism as had his predecessors, Julius and Augustus. He was a Claudian, that is, a true descendant, both in blood and spirit, of one of the oldest, the proudest, and most aristocratic families of the Roman nobility, a family noted and hated for its haughtiness and pride. An as inheritance from this family he was distant, taciturn, austere with all the stern gravity of the ancient Roman statesman, whom he was anxious to imitate in domestic and public economy. In his household he practiced the virtues of simplicity and frugality, all the more severe because of his long familiarity with military camps. His number of slaves was limited, freedmen were kept in check and none of them did he allow to acquire undue influence over him. In

planation. Can it be possible that any historian in whom the slightest reliance for truthfulness can be placed could so far distort the picture? Paradoxical as it may seem, the answer is, Yes. Tacitus can be depended upon for much knowledge that is of the most incalculable value in history and which we would know from no other source. We may say that the loss of the Annals would be irreparable. Cruttwell in the "History of Roman Literature, (page 453) makes the following criticism of the Annals,

"Tacitus in this work shows his personal sympathies more strongly than in any of the others. He appears as a Roman of the old school, but still more, as an oligarchical partisan. Not that he indulged in Chimerical plans for restoring the Republic. That he saw was impossible; nor had he much sympathy with those who strove for it. But his resignation to the Empire as an unvoidable evil does not inspire him with contentment. His blood boils with indignation at the steady repression of the liberty of action of the old families, which the instincts of imperialism forced upon the monarchs from the very beginning;

nor do the general security of life and property, the bettered condition of the provinces, and the long peace that had allowed the internal resources of the empire to be developed, make amends for what he considers the iniquitous tyranny practiced upon the higher orders of the state. Thus he writes under a strong sense of injustice, which reaches its culmination in treating of the earlier reigns. But this does not provoke him into intemperate language, far less into misrepresentation of fact; if he disdained to complain, he disdained still more to falsify. But he can not help insinuating; and his insinuations are of such searching power that, once suggested, they grasp hold of the mind, and will not be shaken off. Of all Latin authors none has so much power over the reader as Tacitus. If by eloquence is meant the ability to persuade, then he is the most eloquent historian that ever existed. To doubt his judgement is almost to be false to the conscience of history. The surpassing vividness of such characters as his Tiberius and Nero forbids us to doubt their substantial reality, but once his prepossessions are known and

and discounted, the student of his works can give a freer attention to the countervailing facts which Tacitus is too honorable to hide."

The above criticism is an admirable one and correct in all particulars except in the statements underscored, which a glance will show to be rather important. Especially should attention be given to the last sentence. In order that the student may arrive at correct conclusions from the study he must know and discount the "prepossessions" of his author. Otherwise as a result of the persuasiveness of this most eloquent of historians, he will be led astray as was Cruttwell when he says, "The surpassing vividness of such characters as his Tiberius and Nero forbids us to doubt their substantial reality." The student of the Annals will admit that the Tiberius is "vivid" but still may "doubt" its "reality". Cruttwell also remarks that Tacitus' sense of injustice "does not provoke him into intemperate language, far less into misrepresentation of fact," and belief in this last is exactly what for centuries led the world, as well as Cruttwell, astray in its

estimate of Tiberius, or perhaps we should not say "misrepresentation" of fact so much as "misinterpretation" of fact, for the facts are there and he who runs may read, if, and a large "if"; if he reads only facts and not their "misrepresentation" or "misinterpretation". In the main the facts presented by Tacitus may be taken at their face value with the exception of a certain class which will be explained below. It is in the interpretation of the facts, the innuendoes, the hints, sneers, the use made of the slanderous gossip of the city, the statements that acts are not to be taken at their obvious meaning, but that they mean something quite different, etc, that one must beware. So that if the reader knows the "prepossessions" of the author and discounts them he may arrive at the picture of the true Tiberius.

Tacitus was a patrician; thought patrician thoughts and saw with patrician eyes. He was probably a "novus homo"; at least he was the first of his family to attain to senatorial rank and he, like Cicero, threw himself wholly into the interest of his party and the Annals

were written entirely from the political standpoint of the aristocratic-republican party. It was through the imperial system that this party was deprived of influence, power and means of accumulating wealth. So naturally their resentment manifested itself toward Tiberius, the reputed founder of this system.

Under Tiberius the administration of the provinces was improved, convictions for extortion were frequent, no longer were the nobles allowed to go out and enrich themselves at the expense of defenseless provincial, nor did the emperor scruple to place in office a man of low birth if he possessed ability and honesty and to keep him in office many years. Whereupon Tacitus is constrained to insinuate that the reason was that he was too lazy to go to the trouble of choosing others or that his nature was so malign that he could not endure that many reap the benefits of office. (I.80)

M. Hortalus, a grandson of the orator, Hortensius, and a senator, had been given money by Augustus to maintain his rank. This had been squandered and he appear-

ed in the Senate with his children begging more aid. Tiberius refused but seeing that the senate was offended gave to his sons \$37,000.00. Tacitus then remarks, "Nor did Tiberius ever after show pity, though the house of Hortensius was fallen into shameful impoverishment." (II.38)

Why should he? Many other instances could be cited where Tacitus evidently thinks favor should be shown malefactors because they were blue-blooded. (II.22) (IV.29; IV,40)

We modern advocates of democratic principles naturally side with the emperor in this view. Tacitus in modern politics would be a "reactionary" of the most pronounced type. To him the aristocrat could do no wrong. So Tiberius, the oppressor of this order, receives the full weight of his biting satire.

Tacitus is writing under the reign of Trajan who besides enlarging the boundaries of the empire, pursued the policy of restoring to the down-trodden senate its old rights and who is accordingly venerated by Tacitus. We find many hints that Tiberius pursued a shameful, unambitious course in following the advice of Augustus in re-

fraining from further conquests, which both his own age and history has amply approved.

The aristocratic party conceived the idea that Drusus, the brother of Tiberius, if he had succeeded to the throne, would have restored the republic. So we find that Germanicus, his son, is lauded beyond measure by Tacitus. He omits no opportunity of drawing invidious comparisons of Tiberius with Germanicus. So the latter is pictured as the great general, magnanimous, brave, shrewd and unfortunate, oppressed by the unjust hatred of his brother, whereas he was only a mediocre general, more or less of a dilettante and a careful reading of the Annals will fail to reveal that Tiberius ever treated him other than in a most fair and friendly manner. Tacitus remarks that he drew much of his information from the memoirs of Agrippina Minor, who was the daughter of Germanicus and Agrippina Major, the most virulent enemy of Tiberius. These memoirs could not have been other than violently coloured with hatred.

Tiberius undoubtedly was unpopular in his own

day but not an object of hatred. He was out of touch with the Rome of his day. Suetonius says, "He walked with head bent and fixed, the face stern, a taciturn man exchanging no word with those about him." We must not forget that Tiberius was a Claudian, a house noted for its haughtiness and pride. Tiberius possessed all the good qualities and all the defects of the old Roman aristocracy. He viewed with the eyes of another Cato, a society that was tired of the traditional standards of discipline. He kept aloof from the undisciplined frivolity of his contemporaries<sup>or</sup>. There was between him and his generation irreconcilable discord. He should have lived one hundred years<sup>later</sup>. So it was easy for one seeking for such things to find much carping criticism on the part of the discontented nobles and people who were limited in their gladiatorial games and pantomines. And yet writers nearest him in point of time treat him best. Velleius Paterculus and Valerius Maximus, his contemporaries and subjects, have nothing but praise for him; Seneca speaks of him with moderation; Philo and Josephus describe the government of Tiberius as mild and equitable.

It is not until three generations had passed that Tacitus Suetonius and later Dio picture to us the Tiberius of history. In that length of time only had the carping hatred of the nobles been able to obscure the good qualities of the third Caesar for a generation who knew him not and to present the caricature which was accepted as real. So we would not be correct in saying that Tacitus is moved by malignity, when he is merely describing to us vividly the picture of Tiberius which held in his day. A task, by the way, in which he thoroughly delights and which he performs as pleasurable tasks generally are performed, most completely.

Having with the utmost brevity touched upon the difference between the Tacitean caricature and the real Tiberius and the motives which led Tacitus to so misrepresent to posterity the third Caesar, we now come to a consideration of the technique of the artist.

Furneaux says, "The special qualities of the style of Tacitus have been held to consist chiefly in rhetorical or poetical colouring, in the study of brevity,

and in that of variety, all of which characteristics are no doubt due mainly to his professional career." The personal colouring found in the Annals is due to two things: first, his politics; second, his profession. Or rather we should say, the colouring is due to his politics and found vivid expression through the art he possessed due to his rhetorical study under Aper Secundus and perhaps Quintilian. For, Tacitus was the foremost rhetorician of Rome. When he, thoroughly imbued with the conceptions of his own generation and party, came therefore to write the history of Tiberius and found that the facts did not bear out this view, he was at no loss to supply either the inclination or the rhetorical skill to colour these facts, so that, although as Cruttwell says he was "too honorable to hide the facts", yet, in spite of these facts, inconsistent with his major premise that Tiberius was all that was bad, he preserved the caricature which would be pleasing to his readers. Shall we say he was not "too honorable", even though he did not hide the facts, to disguise and distort them almost out of all semblance of truth? We may not say.

The most the greatest generosity can say of the "honour" of Tacitus is that a man, thoroughly determined and not wishing to be convinced to the contrary, can be blind to much.

The rhetorical methods used by Tacitus to colour the facts given may be, for convenience, grouped under eight heads.

- I.- Hints, Innuendos and Sneers.
- II.- Motives ascribed for actions.
- III. - Stress and Reticence.
- IV.- Use of the Gossip of the Capital.
- V. -Facial Expressions.
- VI.- Invented Episodes.
- VII.- Mere Assertions.
- VIII.- Generalizations unsupported by facts.

I. Hints, Innuendos and Sneers.

We find in the Annals, Books I to VI, a great mass of facts stated which taken by themselves as bare facts contradict the general premis<sup>e</sup> of Tacitus that Tiberius was wholly bad. But to a very great proportion of

them are attached hints, sneers or assertions that the facts are not to be taken at their obvious and apparent significance but that they meant something quite different. As Cruttwell says, "He disdained to falsify. But he cannot help insinuating; and his insinuations are of such searching power that once suggested, they grasp hold of the mind and will not be shaken off."

List of Innuendos, Sneers and Hints in Annals,  
Books I-VI.

Book I.

1. It is my purpose to relate a few facts concerning the latter part of the reign of Augustus and then the reign of Tiberius, without anger and prejudice, since I am at a distance from the causes of these.

3. After the death of Agrippa, either a premature but natural death or the arts of their step-mother, Livia cut off Lucius and Gaius Caesar.

Tiberius was promoted not by the secret wiles of his mother as before, but by her open urgings.

At that time there remained no war except that against the Germans which was carried on more to wipe out the disgrace of the loss of the army with Varus than because of a desire of extending the empire or of any other worthy object.

4. Triumphs and consulships had been heaped upon Tiberius in his youth, undeservedly.

5. The illness of Augustus grew worse and some suspected nefarious practices on the part of his wife.

6. The first slaughter of the new reign was the murder of Postumus Agrippae.

7. Tiberius preferred to seem to be called and chosen by the state than to have crept into power through a wife's intrigues and the adoption by a princeps in his dotage.

8. Tiberius granted consent to the senate with arrogant moderation.

Soldiers stationed as a guard at the funeral

of Augustus were a cause of derision.

11. Augustus recommended that the empire be kept within fixed limits; but whether from apprehension for its safety, or jealousy of future rivals is undertain.

13. Tiberius almost caused the death of Haterius either by chance or designedly.

69. Marcellus was accused of speaking evil of Tiberius, an irrefutable accusation, since from the habits of the emperor the accuser chose all the foulest and charged the accuser with having said them. And because they were true, they were believed to have been spoken.

75. By the presence of Tiberius in court justice was promoted but liberty undermined.

Tiberius retained the virtue of not being greedy for money long after he had put aside all other virtues.

77. Tiberius in silence allowed the senate mockeries of freedom.

81. In regard to the nomination of consuls his statement of his policy was plausible but in sub-

stance, hollow and insidious and the more it was covered by the appearance of liberty, the more it would result in slavery.

Book II.

5. The greater the hatred of his uncle, (Tiberius) the more did Germanicus devote himself to hastening victory and to thinking over methods of battles, etc.

38. And never after did Tiberius take pity though the house of Hortensius fell into shameful distress.

42. Tiberius craftily framed an opportunity of removing Germanicus from Rome or took advantage of such as chance offered.

Tiberius enticed Archelaus to Rome by letters from his mother.

72. Germanicus before his death spoke with his wife in secret, whence he was thought he had warned her to be on her guard against Tiberius.

84. For Tiberius turned to his glory all things, even mere accidents.

Book III.

18. Tiberius, as I have often remarked, was firm enough against money and then he was more inclined to mercy because of shame of having freed Plancina.

37. It would be better for Drusus to employ his days in shows, his nights in banquets, than, in solitude and secluded from all pleasures, to wear himself out in gloomy suspicions and meditations of mischief, (as did his father Tiberius.)

44. The more carefully did Tiberius feign security either because he had learned the revolt of the Gauls was trivial or because of the depth of his dissimulation.

48. Tiberius asks for a public funeral for Sulpicius Quirinus but his memory was not agreeable to the senate because of the danger he had brought upon Lepida.

60. Tiberius amuses the senate with a shadow of its ancient rights by referring to its petitions

and claims from the provinces.

64. The illness of Livia recalled Tiberius to Rome, for hitherto mother and son had lived in real unanimity or dissembled hate.

65. Even Tiberius, the enemy of public liberty, despised the servility of the senators.

69. This speech was heard with greater delight as manifestations of popular principles were rare with Tiberius. He, also, was prudent in mitigating sentences where his own personal hatred was not involved and so he mitigates the sentence of Silanus.

Book IV.

8. During the illness of Drusus he showed no signs of care, perhaps from ostentation or firmness of spirit.

9. His speech had moved the minds of his hearers to pity and praise, if he had limited it and not proceeded to the empty and often derided proposition concerning the restoration of the republic.

19. The senate was summoned to try Silius

as if he were to be dealt with legally.

20. This was the first time Tiberius had showed a greed for the property of others.

31. It was strange that Tiberius, who knew better things, and the honor that comes from clemency should prefer severity.

32. I am writing only of the sad condition of affairs in the city and a prince indifferent about extending the bounds of the empire.

Book V.

7. After the death of an enemy Tiberius did not blacken his memory with reproaches and accusations as he had that of Blaesus.

Book VI.

2. A decree of the Senate was passed transferring property from the public treasury to the private purse of the emperor, as if that made any difference.

9. Tiberius attacks Sextus Vestilius because he had slandered Caligula or because of credit given to false statement that he had done so.

After impressing upon the mind of the reader at the very outset that his account is going to be strictly impartial and fair,- a statement which he makes at intervals throughout the work- he proceeds to his task of artistically coloring the narrative. At this point, however, we shall confine our attention only to the list given above of innuendos, hints and sneers.

In saying that, "when Agrippa died," Livia might have had a hand in the deaths of Gaius and Lucius Caesar. He used a rather strong statement for periods of fourteen and sixteen years intervening and there is very little probability of anything irregular in their deaths, both occurring in distant parts of the empire. We learn that Caius' death was the result of a wound received in battle.

Then he proceeds to remark that it was only by the artifices of his mother that Tiberius was advanced. A statement rather inconsistent with the brilliant military campaigns and services of Tiberius to Augustus.

The insinuation that Augustus might have been

23. Whether Asinius Gallus died of his own accord or by constraint, is uncertain.

25. Agrippina died by voluntary starvation or else by depriving herself of food; a mode of death was pretended which would seem self-imposed.

26. The fact that Agrippina hated her was sufficient to protect Piancina until after her death.

27. It was a cause of grief that Julia, the daughter of Drusus, was married to Rubellius Blandus, whose grandfather was only a knight.

38. Tiberius ordered invectives against himself published to parade his tolerance of free speeches and his scorn of reflections upon his own character or else he wished to get at the truth which flattery smothered.

45. Caius, although naturally impetuous, learned to be an adept in the hollow arts of simulation from his grandfather.

48. Since the mind of Tiberius underwent such a change for the worse from the influence of imperial power, Caius would be sure to degenerate, also.

poinoned by his wife is most preposterous, there being absolutely nothing for her to gain by his death.

Tacitus cannot give Tiberius credit for the honors secured by him in warfare but says, "they had been heaped upon him in his youth."

The slaughter of Postumus Agrippa is attributed to Tiberius when in all probability, it took place, as Tiberius says it did, without his knowledge.

I, 3 and 11. and elsewhere he sneers at the inactivity in not pursuing further conquests as did Trajan, the emperor under whom Tacitus writes and whom he admires. History has shown that the policy of Augustus and Tiberius was wise in this respect and undoubtedly was so regarded in their own day. Nevertheless the sneer adds its bit to the general coloring.

Note the subtlety used in I., 69 in indirectly charging the emperor with vile deeds, of which he was innocent, but which fact would rarely occur to the reader.

Nor can Tacitus forgive Tiberius for his

presence in court, although acknowledging that thereby many guilty were condemned, because these guilty were, in most cases, of the nobility who ought to have been dealt with leniently.

Even his granting liberty of action to the senate is always followed by some such statement as is given in I., 77; III., 60; IV., 19.

I. 81. His statement of policy in the nomination of consuls is very good but Tacitus takes care to conceive a bad impression of it.

II. 5,- The insinuation that Tiberius hated Germanicus is repeated frequently, but is not borne out by facts. Germanicus, as here, is continually lauded, not so much from love of Germanicus as to throw into contrast the dark hues with which he paints the emperor.

Note in II., 72. that merely because Germanicus, on his deathbed, spoke with his beloved wife in private, he must, of course, have been warning her against Tiberius.

III., 37, A subtle striking at Tiberius

over the head of his son, Drusus. It is needless to point out that Tacitus must have been more or less of a clairvoyant to know what Tiberius' meditations in secret were, -

III., 48, Quirinius was a man of low birth and Lepida, his high born wife, had tried to foist a spurious child upon him, which he resented. Tacitus says he should not have resented this. Yet the casual reader would probably be unaware at this point just what the "danger" was that he had "brought upon Lepida."

III., 65. "Tiberius, the enemy of public liberty." The emperor consistently adhered to all precedents and was a stickler for legality and it was not so much his fault that the senate lost its power as its own incompetency which Tacitus does not hesitate to portray. We make take at their face value, Tiberius' statements about restoring the republic (IV, 9.) but the senate and people, themselves, rendered this impossible.

In III. 69, the emperor mitigates a heavy sentence imposed by the senate and as it would not do at

all to let this fact have its effect on the mind of the reader, the above sneer is attached, which is entirely unwarranted and unfair. (Compare IV. 31.) As a matter of fact Tiberius more frequently than not softened the severity of the senate as will be shown below.

In IV. 9, in the same way the force of a speech of most excellent sentiments is destroyed.

One gets the impression in V. 7, that reproaching the dead was his habit which is, of course, not the case.

So the purpose of all these hints, sneers and innuendos is apparent. They ~~are~~ all original with Tacitus and just so far as the reader allows them to influence him in his own interpretation of the facts, just so much have they served the purpose Tacitus intended they should. It requires more than ordinary care to discard the colored glasses the historian puts before our eyes and to look upon the picture in clear light. But only in that manner can we arrive at the truth. In every instance given above the reader should form his own idea of the force of

the facts and Tacitus is unfair, as a historian, in adding these personal touches.

II. Motives ascribed for actions and stating thoughts.

Another ~~one~~ of the most important rhetorical devices, and one which he uses freely, is that of ascribing motives for actions; of giving an interpretation of facts; stating that an act is not to be taken at its obvious and apparant significance but that it meant some thing quite different. Tacitus writing three generations later, without the least hesitation and in the most matter of fact way, proceeds to inform us just what was in the mind of the emperor when he did a certain thing and why he acted as he did, information which he could not have arrived at from any writers or records and which we must take as pure intuitions and value as such. If we take at their face value such statements we shall have to acknowledge that Tacitus was the greatest mind-reader of history, which we practical moderns, not believing in the occult, are scarcely ready to acknowledge.

And yet these statements have the greatest influence upon the unsuspecting reader and it is only by the greatest of care that even the reader, aware of the "prepossessions" of the writer, is able to form a true opinion of the import of such passages, uninfluenced by these misleading remarks.

List of Motives Ascribed for Actions and Mind-reading.

Book I.

6. Tiberius, after the death of Posthumus Agrippa says that he was in ignorance of the orders for his death and that they had been given by Augustus, whereupon Tacitus remarks that this was all pretence. A careful study of the conditions surrounding the death of Agrippa leaves it extremely probable that it was as Tiberius said.

7. "It was afterward found that his irresolution (in taking power at the death of Augustus) was feigned, that he might perceive the wishes of the nobles. for warping their words and looks into accusations, he

stored them up in his heart". We may wonder at what time afterward this knowledge was found. It is not recorded in the Annals. Following events show that his statement is false.

8. Augustus, out of vainglory and for future renown, named in his will great men of Rome, who hated him.

10. Augustus in a speech in the senate while pretending to apologize for the personal habits of life and manners of Tiberius really wished to reproach him with them.

12. Tiberius retained hatred for Asinius Gallus because he thought that Gallus aspired to the principate.

13. He hated L. Arruntius because he was rich, active and popular.

13. Tiberius was tortured by jealousy of Livia, regarding honors paid to her as a depression of himself and so he forbade them.

47. A whole chapter on reasons in the

mind of Tiberius for not leaving Rome for the provinces.

52. Tiberius was tortured by the fact that Germanicus should have gained popularity with the army, and military fame.

53. Some say that the soldiers sent to slay Sempronius Gracchus, were not sent from Rome, but by L. Asprenas, proconsul of Africa, at the command of Tiberius, who vainly hoped that the murder might be shifted on Asprenas. Gould (Tragedy of the Caesars, p. 658) says, "In all probability, when Gracchus heard that the man he had so deeply wronged had succeeded to power, he committed suicide. Almost certainly Tiberius had no hand in his death."

53. Tiberius caused Julia, his former wife, to die of want calculating that from the length of her exile, her murder would be unnoticed. We have strong reason to doubt this.

69. The conduct of Agrippa sank deep into the heart of Tiberius.

69. Sejanus, since he knew his temper, inflamed the jealousy of Tiberius against Agrippa and

supplied him with materials for anger that he might store them up in his heart and draw them out augmented in bitterness. Note the subtlety of this.

76. "I believe Tiberius did not attend the shows with his son Drusus, that he might expose the cruelty of his son and cause him to be hated by the people." Rather a preposterous reason to give.

80. Tiberius did not seek men of the highest virtue nor of the lowest, as from the best he feared danger to himself and from the lowest danger to the state.

#### Book II.

5. Tiberius was glad of the revolt in the East, since he had a pretext for separating Germanicus from the legions that were attached to him and by placing him in new perils expose him to the danger of death either by chance or intrigue.

26. Tiberius recalled Germanicus from Germany where he had been a failure but to save his feelings gave as his reasons that he had won enough honors.

Tacitus remarks that "Germanicus knew that this was all hypocrisy and that he was torn from a field of ripe glory through envy.

38. Tiberius was inclined more eagerly to oppose Hortalus because the senate was favorable.

42. Tiberius presented the people in the name of Germanicus with three hundred sesterces a man and made him his colleague in the consulship. Since not even then did he get the credit of sincere affection he, on the pretence of investing the prince with new honors, resolved to remove him from Rome and to do this, framed an opportunity or availed himself of such as chance offered.

43. Piso had no doubt that he was placed in command of Syria to defeat the plans of Germanicus.

51. Tiberius rejoiced to see the senate adjudge between his sons and the law although, of course, the law was vanquished.

Book III.

3. "Tiberius and Livia did not appear

in public at the funeral of Germanicus as they thought public mourning below their dignity or else they feared lest their hypocrisy would be detected if their countenances were seen of all. Neither did Antonia, the mother of the dead, take part in the funeral, because as I believe, Tiberius and Livia restrained her that they might seem to grieve alike." If Tiberius was such a past master in the art of dissimulation as Tacitus says, he, it seems, would have had little difficulty in veiling his "hypocrisy"

4. "Nothing pierced Tiberius more than the honors paid Agrippa." How did Tacitus know?

8. "Tiberius received the son of Piso kindly to make it appear that the trial of the father would be fair." And then at once, in the discussion of the trial, Tacitus explicitly says that Tiberius was most fair and just but that it was the senate that was prejudiced and unfair.

10. "Piso knew that Tiberius despised popular opinion and was implicated with Livia, his mother, in guilt of the murder of Germanicus." So does Tacitus

bring in the accusation of Tiberius for the murder although he admits that at the trial there was not the least evidence that either Piso or Tiberius was implicated in it. Our author as in these last two instances is often strangely inconsistent.

10. Tiberius knew the responsibility of the trial and the imputations against him so he referred the whole case to the senate.

44. "All the good men grieved for the state of the country, many from hatred of the present state and the desire of a change, rejoiced even in their own perils." We may well wonder where Tacitus secured his facts upon which to base the above statement and how he knew what was in the minds of all patriotic man.

#### Book IV.

I. Tiberius regarded the death of Germanicus as one of the most lucky events that had befallen him.

18. Tiberius attacked C. Silius and T. Sabinus because they had been friends of Germanicus. Ta-

citius admits Silius was guilty and of Sabinus he says nothing more than the above, which is strange.

19. Tiberius hates Sosia, wife of Silius, because Agrippa loved her.

31. Catus Tirmius, sentenced to banishment was pardoned by Tiberius, because he had been useful to Tiberius as an informer. Tacitus says repeatedly that the emperor was cruel and caused the death of many. So when he finds him pardoning or alleviating the sentences of the senate as he does so often, to keep up his color, he tacks on some such statement as above.

74. Tiberius concealed the loss in Germany in order that he might have to trust no man with the conduct of the war.

Book V.

2. Tiberius limited the honors decreed to his mother after her death, saying that such was her desire; but this was all pretence; (he was envious of his mother after her death.)

Book VI.

I. "The emperor sailed along the shore of Compania, either undetermined whether to enter the city or only feigning a show of coming because he had determined otherwise. He returned to his lonely island because he was ashamed of his lusts and crimes." As will be explained later this statement about his lusts is not true.

30. Lentulus Gaetulius was favored by Tiberius because he was hated by the people and not powerful. Again Tacitus cannot give Tiberius credit for leniency.

---

In every one of the above instances the attention is drawn from the real significance of the act to the interpretation which Tacitus wishes to be placed upon it to fill in the portrait which he had already sketched. Space prevents a full discussion of all the conditions surrounding each of the statements listed above but a simple reading of them will show that Tacitus could have had no authority for them; that they are only what

Tacitus, himself, thinks; or wishes the reader to accept as the motives for the actions, while a careful study of the history and circumstances will show that the motives imputed are almost invariably wide of the mark and unfair.

### III. Stress and Reticence.

The third point in the technique which is used in the painting of the picture lies in the handling of the lights and shadows; in the stress and reticence: that is; in touching lightly upon the points favorable to Tiberius and laying stress upon the unfavorable. As this picture was to be a dark one, the light or good points of his character are briefly mentioned or passed over altogether, while the dark or bad points are dwelt upon and magnified and, in order to make it more vivid, several are imagined and then described with such force as, almost, to assimilate with the rest of the picture as an integral part of the same.

It would be impossible to list all of the examples of stress and reticence as they are to be found

from beginning to end but some of the more prominent will be given and they will abundantly illustrate the method of Tacitus in the handling of this part of his rhetorical art. This he employs with such skill as almost to escape detection, so naturally is it done and with such candor, show of impartiality and repeated assurances of his absolute fairness and desire to be true to fact.

Book I.

9. and 10. In these chapters with the greatest of seeming fairness he gives the opinion of the people of Rome of the character of Augustus. First he gives the opinion of those who favored Augustus and named his good qualities, using twelve lines for this. Then he gives the opinion of his detractors, extending this to cover thirty-three lines; until the reader is pretty well persuaded of the fact that the bad far outweighed the good in Augustus. In 10, he says, "at Rome the Varroes, Egnatii and Iuli had been killed"; using the plurals for the executions of one Egnatius in 19 B. C. and one Varro in 22 B. C. in due course of law, and the suicide of one Iulus in 2 B. C.

to escape trial for his adultery with Julia.

34. Germanicus, as commander, does his duty in putting down a rebellion in Gaul, Although showing more or less incompetancy in the handling of the situation, yet Tacitus dwells upon the fact that the nearer he stood in succession to the throne, the more earnestly he exerted himself in behalf of Tiberius. Germanicus acted a most ridiculous part in this crisis and Tacitus remarks that even his own officers hurried him to his tent to prevent him making more of a spectacle of himself and that he was generally censured but he does it so briefly and dwells so long on the critical nature of the revolt that Germanicus is made out a hero.

I6-30. By way of contrast at almost the same time as the revolt in Germany, the same kind of a revolt broke out in the army in Pannonia, whither Drusus, son of Tiberius, was sent to quell it, which he does most courageously and with great ability. But Tacitus obscures the part of Drusus and caps the climax by saying that the only way in which the army was subdued was because of an eclipse

of the moon, which so worked upon the superstitious minds of the soldiers that they returned to their allegiance.

53. In telling of the death in exile of Sempronius Gracchus, (who probably committed suicide) he describes him "as sitting on an eminence which jutted out into the sea on his lonely isle, expecting no good tidings and after writing a letter to his beloved wife," (he had been exiled for adultery with Julia), "presenting his neck to the executioners; being in the bravery of his death not unworthy of the Sempronian name." This bears plain evidence of being all pure imagination.

In the narration of the German campaigns of Germanicus in I., 55-72 and II., 5-26, Tacitus so manipulates stress and reticence as to veil continually the disaster and magnify the victories so as to show him a great general. Several times are the Germans thoroughly crushed in battle with great slaughter only to find them a few weeks later, as strong, apparently, as ever. For three summers Tiberius left him in charge there, notwithstanding his failure to accomplish anything and then re-

moves him with kind words, but Tacitus says, II. 26, it was merely through envy and his kind words were all hypocrisy.

72. The adulation of the senate is checked by Tiberius, which fact is barely mentioned and immediately followed by the statement that this did not gain him favor with the people because he revived the law of treason.

78.

Book II.

37 and 38. Two long chapters are devoted to a discussion of the case of Hortalus of high family, who asks for pecuniary aid from the emperor, which the emperor refuses. Tacitus veils the fact that he had become impoverished by dissipation after having once before been aided and strongly insinuates that it was very niggardly of Tiberius not to assist him again. He ends with the statement; "Nor did Tiberius ever after show pity, though the house of Hortensius was fallen into shameful poverty."

47 and 48. Two instances are given very briefly of the emperor's generosity; first, in helping from his own purse some cities harmed by earthquakes and second, in surrendering an estate which he might legally have retained, to rightful heirs. It is stated that "he never accepted any man's inheritance except where friendship gave him a title; all others he rigidly rejected." This briefly; then he begins: "but the law of lese-majesty in the meantime rapidly advanced."

71 and 82:83. The death of Germanicus and the mourning and love of the people is dwelt upon in the most minute details to throw into relief the unpopularity of Tiberius.

87. When the price of corn was high he paid part of its price out of his private purse and then checked the adulation of the senate, whereupon Tacitus says, "Hence it was difficult and dangerous to speak under a prince, who dreaded liberty and abhorred flattery". The above good acts he describes in five lines.

Book III.

I-6. With extraordinary minuteness of detail does he describe Agrippina's arrival with the ashes of Germanicus and the public sorrow, much of which must have been imaginings.

57. The senate had for a very trivial crime convicted and immediately executed C. Lutorius Priscus without consulting Tiberius, who would have pardoned him. To avoid a repetition of this Tiberius orders that ten days shall intervene between condemnation and execution but "Tiberius was never softened by time". A most unfair statement. Time and again does the emperor pardon men condemned by the senate and he was the only restraint upon their cruelty. We must remember that the senate and not the emperor convicted. The emperor was responsible for deaths only in the virtue of his right to pardon.

70. Tiberius pardons L. Ennius, condemned by the senate, but Tacitus diverts subtly the attention from the emperor's leniency by describing and reproaching the servility of a senator, Ateius Capito.

Book IV.

34 and 35. Two long chapters are devoted to the speech of Cremutius Cordus, arraigned for praising Brutus and Cassius in his history.

66. After a great fire in the city the emperor from his own money gives aid to the sufferers. Then Tacitus says "as the bounty of the prince had solaced the sufferers under the events of fortune, so the fury of the informers grew daily worse". Even if this statement were true, which it is not, it would be hard to see the connections here.

70. With the most <sup>uu</sup>gruesome details so as to throw odium upon Tiberius, is the death of Sabinus described who was guilty of attempting the life of the emperor.

Book VI.

4. "Latiaris, a chief instrument in ensnaring T. Sabinus, was the first to pay the penalty." What his accusation was is not stated but we may suspect it just, as Tacitus is fond of giving details where they

are damaging to the emperor.

5. Cotta Messalinus was "accused of a multitude of crimes", Those mentioned were that he had given Caius a foul nickname and had spoken flippantly of Tiberius and Livia. He was convicted by the senate and pardoned by Tiberius. It is insinuated that he deserved death and the emperor is given no credit for leniency.

19. He describes the slaughter of Sejanus' friends in gruesome but general terms, "there lay the countless mass of slain, of every age and sex, some scattered, others in heaps, their friends and kindred were not permitted to weep, the putrid bodies were thrown into the Tiber.

It is remarkable that Tacitus speaks so vaguely of this massacre, giving no names, contrary to his usual custom. We are not told whether the convicts were tried in the senate or in the ordinary courts, who were accusers, or what the accusations, despite the fact that Tiberius was always a stickler for legal procedure. This passage bears every evidence of being manufactured out of

whole cloth.

40. The death of Vibulenus Agrippa, who took poison in the senate-house is descried vividly as being among one of the deaths ascribable to Tiberius.

45. After a fire Tiberius expended, to relieve the sufferers, one hundred thousand great sesterces, but Tacitus says he could afford to do this/"as he was ever sparing in his own private building.

---

As stated before, this list does not pretend to be a complete one of all the instances of the juggling of stress and reticence by Tacitus as that would be manifestly impossible in a space so brief, and would involve an analysis of the Annals from first to last as it is found on almost every page. But this much suffices to indicate his method in this respect, which is so subtle as, in many instances to defy detection except after a most careful analysis of passages and a comparison with information derived from other authors, and requires with all a thorough understanding of the history of the times.

#### IV. Use of Gossip.

Often when facts are lacking, the gossip of the people is introduced and, practically always it is adverse to Tiberius. Sometimes with a show of candor, the gossip on both sides will be given but the adverse always predominates. As the Romans were a very free-spoken people and highly censorious people, indulging much and on the slightest grounds, in scurrility, vituperation, invective and personal abuse, there is little wonder that a supply of virulent invectives against the emperor could have been found if Tacitus had had the material available but one wonders if most of the sentiments attributed to the people were not merely invented by Tacitus, as he, living three generations later could hardly have known the minds of the people then, and it is extremely doubtful if so full an account of popular opinions (regarded lightly, as they were by the higher classes) was to be found in any authorities at his command. On the whole, it is not too much to say that Tacitus intends us to believe these statements.

which he puts into the mouths of people, as presenting an accurate view of events.

List of Thoughts presented in Gossip.

Book I.

4. "Tiberius was mature (at the time of the death of Augustus) but possessed the inherent pride of the Claudian family; he was cruel, honors had been heaped upon him and during his retirement at Rhodes he was meditating future vengeance, studying the arts of dissimulation and practicing secret lusts."

As a matter of fact he fully merited his honors and the people would scarcely know his meditations and secret habits in retirement.

5. A preposterous rumor to the effect that Augustus had visited Agrippa and intended to make him his successor is given.

9. Twelve lines are given to talk of the people mentioning good qualities of Augustus.

10. Thirty-three lines are devoted to bad

qualities, in which among other things, it is stated that "he adopted Tiberius as his successor not from love of him or of the state but because he sought glory for himself by contrast with a character consummately base.

46. The people reviled Tiberius as being inactive in putting down a revolt of the armies.

80. People thought Tiberius kept men in office longer than the usual term of one year "either because he was too indolent to choose others or his nature so malign that he could not indure that many reap the benefits of office." It certainly was good policy to retain good men in office, especially in view of the great amount of exortion. But Tacitus is indignant as his class is barred from enriching themselves at the expense of the state and provincials.

Book II.

41. At the triumph of Germanicus the people are secretly apprehensive when they reflected that "popular favor had proved fatal to his father, Drusus; his uncle, Marcellus, was snatched away from the affec-

tions of the populace; and that ever short-lived and unfortunate were the favorites of the Roman people. "The statement in regard to Drusus has no grounds and the rest is only intended to prepare the reader to believe that Tiberius caused the death of Germanicus.

43. Some believed that Piso had secret orders from Tiberius against Germanicus." See note on II., 4I, above.

55. A rumor was whispered abroad, "that all this (Piso's actions against Germanicus) was not acceptable to Tiberius."

77. Domitius Celer is represented as advising Piso as follows: "Livia, it is true, is your confidant; Tiberius is your friend; but both secretly and none will more ostentatiously bewail the fate of Germanicus, than such as most heartily rejoice at it." From its very nature this speech must have been pure invention on the part of Tacitus. (Piso was under charge of murder of Germanicus) The same purpose is here as in II., 4I and 43 above.

82. "There was no doubt", they said, "that Germanicus had been exiled to the extremities of the empire to secure his death, and it was for this that Piso had been given Syria. Drusus and Germanicus were sacrificed because they meditated giving Rome equality and freedom."

By all these statements he impresses the idea upon the minds of the reader that Tiberius intrigued for the death of Germanicus, although, later, he briefly states that there was not the least evidence that he had any connection with his death or that it was anything but natural.

Book III.

4. At the funeral of Germanicus the people passionately exclaimed, "that the state was utterly lost and that there was no further hope" so openly that they seemed to have forgotten who ruled them.

5. Tiberius is censured for not being ostentatious in his grief for Germanicus and that he had not shown as much honor to the corpse as he should.

7. "Many complain that Piso was left at liberty to destroy evidence of his crimes; for it was generally known that Martina, a sorceress, sent to Rome as his confederate had died at Brundisium." Tacitus neglects to state that Martina was in the hands of Germanicus friends at the time of her death and Piso in Asia could hardly have been destroying evidence by the death of Martina in Italy.

9. Censure of Piso's conduct on return to Rome is given.

16. "I remember to have heard from old men that Piso had frequently in his hands a bundle of papers, which he did not open, but which his friends said, "contained the orders of Tiberius against Germanicus." Note the extremely flimsy ground upon which the historian does not hesitate to make insinuations.

17. The people vent their anger at the mercy of Tiberius toward Plancina.

22. Tiberius prevented Drusus from voting first at a trial in the senate that he might not unduly in-

fluence the vote; so some ascribed it to his cruelty as he would not have given up his privilege had he not had the intention of condemning her." Rather illogical arguing.

44. The people "inveighed against Tiberius because he spent his time upon information given by state accusers that he should have devoted to the Gallic revolt."

59. Drusus is censured for absenting himself from the city as Tiberius, his father had done.

Book IV.

IO and II. Two chapters are devoted to a story that Tiberius himself had given the poison to Drusus which Tacitus says he cannot bring himself to believe but which he evidently mentions to excite a suspicion in the minds of his readers.

38. Tiberius restrained the provincials from worshipping him as a god, so some thought "this due to modesty; others, to distrust of his merit; others to degeneracy of spirit, for by despising fame, the virtues

that acquire it are contemned." Undoubtedly the first of the reasons was the right one but note that he gives one good motive and two bad ones.

57. Some believe Tiberius retired to Caprae because he was ashamed of his hideous personal appearance, and that he practiced lusts in secret. Others thought the ambition of his mother drove him from Rome.

---

The potency of these suggestions is seen at once. Especially is this noticeable in the case of the death of Germanicus. As Tacitus admits, at the trial of Piso for this murder, not the least evidence was found to connect either Piso or Tiberius with his death and undoubtedly they had nothing to do with it. So with no facts upon which to base a charge but wishing to impress upon the reader the fact that Tiberius was responsible for it, he puts the charge against the emperor into the mouths of the populace and repeats it over and over until the mind acquiesces in it.

V. Facial Expressions.

To show the cruel nature of Tiberius and to lay the blame for a suicide upon him, Tacitus uses the device of having the accused observe the demenour and expression of the emperor and loose courage because of his threatening countenance and so commit suicide in despair. This must be pure fiction for in no place were the facial expressions recorded and at any rate, Tiberius could not convict a man; the senate did that and the emperor could only refrain from pardoning him. Even his expressions while he was in retirement at Capreae are described.

List.

II. 28. "Tiberius entertained Libo at his table and showed no signs of aversion in his countenance, no resentment in his words( so deeply had he smothered his vengeance.)

II. 29. On the day of the trial Tiberius received Libo with a hard countenance and he later committed suicide

II. 42. Archelaus was received by Tiberius sternly and he either dies naturally or by his own hand.

III. 15. "Nothing daunted Piso so much as the sight of Tiberius exhibiting no token of pity or anger, but silent and reserved, and not to be moved." How did Tacitus know that this was what daunted Piso? Evidently here Tiberius was merely impartial. Piso committed suicide, the author says owing to this.

III. 16. Tiberius with face framed to sadness complained that Piso by his death, sought to blame him.

III. 67. "Tiberius addressed Silanus harshly and frowns upon him." Tacitus says he was guilty.

IV. 34. Tiberius received the defence of Cremutius Cordus with a countenance of settled austerity so the accused decided to die.

IV. 60. "The prince received Nero either sternly or with a countenance smiling treacherously." This was at Capreae, while the prince was in such secret retirement as to make it impossible for Tacitus to have knowledge of the above fact.

## VI. Invented Episodes.

We said in the beginning that in the main the facts given by Tacitus could be taken at their face value, if we discard the innuendos, sneers, hints, insinuations and motives attached to them. These facts we find almost without exception to be favorable to Tiberius. But there are a small number of acts attributed to Tiberius which could not have been committed by a man of his character as it is revealed by these facts. A few of the facts do not harmonize with the rest of the picture and so glaring is the discrepancy that we are forced to the conclusion that they must have been invented to fill out the coloring. These facts we find in the sixth book. It is in this book that his rhetorical coloring most nearly obscures the true picture. It would seem that as he progressed he warmed to his task and used more and more coloring until in the last book he departs from his scrupulousness in regard to the truth of his facts, noticeable in the first books, and inserts some false facts to still further add a dark hue to the picture. For in the first books, though

he does not scruple to distort and discolor facts, there is no evidence that they are not true. This cannot be said of all in the sixth book. Among this number is the story of his lustful debaucheries in his retreat at Capreae which is described among the other passages in VI., I.

"Tiberius often came into the neighborhood of Rome, but went back again to the loneliness of the island, ashamed of his crimes and lusts; in which he indulged so inordinately, that, after the fashion of foreign tyrants, the children of freeborn parentage became the object of his passion. Nor were beauty and gracefulness of person the only provocatives of his lust, but the modesty of some, the ancestral images of others. Then, likewise, first were devised the names, till then unknown, of "Sellarii, and 'Spintriae', expressive of the abominable lewdness of the place and the manifold methods of prostitution. Procurers were appointed to hunt out victims, the backward they terrified with threats; and upon such parents or kindred as withheld them, they employed force, seizure and just what they pleased, as upon so many cap-

year of his life and it was between the ages of seventy-two and seventy-eight that he broke out into the depravity mentioned above, VI., I. Besides being a psychological improbability it was a physical impossibility. All writers, even Tacitus, agree upon the natural austerity of the life of the prince. His health was good up to the end of his life and he said that those were poor creatures who had need of other advice than their own experience as to what was good or bad for their health after they had passed their thirtieth year. If he had indulged in the dissipation and debauchery Tacitus credited him with he would scarcely have lived to the ripe age of seventy-eight with no weakening or attacks of disease.

As companions at Caprea there were of his own family the two boys, Caligula and Gemellus, Livilla and her daughter, Julia, and the young wife of Caligula. Others included Cocceius Nerva, of consular rank and an upright man, Sejanus, Curtius Atticus and some other men of letters, chiefly Greeks, whose conversation might amuse him, IV., 58. He certainly would not have exhibited his

tives".

We may say with positiveness, secure of our proofs, that the above is absolutely false.

Tacitus in summarizing the character of Tiberius VI. 51, says that his conduct was exemplary and his reputation high, while in a private capacity, or holding dignities under Augustus, (that is until he was fifty-five years of age.): while Germanicus and Drusus were alive he was reserved and mysterious, artfully assuming the merit of virtues (until the age of 63): while his mother lived his character was mixture of good and evil (until the age of 69): While he loved and feared Sejanus, though hated for his cruelties, he observed a secrecy and caution in his lusts, (until the age of 72): then at last, all restraints of shame and fear being removed, he without control indulged the bent of his genius and broke out into the most revolting depravity (between the ages of 72 and 78).

A glance at this schedule of his advance in debauchery will reveal its inconsistency. There was no breath of reproach upon his morals before the fifty-fifth

debaucheries to these members of his family nor were the others, men such as a libertine would choose for companions. And these were all that are named. The others are only included in general statement.

Also during his retirement he kept close watch upon political affairs as is evidenced by his frequent letters to the senate.

No details are anywhere given as to what were the names of the children of high parentage ravished by him or the names of any parents to be punished for withholding their children. This is contrary to the general habit of Tacitus, who is only too glad to give details unfavorable to the emperor. The terms used are all most vague and general.

These stories must have been circulated by his enemies at Rome and colored from the vilest scenes of the stews. This was the only opportunity they had had to thus vilify his character. Hitherto his life at Rome, in the public eye, was known to all men to be pure and free from blame, But when he retired to the solitude of

Capreae, then they were free to indulge their malignity in picturing him revelling in lusts, as he was out of the public eye. The light Roman could not conceive of a man not being infatuated with the frivolous pleasures of the capital and at once gave vent to the scurrility and Bilingsgate, which the Roman knew so well how to use. Even Cicero was a master of this as his attacks on Clodius proves.

It is also worth while to note that by no other writer before Tacitus is this story told. The reason why such a man as Tiberius should wish to get away from the turmoil and intrigues of the city, whose people he despised and where he was unpopular and retired to the lonely quietude of Capreae are self-evident.

VI. 10. "Vitia, mother to Fusius Gemminus, once consul, was executed in her old age for bewailing the death of her son." We may strongly suspect this of being an untruth. It is too strong and out of harmony with all other facts.

VI. 19 and 38, Tacitus describes a promiscuous slaughter of all those in prison under accusation

of friendship of Sejanus. Dead bodies lay around putrefying, etc.etc.etc. But strange to say, contrary to Tacitus' almost invariable custom no names, or any other details are given. A careful analysis shows that apparently five people were all that lost their lives as being connected with the plots of Sejanus (Tufius, Geminus and wife, Geminus, Pompeius and Julius Celsus) and these have been magnified into a wholesale slaughter. Suetonius takes this story up where Tacitus leaves off and adds more gruesome details but no names.

#### Mere Assertions.

A rhetorical method, which is sound psychologically is, when there are no facts upon which to argue merely to assert, boldly and persistantly. And this is one of the methods most frequently employed by Tacitus. In all examples of this listed below we may say, either that the assertions are untrue, or that certainly Tacitus has no information or knowledge upon which to base his assertions.

List.

Book I.

3. Livia persuaded Augustus to banish Agrippa.

4. Tiberius warps men's words and looks into crimes and stored them up in his breast for future vengeance.

II. "The words of Tiberius, even upon subjects on which he sought not disguises were dark and cautious, either from nature or habit, but when he labored to hide his heart, they were more than even ambiguous and uncertain." Tiberius seems merely to have the usual caution in not revealing his thoughts.

13. After naming a list of men Lepidus, Asinius, Arruntius, and Piso whom Augustus had said were of high ability, Tacitus says, "and every one of these great men, except Lepidus, were afterward cut off, under various charges, all concocted by Tiberius." Against Asinius, Tiberius had an additional reason for hatred in that Asinius had boasted that he had carried on an intrigue —

with the wife of Tiberius, nevertheless for seventeen years he remained unharmed until he became involved in a conspiracy with Agrippina and Nero and was allowed to remain under supervision for three years when Tacitus says he perished, whether voluntarily or by constraint is uncertain.

Arruntius lived in favor, being appointed to various office, until that last year of the life of Tiberius, when, as Tacitus tells us, he was arrested on charges of adultery and treason without the knowledge of the emperor and then committed suicide.

This illustrates well the accuracy and veracity of Tacitus in the matter of these assertions.

14. "Tiberius was torn with jealousy at the honors paid Livia and regarded the honors paid her as a depression of himself."

Tacitus affects to be thoroughly familiar with the secret thoughts and feelings of people living three generations before his time.

24. Tiberius was always close and ever laboring to smother all events of a disastrous nature.

33. Germanicus was hated secretly by Tiberius and Livia, the causes of which were keener because unjust.

52. "The news of Germanicus' success was received by Tiberius with mingled joy and anxiety. He was glad the mutiny was suppressed but tortured that Germanicus should have won favor with the army and military glory." Another example of mindreading.

62. Tiberius was exasperated by the publication of some satirical anonymous verses, exposing his cruelty, pride and dissention with his mother.

73. "Delation now crept in under Tiberius, was restrained and at last it blazed out and bore down all before it." In II. 27, he has it again creeping in for the first time saying, "Then for the first time were those arts devised (delation) which for so many years preyed upon the state."

74. Tiberius was naturally cruel. Marcellus accused of having slandered Tiberius was believed to have made the foul statement in regard to his character because they were true.

75. "Tiberius later abandoned all virtues except that of being proof against money.

Book II.

5. Tiberius was glad of the commotion in the East as it gave him an opportunity to expose Germanicus to death, by natural means or by fraud. - Mind-reading again.

26. Germanicus knew Tiberius' conduct was hypocrisy.

28. Tiberius when he might have restrained the treasonable utterances and practices of Libo preferred to know them.

50. The law of lese-majesty was rapidly advanced. He contradicts this in IV. 6 and 8, by saying that then began the pernicious changes introduced by Tiberius and that his reign hitherto had been all that could be desired.

Book III.

2. All knew how real the joy, how hollow the grief of Tiberius for Germanicus.

3. Tiberius and Livia thought public mourning below their dignity.

10. Piso knew that Tiberius was implicated with his mother in the guilt of the death of Germanicus.

40. Tacitus speaks of the "murder of Germanicus." In III. 14, he says that there was no evidence that Germanicus dies any other than a natural death.

44. All worthy men were grieving from concern for their Country.

57. Tiberius was never softened by time.

64. Tiberius was thought to have resented grievously Livia's having inscribed her own name before that of Tiberius on a monument to Augustus.

69. Manifestations of popular ideas were rare in Tiberius.

69. He was prudent in mitigating extremes where his own personal animosities were not involved.

Book IV.

I. Tiberius regarded the death of Germanicus as fortunate to him.

17. Tiberius was never kindly disposed

to the house of Germanicus.

19. It was a policy peculiar to Tiberius to shelter under venerable names the Villainies of modern invention.

21. Tiberius had a soul that brooded over vengeance and though the resentment had cooled, the impression remained deep in his memory.

29. "Tiberius did not conceal his old hatred for the exile Serenus." Tiberius had no personal hatred as will be seen from a reading of II. 27, where the reasons of the exile of Serenus are given. Tacitus says in the very next chapter that after his conviction, Tiberius pardoned him. A strange way of showing "old hatred". Such inconsistencies are not uncommon in Tacitus.

31. "This long continued series of sad events" The only series had been the accusation of three men, two of whom were acquitted and the other pardoned. Examples such as these are common.

36. "The more active the accusers were, the more they were protected; those who practiced on a

small scale were punished." There are forty names of accusers that occur in the Annals of which number twenty-three suffer death.

There is hardly a case on record of an accuser's enjoying favor from the prince, certainly not of a professional delator receiving advancement or reward. Tacitus has to take some notice of the great number of delators who were punished for bringing false charges, so he says, "They were the small fry."

57. It was owing to Livia's influence that Augustus had appointed Tiberius as his successor.

67. "Tiberius now neglected public cares and abandoned himself to secret debaucheries"(at Capreae) We have discussed the fallacy of both the statements above.

68. Silanus and Nerva were arrested because of their friendship for Germanicus.

71. "When delators had outgrown their usefulness Tiberius struck them down."(See note on IV. 36, above).

71. Tiberius considered his dissimulation a virtue.

71. "Livia by secret devices overthrew her step-children in their prosperity and made a show of compassion toward them in their adversity." This is unwarranted.

Book V.

2. "Tiberius did not suffer the death of his mother to interfere with his own pleasures." How did Tacitus know that Tiberius was then at Capreae.

Book VI.

10. "Vesularius was the go-between of Tiberius in the plot against Libo." See II. 27-32. Libo had committed suicide before the conclusion of the trial and Tiberius swore solemnly that he would have pardoned him.

13. His own silence, was not, as he had hoped, ascribed to his regard for civil equality, but to scorn.

38. "Tiberius was not appeased by time, prayers or satiety of blood, means which are wont to soften all other men, but he still punished even stale and du-

bious accusations, as the most heinous and recent crimes."

40. In his last illness he relinquished nothing of his libidinous excesses.

50. Though his strength was exhausted, his dissimulation did not fail him.

---

A glance at most of these, as for example the last two (VI. 40, 50). will show that they could have no foundation on fact (here Tiberius being in retirement and seclusion and the statement about his lusts being manifestly false). The rest, a careful study of historical conditions and facts will show to be wide of the mark. Yet it is apparent how much weight such general assertions as the above had upon the mind of the reader.

Generalization unsupported by facts.

In no respect does Tacitus show so little regard for accuracy as in general statements, utterly unsupported by facts, No where is the color so glaring as in the disharmonies between data and generalization.

Generalizations especially dwelt upon time and again by him are that (1) Delation developed under Tiberius and was fostered by him, resulting in a continual slaughter of citizens, the delators being protected and rewarded by the emperor; (2) Tiberius always practiced dissimulation, being hardly able, even when there was no cause, to express his thoughts plainly; so great was the force of this habit; (3) He was cruel and proud, delighting in slaughter, never satiated with blood. (4) He was immoral, indulging in the most abominable debaucheries.

It is self-evident, that the trustworthiness of a historian depends, more than on any thing else, upon his summary of the facts narrated by himself. In this most important point, Tacitus fell far short of the standard, revealing plainly his bias.

#### Delation.

With absolute disregard of facts Tacitus states that delation first began under Tiberius, (I. 72, 73.) increased to alarming proportions (VI. 18, IV. 33)

under his favor toward it, (IV. 36.) and resulted in great slaughter (VI. 29), each one of these four generalizations in regard to delation being untrue.

Delation or informing did not begin under Tiberius. It was the only method the Romans had of bringing anyone to trial, there being no public prosecutor, and of course, this method of legal procedure did not begin with the reign of Tiberius as Tacitus intimates. Nor did it increase to alarming proportions. During the twenty-three years of the reign of Tiberius there were only one hundred seventeen cases recorded by Tacitus, an average of about five per year and he professes to give them all. Tiberius certainly did not protect and favor the delators as Tacitus says in IV. 36. (For every accuser, the more eager and busy he was, the more his person was sacred and inviolable) Forty delators are named in the first six books of the Annals of which number twenty-three met death. As to the resultant slaughter Gould (Tragedy of the Caesars p. 666.) has thus summarized the facts given by Tacitus as to delation during the reign of Tiberius.

"Of 117 cases there were fifty-four of high treason. There were from eight to ten of murder, twenty-two of sensual crimes.

There were seven of ill-treatment of provincials and corruptions of justice.

Tiberius interferred, to mitigate a sentence or to pardon in twenty-five cases, and in the cause of justice two or three times as well. There were thirty-six acquittals, twenty-three executions in twenty-three years.

Tiberius himself condemned to death only seven persons. Some of those who came in the above list, recur, so that the number of persons tried was not so great as one hundred and seventeen."

Tacitus says, (IV. 33.), "I have only to record cruel mandates, incessant accusations, faithless friendships, the ruin of the innocent and the causes of the destruction." During the seven years, in the midst of which he makes this remark, there was only one execution for high treason.

VI. 29, "At Rome destruction of her citizens continued without intermission." Of ten cases the previous year, two had been executed, one for incest; The following year the "destruction" consisted of the suicide of two guilty men and two women, who were not accused.

References to the growth of delation, destruction caused by it, etc. are found in I. 72,73; II. 27, 28, 50; III. 38,56; IV. 30, 31, 52, 65, 69, 71; VI. 7, 9, 10, 16, 18, 29, 30.

#### Dissimulation of Tiberius.

The most persistent charge that Tacitus makes is that the whole life of Tiberius was one of concealment, duplicity and dissimulation; that there is nothing honest or straightforward about his thoughts, words or actions. He could use clear language only with the greatest difficulty. References to his dissimulation are found in I. 4, 7, II. 24, 33, 47, 52, 74, 80; II. 26, 28, 42, 66, 78; III. 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22, 31, 44, 64; IV. I, 4, 21, 31, 52, 60, 71, 74; VI. I, 46, 50, 51.

In I. 11, he says: "Tiberique, etiam in rebus quas non occulere, seu natura sive assuetudine, suspensa semper et obscura verba". Tacitus has preserved for us quite a number of the speeches of Tiberius. (I. 7, II, 74; II. 33, 36, 38, 66; III. 6, 12, 47, 52, 64, 69; IV. 8, 16, 37, 38, 40; VI. 3, 6, 29.) and a reading of these will fail to show anything either obscure or ambiguous. Their thought is clear and to the point. Nor in his action do we find anything that would indicate that he was endeavoring to conceal anything or to give a false impression. In a few instances he acts as anyone naturally might in keeping his opinions and intentions to himself. Indeed his character seems to have been very reserved, he being too proud to descend to deceit, the only thing that might give grounds for such a charge being the fact that he was austere and distant.

#### Cruelty and Pride of Tiberius.

Statements to the effect that Tiberius was cruel and proud, never stated with blood, causing the slaughter of many innocent people are found in I. 4, 10,

I3, 72, 74; II. 31; III. 44, 51, 55; IV. 7, 21, 29, 31, 33, 52, 70, 71; VI. 6, 21, 38, 39.

VI. 38, "Tiberius, though three years had elapsed since the execution of Sejanus, was not so far appeased by time, supplications and satiety of blood, means which are wont to soften all others, that he failed to punish even state and dubious accusations as the most heinous and recent crimes."

As mentioned above there were only twenty-three executions in the twenty-three years of Tiberius' reign and he, himself, only condemned to death seven persons. The rest were condemned by the senate. So the statements above would seem a trifle strong. Tacitus has already told us that Tiberius refrained from attending the shows, owing to his aversion to bloodshed. Also we are informed that Tiberius interfered<sup>ed</sup> twenty-five times to prevent the death of people condemned by the senate.

VI. 39, "During these executions, Tiberius was in the neighborhood of Rome, gazing as it were, upon the bloody torrent as it rolled on from house to house;

and watching the busy hands of the ministers of death."

#### Immortality.

Charges of immortality, lewdness and debauchery are made against Tiberius in I. 4, 74, 80; IV. 5, 7, 67, V. 2; VI. I, 6, 46, 51. The falsity of this charge has been shown in the discussion of "Invented Episodes above.

An excellent example of the way in which Tacitus used rhetorical art to apply color is found in his narration of the relation of Germanicus and Tiberius, ending in the death of the former which he would have us believe was due to Tiberius, although he explicitly says that there was no evidence of any connection of the death and Tiberius, and we may assert with assurance that he had no part in it and as far as we can tell it was due to natural causes.

To prepare the mind of the reader he first remarks (I. 33) that Germanicus was harassed by the secret

and unjust hate of his uncle, Tiberius and grandmother, Livia. This he follows with a description of the young man, dwelling upon his unassuming disposition and remarkable sweetness of manners, diametrically opposed to the language and looks of Tiberius which were haughty and mysterious. But the nearer Germanicus stood in succession to power, the more vigorously he exerted himself on behalf of Tiberius. Then after manipulating facts carefully to make it appear that Germanicus was winning great victories, whereas he was accomplishing nothing of any lasting effect, we are told (I.55) that the news of these successes affected Tiberius with mingled joy and anxiety. He was glad that the mutiny was suppressed but tortured that Germanicus was winning glory. Then followed a skillfully handled account of his military campaign during which it is said that the Germans were defeated with great slaughter several times, but they appear again in a few weeks as strong as ever. The statement again is thrown in to keep the proper color (I. 62) that Tiberius put a malign construction upon every action of Germanicus. Then because he

was winning too much military glory and favor with the legions Tiberius resolved to remove him from Germany (2. 5). The real reason was that now for three summers he had wasted his time and energies there with no results, narrowly escaping defeat several times. But Tacitus says, "Tiberius was not displeased with the disturbances in the East as it gave him a pretext of separating Germanicus from the legions that were attached to him and of exposing him to new dangers where he might meet death either by accident or fraud. But Germanicus the greater the hatred of his uncle, was more earnest in considering means of bringing victory to the Roman arms." Tiberius kindly removes him from Germany, saying that he had won enough glory for one man but Tacitus says (2. 26) Germanicus knew that this was all hypocrisy and that through envy he was torn away from a harvest of ripe glory.

Then he returns to the city where he celebrates a triumph and the people <sup>are</sup> represented as beholding him with the greatest admiration but with "secret apprehensions" that the favorites of the Roman people were ever

short-lived and unfortunate. (2. 41) So we are prepared to hear that the worst had befallen him.

Tiberius, then, in the name of Germanicus presents the people with a gift of three hundred sesterces a man and names him his colleague in his consulship. But not even thus gaining credit for sincere affection on pretense of investing the young prince with fresh honors, he resolved to remove him from Rome; and to accomplish it, craftily framed an occasion, or availed himself of such as chance presented. (2. 42) So he sends them to quell the disturbances affected in the East with Cneius Piso, "who did not doubt that he was made governor of Syria on purpose to thwart Germanicus." Some thought "he had secret orders from Tiberius" (2. 43) "Piso loses no time in commencing to put into execution his purposes against Germanicus" (2. 55) To this Germanicus gives no attention but devotes himself to his task. But then Tacitus contradicts himself by describing <sup>Germanicus'</sup> journeys to out of the way places of historical interest and a long sightseeing tour into Egypt, at a time when he should have been attending to his duties. He seems

to have been a dilettante

Then as evidence that Piso was plotting his death during his illness, it is stated that upon the floors and walls were found the exhumed remains on human bodies, with charms and spells and the name of Germanicus graven on sheets of lead; carcasses half burned, besmeared with gore and other instruments of sorceries by which souls are thought to be doomed to the infernal gods; besides certain persons sent by Piso were accused of coming to ascertain the unfavorable symptoms." (2. 69)

On his death bed he had a private talk with his wife, whence it was thought that "he was warning her against Tiberius." (2.72) After his death he was compared to Alexander the Great, but in reality greater than he. (2. 73)

Piso is then accused of causing his death and when he was debating whether to go to Rome and meet the charge, Domitius Celer, is represented as persuading him not to go, saying that "Livia and Tiberius were, to be sure, his confederates and friends; but both secretly; and none

would more ostentatiously bewail the fate of Germanicus, than such as most heartily rejoice at it." (2. 77)

The grief of the people when the ashes are brought back to Rome is described in great detail and "all knew how real was the joy, how hollow the grief, of Tiberius for the death of Germanicus". (3. 2) Note with how great assurance of truthfulness Tacitus states as a fact what he thought the people thought were the thoughts of the emperor. Tiberius and Livia did not appear in public at the funeral because "they thought public mourning beneath their dignity or perhaps they feared that if their faces were examined by all eyes their hypocrisy would be detected. Antonia, the mother of the dead took no part in the funeral but I believe her constrained by Tiberius and Livia, who left not the palace, that they might seem to grieve alike and that grandmother and uncle might appear to have followed her example in staying at home" (3. 3) Tacitus shows great ingenuity in reading minds. As further illustration of this, he proceeds to say that "nothing pierced Tiberius more deeply than the warm interest ex-

cited in favor of Agrippa and the honors paid her (3.4)

"Then the minds of all men turned to thoughts of vengeance upon Piso" (3.7) When brought to trial before the senate, Tiberius opens with a "studied speech of artful restraint" (3. 12). Of the defence of Piso, Tacitus says (3. 14) "It is faltering in every article but one. He could not deny the charge of debauching the soldiers, nor of insulting Germanicus. He seemed only to clear himself of the charge of poisoning Germanicus." Note how artfully he obscures the main point; That neither Piso nor Tiberius were connected with the death which was probably natural. During the course of the trial nothing so daunted Piso as the face of Tiberius showing neither pity nor anger but sullen and taciturn, so he goes home and commits suicide. "He was seen to have in his hand a bundle of letters, as I have heard from old men, which his friends said contained the letters and orders of Tiberius against Germanicus." This seems rather farfetched.

After the death of Piso, Tiberius prevents his wife from being attacked, whereupon in detail are

given the supposed railings of the people against him for protecting the "murderess".

"The son of Piso, Tiberius pardoned and allowed to keep his whole paternal inheritance, for as I have already often observed he was tolerably proof against money, and at the time he was more disposed to mercy, from shame of having screened Plancina". (3. 18).

Then to show how fair he is, he thus summarizes (3. 19. "Here was the termination of the proceedings for avenging the death of Germanicus; an affair which had been the subject of every variety of misrepresentation, not by those only who then lived, but likewise in succeeding times: so true it is that all transactions of great importance are wrapped in doubt and obscurity: while some hold for certain facts the most precarious hearsay, others turn facts into falsehoods; and both are exaggerated by posterity."

With this summary we will end, by merely calling attention to the fact that the last lines of the above fit the case of Tacitus, himself, the master of rhetoric.

.We have found that he is exceedingly accurate in the giving of facts but he presents the "most precarious hearsay" which, it is not too much to say, he would have us believe; he presents facts of which he destroys the effect, if he does not "turn them into falsehood" by his rhetorical devices. Still, in forming our opinion of Tacitus as an historian, we must remember that he was presenting the picture of Tiberius which prevailed in his own life-time, and his portraiture is accurate in that respect. Also his avowed purpose in writing history was to present virtues to posterity, so that they may be imitated and also to display vice for the same purpose. As De Bury (*Les Femmes de l'Empire*) has said, "He summons the guilty to his tribunal, and it is in the name of the Future and of Posterity that he pronounces the implacable and irreversible verdict." So, keeping in mind his purpose, the time at which he wrote and his accurate and honest statement of facts we may say that Tacitus was a great and good man, and with this admixture of excellences a great historian.