STUDIES IN CONTEMPORARY HISTORIOGRAPHY

HISTOS
The Online Journal of Ancient Historiography
FOUNDING EDITOR: J. L. MOLES (1949–2015)

Histos Supplements
Supervisory Editor: John Marincola

1. ANTONY ERICH RAUBITSCHEK, *Autobiography*. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Donald Lateiner (2014).
2. A. J. WOODMAN, *Lost Histories: Selected Fragments of Roman Historical Writers* (2015).
3. FELIX JACOBY, *On the Development of Greek Historiography and the Plan for a New Collection of the Fragments of the Greek Historians*. Translated with notes by Mortimer Chambers and Stefan Schorn (2015).
4. ANTHONY ELLIS, ed., *God in History: Reading and Rewriting Herodotean Theology from Plutarch to the Renaissance* (2015).
5. RICHARD FERNANDO BUXTON, ed., *Aspects of Leadership in Xenophon* (2016).
6. EMILY BARAGWANATH and EDITH FOSTER, edd., *Clio and Thalia: Attic Comedy and Historiography* (2017).
7. J. L. MOLES, *A Commentary on Plutarch's* Brutus (2017).
8. ALEXANDER MEEUS, ed., *History and Narrative in Hellenistic Historiography* (2018).
9. GEOFFREY GREATREX, ed., *Work on Procopius outside the English-Speaking World: A Survey* (2019).
10. PAUL CHRISTESEN, *A New Reading of the Damonon Stele* (2019).
11. CHRISTY CONSTANTAKOPOULOU and MARIA FRAGOULAKI, edd. *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece: Poetry, Historiography, and Epigraphy* (2020).
12. RACHEL BRUZZONE, ed., Polemos *and his Children: War, its Repercussions, and Narrative in Ancient Greek Literature* (2021).
13. BRUNO CURRIE, *Herodotus as Homeric Critic* (2021).
14. IVAN MATIJAŠIĆ, ed., *Herodotus—The Most Homeric Historian?* (2022).
15. ANDREW G. SCOTT, ed., *Studies in Contemporary Historiography* (2023).

STUDIES IN CONTEMPORARY HISTORIOGRAPHY

Edited by

ANDREW G. SCOTT

HISTOS SUPPLEMENT 15

2023

Oxford • Edmonton • Tallahassee

Published by

HISTOS

ISSN (Online): 2046-5963 (Print): 2046-5955

www.histos.org

Published online 28 April 2023

© 2023 THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface vii

About the Authors ix

1. Introduction: The Methodology, Politics, and Value of Contemporary Historiography
Andrew G. Scott 1

2. Being There: Three Examples of Brief Dialogue in Herodotus and Thucydides
Christopher Baron 15

3. Contemporary Historiography and Ptolemy's Creation of an 'Egyptian' Alexander
Frances Pownall 39

4. Caesar's Talkative Centurions: Anecdotal Speech, Soldierly *Fides*, and Contemporary History
Lydia Spielberg 65

5. Sallust and the 'Modern' Lie
Jennifer Gerrish 107

6. Tacitus and the Older Generation: Fatherhood and its Alternatives in the *Agricola*
Adam M. Kemezis 133

7. Autopsy from a Broken Monarchy: Trauma-based Readings from Cassius Dio's Contemporary Rome
Jesper Majbom Madsen 163

8. The Images of Young Tyrants: Representation and Reality in Herodian's *Roman History*
Andrew G. Scott 191

This page intentionally left blank.

PREFACE

This volume examines various aspects of contemporary historiography in the ancient Greek and Roman worlds. The term 'contemporary historiography' (Jacoby's *Zeitgeschichte*) is usually applied to historical works that cover, in whole or in part, the periods of time through which the historians themselves lived. These works are typically valued for their proximity to the events they narrate, though they are not without their problems of interpretation. Through various devices, authors might attempt to give the impression of eyewitness status even when they themselves were not present; contemporary events could shift authors' point of view and compel them to provide unrealistic or biased accounts; and memories of eyewitnesses were not always sharp. The papers in this volume examine how we might read and understand histories of this type. They demonstrate how contemporary historiography was practiced across time and how it was a constantly evolving part of the Greco-Roman historiographic tradition.

The papers on Herodotus and Thucydides, Julius Caesar, Cassius Dio, and Herodian originated in a session held at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Classical Studies in San Diego in 2019. To the original four papers presented there have been added chapters on Ptolemy I Soter, Sallust, and Tacitus.

My thanks go to the contributors to this supplement, for their dedication and persistence, and to John Marincola, for his help and patience in bringing this work to publication. I also thank the anonymous reviewers, who offered many criticisms and suggestions for the improvement of this volume as a whole.

A.G.S.
Philadelphia, November 2022

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

CHRISTOPHER BARON is Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Notre Dame. He specialises in Greek and Roman historiography and Greek history, especially in the Hellenistic and Imperial ages. His publications include *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography* (Cambridge University Press, 2013); *Cassius Dio and the Late Roman Republic*, co-edited with Josiah Osgood (Brill, 2019); *The Herodotus Encyclopedia* (Wiley, 2021); and numerous articles and book chapters. Among his current projects is a monograph on *Greek Historians under the Roman Empire*.

JENNIFER GERRISH is Associate Professor of Classics at the College of Charleston. Her research focuses primarily on Latin historiography, with particular interest in allusion and intertextuality in the ancient historians and conceptions of civil war. Her publications include *Sallust's* Histories *and Triumviral Historiography* (Routledge, 2019) and a translation and commentary of Caesar's *Gallic Wars* Books 5–6 for the Aris and Phillips series (2022). She is currently working on a translation and commentary of *Gallic Wars* 1–2 as well as a monograph on literary allusion in Caesar's commentaries.

ADAM M. KEMEZIS is Associate Professor in the Department of History, Classics, and Religion at the University of Alberta. He is the author of *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian* (Cambridge University Press, 2014) and co-editor (with Colin Bailey and Beatrice Poletti) of *The Intellectual Climate of Cassius Dio: Greek and Roman Pasts* (Brill, 2022). He has published numerous articles on Roman imperial historiography and history, as well as the Greek culture of the Roman Empire.

JESPER MAJBOM MADSEN is Associate Professor of History at the University of Southern Denmark. He is co-editor (with Carsten H. Lange) of Brill's 'Historiography of Rome and Its Empire' series. His books include

Eager to be Roman: Greek Response to Roman Rule in Pontus and Bithynia (Duckworth, 2009) and *From Trophy Towns to City-States: Urban Civilization and Cultural Identities in Roman Pontus* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020), as well as the co-edited volume (with Roger Rees) *Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing: Double Vision* (Brill, 2014). Apart from the co-edited volume (with C. H. Lange) *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician* (Brill, 2016) he has published extensively on Cassius Dio including 'Cassius Dio and the Cult of Iulius and Roma at Ephesus and Nicaea (51.20.6–8)' (*Classical Quarterly*, 2016) and *Cassius Dio* (Bloomsbury, 2020).

FRANCES POWNALL is Professor of Classics in the Department of History, Classics, and Religion at the University of Alberta. She has published widely on Greek history and historiography, and has contributed extensively to *Brill's New Jacoby*. Recent publications include *Ancient Macedonians in the Greek and Roman Sources* (co-edited with T. Howe, Classical Press of Wales, 2018), *Lexicon of Argead Macedonia* (co-edited with W. Heckel, J. Heinrichs, and S. Müller, Frank and Timme, 2020), *Affective Relations & Personal Bonds in Hellenistic Antiquity* (co-edited with E. M. Anson and M. D'Agostini, Oxbow, 2020), and *The Courts of Philip II and Alexander the Great: Monarchy and Power in Ancient Macedonia* (co-edited with S. Asirvatham and S. Müller, De Gruyter, 2022).

ANDREW G. SCOTT is Associate Professor of Classical Studies at Villanova University. He is the author of *Emperors and Usurpers: an historical commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 79(78)–80(80) (217–229 CE)* (Oxford University Press, 2018) and *An Age of Iron and Rust: Cassius Dio and the History of His Time* (Brill, 2023). He is also co-editor (with C. H. Lange) of *Cassius Dio: The Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War* (Brill, 2020) and (with Jesper Majbom Madsen) of *Brill's Companion to Cassius Dio* (Brill, 2023).

LYDIA SPIELBERG is Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her primary areas of research are Roman historiography, ancient rhetoric and rhetorical education, and speech representation. She is currently working on a monograph on quoted speech in the Roman historians.

Histos Supplement 15 (2023) 133–61

6

TACITUS AND THE OLDER GENERATION: FATHERHOOD AND ITS ALTERNATIVES IN THE *AGRICOLA**

Adam M. Kemezis

Abstract: While fatherhood in the abstract and generational succession are major themes throughout Tacitus' *Agricola*, biological father-son relationships are surprisingly under-emphasised. This article examines how Tacitus portrays Agricola's father, Graecinus. Graecinus was a significant exemplary figure thanks to his noble death under Caligula, but Tacitus allots him only one sentence. I argue that this is a marked choice that by implication positions Graecinus as a negative *exemplum* for his more circumspect but effective son. This move of Tacitus' is considered in relation to his portrayal of the 'Stoic martyrs' and to questions of generational continuity within the Roman elite between the hereditary Flavian dynasty and the age of the adopted emperor Trajan.

Keywords: Tacitus, fatherhood, Trajan, Agricola, Domitian, succession

We experience contemporary history generationally. What recent events mean to someone depends heavily on how those events map onto their life-cycle and the age-determined social roles and relationships they are involved in when the events occur. Thus for middle-aged adults, the story of two or three decades ago is something they experienced in person, but also at second hand, as the story of their parents and their parents' contemporaries. This is above all true of the political history of a patriarchal society, in which the leading roles are typically reserved for men of mature years. Few works of Roman literature illustrate

* The author is grateful to the editor for the invitation to contribute, to panel attendees from the Classical Association of Canada annual meeting (Winnipeg, 2013) at which a version of this article was presented, to the anonymous referees, and to Jakub Pigón for many useful suggestions and corrections. The text of the *Agricola* is cited from Woodman–Kraus (2014), with consultation of other editions where appropriate. Translations are my own.

this more clearly than Tacitus' *Agricola*. This text, written likely during the joint reign of Nerva and Trajan (97–8 CE), is explicitly a posthumous tribute to the author's father-in-law, who had died in 93 after a career of military command under Nero and the Flavians. Yet from its preface on, the *Agricola* evokes (in the first-person plural) a wider, multi-generational experience of Domitian's era and the need to process it in the present. This chapter will explore how Tacitus expresses the experience of his coevals through narrating the relationships of sons to their fathers and father-figures. In particular I examine apparent tensions between biological fatherhood, in the shape of Agricola's own father, and the many surrogate or alternative forms of intergenerational male relationships present in the text.

It scarcely needs underlining how crucial paternity was to self-definition among elite Roman males at all periods.[1] From the everyday *paterfamilias* with his distinctive legal powers to senators as *patres conscripti* and the emperor as *pater patriae*, Roman culture has left us with one icon after another of idealised fatherhood, but also of filial piety. It is not so much that the elite Roman male always speaks as a father. Just as often he speaks as a son modelling his relationship to a father or other older male. This is how we see Tacitus in the *Agricola*, a text that he characterises from the start as a *professio pietatis* (*Agr.* 3.3) and which at times takes the tone of the funeral oration that a son would have been expected to give for his father.[2] Except of course that Tacitus is not Agricola's son. Agricola left no son, and Tacitus' surviving writings never mention his own father.[3] This absence or occlusion of direct paternal continuity is far from exceptional given the demographic circumstances of the Roman elite, particularly the high childhood mortality, low life-expectancy for adults, and relatively late age of first marriage for men.[4] For a father to be present long into his children's adult lives was very much the exception rather than the rule. Given how saturated Roman society was with patriarchal language, it is not surprising that elite Roman males reflected often on ways of filling an absent patriarch's role by proxy. Adoption, tutelage, and other less formal mechanisms existed to provide

[1] Studies of various aspects of Roman fatherhood will be cited throughout this article, but here one may mention Eyben (1991) for an overview of *loci classici* about fathers, Wlosok (1978) for close readings of several key texts, and Saller (1994) for a social-historical study of the functioning of paternity.

[2] On the role of the son in a *laudatio funebris*, see Flower (1996) 130–1.

[3] For Tacitus' probable father, see *PIR*^{2} C1466.

[4] For a recent analysis of the demographic phenomena involved, see Scheidel (2009), drawing on the influential work of Saller (1994) 73–93.

fatherless children with substitutes, and there was a well developed discourse around this surrogate role.[5] For young men in particular, because of the typical age gap between husbands and wives, one's father-in-law was more likely than one's biological father to be still living, and the *socer–gener* relationship had its own particular set of social expectations.[6]

Having such a rich world of father substitutes, however, only opened up the question of how one positioned these roles relative to biological paternity. Were surrogate paternal relationships simply substitutes, satisfactory or otherwise, for an unavailable reality, or did they have positive qualities of their own, such as the possibility of choosing and being chosen out of personal and ethical affinity, or a simpler affective relationship free of the power differential that went with *patria potestas*?[7] This article will consider how questions of this kind play out in the *Agricola*. While this text is an idealised enactment of the *socer-gener* relationship, there is one biological *pater* whose role deserves more exploration than it has thus far received, namely Julius Graecinus, father of Agricola. Graecinus, as will emerge, was before his death under Caligula a not insignificant figure in his generation, one whom a good number of Tacitus' pedigree-conscious readers would have known of and expected to read about in any biographical work on his son.[8] This expectation is largely disappointed in Tacitus' text: in one of the fullest biographies in extant Latin literature, only one sentence will be devoted to the subject's father. This is surely a deliberate authorial choice.

This chapter is concerned with the implications of that choice both for the meaning of the *Agricola* and for our understanding of how Romans talked about familial, political, and cultural continuity at a key moment of dynastic change after the fall of the Flavians. In particular, Tacitus markedly avoids using Graecinus as a positive role model for his son, and implicitly presents him as a negative one. This helps Tacitus to sharpen his idealised portrait of Agricola as a pragmatic sort of senatorial aristocrat who is able to be of

[5] See on this point esp. Bernstein (2009) and Harders (2010).

[6] Most recently Gowers (2019) has read the *Agricola* alongside parts of the Ciceronian corpus as 'son-in-law literature' modelling idealised *socer-gener* relationships. In what follows, I often use the Latin terms *socer* and *gener* rather than their English equivalents, mostly to avoid such inelegant phrases as 'father-in-law-son-in-law relationships'.

[7] For the argument that the emotional aspects of father-son relationships were heavily affected by *patria potestas*, see Cantarella (2003).

[8] Suetonius makes full use of emperors' fathers (above all Germanicus in *Cal.* 1–6, as Jakub Pigón points out to me). Often they serve to set the thematic background for the life, if only, like Germanicus, by contrast. For other examples, see Garrett (2021).

service to Rome even in a time of political dysfunction. Furthermore, Agricola's seeming avoidance of his father's example is part of a larger pattern whereby Tacitus' protagonist judiciously interprets the stories of the various older men in his life to steer for himself a course that follows no single forerunner, thus retaining a level of initiative that might have been inhibited if he were still embedded in the obligations of filial *pietas* and *patria potestas*. Nonetheless, Agricola's seeming neglect or even rejection of his father's example is not without its discursive problems, and I will be exploring how Agricola's and Graecinus' stories work against the background of Tacitus' own self-positioning and of the uncertainties surrounding biological and adoptive succession at the start of Trajan's reign.

As will become clear, the questions that Tacitus poses around Agricola relative to his father-figures apply to Tacitus himself relative to Agricola, to Trajan relative to his predecessors, and to Tacitus' contemporaries relative to their counterparts under the Flavians.[9] Although the *Agricola* for the most part takes place in the 60s to early 80s CE, Tacitus, from the first pages on, implicates it in the problems of the post-Domitianic age. In this same sense, much of what we call 'contemporary history' in antiquity represents not so much immediate reportage as the processing by mature adults (authors but also part of the readership) of events from their youth. In the case of the *Agricola,* men like Tacitus, who began their adult public lives under the last Flavian and now have to deal with his successors, are coming to terms with the legacy of men like Agricola, who ended their careers under Domitian after building them under Vespasian, and Nero before him. This generational division can be seen toward the end of the *Agricola* preface when, after a brief flourish of optimism about the new era of Nerva and Trajan, the fifteen-year reign of the un-named previous emperor is characterised in ruefully emotive terms (3.2):[10]

[9] The idea of Nerva's reign as a watershed in Roman culture has been rightly questioned, but it remains one that contemporary authors clearly found it fruitful to think with, as Tacitus does here. For questions of periodisation, see now König–Whitton (2018) and many of the essays in that book.

[10] This passage can usefully be contrasted with the Severan narrative of Cassius Dio, as explored in this volume by Madsen, below, Ch. 6. Dio, as Madsen shows, constructs a unified senatorial experience of persecution by successive rulers over more than 40 years down to 222 with continued dysfunction under Alexander, such that only the older generation (including Dio) can remember properly functioning government, which makes his perspective normative. Tacitus (necessarily) posits a sharp break in the immediate past after Domitian's death, which comes at different life-cycle stages for different generations, of which he identifies with the younger.

Quid si per quindecim annos, grande mortalis aevi spatium, multi fortuitis casibus, promptissimus quisque saevitia principis interciderunt, pauci et (ut ita dixerim) non modo aliorum sed etiam nostri superstites sumus, exemptis e media vita tot annis, quibus iuvenes ad senectutem, senes prope ad ipsos exactae aetatis terminos per silentium venimus?

What, then, if during fifteen years, a great stretch of one's mortal term, many have died by chance events, and all the bravest by the cruelty of the emperor? And we are few and, as I might say, the survivors not just of those others but of ourselves as well. There are so many lost years from the span of our lives, years during which young men have become old and old men have almost reached the very end of their appointed time, and all in silence.

The experience of recent years, while uniformly negative, still takes two (and only two) distinct generational forms. One of these, the former *iuvenes*, the author identifies with himself, while the other includes his subject.[11] The two groups are going through the chronological motions of age-group succession. However, the cessation of public life and discourse summed up by *exemptis annis* and *per silentium* make one question whether the processes that ensure the continuity of the political elite, the 'passing of the torch' as it were, have been able to take place.[12] Since the quoted passage is immediately followed by a sentence that appears to anticipate the writing of Tacitus' *Histories*, we are left to wonder if the elite's task of recording the past is one

[11] Since Tacitus is about forty years old when these lines are written, he is stretching a rhetorical point by claiming to have become a *senex*. In part this is because his parallel structure requires male adulthood to be divided into three stages that might be characterised as 'youth–maturity–old age', each encompassing fifteen years. Latin age-group vocabulary does not have a single convenient noun for a man in the second stage, maturity or middle age, i.e., a *senex* as Tacitus uses it here. Thus Varro's set of fifteen-year stages of aging (*ap.* Cens. *die nat.* 14.2) has *iuvenes* going from 30 to 45 and *senes* beginning at 60, with those between referred to as *seniores*. It is clear that terminology was highly adaptable to one's immediate rhetorical needs, and the point here may be to emphasise that Tacitus' generation have prematurely aged and Domitian has robbed them of the peak period of their lives as public men. Ten or more years later, in the *Histories* preface, Tacitus will imply that *senectus* still lies in his future (*principatum divi Nervae … senectuti seposui*, 1.1.4). For a summary of Greco-Roman schemes of the stages of aging, see Parkin (2003) 15–18.

[12] For O'Gorman (2020) 156, Tacitus is here signalling Domitian's reign as a near interruption in a generational tradition of political values and practices among senators.

of the functions that has been interrupted. It is only after this ambivalent chord has sounded that Tacitus modulates into the key of *pietas* by declaring that the subject of this biography will be his *socer*, whom he then names for the first time (3.3). Tacitus' quasi-filial relationship with his subject becomes a pattern for how the *senes* of Tacitus' world are to understand the men who were *senes* when they themselves were young. The patterning, crucially, is recursive.[13] One way to answer the question of how we relate to the previous generation is to find out how they related to their own forbears. In Agricola's case, Tacitus sets up that move by his brief but significant portrait of Graecinus.

Graecinus Before Tacitus

Before examining the crucial passage of the *Agricola*, however, we need to glance briefly at the background against which Tacitus wrote, the references to Graecinus in earlier literature. Agricola's father came from an equestrian family in southern Gaul and must have been born late in the reign of Augustus. An inscription (*CIL* VI.41069) attests that he rose to be tribune of the plebs and praetor. But for his early death, he might well have moved his family from equestrian to consular rank in one generation. We have significant posthumous references to him in two of his longer-lived contemporaries. The shorter one is in Columella, whose *De re rustica*, written perhaps twenty years after Graecinus' death, completes an opening survey of previous agricultural writers by naming Graecinus as the author of a two-book treatise on viticulture that is 'written with much charm and learning' (*Rust.* 1.1.14: *composita facetius et eruditius*). The longer is in the younger Seneca, who mentions him most extensively in the *De beneficiis* (2.21.4).[14] In discussing the sorts of people one should and should not accept favours from, Seneca tells the following story about Graecinus (2.21.5–6):

> Si exemplo magni animi opus est, utamur Graecini Iulii, viri egregii, quem C. Caesar occidit ob hoc unum, quod melior vir erat, quam esse quemquam tyranno expedit. Is cum ab amicis conferentibus ad inpensam ludorum pecunias acciperet, magnam pecuniam a Fabio

[13] Langlands (2018) 94 notes a recursive pattern in exemplary ethics, whereby characters like Scipio Africanus or Horatius are both *exempla* in themselves and readers of earlier *exempla*.

[14] See on the episode Griffin (2013) 200.

Persico missam non accepit et obiurgantibus iis, qui non aestimant mittentes, sed missa, quod repudiasset: 'Ego' inquit 'ab eo beneficium accipiam, a quo propinationem accepturus non sum?' Cum illi Rebilus consularis, homo eiusdem infamiae, maiorem summam misisset instaretque, ut accipi iuberet: 'Rogo' inquit 'ignoscas; et a Persico non accepi'. Utrum hoc munera accipere est an senatum legere?

But if we need an example of a noble spirit, let us use that of Julius Graecinus, an eminent man whom Gaius Caesar killed for this one reason, that he was a better man than it suits a tyrant for anyone to be. When he was receiving money from friends, who were contributing for the expenses of his games, he did not take a great sum sent by Fabius Persicus [a senator apparently known for pathic sexual behaviour]. Those who take account of the gift but not the giver chided him for refusing, and he said 'Am I to accept a favour from a man from whom I won't accept a toast?' When the consular Rebilus, a man known for the same vice, sent him a greater sum, and was pressing him to allow it to be taken, he said 'Do forgive me, I didn't take Persicus' money either.' Is this accepting gifts or reviewing the Senate?

The use of Graecinus as an *exemplum* surely testifies to his posthumous reputation, and Seneca's brief mention of his eventual fate indicates that the earlier incident was typical of how his character was remembered.[15] Still, one can imagine the story being read as a less straightforwardly positive lesson than it appears in Seneca. Graecinus' rise and conspicuous talent made it inevitable that powerful people would want to do him favours, including people to whom he would not wish to be indebted. This created awkward social dilemmas that he resolved with an integrity untainted by tact. Another man might have tried to find a quieter way of declining that would minimise offence to the would-be benefactors, who were consulars of some standing. Graecinus, on the contrary, seems quite happy to make a

[15] In what follows, I use *exemplum* in a relatively narrow sense to refer to figures and anecdotes that had wide public circulation, usually by literary means, and were widely viewed as expressing or setting general moral norms. This broadly follows Roller (2018) 3–8, though not all parts of his schema are present in all instances that I refer to as *exempla*. Other forms of role-modelling, in particular those based on individual personal relationships rather than in public contexts, are not here referred to as *exempla*. The topic of exemplarity and its ethical ramifications has now received full treatments from Roller and from Langlands (2018).

powerful enemy, if in doing so he can make a cutting epigram.[16] Furthermore, Seneca's reference to *senatum legere* casts Graecinus as a censor, by tradition a morally exalted role, but a potentially invidious one unsuited to a young man in need of peer approval, and one which in the contemporary world infringed on the emperor's prerogatives. One does not need a modern distaste for Graecinus' policing of his peers' sexual activities to see how his behaviour might create difficulties if taken as a norm.

Graecinus in the *Agricola*

Tacitus likely knew of Seneca's anecdote and surely knew of the incident it described.[17] If we turn now to Tacitus' own short narrative of Graecinus and his death, that story seems like an ominous foreshadowing. The account runs as follows (*Agr.* 4.1):

> Pater illi Iulius Graecinus senatorii ordinis, studio eloquentiae sapientiaeque notus, iisque ipsis virtutibus iram Gai Caesaris meritus: namque Marcum Silanum accusare iussus et, quia abnuerat, interfectus est.

> His [Agricola's] father was Julius Graecinus of the senatorial order, well known for his pursuit of eloquence and philosophy, who by those very attainments earned the wrath of Gaius Caesar. For he was told to prosecute Marcus Silanus and, because he refused, was killed.

Tacitus' Graecinus is a talented young man with a particular combination of abilities that gets him in trouble with Caligula. The compressed language conveys a complex dilemma: Graecinus' *studium eloquentiae sapientiaeque* attracts the anger of Caligula, but it is not simply a case of a stereotypical tyrant resenting and fearing virtue wherever it occurs. The

[16] A similar tendency can be seen in Seneca's other mention of Graecinus, at *Ep.* 29.6. When Graecinus was asked his opinion of Aristo, a philosopher who was known for going everywhere in a carriage, he said 'I couldn't tell you, I don't know how he does when he's dismounted' (*nescio enim quid de gradu faciat*), apparently likening the philosopher to a chariot-gladiator (*essedarius*).

[17] For Tacitus' reading of Seneca, see Ker (2012) 313–15, who points out a near-quotation of the *de Beneficiis* (4.17.3) at *Agr.* 42.3. The consular Caninius Rebilus receives an obituary notice at *Ann.* 13.30, where his dignity in death seems to Tacitus inconsistent with his being *ob libidines muliebriter infamis*.

specific talents, and their being known about (*notus*) create the story. As with the incident in Seneca, Graecinus' *eloquentia* causes him to be offered an opportunity that it is morally compromising to accept but politically dangerous to reject. In this case the consequences of offending his would-be benefactor are much more serious, but his philosophical principles (*sapientia*) win out.[18] Caligula's invitation forces him to choose between death and self-betrayal, and that invitation is portrayed as an inevitable consequence of his talents becoming known.

On one level, this story is, like Seneca's, a positive portrait that establishes Agricola's *bona fides* as being from a virtuous family that was victimised by earlier tyrants as he himself will be by Domitian.[19] Nonetheless, the anecdote is remarkably brief and plain, with no really emotive language, as compared to the affecting portrait of Agricola's mother that follows it. This might be natural given that Agricola knew his mother and not his father. There was no way for Graecinus to play in person the didactic role that Romans saw as a strength of their culturally distinctive form of paternity.[20] But precisely because it was so common for Roman aristocrats to lose their fathers at a young age, Tacitus had ample rhetorical means at his disposal to create a link between a dead father and his son, and he uses none of them. In particular, there is no suggestion that the father's memory served as an inspiration or an *exemplum* to the son. This is all the more remarkable given both Graecinus' appearance in Seneca, which is presumably evidence of a wider persistence of his memory, and the often-observed affinities between the *Agricola* and the funerary *laudatio,* a genre ideally suited for imagining intergenerational continuity.[21] We can be certain that the real-life Agricola

[18] Thus the interpretation of Woodman–Kraus (2014) 97, for whom *iisdem ipsis virtutibus* represents a sort of zeugma, *eloquentia* making him useful and *sapientia* obliging him to refuse. It is possible, however, that Graecinus' *sapientia* also makes him more desirable as a prosecutor, because of the moral authority he would bring to the job, while conversely the anecdotes from Seneca suggest that in refusing he might have employed his *eloquentia* with self-destructive effect.

[19] This is the reading of Castelli (1971), Guerrini (1977) 482 n. 5, and recently Balmaceda (2017) 162. Woodman–Kraus (2014) 97 do note that 'the danger of one's *virtutes* incurring the imperial anger was a lesson that his son tried to learn'.

[20] On Roman tropes of paternal instruction, see LeMoine (1991). It is notable that the tradition of fathers dedicating didactic works to sons begins with Cato the Elder, to whom Tacitus alludes in the opening lines of the *Agricola*. Agricola was born too late to be the dedicatee of his father's treatise, though his *cognomen* is curiously suggestive of it.

[21] It is possible that Tacitus' narrative of Graecinus is expressly constructed as a riposte to Seneca's *exemplum*-making. The *de Beneficiis* dates to some point between 56 and 64 (see

heard a great deal of praise of his father, and faced conflicting pressures both to follow his example and to avoid his fate.[22] But if Agricola ever looked at his father's *imago* (literal or otherwise) and came thus to aspire to virtue, we are not told a thing about it.

Tacitus makes it clear which of those pressures won out, which on one level explains why he does not give Graecinus a greater role. As the next section demonstrates, Agricola's career is very different from his father's. The eponymous protagonist is portrayed as, in Ronald Mellor's words, 'the first of the Tacitean survivors, through whom the historian praises accommodation and justifies his own career'.[23] He is flexible rather than intransigent, able to do good from within a bad system without becoming morally compromised. But we should not, because of this dissimilarity, read Graecinus as a minor figure whose role Tacitus minimises because his quasi-martyrdom is thematically inconvenient. In that case, Tacitus might have told his story differently, with less emphasis on the conflict with Caligula and Graecinus' moral agency in it.[24] Rather, Graecinus is well integrated into his overall rhetorical strategy. I want to suggest that this brief episode establishes a specific agenda for his son's career. The remarkable thing is not that Tacitus sets up Agricola and Graecinus as dissimilar (which presumably they were) but that he portrays their situations as so similar, both comprising the dilemma of being able, ambitious, and upright in an authoritarian climate where that is a dangerous combination of qualities. Their responses differ greatly, which generates moral and political questions that go beyond the men's individual characters and persist into Tacitus' contemporary moment. It is evidently Agricola's response that Tacitus is mainly interested in, but by placing it in the context of a father-son relationship, the historian adds layers

Griffin (2013) 91–6 for the difficulties of any more precise dating). This would have been Agricola's mid-teens to early twenties, perhaps coinciding with his 'philosophical' phase.

[22] On the aristocratic Roman obligation to live up to one's ancestors, see Baroin (2010). For a situation curiously parallel to Agricola's, see Plin. *Ep.* 3.3, in which Pliny, advising the widowed Corellia Hispulla on the education of her son, repeatedly stresses the boy's duty to display similarity to a series of male ancestors including his father, but more prominently his maternal grandfather, the addressee's own father. The idea of masks as inspiration goes back to Sallust (*Iug.* 4.5–6) and before him Polybius (6.53).

[23] Mellor (1993) 13.

[24] Tacitus probably makes the connection between Graecinus' refusal and his death artificially direct, since Silanus' and Graecinus' deaths appear to have come at least a year apart (see Soverini (2004) 126). Furthermore, Tacitus' *quia abnuerat* lays rather more stress on Graecinus' own actions than Seneca's vague *melior vir erat, quam esse quemquam tyranno expedit.*

of complexity for readers to consider in deciding how well Agricola's solution to his dilemma works.

Agricola Avoids His Father's Footsteps

Explicit characterisation of Graecinus in the *Agricola* is short indeed, being arguably confined to four words, *studio eloquentiae sapientiaeque notus*. They are four peculiarly loaded words, however, and each of them will turn out on examination to illuminate what it means for Agricola to be a different man in the same world as his father. To start at the end, the idea of being *notus* touches on the larger themes of fame and recognition that preoccupy the *Agricola* from its first sentence to its last. Evidently it is Tacitus' purpose to make Agricola *notus*, but within the narrative, being recognised for one's virtues is by no means an unqualified good. After all, being *notus* by the wrong people is what brought Graecinus to his fatal predicament. Tacitus does not suggest that Graecinus sought out fame in a reckless way: rather he presents the situation as a natural consequence of the eager pursuit (*studium*) of areas in which to display one's abilities. Under bad rulers, one has to actively avoid the dangers of recognition, and Agricola will be very careful about who notices him and when. As a military tribune, he takes care to 'become known to the army' (*nosci exercitui*, 5.1), thus laying the foundation of his future success as a commander, but otherwise *nosco* and its cognates will not be applied to him again until Tacitus' final obituary notice, when he speaks of posterity wishing to *noscere* Agricola's appearance (44.2).[25]

This is not a mere verbal coincidence, as we can see in the narrative of Agricola's early career. From his late teens to his thirties, Agricola will carry out a very careful balancing act by doing as much as he can and acquiring enough of a reputation to get noticed by the right people, without allowing his talent to become dangerously conspicuous to the world in general.[26] Thus after acquiring a favourable reputation as a military tribune he fends off a series of dangers. As a provincial quaestor in Asia, he avoids becoming corrupted by either the rich province or his venal superior (6.2). In the years after that, including his tenure as tribune of the plebs and praetor, he does as little as possible. He receives no judicial duties as praetor. He does give games that 'kept a balance between economy and open-handedness, far

[25] One near-exception proves the rule: at 40.3, on his return from Britain, Agricola enters the city discreetly at night *ne notabilis … introitus esset*.

[26] I have explored this part of the *Agricola* more fully in Kemezis (2016).

from the taint of luxury, and closer to fame for all that' (*ludos et inania honoris medio rationis atque abundantiae duxit, uti longe a luxuria, ita famae propior*, 6.4).[27] Seneca's anecdote of Graecinus had come in the context of praetorian games, and we are perhaps invited to contrast the father's virtuous but offensive conduct with the son's combination of rectitude and finesse. The same can be said for Agricola's next assignment, (6.5) when he is commissioned by Galba to sort out the aftermath of Nero's mass plundering of the empire's temples for his post-fire building projects in Rome.[28] Agricola does emerge briefly during the Civil Wars of 68–70, but still in a self-effacing role when as legionary legate he quietly but effectively restores discipline to troops whom his self-serving predecessors had allowed to fall into disorder (7.3).

Throughout these episodes he consistently adapts his performance to suit his superiors, for good or bad, and his situation. Above all, he avoids gaining the kind of renown that would offend superiors or attract unwelcome attention in Rome. The way Tacitus tells it, the result of all this careful management is that when it comes time for him to take consular office, in better times under Vespasian, he has enough of a reputation that he is a natural candidate for the governorship of Britain, but not too much so that he seems dangerous to anyone. Thus he is able to go to Britain and earn glory to the greatest degree possible for a subject under the Principate. He avoids giving Nero any opportunity to desire or fear his talents as Caligula had done Graecinus'. The glory he eventually gains does provoke Domitian's fear, but only after Agricola's previous discretion has gotten him into a position to do far more service to the *res publica* than Graecinus ever did.

In doing so, he has conspicuously failed to display *eloquentia*, again a key quality of Graecinus.[29] We never hear of the rhetorical education that

[27] The sense of *uti … ita* is difficult to pin down: see Woodman–Kraus (2014) 113. There is a concessive force (*OLD*, s.v. *ita* 4) of 'even though they weren't lavish, still people didn't exactly hate them', but simultaneously there is the idea that the (near-) *fama* consists of approval for his avoiding *luxuria* (*OLD*, s.v. *ita* 2 and 3). Tacitus is playing with the paradox of acquiring a reputation for avoiding reputation.

[28] For an explanation of the situation, see Ogilvie–Richmond (1967) 152. The plundering is referred to in detail at Tac. *Ann.* 15.45 and the restoration at Suet. *Nero* 32.

[29] The two other occurrences of *eloquentia* in the *Agricola* are both oddly ambiguous. At 10.1, Tacitus claims that previous writers on Britain, being ignorant of facts, have described the island with *eloquentia* rather than the *rerum fides* that he himself will employ. One sentence later, Livy and Fabius Rusticus are labelled *eloquentissimi auctores* for a geographical description of Britain that will however be shown as incomplete by Agricola's campaigns. At 21.2, the Britons under Agricola's government come to desire *eloquentia* as part of the

Agricola surely received, or of any use he ever made of it in the Senate or the courts. To be sure, he makes one speech, before the Battle of Mons Graupius, but given that it is preceded by a longer and more sophisticated oration by a Caledonian chieftain, we are presumably not meant to take it as an accurate reflection of Agricola's rhetorical gifts.[30] Many of the most significant utterances in Agricola's career are those he does not make: the boasts he omits in reports; the *iurisdictio* he does not exercise as praetor; the canvassing he does not do for a post that he then receives anyway (9.4). The biting one-liners and literary elegance for which Graecinus was known are nowhere to be found.

Graecinus' other key pursuit, *sapientia,* will find a greater and more complex resonance in his son's career, thanks to its double meaning, either as practical wisdom or as a Latinate synonym for *philosophia.* For Graecinus, it clearly has the latter signification, being paired with *eloquentia* in a quasi-educational context. The one time that a cognate of *sapiens* is ever straight-forwardly applied to Agricola, it has the former sense, referring to shrewdness in the siting of military fortifications.[31] Nonetheless, this vocabulary will also figure as part of Agricola's ongoing relationship to philosophy and its most notable Roman practitioners, which turns out to be just as ambivalent as his attitude to Graecinus.

This emerges almost immediately after the quoted passage about Agricola's father. As noted, we get a rather longer account of how Agricola was raised in Massilia by his widowed mother Julia Procilla. In particular, we hear that he early showed an interest in philosophy, and that in fact he 'took to the study of philosophy avidly, more so than is permitted for a Roman and a senator' (*Agr.* 4.3: *studium philosophiae acrius, ultra quam concessum Romano ac senatori, hausisse*). Read in isolation, this reflects a traditional Roman anxiety that the governing class will turn from *negotium* to *otium* and withdraw from public life. But surely *studium philosophiae* is meant to be read in light of

aping of Roman ways that Tacitus characterises as an aspect of their enslavement (*pars servitutis*). The word and its cognates are also remarkably scarce in the *Histories,* with only four instances (1.1.4; 4.7.5, 42.1, 43.3).

[30] Nearly all commentators on the two speeches find Calgacus' the more compelling: see recently Rutherford (2010) 314–9; also Soverini (2004) 230, for whom Agricola's speech is conventional and overloaded with clichéd allusions.

[31] *Agr.* 22.2: *adnotabant periti non alium ducem opportunitates locorum sapientius legisse.* At 27.1, some previously timid lieutenants of Agricola's who become more aggressive after a victory are sarcastically termed *illi modo cauti ac sapientes.*

Graecinus' *studium sapientiae*, which had a very different result.[32] *Ultra quam concessum*, after all, could mean 'more than is permitted by our cultural norms' or 'more than is permitted by our political climate'.[33] When Procilla intervenes to constrain Agricola's philosophical tendencies, she is directing him towards one traditional view of Romanness, but she is also drawing him away from the path that had led to his father's death, which forced her to take over Graecinus' role of supervising Agricola's entry into elite male society.[34] But the double meaning of *sapientia* allows for a complex play on words. Tacitus claims that after Agricola recovered from his philosophical episode, he 'retained the part of philosophy that is moderation' (*retinuit … ex sapientia modum*), which introduces one of our hero's signature characteristics.[35] Agricola's whole career will be characterised by *modus, modestia*, and *moderatio*, and these can indeed be said to constitute *sapientia*. In a masterfully double-edged *sententia*, Tacitus will justify Agricola's inactivity as tribune and praetor by claiming that he was 'aware of the conditions of Nero's reign, when indolence served for wisdom' (6.3: *gnarus sub Nerone temporum, quibus inertia pro sapientia fuit*). The word is Graecinus', but the behaviour is quite the opposite.

Studium, the last of the four words applied to Graecinus, also has a curious pattern of usage in the *Agricola*.[36] In references to Agricola himself, we have just seen it used of his abortive start down his father's philosophical path. In the immediately previous sentence (4.2), Massilia is called his *magistram*

[32] The Grecism *philosophiae* is a marked choice for Tacitus. Outside of the *Dialogus* he uses it or cognates only twice more, both in disparaging contexts (*Hist.* 3.81, referring to Musonius Rufus' abortive peace-making, and *Ann.* 13.42 in a speech castigating Seneca's hypocrisy).

[33] Tacitus' readers in the 90s might have read in *ultra quam concessum* an anticipation of Flavian-era sanctions against philosophical teaching, to which Tacitus has referred at *Agr.* 2.2.

[34] One might have expected this role to fall to a male *tutor*, as I am reminded by Jakub Pigón, but none is mentioned. The 'M. Julius Graecinus' who put up *CIL* VI.41069 in memory of Agricola's father (L. Julius Graecinus) was likely Agricola's paternal uncle, and might naturally have taken on the task, though we have no information on how long he lived after the elder Graecinus' death (see *PIR*^{2} I 345).

[35] For the vocabulary of *modus* in the Tacitean corpus see esp. Christes (1993). Balmaceda (2017) 157–241 also makes *moderatio* a key term in her study of Tacitus as reflecting the changed nature of *virtus* in the post-Augustan monarchy.

[36] There is one further use of *studium* in addition to those cited below: in describing Britons' political disunity (12.1), Tacitus says that they *per principes studiis ac factionibus* *<dis>trahuntur*.

studiorum. But the adult Agricola never displays this quality. Instead, it is used of things he avoids (Agricola does not choose subordinates based on *studiis privatis*, 19.2) or deprecates (Agricola prefers the *ingenia* of the Britons to the *studiis* of the Gauls, 21.2). This is not unexpected, since Tacitus typically uses *studium* to refer to intellectual activities rather than the military pursuits that are Agricola's strong point.[37] What it means in practice, though, is that the word is also applied to targets of Domitian's oppression. In the preface (3.1), Tacitus notes apropos of Domitian's tyranny and fall that *ingenia studiaque* are more easily repressed than revived. Much later (39.2), imagining Domitian's private response to Agricola's successes, Tacitus has the tyrant reason that it was pointless to suppress *studia fori* if subordinates were still permitted to earn military victories. In the *Agricola*, Domitian's targeting of *studium* has a quite specific meaning. The earlier of the two references just quoted comes directly after Tacitus' long prefatory discussion of various iconic and persecuted oppositional figures of the previous reign, notably Herennius Senecio and Arulenus Rusticus, and how Domitian suppressed their writings about an earlier generation of dissidents (2.1–2). These characters to varying degrees shared the *studium sapientiae* that Graecinus pursued and his son renounced.[38] The language used to describe Graecinus sets up an opposition with his son that aligns the father with Flavian dissidents. This is not exactly a surprising move, given the facts of Graecinus' case, but it will have important implications for Tacitus' complicated positioning of Agricola and himself relative to these celebrated figures. This is explored in detail below, after I have further considered how Graecinus colours Agricola's role in his own narrative.

The Failure of Paternity?

The figure of Graecinus thus negatively reinforces key aspects of Tacitus' portrait of Agricola, but also complicates its ethical colouring. Implicitly positioning his hero's father as a negative role model creates considerable

[37] Thus, though Tacitus discusses young Agricola's enthusiasm for all things military (5.3: *militaris gloriae cupido*), he does not use any phrase comparable to the *armorum studium* found at Liv. 41.20.12 (see also Plin. *Pan.* 13.5) or Cicero's *studium bellicae gloriae* (*Off.* 1.61).

[38] Tacitus' reference to Rusticus and Senecio is paired with one to the expulsion of philosophers (*expulsis insuper sapientiae professoribus*). Brunt (1975) and Penwill (2003) have sensibly cautioned against any straightforward equation between Neronian/Flavian dissidence and Stoicism, but Tacitus does much to associate the two ideas, however imprecisely, which indeed has contributed to the modern search for a 'Stoic opposition'.

discursive problems, some of which become all the sharper in the specific contexts of Tacitus' relationship to Agricola and of the transition from Domitian's reign to Trajan's. We have seen that Tacitus goes out of his way to emphasise Agricola's departure from the paternal model. But at no point does Tacitus deny that Graecinus is a virtuous man, and therein lies the problem. In a society like Rome's, should it not be possible, indeed ideal, for a son to imitate the behaviour of a virtuous father, what Pliny (*Ep.* 8.13) terms the *optimum et coniunctissimum exemplar*?[39] Is there not something wrong with a community in which he is obliged to do the opposite?[40]

Tacitus had options for how to approach this problem. Given that for Tacitus' readers there obviously *was* something wrong with society under Caligula and Nero, one could see the exemplary problem simply as an extension of the overall tyrannical dysfunction that led to Graecinus' death in the first place. Tyrants are hostile to virtue, therefore to imitate a virtuous exemplar entails replicating their fate in an exemplary cycle. As we will see, there were works circulating in Tacitus' time that portrayed the Domitianic dissidents in just those terms relative to their predecessors of the 60s and 70s. This presented an obvious problem in Agricola's case, given that he had survived and flourished, which by the above logic suggests he had failed to live up to the merits of his martyred father. This might have been finessed, however. As Rebecca Langlands has recently emphasised, Roman exemplary ethics was by no means a process of rote imitation.[41] In using a particular *exemplum*, one had always to consider differences between one's own situation or character and those of the model. It was sometimes wrong for a Torquatus to engage in single combat or for an Arria to follow her husband into suicide.[42] One can imagine a version of the *Agricola* in which the hero finds a way to draw on his father's example without following him to an early grave. The two men obviously had similarities: energy, brains,

[39] Important *loci* for parental exemplarity include Cic. *Off.* 1.116 and Sen. *Contr.* 10.2, the latter cited by Roller (2004) 24–5, who gives a brief but important survey of the Republican tradition of family exemplarity. See Baroin (2010) for examples of how often sons are spoken of as in some sense copies (*imagines*, etc.) of a paternal original.

[40] This can be linked to the larger issue highlighted by Whitmarsh (2006) that the *Agricola* seems to make a special effort to point out unsettling discursive alternatives to the text's ostensible message.

[41] See Langlands (2018) 112–27 and also (2011).

[42] See respectively Liv. 8.7 and Tac. *Ann.* 16.35, both cited by Langlands (2018) 114–18.

courage, and a certain directness of manner.[43] The *Agricola* could have been a more straightforward story in which the military life offers the son scope for displaying the *virtus* he inherited from his father without the perils of doing so in Rome.[44] Agricola's thwarting of Domitian's efforts to stamp out everything *honestum* might have been portrayed as a vindication of his father.

This is not at all the way Tacitus tells the story. Rather than emphasise their similar characters and different situations, he emphasises the similarity in their situations and the differences in their characters. We have already seen how the key characteristics of Graecinus are significantly absent in his son. As it turns out, the converse will apply: the virtues that Agricola does have are those his father did not possess. Above all, as previously noted, there are the cluster of attributes cognate with *modus* and *moderatio*. This includes being able to read situations and people and respond to their differences—Agricola's *sapientia* tells him that where you build a fort is just as important as how. Contrast Graecinus' untimely displays of wit and talent. Furthermore, Agricola's ability to demonstrate ability without being punished is not simply the result of his having chosen the military life as safer. On the contrary, when Tacitus describes his hero's first yearnings for military glory, he calls that inclination 'unwelcome in times that take an unkind view of those who stand out, when a great reputation brings no less danger than a bad one' (*ingrata temporibus quibus sinistra erga eminentes interpretatio nec minus periculum ex magna fama quam ex mala*, 5.3). The trap into which Graecinus fell is still there, and Agricola will avoid it by displaying the moderation and situational awareness that his father lacked. Agricola is not playing Graecinus' role on another stage, and indeed one does not get the impression that he ever wanted to act like his father, even if the political climate had permitted it. Agricola's virtues are very different from his father's assertive verbal talents, and, crucially, better suited to a monarchical state, be the emperor bad or good.[45] But these are awkward doctrines for a

[43] The passage at *Agr.* 22.4 in which Agricola is said to be *ut … comis bonis, ita adversus malos iniucundus*, and to have been open rather than secretive in his disapproval, is reminiscent of the little we know of Graecinus, though the line is mainly meant as a contrast to the opposite characteristics as displayed by Domitian.

[44] One overall reading of the *Agricola* is that it locates *virtus* under Domitian in military activity and frontier zones, whereas in Rome amid civilian activities it cannot operate. See Clarke (2001) and Balmaceda (2017) 161–72.

[45] The idea of Agricola as representing the new ruling class of the post-Julio-Claudian state is powerfully laid out by Syme (1958) I.26–9, while a more straightforward version of Agricola as *exemplum* for the Trajanic consensus-regime is set forth by Geisthardt (2015) 39–

society that placed so much ideological weight on the *mos maiorum*, and the problem of paternity with which this section began persists.

Another solution might be substitution. As noted above, Roman society had much discursive room in it for surrogate father figures. Even here, however, Agricola's case gives us no simple instances of generational continuity. To be sure, there is an abundance of older male figures, from the corrupt Salvius Titianus to such able soldiers as Frontinus and Cerialis, who offer a range of alternative models for Agricola as he encounters them, and for us comparing them in hindsight.[46] Agricola will learn from all of them, positively and negatively, but no single older man plays a dominant role in Agricola's youth or is allowed to become the paternal model Graecinus might have been. The closest is his first commander, Suetonius Paulinus. This impressive military figure of the 40s and 50s is characterised as a *diligenti ac moderato duci* who makes the tribune Agricola his *contubernalis* (5.1).[47] The two men's relationship is dealt with in one sentence, but Paulinus will later figure in Tacitus' account of the various governors of Britain (14.3–16.2), all of whom are models of a sort for the future Agricola. He comes across as an able general, but one who over-reached in his conquests (*terga occasioni patefecit*, 14.3) and permitted administrative abuses (15.1), all of which led to the Boudican revolt. Even if the *Agricola* stresses the virtues and autonomy of earlier senatorial commanders, the prevailing impression is still that Agricola has charted his course with little aid beyond his own wits, which have allowed him to distinguish his elders' virtues from their errors so as to draw advantage from both. His seemingly dispassionate picking and choosing in fact reminds one more of Tacitus' own authorial persona in his later histories than of any affective practice modelled on familial continuity.[48]

82. An important Russian-language treatment of the question can be found at Knabe (1980), a partial English translation of which is being prepared for publication.

[46] McGing (1982) shows convincingly how the various supporting characters in the *Agricola* serve as counterpoints to bring out the virtue of the hero, although he does not mention Graecinus. For an instructive analysis of Frontinus' brief role in the *Agricola*, see König (2013).

[47] For *contubernium* as analogous to a parental relationship, see Bernstein (2008) 225–6, though citing pedagogical relationships from Fronto rather than military ones.

[48] Langlands (2018) 86–111 emphasises the affective and emotional aspects of engaging with an *exemplum,* although in her presentation they co-exist with an intellectually discerning approach as seen above (n. 41). For the argument that Tacitus rejects moral exemplarity in historiography, see, e.g., Luce (1991).

Tacitus, Agricola and the 'Stoic Martyrs'

Where, one then asks, does this leave Agricola's relationship to Tacitus? The younger man's *professio pietatis* evidently positions him in a quasi-filial role toward Agricola. The latter's chain of paternal continuity is broken on both ends, thanks to the deaths of two infant sons, both carefully noted by our narrator (6.2, 29.1) and one should further note that by the dramatic date of the *Agricola* Tacitus has been married to Agricola's daughter for twenty years, and there is no reference to any grandson of our hero.[49] Tacitus thus positions the whole work within the economy of ethical heredity, with its overtones of exemplarity. The *Agricola* opens and closes with the idea of 'passing on to our successors' either the memory of famous men (*clarorum virorum facta moresque posteris tradere*, 1.1) or, somewhat more daringly, Agricola himself (*Agricola posteritati narratus et traditus superstes erit*, 46.4).[50] The last section, which recalls the peroration of a *laudatio funebris*, includes the suggestion that, rather than mourning Agricola, readers should 'show you [i.e., Agricola] honour by admiring you, praising you, and, if nature permits, by being like you' (*admiratione te potius et laudibus et, si natura suppeditet, similitudine colamus*, 46.2).

Here we return to the question with which this article began, that of how Tacitus' contemporaries deal with the legacy of the previous generation and their experiences under Domitian. The *Agricola* is explicitly an intervention in political discourse as well as an act of filial piety.[51] In particular, it is clearly in dialogue with other commemorative biographical works, those written about (and in some cases by) oppositional figures of the Neronian and Flavian periods.[52] The preface to the *Agricola* singles out works on Thrasea

[49] Judging from *Agr.* 9.6, the marriage took place in 76 or 77: see Birley (2005) 76–7 with references. There is no literary or epigraphic evidence that Tacitus had any children at all: Birley (2000) 236–8 does note that if, as it appears, Tacitus was born in 58, then he held several offices unusually early, which might be explained by a fruitful marriage. However, Tacitus' final apostrophe takes in his wife and mother-in-law (*Agr.* 46.3) and it would have been strange to omit children of either sex, had any survived.

[50] See Woodman–Kraus (2014) 67–9 for the reminiscences of the elder Cato.

[51] On Tacitus' writings as both modelling and constituting political speech under the monarchy, see now O'Gorman (2020).

[52] For this literature in connection with the *Agricola*, see recently Szoke (2019) and now Whitton (2020). The idea of these men as a coherent group united by Stoic philosophical beliefs is notably set forth in the first two chapters of MacMullen (1966); see more recently Wilkinson (2012) 61–82, who sees Stoicism as secondary (to specifically Roman political

Paetus and the elder Helvidius Priscus written by like-minded men, Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio respectively, who were themselves then put to death by Domitian for doing so.[53] Further laudatory writings on oppositional personalities of the previous generations were emerging under the new regime in the late 90s.[54] Significant political and literary figures were anxious to take on their legacy under the new regime through a politics of memory and redress. Not the least of these was the younger Pliny, whose correspondence puts on show his relationships with Arulenus Rusticus' surviving brother Mauricus and Helvidius' widow Fannia.[55] At more or less the same time in 97 that Tacitus was writing the *Agricola*, Pliny was prosecuting one Publicius Certus, an apparently secondary figure in the denunciation of the younger Helvidius, and circulating his prosecuting speech as *De Helvidi ultione*.[56]

Tacitus' characterisation of these men is complicated, both in the *Agricola* and elsewhere in his corpus.[57] He recognises their claims as morally courageous victims of tyranny, and condemns both Domitian for suppressing them and himself and his peers for acquiescing (*Agr.* 2, 45). Nonetheless, Agricola's way is very different from theirs. The qualities that set Agricola apart from his father do the same, relative to his oppositional contemporaries. Tacitus' famous final verdict on his hero's career draws the contrast (42.4):

ideology) but not irrelevant. For objections to the philosophical or ideological characterisation, see n. 38 above.

[53] Both works, and their authors' fates, are mentioned by Cassius Dio (67.13.2), while Rusticus' work is mentioned alone by Suetonius (*Dom.* 10.2–3) and Senecio's by Pliny (*Ep.* 7.19.5–6). For their place in the genre of works on *exitus illustrium virorum* and Tacitus' contacts with them, see Marx (1937) (discussing mostly *Annales* 15–16), Pigoń (1987) (with specific reference to the *Agricola* preface), and Sailor (2008) 11–24.

[54] Pliny's letters specifically name two authors, Titinius Capito (*Ep.* 8.12.4, mentioning *exitus inlustrium virorum* with no further specification) and C. Fannius (*Ep.* 5.3.3, *exitus occisorum aut relegatorum a Nerone*, three books completed at the author's death).

[55] O'Gorman (2020) 140–8 is the most recent of many studies of this aspect of Pliny's correspondence.

[56] Related in detail (and with more than ten years of hindsight) in *Ep.* 9.13. On the trial, see now Gibson (2020) 103–5, also Geisthardt (2015) 32–8, with reference to the extensive earlier scholarship.

[57] Important recent considerations of Tacitus' relationship to the 'Stoic opposition' in the *Agricola* particularly include Whitmarsh (2006), Sailor (2008), esp. 11–24, and Lavan (2011). For extended arguments that Tacitus is fully sympathetic to Thrasea Paetus *et al.*, see Turpin (2008) and Strunk (2017) 104–31.

Sciant, quibus moris est inlicita mirari, posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse, obsequiumque ac modestiam, si industria ac vigor adsint, eo laudis excedere quo plerique per abrupta, sed in nullum rei publicae usum ambitiosa morte inclaruerunt.

May they know, they who always so admire transgression, that great men can exist even under bad emperors, and that obedience and restraint, when combined with an energetic diligence, can attain to those same heights of renown that many have reached by dangerous paths, who there shone forth in deaths that were ostentatious but of no public advantage.

It is difficult to see what this passage could be referring to if not the 'Stoic martyrs' and the literature about them.[58] For all that Tacitus deplores their deaths and admires their virtue, the *Agricola* presents a hero and an ethos that are at odds with all they represent. Agricola's entire course of behaviour, from his self-effacement as a military tribune to his management of Domitian after his return, are the opposite of how Tacitus at this early stage of his own career characterises Helvidius *et al.*

In turn, Tacitus' positioning of himself relative to Agricola also looks like an answer to the oppositional-hagiographical approach to the Flavian past. While the works in question have not survived, we can guess that they emphasised generational continuity and its memorialisation. The Flavian-era senatorial opposition, after all, depended heavily on family continuities both biological and elective, from Thrasea Paetus to his *gener* Helvidius Priscus to the latter's less illustrious but equally martyred son, with female counterparts in the two Arrias and Fannia.[59] These links not only gave

[58] This is the generally accepted reading of the passage, but Woodman–Kraus (2014) 303 and Strunk (2017) 14–18, writing from very different critical perspectives, both express doubts based on what they perceive to be Tacitus' favourable attitudes towards the same characters elsewhere. In neither case, however, is a convincing alternative suggested for who the *plerique* might be. Given these oppositional figures are mentioned several times in the rest of the *Agricola*, it seems to me impossible that readers would not have thought of them. Turpin (2008) makes several specific suggestions about the reading of this passage that are not adopted here: see my arguments in Kemezis (2016) 110 n. 51.

[59] For the various relationships, see Syme (1991). O'Gorman (2020) 156–65 sees Pliny in particular as positioning himself as leading figure of a new generation in this tradition, even though he has no formal family ties to Helvidius *et al.* O'Gorman sees less difference between Tacitus' and Pliny's positions than do I.

structure to the 'movement', such as it was, but perhaps more importantly gave emotive authority to each new generation's repetition of the cycle of resistance, withdrawal, and martyrdom. As laudatory biographer of his own *socer*, Tacitus may seem to be enacting this practice—indeed more closely than the earlier works, which do not actually include a son/*gener* writing about his own father/*socer*. As Helvidius was to Paetus and Senecio to Helvidius, so is Tacitus to Agricola, but with the opposite message, one of pragmatism rather than intransigence, and survival rather than self-sacrifice. Tacitus himself would thus represent a new generation that had survived under Domitian as Agricola had survived under Nero and were now in a position to assist their fellow-survivor Trajan in reviving the fortunes of the *res publica*. The same history was now material for a different set of contemporaries, and different characters could provide *exempla* for the behaviours needed in the new age.

The *Agricola* does invite such a reading, and we are meant to consider the idea of Tacitus as counterpoint to Senecio and Rusticus. The role of Graecinus, however, is one of many aspects of the *Agricola* that should make us question how fully such a reading can be sustained. To judge from the behaviour of the people in question, and indeed the feeling of *déjà vu* that hangs over the Domitianic opposition, the works in praise of Paetus and Helvidius emphasised a relatively direct form of continuity and exemplarity. The memory of martyrs was to bring forth more martyrs. This is precisely the kind of continuity that Agricola rejects relative to Graecinus. As he emerges from the shadow of one paternal *exemplum*, Agricola seems never to seek out another. Again, this brings us to Tacitus' self-positioning. For all the reverence Tacitus shows Agricola, and for all they are both survivors of tyranny, they are dissimilar in many ways that Tacitus seems rather to emphasise than minimise. Dylan Sailor has cogently pointed out how Tacitus in the *Agricola*'s preface positions himself in the role of literary senator over against Agricola the military man.[60] If anything, Tacitus is superficially more similar to Graecinus than to his son.[61] Both are authors and practitioners of *eloquentia*. Graecinus, however, had written a witty agricultural treatise under a bad emperor and in the political realm his *eloquentia* was harmful to him rather than serviceable to the *res publica*. Tacitus emphasises

[60] Sailor (2008) 51–118.

[61] It is worth considering in this context the suggestion of Woodman–Kraus (2014) 330, based on Columella (*Rust.* 1.1.14), that the *posteritati* … *traditus* of the *Agricola*'s final sentence (46.4) echoes a phrase that Graecinus had used to describe his own viticultural treatise.

his own silence under a bad ruler, which has seemingly enabled him to survive so he can now write high-status, politically meaningful literature under good ones.

One might suppose that Tacitus was able to escape Graecinus' fate because he had before him Agricola's example of *moderatio* and was able to apply it in a different role. But that is not how Tacitus tells the story, at least not exactly. In his final words on his hero (45.1), Tacitus claims that Agricola was spared the last and worst episode of Domitian's tyranny, the trials in late 93–early 94 of Rusticus, Senecio, and the younger Helvidius.[62] These are presumably the events that Tacitus is thinking of when he claims his generation experienced 'the final stage of slavery' (*quid ultimum … esset … in servitude*, 2.3). He presents the episode as a collective trauma for senators, but also a disgrace and a source of guilt for the roles they were forced to play in destroying their colleagues. He famously repeats (45.1) how 'our hands led Helvidius into prison' and that 'we' were soaked with the blood of Senecio and felt the gaze of Mauricus and Rusticus. These are the events that would have been in readers' minds earlier in the *Agricola* when they read of Graecinus dying rather than participate in similar prosecutions under Caligula. Whether through good fortune (*tu vero felix … etiam opportunitate mortis*, 45.2) or Domitian's poison (43.2), Agricola never experienced this ordeal, but one cannot help asking how he would have responded if he had been alive and active. It is difficult to see how his characteristic *moderatio* would have allowed him to rise above the general humiliation and disgrace. In that sense his exemplary value comes up against a hard limit, and it is notable how much emphasis Tacitus chooses to lay on precisely the problems where Agricola seems least equipped to offer exemplary guidance.

In another sense, perhaps, Tacitus may be said to have followed Agricola's *exemplum* in 93–4. Agricola had found expression for *virtus* in service away from Rome, and Tacitus' text at least suggests that he himself was absent on provincial service during the key trials.[63] If this is indeed the case, however, that only further underlines the limits of such a response. Tacitus might have found a way to include himself in Agricola's good fortune, by setting his absence parallel to his *socer*'s timely death. Instead, he ostentatiously implicates himself in the same guilt as those who were actually

[62] The precise date of Agricola's death, 23 August 93, is given at *Agr.* 44.1, and the trials must have occurred later that year or early in the next: see Gibson (2020) 97–8. It is significant that Tacitus does not choose to emphasise how short this interval was.

[63] Suggested by Syme (1958) 25 and argued in more detail by Woodman–Kraus (2014) 77, 317.

there. By doing so, Tacitus authorises himself to speak for his own generation, but thus also stresses how incompatible their experience is with that of Agricola's.[64] And the same goes for the changed world after Domitian's death. In one sense, Agricola provides an exemplary model for the new military emperor, but what of his subjects? At the start of the *Agricola* (3), Tacitus defines the problem of his generation as one of discourse, of finding a voice after years of enforced silence. Agricola's *exemplum* here also seems of little use to his *gener*: we have seen the older man avoiding *eloquentia* as part of rejecting his own father's example, and Tacitus gives us no reason to suppose that he would have become more articulate in his old age.

Rather than try to rescue generational continuity, it is better to recognise how systematically the *Agricola* undermines it. For all the presumably genuine admiration that Tacitus expresses for his *socer*, he has no more taken him as a model than Agricola did with his father. Agricola's praiseworthy actions were not prompted by any particular examples or a family legacy, and it is hard to make out what concrete meaning his own example or legacy has for Tacitus. The political upheavals that go with the monarchy have produced new presents that the experience of one's predecessors gives no clear guidance in facing. The question of father-son exemplarity is a microcosm of how to understand changing generational perception of a given set of events. The *Agricola* represents a small-scale and personal approach to this question. In the decade to follow, Tacitus would address it on the grand scale in the *Histories*, and in doing so he would have to encounter the issue of paternal continuity in its grandest form, that of imperial succession under the Flavians and the new regime.

Conclusion: Looking Forward to a New Past

The *Agricola* is not quite contemporary historiography. It describes events from a decade or two before its own present, and it positions that past as another age, radically different from the present. Not only is the current regime the opposite of the Flavians, but the contemporary experience is defined by events (the trials of 93–4) that occur in the interval after the events being narrated. Precisely because of this distancing effect, however, Tacitus' text remains a rich document of its own immediate setting in 97–8 and what the recent past meant to the Roman political elite in those transitional years.

[64] In the same section (45.2), Tacitus stresses how Domitian's cruelty was even worse than that of Nero, the tyrant of Agricola's youth.

I hope to have shown that in the Graecinus episode, Tacitus explores how his father-in-law had responded to the legacy of his own recent past, which was analogous in key respects to Tacitus' own situation. Agricola's career, from his early seeking out of obscurity to his emergence in military glory to his survival under Domitian, should be read as a rejection of Graecinus' example, one that is successful on its own terms. Paradoxically, however, this very rejection of his own father's example becomes part of his legacy to his son-in-law, and that has crucial implications for how we should read the exemplary aspects of Tacitus' text. The *Agricola* shows us a historical moment in which the violent end of a hereditary dynasty and an awkward adoptive succession have left a patriarchal society uncertain and anxious about how sons should learn from their fathers. Tacitus' opening quasi-apology for his work (3.3), in which he claims to speak *rudi ac incondita voce* and hopes to be praised or at any rate excused for his *professio pietatis*, is in part a deprecation of familial exemplarity as a way of understanding the recent past, and a corresponding valorisation of the larger-scale historical inquiry to which the *Agricola* is but a prelude (*hic interim liber*).

The larger work in question, the *Histories*, will naturally be a very different survey of the same territory. Grand-scale history will not call for the same level of explicit personal reflection on one's own experience. Nonetheless, the question of where to locate the Trajanic present relative to the Flavian past will certainly not go away, and nor will the problems of generational succession. Approaches to that problem will, however, change as the shape of the new regime becomes clearer and as the life cycle of the new ruler progresses. One stage in this progression can be seen three years after the *Agricola* in Pliny's panegyric on Trajan. That text, as is well known, engages with the *Agricola* in any number of ways, including in its presentation of paternal succession.[65] In extolling Trajan, Pliny has to find praise for his two fathers, both Nerva (esp. *Pan.* 5–9) and Trajan's biological father (cf. *Pan.* 15, 89).[66] Nerva and adoptive fatherhood get more explicit kudos, but there is enough of the older Trajan to create an ambiguity, given how little real affinity there was between the two emperors. Pliny also has some awkward rhetorical hedging to do as to whether Trajan's successor will be a yet-to-be-born biological son or a yet-to-be-chosen adoptive one (*Pan.* 94.5). Even if the immediate confusion seen in the *Agricola* has settled, the uncertainties

[65] On the *Agricola* and the *Panegyricus*, see most recently Whitton (2020) 162–8.

[66] For Trajan's 'two fathers' both in the *Panegyricus* and in his own self-presentation, see Hekster (2015) 58–78.

around paternity and succession have not gone away, and will persist over the next decade as Tacitus writes the *Histories*.

That work in its full form described the first direct transfers of power among immediate biological family members in the history of the Principate. Questions of heredity must have dominated the second third of the work just as much as internal warfare dominates the surviving first third. We can glimpse this theme throughout the surviving material, in the adoption-scene between Galba and Piso (*Hist.* 1.14–19) and in the emerging roles of Titus and Domitian in Books 2–3.[67] Succession anxieties also reach into the nobility, as in Book 4 we see Helvidius Priscus set out to avenge his *socer* Paetus by prosecuting the Neronian *delator* Eprius Marcellus.[68] The set-piece debate between the two fails as a triumph of the Neronian opposition, and becomes instead the first skirmish of a second war, in which Helvidius will step fatally into the role of the *socer* he thought he was avenging. These echoes of 97 will naturally have increased as the narrative moved into its last third, describing the same events as the *Agricola*. They sounded, however, at a very different moment, when the question of succession was being posed in the future tense. By the time the *Histories* come out around 110, we are almost as far away from Domitian's death as that event was from his accession. Trajan is no longer new or young, and he has neither sired nor adopted an heir. Within Tacitus' own corpus we can see once again the same set of events going from 'contemporary history' to 'the recent past' that is being reassessed from the viewpoint of a new present.

kemezis@ualberta.ca

[67] It is significant in this respect that on two separate occasions in *Histories* 2 the idea is brought up of Titus reaching the throne by adoption (2.1.2, rumours Galba means to adopt him and 2.77.1, where Mucianus claims he would do so if he were emperor). On the possible Trajanic resonance see Ash (2007) 75–6, 298. The question of Titus' succeeding his father would likely have come into focus soon after the end of the existing text, given that at some point late in 70 a public confrontation took place between Helvidius and Vespasian apparently over the issue of Titus' status (see Cass. Dio 65[66].12.1, with Birley (1975) 141–3 and Murison (1999) 158–9).

[68] The relevant episodes are *Hist.* 4.5–11 and 40–45, now the object of a compelling analysis by Spielberg (2019).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ash, R., ed. (2007) *Tacitus: Histories Book 2* (Cambridge).

Balmaceda, C. (2017) Virtus Romana*: Politics and Morality in the Roman Historians* (Chapel Hill).

Baroin, C. (2010) 'Remembering One's Ancestors, Following in Their Footsteps, Being Like Them: The Role and Forms of Family Memory in the Building of Identity', in Dasen–Späth (2010) 19–48.

Bernstein, N. W. (2008) 'Each Man's Father Served as His Teacher: Constructing Relatedness in Pliny's *Letters*', *ClAnt* 27: 203–30.

—— (2009) '*Cui parens non erat maximus quisque et vetustissimus pro parente*: Parental Surrogates in Imperial Roman Literature', in S. R. Hübner and D. M. Ratzan, edd., *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity* (Cambridge) 241–56.

Birley, A. R. (1975) 'Agricola, the Flavian Dynasty and Tacitus', in B. Levick, ed. *The Ancient Historian and His Materials: Essays in Honour of C. E. Stevens* (Farnborough, Hants.) 139–54.

—— (2000) 'The Life and Death of Cornelius Tacitus', *Historia* 49: 230–47.

—— (2005) *The Roman Government of Britain* (Oxford).

Brunt, P. A. (1975) 'Stoicism and the Principate', *PBSR* 43: 6–35; repr. in id., *Studies in Stoicism*, edd. M. Griffin and A. Samuels (Oxford) 275–309.

Cantarella, E. (2003) 'Fathers and Sons in Rome', *CW* 96: 281–98.

Castelli, G. (1971) 'Motivi d'ideologia tacitiana nei capitoli di giovinezza di Agricola', *Rivista di Studi Classici* 19: 10–17.

Christes, J. (1993) '*Modestia* und *moderatio* bei Tacitus', *Gymnasium* 100: 514–29.

Clarke, K. (2001) 'An Island Nation: Re-reading Tacitus' *Agricola*', *JRS* 91: 94–112.

Dasen, V. and T. Späth, edd. (2010) *Children, Memory, and Family Identity in Roman Culture* (Oxford).

Eyben, E. (1991) 'Fathers and Sons', in B. Rawson, ed. *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (Canberra and Oxford) 114–43.

Flower, H. I. (1996) *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford).

Garrett, P. (2021) 'Ancestry and Family Identity in Suetonius' *Caesars*', *CQ* 71: 777–90.

Geisthardt, J. M. (2015) *Zwischen Princeps und Res Publica: Tacitus, Plinius und die senatorische Selbstdarstellung in der Hohen Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart).

Gibson, R. K. (2020) *Man of High Empire: The Life of Pliny the Younger* (Oxford).

Gowers, E. (2019) 'Knight's Moves: The Son-in-law in Cicero and Tacitus', *ClAnt* 38: 2–35.

Griffin, M. T. (2013) *Seneca on Society: A Guide to* De Beneficiis (Oxford).

Guerrini, R. (1977) 'La giovinezza di Agricola: Tecnica allusiva e narrazione storica in Tacito', *Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei* 32: 481–503.

Harders, A.-C. (2010) 'Roman Patchwork Families: Surrogate Parenting, Socialization, and the Shaping of Tradition', in Dasen–Späth (2010) 49–72.

Hekster, O. (2015) *Emperors and Ancestors: Roman Rulers and the Constraints of Tradition* (Oxford).

Kemezis, A. M. (2016) '*Inglorius labor*? The Rhetoric of Glory and Utility in Plutarch's *Precepts* and Tacitus' *Agricola*', in id. and P. Hogan, edd., *Writing Imperial Politics in Greek*, *CW* Special Issue 110: 87–117.

Ker, J. (2012) 'Seneca in Tacitus', in V. E. Pagán, ed. *A Companion to Tacitus* (Malden, Mass.) 305–29.

Knabe, G. S. (1980) 'Tacitus' *Agricola* and Roman Biography', *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* = *Journal of Ancient History* 154: 53–73 [in Russian].

König, A. (2013) 'Frontinus' Cameo Role in Tacitus' *Agricola*', *CQ* 63: 361–76.

—— and C. Whitton (2018) 'Introduction', in idd., edd., *Roman Literature under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian: Literary Interactions, AD 96–138* (Cambridge) 1–34.

Langlands, R. (2011) 'Roman *Exempla* and Situation Ethics: Valerius Maximus and Cicero *de Officiis*', *JRS* 101: 100–22.

—— (2018) *Exemplary Ethics in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge).

Lavan, M. (2011) 'Slavishness in Britain and Rome in Tacitus' *Agricola*', *CQ* 61: 294–305.

LeMoine, F. (1991) 'Parental Gifts: Father-Son Dedications and Dialogues in Roman Didactic Literature', *ICS* 16: 337–66.

Luce, T. J. (1991) 'Tacitus on 'History's Highest Function': *praecipuum munus annalium* (Ann. 3.65)', *ANRW* II.33.4: 2904–27.

MacMullen, R. (1966) *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest and Alienation in the Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Marx, F. A. (1937) 'Tacitus und die Literatur der *exitus illustrium virorum*', *Philologus* 92: 83–103.

McGing, B. C. (1982) 'Synkrisis in Tacitus' *Agricola*', *Hermathena* 132: 15–25.

Mellor, R. (1993) *Tacitus* (New York).

Murison, C. L. (1999) *Rebellion and Reconstruction: Galba to Domitian. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's* Roman History, *Books 64–67 (AD 68–96)* (Atlanta).

O'Gorman, E. (2020) *Tacitus' History of Politically Effective Speech: Truth to Power* (London and New York).

Ogilvie, R. M. and I. A. Richmond, edd. (1967) *Tacitus: Agricola* (Oxford).

Parkin, T. G. (2003) *Old Age in the Roman World: A Cultural and Social History* (Baltimore).
Penwill, J. L. (2003) 'Expelling the Mind: Politics and Philosophy in Flavian Rome', in A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik, edd., *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden) 345–68.
Pigoń, J. (1987) 'Some Remarks on Tacitus' *Agricola* 2.1', *Eos* 75: 323–33.
Roller, M. B. (2004) 'Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia', *CPh* 99: 1–56.
—— (2018) *Models from the Past in Roman Culture: A World of Exempla* (Cambridge).
Rutherford, R. (2010) 'Voices of Resistance', in C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola, and C. Pelling, edd., *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman* (Oxford) 312–30.
Sailor, D. (2008) *Writing and Empire in Tacitus* (Cambridge).
Saller, R. P. (1994) *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge).
Scheidel, W. (2009) 'The Demographic Background', in S. Hübner and D. M. Ratzan, edd., *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity* (Cambridge) 31–40.
Soverini, P., ed. (2004) *Cornelio Tacito: Agricola* (Alessandria).
Spielberg, L. (2019) 'Fairy Tales and Hard Truths in Tacitus's *Histories* 4.6–10', *ClAnt* 38: 141–83.
Strunk, T. E. (2017) *History after Liberty: Tacitus on Tyrants, Sycophants and Republicans* (Ann Arbor).
Syme, R. (1958) *Tacitus*, 2 vols (Oxford).
—— (1991) 'A Political Group', in id., *Roman Papers VII*, ed. A. R. Birley (Oxford) 568–87.
Szoke, M. (2019) 'Condemning Domitian or Un-damning Themselves? Tacitus and Pliny on the Domitianic "Reign of Terror"', *ICS* 44: 430–52.
Turpin, W. (2008) 'Tacitus, Stoic *exempla*, and the *praecipuum munus annalium*', *ClAnt* 27: 359–404.
Whitmarsh, T. (2006) '"This In-Between Book": Language, Politics and Genre in the *Agricola*', in B. C. McGing and J. M. Mossman, edd., *The Limits of Ancient Biography* (Swansea) 305–33.
Whitton, C. L. (2020) 'Biography and Praise in Trajanic Rome: Tacitus' *Agricola* and Pliny's *Panegyricus*', in K. De Temmerman, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Biography* (Oxford) 153–68.
Wilkinson, S. (2012) *Republicanism During the Early Roman Empire* (London).
Wlosok, A. (1978) 'Vater und Vatervorstellungen in der römischen Kultur', in G. Fruehsorge, ed. *Das Vaterbild im Abendland, I: Rom, frühes Christentum, Mittelalter, Neuzeit, Gegenwart* (Stuttgart) 18–54.
Woodman, A. J. with C. S. Kraus, edd. (2014) *Tacitus: Agricola* (Cambridge).