WARPED INTERTEXTUALITIES: NAEVIIUS AND SALLUST AT TACITUS HISTORIES 2.12.2

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

Introduction

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

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

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

---

1 For example, Lucan exploits the notion once Caesar has crossed the Rubicon in 49 BC. Reports spread that ‘…qua Nar Tiberino inlabitus amni / barbaricas saevi discurrece Caesaris alas’ (Pharsalia 1.475-6) and men think of Caesar as ‘victo…immanior hoste’ (Pharsalia 1.480).
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images, but the old Roman is gradually superseded by the northern barbarian as Tacitus brings into play more conspicuous markers of foreignness which put Otho in context. The fact that part of the Othonian force consists of the ‘deforme…auxilium’ (2.11.2) of two thousand gladiators also contributes to the invading battle column’s foreign identity. Note too that Tacitus carefully exaggerates the peaceful country atmosphere and the idyllic landscape dominated by farmers: ‘pleni agri, apertae domus’ (2.12.2). The simple farmer who was also a fierce soldier was an important figure in idealised Roman views of their ancestors. The initial response of the country people hardly lives up to such patriotic images, but perhaps Marius Maturus’ retaliation force, pointedly described as ‘iuventus’ (2.12.3), will coalesce better with this stereotype. Yet Tacitus quickly reinforces his initial paradoxical subversion of the farmer-soldier category when these young men are cut down at the first charge by the ruthless ‘foreign’ invaders.

Tacitus’ device of civil war being conducted as if it were a foreign campaign is central to the Histories. For example at 1.84.3 Otho derisively claimed that most of Vitellius’ supporters were ‘Germani’, or at 2.87.2, Vitellius’ soldiers strip the fields bare ‘ut hostile solum’, or again at 2.90.1, Vitellius makes a speech in Rome ‘tamquam apud alius civitatis senatum populumque’.

Tacitus adds similar color at Annals 15.58.1-2: after the failed

---

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


8 This may be an extension of the ‘altera Roma’ topos, in which a disloyal citizen tries to transfer the capital elsewhere and treats the mother city as alien. See P. Ceausescu, ‘Altera Roma: Histoire d’une Folie Politique’, Historia 25 (1976) 79-107, who notes how
Pisonian conspiracy against Nero, Rome is dominated by ‘pedites eq-
uitesque, permixti Germanis, quibus fidebat princeps quasi externis’. Nero, 
despite being princeps, is virtually putting his capital city under siege. In the 
Histories especially, this literary stratagem may reflect a pervasive desire 
amongst Roman writers and their audience to rationalise civil war and to 
make it easier to process emotionally: if the enemy was ‘foreign’, then the 
internal conflict did not seem so self-destructive. Moreover, it made it 
much easier to rally people together against the common foe. Cicero knew 
this when he chose to characterise Catiline as an enemy in the senate’s 
midst, perniciously allied with an alien force hovering outside the gates of 
Rome, as at In Catilinam 1.5: ‘Castra sunt in Italia contra populum Ro-
manum in Etruriae faucibus conlocata; crescit in dies singulos hostium nu-
merus’.

Two literary allusions

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

transit Melitam
exercitus Romanus. insulam integram

Vespolian self-consciously aligned himself with Rome by means of the coin types Roma 
resurgens, Roma victrix, and Roma perpetua.

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

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

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

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

---


14 For this incident at Tyndaris see Polybius 1.25.1-4 with F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius Volume I* (Cambridge 1957) 82. There is a tantalising fragmentary reference in Festus, *De Verborum Significatu* (Leipzig 1913) edited by W.M. Lindsay, 156 on the ‘navalis corona’: ‘<M.> Atilius bel< lo>… < scrip> tum est in car< mine>…’. The victory at Tyndaris is probably the reference point, but could the *carmen* be Naevius’ *Bellum Punicum*? Festus cites Naevius’ epic as *carmen* on 306 (Lindsay); no other form of full reference is certainly visible. One might also consider the possibility that with *carmen* here Festus is referring to an *elogium* in verse of Atilius Regulus; cf. Cicero *De Senectute* 61, quoting from the *elogium* of A. Atilius Caiatinus (cos. 258, 254) and adding ‘notum est id totum carmen incisum in sepulcro’ (cf. *De finibus* 2.116).
for the raiders, whereas Regulus’ army targets Carthaginian troops on Malta and reaps rich rewards. Moreover, the Malta campaign was a prelude to a further Roman success against the Carthaginians, but the Othonians will only kill other Romans, including Agricola’s mother at Albintimilium. Therefore echoes of the Naevian passage, which outlined a Roman victory against a foreign enemy, heighten the pointless self-destruction of the AD 68-9 civil war. The allusion may also obliquely recall the literary topos whereby an author laments how much foreign territory the Romans could have gained had they not turned against themselves so catastrophically in civil war.\(^{15}\) Moreover, if, as one critic has argued, the paratactic format of this *Bellum Punicum* fragment evokes the bald style of triumphal military inscriptions, Tacitus *Histories* 2.12.2 offers further ironic undercurrents given the civil war context.\(^{16}\)

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

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

---


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

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

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

---

...
ploits a paratactic style for full impact, just as Naevius did in the fragment. 

Fourthly, there are rich interpretative consequences which are highly appropriate to Tacitus’ general inversion of the civilis / hostis categories here and elsewhere in the Histories. Cumulatively, these points suggest that Tacitus’ allusion to Naevius was deliberate, pointed and pertinent to his wider narrative themes.

Yet there are further allusive layers to unravel. Tacitus’ use of the word ‘metus’ at Histories 2.12.2 triggers another relevant association. Heraeus’ edition suggests that it means ‘Schrecknisse, Veranlassungen zur Furcht’ and offers as a parallel Histories 4.5.2.\(^2\) The word in this context seems to mean a ‘cause of fear’ or ‘terror’: this is rather a poetical expression, and thus one which follows on neatly from Tacitus’ allusion to Naevius’ poetry.\(^2\) Why then did Tacitus choose ‘metus’ rather than ‘irruptio’ or ‘incursio’? One reason is that the word contains a second oblique but suggestive reference to the Carthaginian enemy. The most well-known ‘metus’ occurs in the phrase ‘metus hostilis’, used by Sallust at Jugurtha 41.2.\(^5\) Here Sallust refers to the notion that the destruction of Carthage was a turning-point in Roman history. The removal of this foreign enemy created a vacuum which led to internal strife and significantly contributed to Rome’s decline. Therefore the AD68-9 civil war can be seen in a wider context as another manifestation of these self-destructive tendencies which developed in the absence of a decent external foe. Yet although the Othonians are being temporarily characterised through a foreign filter, the irony is that they are a Roman force.

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


\(^{5}\) See TLL VIII 910.77-911.22 for ‘metus’ used in this sense by Silius Italicus, Lucan, Propertius, Ovid, Statius, Seneca and Valerius Flaccus.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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