



Universitetet i Bergen

Institutt for lingvistiske, litterære og estetiske studier

LAT 350

Mastergradsoppgave i latin

vårsemester 2013

When Galba was still alive

A comparative study of Tacitean vocabulary and opinion

Lars Normann Hansen

Table of contents

Page:

5	List of abbreviations
7	Preface
9	1: Introduction
9	1.A: Abstract
10	1.B: Tacitus
15	2: Approach: Historiography and method
15	2.A: A brief summary on the development of history writing and historiography
17	2.B: The call to history: Roman historiography
23	2.C: My research methods
25	3: A study of the author's role and presence in his literature through the use of a particular vocabulary in Ancient Roman prose
27	3.A: The <i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i>
29	3.B: A short introduction to the Roman authors used with Tacitus in the study
29	3.B.i: Livy
30	3.B.ii: Sallust
31	3.B.iii: Suetonius
32	3.C: A thorough analysis of <i>incolumis</i> in Classical Latin Prose
33	3.C.i: <i>Incolumis</i> I.A: <i>generatim</i>
34	3.C.i.a: Tacitus (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.A.1)
36	3.C.i.b: Livy (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.A.1)
38	3.C.i.c: Sallust (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.A.1)
39	3.C.i.d: Suetonius (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.A.1)
39	3.C.i.e: Summary of TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.A.1
40	3.C.i.f: Livy (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.A.2)
42	3.C.i.g: Summary of TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.A.2
43	3.C.ii: <i>Incolumis</i> I.B: <i>specialia</i>
43	3.C.ii.a: Tacitus (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.B.1)
46	3.C.ii.b: Suetonius (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.B.1)
48	3.C.ii.c: Livy (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.B.1)
52	3.C.ii.d: Summary of TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.B.1
54	3.C.ii.e: Livy (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.B.2)

60	3.C.ii.f: Sallust (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.B.2)
63	3.C.ii.g: Summary of TLL: <i>incolumis</i> I.B.2
65	3.C.iii: <i>Incolumis</i> II.A: <i>de hominibus</i>
65	3.C.iii.a: Tacitus (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> II.A.1)
72	3.C.iii.b: Livy (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> II.A.1)
74	3.C.iii.c: Summary of TLL: <i>incolumis</i> II.A.1
75	3.C.iv: <i>Incolumis</i> II.B: <i>de re publica sim</i>
75	3.C.iv.a: Livy (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> II.B)
81	3.C.iv.b: Summary of TLL: <i>incolumis</i> II.B
82	3.C.v: <i>Incolumis</i> II.C: <i>de rebus incorporeis</i>
83	3.C.v.a: Tacitus (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> II.C)
83	3.C.v.b: Livy (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> II.C)
85	3.C.v.c: Suetonius (TLL: <i>incolumis</i> II.C)
86	3.C.v.d: Summary of TLL: <i>incolumis</i> II.C
87	3.D: <i>Incolumis</i> : the intent of the author
91	4: Conclusion
95	6: Bibliography
99	7: Sammendrag av mastergradsoppgaven

List of abbreviations¹

Livy:

Liv. – *Ab Urbe Condita*

Plutarch

Cam. – *Camillus*

Sallust:

Cat. – *Bellum Catilinae*

Iug. – *Bellum Iugurthinum*

Hist. – *Historiae*

Suetonius:

Iul. – *Divus Iulius*

Aug. – *Divus Augustus*

Tib. – *Tiberius*

Cal. – *C. Caligula*

Cla. – *Divus Claudius*

Nero. – *Nero*

Gal. – *Galba*

Otho. – *Otho*

Vit. – *Vitellius*

Ves. – *Divus Vespasianus*

Tit. – *Divus Titus*

Dom. – *Domitianus*

Tacitus:

A. – *Annales*

Agr. – *Agricola*

D. – *Dialogus de Oratoribus*

G. – *Germania*

H. – *Historiae*

Velleius:

Vell. – *Historiae Romanae*

Other abbreviations:

L&S – Lewis & Short Latin Dictionary

OLD – Oxford Latin Dictionary

PDL – Perseus Digital Library

TLL – *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*

Dates:

BCE – for years before the common era,
years in the common era will not be given
a marker (e.g. Augustus, 63 BCE – 19)

¹ For full references, see bibliography. All abbreviations are my own, mostly based on the Oxford Latin Dictionary.

Preface

I would never have been able to complete my thesis without the help of my supervisor, Associate Professor Aidan Keally Conti, who has been a tremendous help not only for my translations, but also for the entire setup of the thesis. His commentaries on the structure, and on my style and language, as well as his propositions for books, papers, and articles on similar subjects have been paramount for me to be able to write this thesis, and for this I am extremely grateful. I would also like to extend my thanks to my good friend, Erlend Astad Lorentzen, for proofreading my thesis and giving me good advice on how to rephrase confusing and badly organised passages. A special thanks needs to be extended to my friend, John Wilhelm Vinje, who has constantly supported and encouraged me to pursue my interest in Latin, even if it may not be the most profitable of interest. I am also very grateful to the Wednesday seminar group, for helping me developing my idea and foundation for the thesis. Finally, I would like to thank my always-supportive parents, and my stepfather, who have all been extremely encouraging, even if they did not always understand what I was writing about or why I had an interest in it.

1: Introduction

This thesis is dedicated to the Latin language, the master of it, Tacitus, and to the complex nature of some of its words. My work has been very arduous, as the analysis and structure of the thesis, which took long enough on their own, has required several revisions and corrections. The translations in the thesis are all my own, though comments from both my supervisor and from different published commentaries on the texts in question have been extremely helpful.

1.A: Abstract

This thesis explores a particular Tacitean phrase, which occurs twice in his corpus. I argue that this phrase is intentionally ambiguous and reflects Tacitus' clever use of heightened rhetoric. *Incolumi adhuc Galba* occurs in H.1.46 and H.2.1, and is commonly understood and translated to "while Galba was alive." This interpretation is, by all means, correct, but it does not represent the range of meanings in the phrase. It is my claim that Tacitus deliberately uses this exact wording in order to present a personal opinion on Galba, as a person and as a ruler, not solely through the sarcasm I argue is found in the phrase, but also by making Galba the unique recipient of this exact description.

Acknowledging this as an expression of personal opinion on Tacitus' part provides valuable insight into Tacitus' style, and it might help form a better understanding of how he thought. In order to comprehend the vast potential of *incolumis*, I have performed a comparative analysis of its use in Tacitus, Livy, Sallust and Suetonius, based on the examples of said writers in the *incolumis* entry of the TLL. I am convinced that limiting my analysis to only these four writers may only have exposed some of the potential one might find in *incolumis*, but considering that this thesis had to be finished within a year, some limitations were to be expected.

Based on this analysis and my studies, I would further state that one sometimes should acknowledge the author's presence, in which he displays personal opinions and observations, in classical prose, and that this is valuable information in forming an understanding of the author specifically, and also in order to comprehend his subject. Improving the knowledge we have on authors and their works increases the knowledge we have of their times and their societies.

Before the comparative analysis of the use of *incolumis* in Livy, Sallust, Suetonius and Tacitus, I considered it important to have a general understanding of Roman historiography and methodology, in order to be able to recognise individual characteristics of each writer,

and in order to know what generally to expect in Roman historiography. The chapter on the subject is quite brief, and is primarily focused on presenting a short overview on some of Roman historiography's aspects.

All the four writers under consideration in the analysis will be given their due introduction, Tacitus a more extensive one in section 1.B directly below, whereas Livy, Sallust and Suetonius will be given brief introductions in chapter 3.B.

1.B: Tacitus

Tacitus is by many considered one of the greatest prose writers in Ancient Rome. His works range from biography, through dialogue and ethnography, to history. His histories, the *Historiae* and the *Annales*, are probably his most famous works, in which he relates the events of the Year of the Four Emperors² and the succeeding emperors (*Historiae*) and Roman history from the Julio-Claudian dynasty³ (*Annales*).

However, Tacitus' career did not start with literature. It is believed that Tacitus was born around 56 or 57, yet little is known of his early years, of his family and of his land of origin. The most common assumption is that he came from Narbonese Gaul, that his father might have been an equestrian procurator in Gallia Belgica, and that his praenomen was either Gaius or Publius (Damon, p. 1).

He probably came to Rome in order to complete his education of rhetoric, and it is believed possible that he might have studied under Quintilian at his school of rhetoric (Martin, p. 26). Thereafter he began the *cursus honorum*. Tacitus himself admits that he led a political career, and that it begun during the reign of Domitian.⁴ It is commonly assumed that he became a senator in 74-75. He married the daughter of the general, Julius Agricola, in 77, having served his military tribunate under him, and later became a quaestor in 81 or 82 and then praetor in 88 (Syme, pp. 64-65). In 97, Tacitus became a consul in the Roman senate, possibly appointed by the very emperor he seems to have hated the most, Domitian (Mellor, p. 8). His final political position was that of proconsul, which he served as in Asia from 112-113 (Syme, p.72).

Tacitus' literary career began while he was still a politician, but he did not immediately turn to history. First he produced what some call the "lesser" works, namely the *Agricola*, the *Germania* and the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*. These were all written before he

² Generally refers to the civil wars of 69.

³ From the final days of Augustus, up until the death of Nero (27 BCE – 69).

⁴ *dignitatem nostram a Vespasiano inchoatam* (H.1.1)

turned to history, and all helped define his characteristics as an author. Calling these three works lesser than the *Historiae* and the *Annales* is a huge disservice, as this would indicate that they are less important when constructing an image of Tacitus as an author. Admittedly they are all shorter with regard to number of books and pages, but they shaped Tacitus' style, and offer assistance in reading Tacitus' oeuvre as a whole and its development.

The *Agricola* was the biography of his father-in-law, Gnaeus Julius Agricola, a Roman general serving under the tyrannical rule of emperor Domitian. He is clearly Tacitus' example of the ultimate, virtuous Roman, as he managed to live a moderate and honest life, even if he was one of the highest-ranking generals of the worst emperor since Nero. It is especially the circumstances under which he lived that amazes Tacitus, quite evidently expressed in the *Agricola*'s most famous citation:

Sciant, quibus moris est illicita mirari, posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse (Agr.42.4).⁵

The *Agricola* was also probably Tacitus' first literary work, believed to have been released in 98, immediately after his consulate, and hence marked only the beginning of his literary career. There is no doubt that Tacitus was already at this point a master of the Latin language. The *Agricolae*, although primarily a biography, also presented the reader with a short ethnography of the British people, a literary genre Tacitus would further attempt in his next work, released the same year.

The *Germania* (also released in 98) was a thorough ethnography, romanticising, to some extent, the German tribes, their people, and their land. The *Germania* paints an interesting picture of the Germans and their customs, their simple and crude ways of living, their honourable handling of conflicts, and their pure souls, uncorrupted by Roman influence. Tacitus is clearly amazed by the people, considered far greater an enemy of Rome than any other races:

non Samnis, non Poeni, non Hispaniae Galliaeve, ne Parthi quidem saepius admonere: quippe regno Arsacis acrior est Germanorum libertas (G.37).⁶

Libertas, when possessed by others than Rome, was to be considered an extraordinary threat (Thomas, p. 64). Tacitus presents the Roman audience with an interesting insight into an almost mythical, barbaric people. Historiographically, the *Germania* is generally considered

⁵ “[And] let them know, to whom it is customary to marvel at the illegal, that there can be great men even under bad emperors” (Agr. 42.4).

⁶ “Neither Samnite, nor Carthaginian, not Spain, nor Gaul, not even the Parthians have so often warned us: indeed the freedom of the Germans is sharper than the kingdom of Arsaces” (G.37).

to be quite weak, considered “far from reliable as a historical, anthropological or sociological work” (Thomas, p. 59), but historically it is considered quite important. Upon its rediscovery in the 15th century, the *Germania* was a huge influence in the forming of a national identity in Germany, and consequently is considered to have contributed greatly to the ideals of German National-Socialism (Krebs, p. 280-281).

The *Agricola* and the *Germania* were, as already mentioned, Tacitus’ first two literary works, probably released in that order, both in the same year. He would not turn to history yet, however, as he were to explore yet another genre first, namely the dialogue. The *Dialogus de Oratoribus* quite evidently evokes Cicero’s *De Oratore*, and has even been dubbed neo-Ciceronian by some modern researchers (Luce, 1993, p.11). The debate presented in the *Dialogus* certainly resembles that of *De Oratore*, as does the style, but it is still a Tacitean piece of literature, not Tacitus’ attempt at Ciceronian literature. The subject of the debate is the decline of oratory in Rome, and the competence of contemporary orators. Tacitus presents himself as a bystander of the entire debate and gives the reader three different views on contemporary oratory in Rome, presented in speeches by Aper, Messalla and Maternus. Tacitus never makes his own opinions on the subject clear, and never presents his own views in his own voice, but still it is an ongoing debate in modern Tacitean studies whether or not he presented his own opinions through one of the interlocutors, through different parts of all of them, or not at all.

Following the *Dialogus*, Tacitus turned to history, and what by some are called his “greater” works, but which should be called his “most famous” works, namely the *Historiae* and the *Annales*. It is assumed, by reading and dating the Plinian letters to Tacitus, that he had begun writing the *Historiae* in 106, and it is generally assumed that he finished the *Historiae* before he began the *Annales*, and that he did this in 112-113, while serving as proconsul of Asia. There is evidence that could support the claim that Tacitus was in the process of writing the fourth book of the *Annales* in 115 (Martin & Woodman, 2006, p. 12), hence one should not believe that Tacitus sat idle after finishing his first historical work, but rather that he begun his next one (*Annales*) as soon as the *Historiae* was completed.

The documentations of the *Historiae* begins shortly after the death of Nero, and records the events of the civil wars of 69, commonly known as the Year of the Four Emperors, and subsequently the history of the Flavian dynasty. It is unclear how many books the *Historiae* originally consisted of,⁷ but however many there were, only four survive in

⁷ Thought to be twelve or fourteen in total (Damon, p. 4).

complete form, as well as parts of the fifth book. The complete version of *Historiae* allegedly covered Roman history from 69-96, but the extant books and chapters only covers the events of 69 and the first months of Vespasian's reign.

The *Annales* records the events of the Julio-Claudian dynasty and the Roman Empire during this period, beginning with the death of Augustus (14) and the beginning of Tiberius' reign, and finishing with Nero and his reign (68). According to St. Jerome, Tacitus' historical works combined counted thirty books, and there is no certainty as to how many were the *Historiae* and how many the *Annales* (Martin & Woodman, 2006, p. 13). What we do know is from the *Annales* there remains books one through four, parts of book five, the entire book six, books thirteen through fifteen, with books sixteen breaking off midway through. Assuming the *Historiae* consisted of fourteen books, book sixteen of the *Annales* seems to have been the last.

2: Approach: Historiography and method

As previously mentioned, this thesis will mainly be focused on the role of the author in Latin prose, particularly dedicated to Tacitus and a few select phrases. However, in order to understand the author's presence in his own works, one needs also to comprehend the essence of the type of literature he produced. For my thesis in particular, I aim to demonstrate how Tacitus made use of a specific vocabulary in order to subtly express his own opinions. A general comprehension of the archetypal language of High Imperial prose history will then help me separate what is typical of the genre, and what is stylistically particular to Tacitus. In this chapter I will first present, albeit quite basically, the history of history writing and historiography. Thereupon I will give a short introduction to Roman historiography, much of which will be based on readings of John Marincola's *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, as this book in particular has brought great general insight into the topic at hand. Finally I will present some of my research methods when writing the thesis.

2.A: A brief summary on the development of history writing and historiography

The general concept "history" has changed somewhat from Antiquity to today. Modern history is largely focused with making the audience develop their own opinions of the causes and results of historic events. In Antiquity the audience was presented with something one could call absolute truths and a general moral code that was not to be questioned. History had its obvious protagonists and antagonists, all depending on where the historian in question stemmed from. For both Greek and Roman historians, the primary aim with their histories was to teach the history of their particular nation. The Greeks valued the inspirational and educational potential of their history more than anything, and considered the entertainment value to be less important (Breisach, p.17-18).

The Romans adopted the concept of history writing from the Greeks, and Roman history was initially also written in Greek. Polybius⁸ was the most influential of these early historians, himself a freed, Greek hostage of war. He sought to examine and understand why Rome's rise to power had been accomplished and maintained so much better than Greece's. Reading Breisach's chapters (p. 40-76) on the Roman historians, from Polybius, through Sallust, Livy and Tacitus, one gets the idea that they all shared the same goal, quite similar to that of the Greek historians, which was to educate their audience, primarily the Roman socially significant figures, on what to do and what not to do for Rome to prosper and to be

⁸ b. ca. 200 – d. 118 BCE

powerful and honourable. However, most historians did this by pointing out flaws of Roman society, giving the impression that all felt the need to teach because the Romans were losing grip on what had originally made them virtuous and honourable, yet powerful. There seems to have been a general understanding among Roman historians that the Rome of old was better than the new Rome (Breisach, p. 76), although the concept of what the *old*, and what the *new* Rome was changed as years passed.

Late Antiquity experienced the rise of Christianity, a religion that greatly contributed to the continuation of writing history, albeit now with a slightly different basis, namely God. Christian history dominated Late-Antiquity and the Middle Ages, and sought to document history from the Creation through the Fall of Man (Melve, p. 45). With a Christian foundation, history in the Middle Ages was often focused on national history, creating and defining national identity in a Christian context. The most notable historical works were the *Historia Francorum* by Gregory of Tours⁹ and Bede's¹⁰ *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* (Melve, p. 45-46). Teaching was still the primary focus of history, particularly educating and preaching on the Christian moral code.

One could continue on with a thesis of its own on the history and evolution of history writing and historiography; however, this is not the purpose of *this* thesis. A brief (satisfactory, but not at all thorough) summary can inform that through the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, elements of philology, legal studies and philosophy were integrated in history writing, and political history, which had previously considered mostly the state and nation, now also embraced the social and cultural factors (Melve, p.89).

In the 19th century, history was finally considered a science in its own right, and not as part of other sciences. This began with the school of history in Germany, and Leopold von Ranke,¹¹ who wanted history to be treated without the limitations of other sciences. A historian should be a historian only, not a man of another profession that at some point turned to the writing of history (Melve, p. 112). Making history a science of its own, gradually institutionalised in the Universities of Europe, made the availability of sources far greater, encouraged debate and comparison, and established national historical journals and source collections. Sources were examined, compared and evaluated according to a text-critical norm. However, the school of history were criticised by some for their use of sources, as many of these were considered too inaccurate, often based on vague memory, and Ranke's

⁹ b. 538 – d. 594

¹⁰ b. ca. 675 – d. 735

¹¹ b. 1795 – d. 1886

approach to history was considered by many to rely too much on teleology (Melve, p. 118-119).

Post 19th century history continues, and refines the school of history, with a considerable growth in publications and university positions. As history writing and historiography has progressed, it has also transformed substantially. Hayden White¹² is considered to have contributed greatly to the so-called “linguistic turn” in historiography. In his *Metahistory*¹³ he argues that the history writing of the 19th century historians were characterised by several literary features that gave their presentations of the past a subjective flavour (Melve, p. 111). White challenged the possibility of objective history, and pointed out that history, along with all sorts of literature, relied on rhetoric, more so than on evidence. Based on the “linguistic turn” in historiography, one may point out that a written history is simply that particular author’s point of view. This gave way for several points of view, which then again opened the doors for aspects of history that had not before been given much room, or even been taken seriously (Melve, p. 232-233).¹⁴

This section gives a rather simple generalization of the different eras of history writing and historiography, but still provides a short conception of the topic of this chapter. It is important to take the differences between the different eras, especially between pre-modern and post-modern history, into consideration when reading and trying to understand history written in all the pre-modern ages.

2.B: The call to history: Roman historiography

Some may argue that historical documentation began with the Mesopotamian kings and their inscriptions around 3000 BCE (Melve, p.17), in the sense that they desired to make the awareness of their kingdoms everlasting, but it is controversial to call this history, at least in the sense we regard it today. The most common claim is that history writing began with Ancient Greece and Herodotos’ (often referred to as the “father of history”) *Histories*,¹⁵ and also his contemporary counterpart Thucydides, with his *History of the Peloponnesian War*.¹⁶ The tandem, although different in style and conventions, are generally considered to have created history writing, and to have been extremely influential in the development of historical methodology.

¹² b. 1928

¹³ Released in 1973

¹⁴ e.g. feminist history and minority history.

¹⁵ The *Histories* of Herodotos were written sometime between 450 and 420 BCE.

¹⁶ Also produced in the 5th century BCE, but the exact dates are unknown.

Their styles were, as mentioned, quite different. It would be Thucydides that mostly influenced succeeding historians. Herodotos, although a pioneer in investigative historical documentation, approached history in a different way from Thucydides; he justified his authority as a narrator through excessive defence of his sources and his investigation, often partaking in his works with first person narrative (Marincola, p. 8-9). This is fairly atypical behaviour in ancient history writing, as will be demonstrated through Thucydides. Herodotos was not without successors clearly inspired by him, as Livy's style appears to resemble that of Herodotos in that he frequently appears in the first person voice.

The style of Thucydides, and several of his successors, both Greek and Roman, does not require frequent justification of the author's authority, especially not in the first person. The author presents the results of his investigations, not the investigation itself, and these results are not to be questioned, at least the writer does not spur the reader to doubt his authority.

The styles of Herodotos and Thucydides represent to a large extent the two main styles of history writing in Ancient Greece and Rome, although the styles did evolve somewhat through the centuries. Roman history writers often associated with the style of Thucydides are the likes of Tacitus and, to some extent, Sallust; and Livy is often mentioned as the Roman who mostly resembled Herodotos. This is the chief reason why I have chosen Sallust and Livy for my succeeding comparative analysis of the language of Tacitus. Along with Sallust and Livy I have added Suetonius, the biographer, as a contemporary of Tacitus. I will not venture too far into the methodology of biography in this chapter, but I will come back to Suetonius' relevance to my thesis.

It is not strange that Herodotos and Thucydides greatly influenced their successors. It was a great part of ancient literary tradition to mirror or imitate predecessors,¹⁷ given that they were respected practitioners of their literary style, as can clearly be seen in poetry and oratory (Marincola, p. 13), and it is only natural that this phenomenon was also to be found in history.

When studying the style and development of customs in the history writing of Antiquity, it is only natural that we start with the beginning, by which I mean the beginning of the text, in which the author presented his material. It is more or less the inclination of the ancient historian that he would explain to the audience why he sought to write history (Marincola, p. 34). To do this he could magnify the importance of his chosen material, quite

¹⁷ It is necessary to stress that imitation in no way meant copying, but rather referred to an awareness of language and style. The best writers were influenced by their predecessors with regard to style and language, but strived to improve and evolve in order to get better.

simply through the use of superlatives, or adjectives indicating magnificence and extraordinary significance. One can see this quite clearly in how Tacitus introduces his material in the *Historiae*:

Opus adgredior opimum casibus, atrox proeliis, discors seditionibus, ipsa etiam pace saevum (H.1.2).¹⁸

From this one may discern Tacitus' stressing of the immensity of his work. The adjectives he uses here are all quite extreme, and they give a certain indication of what one may expect from Tacitus' *Historiae*. His coupling of the initially opposing *pace* and *saevum* strengthens the extraordinary nature of his chosen subject, and offers a tense, if not oxymoronic, juxtaposition.

In his other historical work, the *Annales*, Tacitus points to the significance of unbiased documentation of history, and in doing so he emphasises the faults of the histories of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, as they were all written in anger or fear, further claiming the importance of writing their histories again, thereby defending his choice of subject.

Inde consilium mihi pauca de Augusto et extrema tradere, mox Tiberii principatum et cetera, sine ira et studio, quorum causas procul habeo (A.1.1).¹⁹

The passage follows Tacitus' paragraph on the faults of previous histories written on this particular subject matter, which he states are corrupted by either the fear (*metum*) of the principes while they lived, or hatred (*odium*) of them after their death. It is clear that Tacitus regarded freedom to write his mind, without influence from any political authority, to be of paramount importance when writing good history.

Sallust, on the other hand, does not follow the tradition of ancient history writers concerning the introduction of his subject matter. He never presents his area of expertise as the most suited for history writing, or most magnificent in any respect (Marincola, p.39-40). Sallust does stress the extreme difficulty of writing history in the introduction of his *Bellum Catilinae*:

Ac mihi quidem, tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur scriptorem et auctorem rerum, tamen in primis arduum videtur res gestas scribere (Cat.3.2).²⁰

¹⁸ "I approach this work, abundant in destructions, horrible with wars, inharmonious with insurrections, violent even in peace." (H.1.2)

¹⁹ "Hence, it is my plan to relate a little of Augustus, and his final acts; then [I will talk] of the principate of Tiberius and about the other [emperors], with neither hatred nor inclination, the motivations of which I hold at a distance." (A.1.1)

And he appears to be in awe of men attempting the challenge of writing history, whereupon he, somewhat amusingly, mirrors this same vocabulary (*res gestae*) when he declares his intention of writing the history of none other than the Romans:

*Sed a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat, eodem regressus statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur, perscribere, eo magis quod mihi a spe metu partibus, rei publicae animus liber erat (Cat.4.2).*²¹

By evoking his previous phrase in this way, Sallust clearly highlights the difficulty of his own work, and as such emphasises its value. However, Sallust strays away from praising any unique greatness of his chosen subject (Catiline), and as such does not continue in the vein of Herodotos, Thucydides and Polybios, and even to some extent Tacitus. His addition to documented Roman history is merely part (*carptim*) of what makes it such a great history. John Marincola (p. 45) suggests that Sallust's avoidance of magnifying his own subject may stem from the fact that he chose to be an historian before he chose what to write about, as opposed to historians who were called to history namely from the magnificence of their subject. Sallust's topic is generally the debasement of morals, and as such his central figures are examples of failed people; negative examples of greed, arrogance etc. This subject matter could certainly be compared to Tacitus' handling especially of Galba, but also other morally corrupt and despicable characters of his historical works, as far as comparisons go, but it does also give the impression that the educational importance of Sallust's works exceeded the need for magnificent subject matter.

The tradition of highlighting the unique greatness of one's chosen subject was followed also by Livy, although he approached the matter somewhat differently. Livy did not claim one particular event to be of such a great nature that it spurred him to write history, like Thucydides with the Peloponnesian War, or Tacitus with civil war reaching even the Capitol. Livy rather puts the focus on the greatness of history in itself, and the magnitude of his work, which is universal history (Marincola, p. 41), with Rome at the centre of said universe. Livy claims the soothing effect writing has upon him as one reason for his decision to be a historian. He cannot boast a prominent past in political or military life, as most other Roman

²⁰ "And for me, indeed, even if by no means at all an equal glory accompanies the writer and the performer of deeds, it still seems of the highest degree of difficulty to write about [these] deeds." (Cat.3.2)

²¹ "but, as ill ambition detained me from such an undertaking and study, I, returning to these, have decided to write in full parts of the deeds of the Roman people, as everything is considered worthy of memory, this [the writing] was more [suited] for me because my mind was free from the expectation, fear or partisanship of the government." (Cat.4.7)

historians before him, to whom writing history was only a natural continuation of virtuous actions having retired from public life.

We can see from these three examples, acknowledging the fact that they all evoked a classical tradition in history writing, that a usual “call to history” was the very magnificence of their subject, the uniqueness of the events or individuals they handled. These three of my chosen writers all followed the classical methodological tradition, with the presentation of their subject, at least in some way. To Sallust and Livy it was not one particular event that was unique and great *per se*, but rather the very fact that the events took place in Rome, the greatest state and people that had ever existed, hence being the greatest in nature. Tacitus on the other hand only presents his subject as unique and significant in the *Historiae*, whereas in the *Annales* he is more modest, claiming that the material in itself in no particular way is special, as it has already been handled multiple times by other historians before him, but that his particular approach to this specific part in Roman history is unique and extremely important, as he will present it unbiased.

There is also the question of the author’s credibility, which is of paramount importance to Greek and Roman historiography. The focus is on the author’s declarations of ability and authority to write his histories. The early, pre-imperial²² Greek historians, mainly Herodotos and Thucydides, emphasised their experiences as cause for authority and credibility in their writing of histories. This experience stemmed from travelling and interviewing eyewitnesses, as well as experiencing events themselves. Herodotos set the norm for successors to follow, and perhaps improve, and hence had no guidelines for how to generate authority and credibility, and all his experience stems from inquiry; whereas Thucydides began his history writing based on personal experiences (Marincola, p.133).

As the Romans began writing their own history, so they also had their own ways in evaluating credibility and authority. It is believed, although a lack of clear evidence and good sources makes many of the probable conclusions somewhat speculative, that it was Cato, being the first known Roman historian, who made the author’s authority and credibility reliant on the social status (*dignitas*) of the author, and on his position compared to other members of society. There was still value in experience, but rather experience in political life than in military life (Marincola, p. 138).

Writing history was generally reserved for the later years of life, after a (preferably) successful career in politics. Sallust, however, could not present such a thing on his résumé.

²² i.e. before Greece was made a Roman province.

His political career was somewhat turbulent, and in order to defend turning to writing he had to demonstrate and justify his decision to leave politics, and present his *dignitas*, i.e. his authority and credibility, in a different manner. In order to do this, he presented the contemporary senate as corrupt, blinded by greed and personal interest, caring nothing for the common good (Marincola, p.139):

nam pro pudore, pro abstinentia, pro virtute audacia largitio avaritia vigeant
(Cat.3.3).²³

Sallust was special in that he was the first Roman historian to turn away from politics before he had succeeded and completed the customary political path; and additionally in that he was renowned as a writer nonetheless.

The need for practical experience in order to write history was initially questioned by Sallust, but it was Livy who truly embraced the idea of writing history simply by personal interest and solely through investigation of sources.²⁴ Livy had no political or military career to look back at; he was an independent author, probably with money and time to do what he wanted (Luce, 1998, p. x). The question of authority and credibility is never explicitly handled by Livy, as he refrains from mentioning his merits in the presentation of the *Ab Urbe Condita*. In many ways, Livy resembles Herodotos, in that he appears in the first person voice in his own works, and in that he often presents and defends his sources; but unlike Herodotos, he never claims supreme authority and credibility to write his histories. He was not the first to handle the subject and he did not boast vast experience in public or military life.

After Livy, authority and credibility was at some point also reliant on the *dignitas* of the writer's family, where the very name of the author was enough to produce credibility.²⁵ Tacitus, however, returned to the old customs, befittingly so, where experience and credibility was closely connected. Tacitus experienced a long and successful political career, completing *cursus honorum* when proconsul in Asia. He witnessed the civil war of 69 in person, and suffered the tyrannical rule of Domitian. However, he did not delay his literary career until he had finished his political career.²⁶

²³ “for in stead of honour, temperance and virtue; audacity, bribery and greed flourished.”
(Cat.3.3)

²⁴ That is to say, Sallust and Livy paved the way for writing history without practical experience from politics or war for Roman writers. Herodotos was the first Greek historian to write history without military or political experience.

²⁵ Trogus and Velleius frequently mention family members, and their experiences, in order to establish authority and credibility (Marincola 141-143).

²⁶ See Chapter 1.B above.

For Roman authors there were several different ways to claim and defend authority and credibility as a writer of history among the Roman authors, and there are peculiar characteristics with almost every writer, making it impossible to write a short, yet thorough introduction to the subject. The most important thing as a Roman historian, however, was that the histories should benefit Rome. They aimed to educate, not only on past events, but also on how to behave properly and virtuously, and how this was the only way for their republic, or empire, to flourish.

There are several other methodological guidelines one should consider in studies of ancient historiography, but addressing them all would be beyond the scope of this thesis. There is no intention to examine whether or not the writers I have chosen for examination wrote within the boundaries of their genres, and if they wrote history “correctly,” as this is hardly for me to decide, but rather to recognise what adheres to typical characteristics of the writer’s genres, and what was their own style.

2.C: My research methods

This thesis offers a comparative analysis of several Tacitean, Livian, Sallustian, and Suetonian passages, all of which were referred to in the *incolumis* entry of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. I translated each passage and examined them all separately, carefully considering the possible connotations of *incolumis* in each example.

Performing this analysis required a thorough familiarity with the TLL, and its organization. The entries of this dictionary provide rather extensive treatments of each word, presenting every generally acknowledged meaning of a word. However, in my examination I did stumble upon a few features of *incolumis*, which I did not get the impression that the TLL acknowledged, and these have been noted.

I made use of the Perseus Digital Library for the Latin passages, as the PDL offers digital versions of the Teubner editions and the Clarendon Press editions, both of which are considered standard critical editions based on thorough examination of the relevant manuscripts. Additionally, the PDL offers a robust search engine, which makes it possible to locate each occurrence of a single word, making it considerably easier to locate *incolumis* in the literature of the four writers in question.

3: A study of the author's role and presence in his literature through the use of a particular vocabulary in Ancient Roman prose

This chapter is focused on the word *incolumis*, specifically on its use in Tacitus, and in Livy, Sallust and Suetonius. The primary claim is based on my interpretation of one particular phrasing of Tacitus, *incolumi adhuc Galba*, a phrase that occurs twice, in H.1.46 and H.2.1, and is generally considered to express simply “while Galba was [still] alive.” My claim is that *incolumis* here is more loaded than this translation indicates, and that one may deduce several meanings from it, some reflecting Tacitus’ personal opinion and voice. The meanings of *incolumis* in this particular phrase sparked an interest in examining how *incolumis* was used in general, or if there even was a general use of the word. Is it always a very loaded word, with several connotations, or is this a Tacitean use of the word? If so, does he use it in one particular way, or differently in different contexts?

When speaking about the Tacitean opinion, it is often associated with reading too much into how he portrays certain characters, and how these may reflect his own views and characteristics. I, on the other hand, will not try to locate Tacitus where he is not obviously present. In other words, I will study his own words, the allegedly objective words, and point out where he may have lost his grip of this objectivity, if he ever did, and where his own opinions may have flavoured the language to the extent that one may deduce more or less concrete examples of who he was and how he thought. The need for this might be questioned, but I am of the opinion that one, in order to completely understand Tacitus’ works and his time, needs to form a general understanding of who the man actually was. Do I believe that his own opinions flavoured his works to such an extent that he produced false representations of men and ages? No, certainly not, as there are several contemporaries of his that presents us with basically the same descriptions and documentations. However, it is still important to form an as exact conception of Tacitus as a politician, historian, and citizen of Rome at the time as possible, in order to comprehend Tacitus as best we can. The Tacitean field of study will be divided concerning this statement, but I hope to convince anyone who reads this of the importance of the study, simply through the material I present here.

The research presented in this chapter is primarily philological, in which I perform a comparative analysis of the use of the word *incolumis* by Tacitus, Livy, Sallust and Suetonius. My claim is that *incolumis* is a loaded word, and that it was rarely, if ever, applied without the intention of additional, and subtle meanings. Examining *incolumis* has given reason to believe that it conveying several meanings by this one word was not an individual feature of Tacitus, but rather that the word was used in specific ways by several prose authors. Examining the

use of this word, I point out that an awareness of word selection, with *incolumis* being the primary example, provides new ways to discover the author's personal opinions and presence in his works, even where it was perhaps not intended. The study will also demonstrate the different scenarios and settings in which the four different authors would apply *incolumis*, in order to determine what were genre characteristics and what was the author's individual traits.

In order to present the most thorough documentation of *incolumis* I have made use of several dictionaries for a best possible overview of the word and its meanings. For English translations I made use of the Oxford Latin Dictionary (OLD) and the Lewis & Short Latin Dictionary (L&S). In addition to these Latin-English dictionaries I also studied the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (TLL), which is a Latin-Latin dictionary rather than a thesaurus, as the name could give reason to believe. The TLL was my primary source of examples, and formed my general understanding of the uses of *incolumis*. Before the study is presented, I will introduce the TLL and address how it is organised, for the reader to find it easier to understand the references I make to the different entries.

3.A: The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*

The TLL is the most extensive and thorough dictionary of the Latin language. Even if it is named *Thesaurus*, it more resembles a dictionary than an actual thesaurus. What sets it apart from other frequently used dictionaries in Latin, is that it does not include translations, meaning that it is a Latin-Latin dictionary, as opposed to the more regular Latin-English Dictionary such as the OLD or the L&S. The series is not yet complete, and the writing of it began in 1894 at the *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, and it was until 1949 only worked on by German scholars. In 1949, however, the project was made international, and the date of its completion still remains uncertain (Blundell, p.25-26).

The entries in the TLL can at first glance seem rather complex, most of all because all the explanations of the Latin in question are also in Latin, and because some of these descriptions might seem somewhat vague at times. Therefore I will now, for the reader's convenience, explain how an entry in the TLL looks like, followed by a map of the word *incolumis*, which will be further investigated later in the chapter.

The user of the TLL will first be presented with the word in question, e.g. *lacus*,²⁷ an immediate presentation of what it essentially means, and some similar words. Following this [often] short introduction to the word's meaning, the user is offered significant uses of said word. These uses have different categories and ranks. First of all, one gets the most general of categories, which are listed with Roman numbers.²⁸ Then the subsequent divisions of categories are ordered according to specification. The complete list starts with the aforementioned Roman numbers, and is followed by capital letters of the Latin alphabet (TLL: *lacus* I.A). Following subcategories are listed after regular numbers, small letters of the Latin alphabet, then small letters of the Greek alphabet (TLL: *lacus* I.A.1.a.α). Specifications beyond this are rare, but when consulting entries of words with a wide range of meaning or varying syntax (e.g. *lacus*), one might at times get even more specific entries, and the list of divisions then continues with encircled Roman numbers, followed by encircled capital letters of the Latin alphabet, and finally encircled regular numbers. Hence the longest reference to an entry of the TLL could look like this: (TLL: *lacus* I.A.1.a.α.ⓐ.ⓑ.Ⓒ). More extensive and complex entries than this I have not observed in the TLL. However, with my particular research, the entry I work with does not get more specific than using the Greek alphabet.

²⁷ As an example I will use the word *lacus*, as this word offers one of the longest divisions found in the TLL.

²⁸ I, II, III, IV, V etc.

Presented below is a map of the TLL entry of the word *incolumis*, which, as has been already stated, will figure later in the chapter. I will not take the time to explain the meanings of each entry of *incolumis* here, as this will follow in the subsequent analysis of it. The map aims to offer the reader an idea of how the TLL is organised, and will offer a point of reference for the following analysis.

Incolumis (i.q. salvus, integer)

- I. *Corporaliter*
 - A. *Generatim*
 1. *De animantibus sanis et integris*
 - a. *De toto corpore*
 - α . *Hominum*
 - β . *Bestiarum*
 - b. *De corporum partibus*
 2. *De rebus variis corporeis*
 - B. *Specialia*
 1. *Respicitur vita conservata*
 2. *Respicitur quantitas seu numerus fere*
 - a. *Animantium*
 - b. *Rerum*
 - α . *In universum*
 - β . *Speciatim de re familiari*
- II. *Incorporaliter*
 - A. *De hominibus*
 1. *De statu externo*
 2. *De animi qualitate*
 - a. *De condicione mentis, animae sim*
 - b. *De fide orthodoxa*
 - B. *De re publica sim*
 - C. *De rebus incorporeis*

3.B: A short introduction to the Roman authors used with Tacitus in the study

In the study that follows, I examine four Roman prose authors, the historians Livy, Sallust and Tacitus and the biographer Suetonius. My main focus for the entire chapter, and the thesis in itself, is Tacitus, but the present study necessitates a comparative analysis. In this section of the chapter, I briefly introduce each of the three other writers, as Tacitus has already been introduced,²⁹ and I will explain why I have chosen these three particular writers and why they were the natural choice of authors to use in comparison to Tacitus. The analysis itself will make up the main emphasis of this chapter, and it will be thoroughly presented below.

3.B.i: Livy

Titus Livius (b. ca. 64 BCE – d. 17) was a Roman historian, born in Patavium.³⁰ Unlike most other historians of Rome, or even Greece, Livy was never involved in politics or the military, but was schooled in rhetoric and philosophy (Luce, 1998, p.x). He states that he wrote history for himself, as it was pleasing for him to do so.

*Iuvabit tamen rerum gestarum memoriae principis terrarum populi pro virili parte et ipsum consoluisse; et si in tanta scriptorum turba mea fama in obscuro sit, nobilitate ac magnitudine eorum me, qui nomini officient meo, consoler (Liv.Pr.3).*³¹

Livy came from an aristocratic family in Patavium, and was economically secure enough to dedicate his life solely to writing. This resulted in one of the most extensive histories ever written in Antiquity, stretching over 142 books. Beginning with the origins of the Roman people, the *Ab Urbe Condita* covered every significant event of Roman history up until the death of Drusus in the year 9 BCE. Sadly only 35 books survive in their entirety (1-10 and 21-45).

The *Ab Urbe Condita*, in contrast to the works of the other two historians studied for this thesis (Sallust and Tacitus), is a massive non-contemporary world history, written with a moral component (Marincola, p. 29), designed to educate the Roman people, not only in their heritage, but also in virtues and vices. It is interesting to use Livy in a comparative analysis of Latin vocabulary and language, because he brings insight into a prominent subcategory of history writing that not many other surviving works treated, and should definitely not be

²⁹ See chapter 1.B, p. 8.

³⁰ Now the Italian city of Padua.

³¹ Liv.Pr.3 translated: “Nevertheless, it will delight to have reflected myself, to the best of my ability, on the memory of the deeds of the foremost people in the world; and if in such a throng of writers my fame is in obscurity, I will comfort myself with the nobility and greatness of those who overshadow my name.”

excluded. There is also no denying the fact that Livy was one of the most successful historians of Ancient Rome, whatever the era, and his contribution to the historical language and rhetoric could have provided valuable sources of inspiration to the likes of Tacitus and Suetonius. Livy's influence on the Latin language can be seen quite evidently in the TLL, where he dominates the references in a large number of entries in the dictionary. This does not necessarily imply more than that Livy is held in high regard in modern studies of the Latin language, but still gives reason to believe that he may have contributed greatly on historical vocabulary and use of Latin.

It is important to note, however, that Livy's style, and his kind of history writing, is not the same as one would find in Tacitus, or Sallust, and to some extent Suetonius, although it is controversial to call Suetonius a historian, rather than a biographer. All four represent different eras, styles or both, and it is the status Livy held in life and in posterity, both with regard to his language and his subject, that makes him an important contribution to my comparative analysis.

3.B.ii: Sallust

Gaius Sallustius Crispus (b. ca. 86 – d. 35 BCE) was born in the city of Amiternum, in the Sabine countryside. This region was given full Roman citizenship, with full citizen rights before the Social War (91-87 BCE), and it is generally assumed that Sallust was born a Roman citizen (Ramsey, p.2). His family, however, was not of high stature and impressive heritage. Sallust was the first member of his family to take on the *cursus honorum*, and was hence, like Cicero, a *homo novus*.

Unlike Livy, Sallust was not primarily a writer and historian, but began his adult life in politics. In Cat.3.3 Sallust tells his readers that he was drawn towards politics at an early age:

sed ego adulescentulus initio sicuti plerique studio ad rem publicam latus sum, ibique mihi multa advorsa fuere (Cat.3.3).³²

The first, documented political position held by Sallust, was that of Tribune, in the year 52 BCE. However, as Tribune is not the natural starting point of the *cursus honorum*, it is generally assumed that he began his political career as Quaestor, most likely in 55 BCE

³² “But I, a young man, was in the beginning, as several others, led by inclination towards politics, but in that matter there was much that was against me.” (Cat.3.3)

(Ramsey, p. 2), and served in the offices of Tribune,³³ Praetor and Proconsul. He was also an officer under Julius Caesar during the civil war (Earl, p. 1). He finished his political career after the death of Caesar in 44 BCE, and dedicated the rest of his life to literature.

A comparison of the style and language of Sallust to that of Tacitus is fruitful, as Sallust is widely considered to have influenced Tacitus greatly, which is especially noticeable in, as said by S. P. Oakley, his “pointed style” (Oakley, p. 195). The subjects they handled are different, however, as Sallust studied and documented specific events,³⁴ while Tacitus’ historical works took on a far wider range of subjects. So with Sallust, my comparisons will be between the language of Sallust and Tacitus, and their use of certain words and phrases in specific circumstances.

3.B.iii: Suetonius

Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus (b. ca. 70 – died sometime after 130) was a Roman biographer/historian of the High Empire, born into an equestrian family. He was close friends with Pliny the Younger, and through him came into the favour of the emperors Trajan and Hadrian. He held three imperial secretary offices, two under Trajan and one under Hadrian (Edwards, p. viii), first as minister *a bibliothecis*, then *a studiis* and finally *ab epistulis*.³⁵ However, he fell out of favour with Hadrian and was dismissed in 122, accused of having conducted himself in an inappropriate manner towards Hadrian’s wife, Sabina (Hurley, p. 4).

Suetonius was not, like the other three authors discussed in this chapter, obviously a historian. It is perhaps more fitting to call him a biographer, at least if we consider his most famous work, the *De vita Caesarum* (released sometime between 119 and 122). This book treats the Caesars of Rome, from Julius Caesar up until and including Domitian. In this literary effort, Suetonius presents the lives of these Caesars from birth to death, a thorough investigation into the early years of the emperor, of his deeds, virtues and vices, and of his family. Historical events extending beyond the life and deeds of the emperor are rarely treated, and his works resembles more Plutarch’s biographies rather than the historical documentations of Tacitus and Livy.

³³ He suffered expulsion by the senate in 50 BCE, but was reinstated by Julius Caesar as Quaestor a year or two later. (Earl, p. 1)

³⁴ The Catilinarian conspiracy in *Bellum Catilinae* and the Jugurthine War in *Bellum Jugurthinum*.

³⁵ *A bibliothecis* was the person in charge of the library (OLD: *bibliotheca*), *a studiis* was the emperor’s adviser on literary matters (OLD: *studium*, 7.c), and *ab epistulis* was the imperial secretary (OLD: *epistula*, 1.d).

Suetonius is part of my analysis because he is the only other revered Roman author writing in Latin that documented the same periods and emperors as Tacitus' *Historiae* and *Annales*, and I may therefore perform a comparative analysis of Suetonius' and Tacitus' vocabulary associated with these emperors in order to find similarities and individual characteristics, from which it may be possible to trace the author's opinion or presence.

3.C: A thorough analysis of *incolumis* in Classical Latin Prose

For reasons of time and space, I limited my search in the different dictionary entries to the four, abovementioned writers. I went through the different entries in the dictionaries and made a note of each occurrence from any one of these writers.³⁶ I then located these occurrences in the original work, translated the passages in which the word occurred, and compared the usage of it between the writers and their individual works. Analysing their individual use of *incolumis*, I aimed to discover what were the general uses of it, and what were the characteristic uses of the word by each of the writers.

Before I began my examination of the above-mentioned dictionaries, I used the PDL and searched through the entire *corpus* of Tacitus, Sallust and Suetonius, and most of Livy, and documented where and how frequently they made use of *incolumis* in total. From these studies, I discovered that Livy was a much more ardent user of it than the other three, as it figures a staggering 25 times in only the first ten books of the *Ab Urbe Condita*. In comparison, Tacitus only made use of *incolumis* 23 times in total, Sallust as little as five times, and Suetonius only six. However, as the TLL demonstrates the varying uses of *incolumis* one finds in the four writers under consideration, I have limited my analysis to the examples listed in the TLL for practicality.

It is important to stress the difference between indirect and direct speech when one attempts to examine the author's presence in his own works. In direct speech, the author arguably seeks to present the reader with the most accurate reproduction of one particular individual's language, seeking to emulate this in a believable, or at least plausible manner. As such, the language of direct speech need not necessarily represent the language of the author, but rather language necessitated by circumstances – the speaker, the rhetorical aims etc. One could definitely state that it is possible to discover the author's personal opinion in direct speech, as one is able to perceive the author's conception of how and who the speaker was. The language the author assigns to the speaker may often represent an idea of the speaker's

³⁶ 48 occurrences in total, of which Livy dominates, with 33.

education and intellect. Representations of speakers may, however, often be compared among writers, as many famous speakers figure across the works of several different writers. If such comparisons reveal that the different writers presented the speeches of their speakers differently, one may often conclude that personal opinion in at least one of the instances may have flavoured the language attributed to the speakers. The difficulty that arises is then to determine which of the presentations were the most neutral and probable.

In indirect speech, however, the author allows his own style and words to relate what was said by others. In instances of indirect speech, it is more reasonable to assume that the author may have made use of a particular vocabulary, in order to demonstrate who the original speaker was, and what were his traits. It also allows the author to let his own opinions of said character flavour his portrayal, to a larger extent than with direct speech, considering that direct speech often would have references from other authors as well. In my thesis, I will gradually go through the entire *incolumis*-entry in the TLL, examining all examples from Livy, Sallust, Suetonius and Tacitus. At the end of every section, I will summarize the patterns for each meaning in these four authors. In occasions of direct or indirect speech, this will be commented and addressed in my study of said example.

3.C.i: Incolumis I.A: generatim

The TLL entry states that *incolumis* is derived from *columna*,³⁷ which means “column” or “pillar,” and that *incolumis* indicates a column standing erect, stable and strong. The entry further states that *incolumis* would then be used to describe something as *salvus* and *integer*. So the overlying impression is that *incolumis* describes something as erect, strong, whole and safe (TLL: *incolumis*).³⁸ This gives the impression that one would not make use of this particular word if the column was not strong and stable, further indicating that this word is used to describe something of good quality. Metaphors concerning people of good health and of being unharmed seem reasonable. It appears unlikely that one would use *incolumis* to describe a pillar barely standing, ready to fall. During my analysis, I came to the conclusion that there are three connotations of *incolumis* that are more prominent than others: namely connotations of dependency, reputation, or quantity. To clarify, *incolumis* is often presented as a state of being that depends on an external factor, it often points to the reputation of its referent, and it often expresses the state of being “in full number.” These connotations will be

³⁷ *A columna nomen habet, quasi erectus, fortis et stabilis.*

³⁸ References to dictionaries will be as follows: (Dictionary: *word entry*, sections of entry).

noted and commented where I have observed them, but should be considered when defining the broad meaning of *incolumis*.

The entry continues with more specific uses of the word. It begins with entry I, which is dedicated to the body (TLL: *incolumis*, I), and follows with entry I.A, which presents the general uses of the word and states that the word is used to describe a body, or person, as whole (*integer*) and safe (*salvus*), unharmed (*invulneratus, illaesus sim*); the entry further on, I.A.1, claims that *incolumis* may be used when describing the living (*animantibus*) as healthy (*sanis*³⁹) and sound (*integris*⁴⁰). The entry continues with yet another subcategory, I.A.1.a, *de toto corpore*, i.e. when describing the entire body of either α : a human being (*hominum*), or β : animals (*bestiarum*). As one can see,⁴¹ there are several divisions of subcategories under this particular entry. Each one the authors under consideration in this thesis figures in the references to this particular usage of the word, i.e. with reference to human beings (I.A.1.a. α). *Incolumis* could also be used in descriptions *de toto corpore* of animals (I.A.1.a. β), but none of my chosen writers made use of *incolumis* in this particular context.

3.C.i.a: Tacitus (TLL: *incolumis* I.A.1)

1. *Vitellius litteras ad Titianum fratrem Othonis composuit, exitium ipsi filioque eius minitans ni incolumes sibi mater ac liberi servarentur* (H.1.75).⁴²

We begin with Tacitus' use of *incolumis* according to entry I.A.1.a. α . In a brewing conflict between Otho, now emperor of Rome, and Vitellius, a general in Germania with aspirations of becoming emperor, after several letters (first of flattery, then of accusations, and finally with threats) had been sent between them, Vitellius, fearing for his own family, sent a letter to Otho's brother. *Incolumis* occurs here in indirect speech, in a reconstruction of the letters sent by Vitellius to Titianus.

In these letters *incolumis* first and foremost expresses "safe and sound," which might seem simple enough, and could at first glance also appear to be the only meaning to be understood. There is more to be perceived, however. In indirect speech, it is rather unlikely that Tacitus would apply *incolumis* in order to give the impression that Vitellius was a particularly eloquent man. This use illustrates that Tacitus would see the necessity of using a

³⁹ *Sanus* may also mean "uninjured" and "sane," and other similar adjectives.

⁴⁰ *Integer* could also mean "complete," "whole," or "intact."

⁴¹ See map of the *incolumis*-entry above in section 3.A.

⁴² "Vitellius composed letters to Titianus, the brother of Otho, threatening death to him and his son, unless his [i.e. Vitellius'] mother and children were kept safe and sound." (H.1.75)

particular vocabulary describing, or illustrating the character of Vitellius in the best manner. In this instance, Vitellius is portrayed somewhat helpless and pathetic, where the state of his family, which he hopes and seeks to be *incolumis*, is entirely dependent on another man, namely Titianus, the brother of Vitellius' enemy, and therefore also his enemy. The threats are quite empty, but indicate that Vitellius aspired to give the impression of power, even where he had none; but as for *incolumis* alone, it here expresses a highly uncertain state of "safe and sound," depending on an external factor. The end result was in favour of Vitellius, however, as his family was spared and he eventually won the war against Otho.

2. *an Vitellium tam inmitis animi fore ut pro incolumi tota domo ne hanc quidem sibi gratiam redderet?* (H.2.48).⁴³

This citation from Tacitus is collected from a recited speech performed by Otho, and whatever sarcasm and metaphor one may find in the use of *incolumis* here, should thus be attributed to Otho, which, by all means, would not be unlikely, as Tacitus appears to warm to Otho throughout the second book of the *Historiae*.⁴⁴ This speech and rhetorically clever language attributed to Otho is definitely Tacitean, as a speech similar to this one occurs in neither Suetonius, Plutarch nor Cassius Dio. This furthers the notion that Tacitus, although hostile towards Otho's manner of obtaining power, valued the virtue of his death and aftermath.

The speech aims to point out the foolishness and stubbornness of Vitellius. The rhetorical question he presents to his audience can have only one answer: Yes, of course he can be, because he is a cruel man. *Incolumis* itself is also here relying on the will of Otho, as in the previous example, and Otho uses it in order to illustrate his power. Its basic meaning is still "unharmful," but it might appear that *incolumis* is rarely used to express this in scenarios where such a state is not highly uncertain and depending on some other factor.

⁴³ "Will Vitellius really be so cruel of mind that he indeed will not give this gratitude in return for the safety of his entire house?" (H.2.48)

⁴⁴ To say that he warms to Otho may be a stretch, but the manner of Otho's death (an honourable suicide) and Tacitus handling of Otho's *post mortem*-reputation (never turning to ridicule, like he did with Galba), supports the idea that Tacitus regarded Otho's life as a transition from bad to good.

3.C.i.b: Livy (TLL: *incolumis* I.A.1)

1. *in Italia Arpi recepti, Capua capta; iter omne ab urbe Roma trepida fuga emensus Hannibal, in extremum angulum agri Bruttii compulsus, nihil iam maius precatur deos, quam ut **incolumi** cedere atque abire ex hostium terra liceat* (Liv.26.41.16).⁴⁵

The first Livian example is somewhat unusual, considering that *incolumis* here is found as part of indirect speech (*he prays to the gods that...*), but the entire phrase is part of a speech performed by Publius Scipio. So, *incolumis* is used similarly to H.1.75 above, where Scipio aims to give his audience an encouraging vision of Hannibal, in which he fears Scipio and the Roman army, praying futilely to his gods. The fact that Scipio uses *incolumis* as the state Hannibal hopes for himself, might indicate that he wished to express how futile these prayers actually were. In order to understand why *incolumis* is so important to this phrase, one should take into consideration a connotation of dependency, as the state of *incolumis* is presented by Scipio as completely dependent on the Carthaginian gods.

H.2.48 above gives the impression that *incolumis*, at least in Tacitean use, could be used as the goal of an aspiration, only if this goal would not be achieved; i.e. *incolumis* foreshadows a future state of being that is not *incolumis*. This use of *incolumis* will be observed on several occasions throughout the thesis. With this in mind, one would at least have to consider the sarcasm in this passage. It seems that Scipio, in using *incolumis*, demonstrates how pathetic Hannibal's prayers are, and the certainty of a Roman victory.

However, it is still part of direct speech, and these personal opinions of Scipio are presented by Livy's understanding of who Scipio was, and how he thought. Considering this, Livy appears to depict Scipio as a confident leader, whose authority must have been inspirational for his troops. This ridicule of Hannibal and the power of his gods intends to fire up Scipio's soldiers for one last push in the battle against the Carthaginians, for Hannibal is weak and he now fears them. This confidence is justified by the final achievements by Scipio, where he ultimately kills Hannibal and defeats Carthage. Known in posterity as one of the greatest Roman generals ever, this speech gives some insight into how he managed to become so. Military skill and supreme confidence in himself as a leader, and in his men.

⁴⁵ "In Italy, Arpi has been taken back, Capua has been captured; Hannibal has traversed the entire road from the city of Rome in agitated flight, driven to that outermost corner of the Bruttian land, he now prays to the gods for nothing more than that he may withdraw unharmed and depart from this land of the enemy." (Liv.26.41.16)

2. *ita sicut erat armatus in Tiberim desiluit multisque superincidentibus telis incolumis ad suos tranavit rem ausus plus famae habituram ad posteros quam fidei* (Liv.2.10.11).⁴⁶

Livy here presents the word in a mythical incident, the credibility of which he questions. The word translates to “unharméd” and “safely.” The act is performed by a soldier, Horatius Cocles, who is guarding a wooden bridge over the Tiber, which gave entrance to Rome. In an Etruscan attack, he and two other soldiers fight off the Etruscan soldiers by the bridge, while other Roman soldiers attempt to demolish it. In the final part of the battle he orders his two companions to flee over the bridge before it is completely destroyed. Having defended the bridge long enough, he leaps into the river and swims ashore on the other side. Cocles is a Roman legend, and crucial to the forming of Roman identity in the early Roman histories. A similar occurrence of *incolumis*, in which the credibility of the claim is questioned directly by the author, I have not observed elsewhere, and I would hence conclude that this usage is rather unusual.

3. *precor... salvos incolumesque victis perduellibus victores, spoliis decorates⁴⁷, praeda onustos triumphantesque mecum domos reduces sistatis⁴⁸; inimicorum hostiumque ulciscendorum copiam faxitis* (Liv.29.27.3).⁴⁹

Here, *incolumis* is even used together and in agreement with *salvus*, which really emphasises that it signifies more than simply being “unhurt,” or “safe and sound.” It is also part of a prayer to the gods, performed by Scipio, rendering their state of being *incolumes* as up to the gods, and as such, it is clearly uncertain whether or not they will be so. Considering that Scipio above, in Liv.26.41.16, ridiculed the Carthaginian gods, one might here see a demonstration of the power of the Roman gods, confirmed by the fact that the Roman gods

⁴⁶ “Thus he leaped into the Tiber, as he was fully armed, and he swam across to his men unharméd with many spears raining over him, a daring act to be considered a famous rumour by posterity rather than credible.” (Liv.2.10.11)

⁴⁷ Must be *decoratos*. Probably a typographical error when the text was made digital.

⁴⁸ The subjunctive is used here as a part of a subordinate clause expressing desire, when Scipio asks that the gods may lead him and his men home safe.

⁴⁹ “I pray... that, with the public enemies defeated, you lead the victors, safe and unharméd, decorated with their spoils, triumphant and loaded with loot, back home with me; that you give us power to the punishment of our enemies and foes.” (Liv.29.27.3)

succeeded in letting the Romans win, whereas the Carthaginian gods failed at aiding their people to victory.

One might also argue that there is a connotation of reputation attributed to *incolumis* here, meaning that Scipio prayed for his soldiers to return to Rome with unspoiled reputations. This would fit with section II.A.1⁵⁰ in the TLL, where such connotations of reputation are treated; however, in the examples used there, *incolumis* expresses the state of the reputation of single individuals, and not armies. Claiming that this meaning applies here might be going too far, but it should certainly be considered when reading it. What is unquestionable on the other hand, is that *incolumis* here expresses “unharméd,” but also perhaps “in full number.” Another section of the TLL entry on *incolumis* (I.B.2.a)⁵¹ is actually dedicated to quantity, and the example here might fall under said section, in addition to section I.A.1.

3.C.i.c: Sallust (TLL: *incolumis* I.A.1)

1. *deinde Iugurtha postero die cum Aulo in conloquio verba facit: tametsi ipsum cum exercitu fame et ferro clausum ten<er>et, tamen se memorem humanarum rerum, si secum foedus faceret, **incolumis** omnis sub iugum missurum; praeterea uti diebus decem Numidia decederet (Iug.38.9).*⁵²

Yet again *incolumis* figures in direct speech. This time in a speech performed by Iugurtha as part of a conversation with Aulus. The language then, as have been stated above, probably represents Sallust’s conception of Iugurtha, and the expressions applied in *incolumis* could therefore be considered Sallust’s opinions of Iugurtha’s intellect and eloquence. The meaning of *incolumis* here appears to be “unharméd,” which is reasonable; simple, yet effective. It is worth noting that it is also here used in a hypothetical scenario, and one should consider a connotation of dependency, as the actual state of being unharméd is by no means certain, but depending on particular condition.

A connotation of quantity in *incolumis* seems applicable also here, presenting yet again multiple meanings through *incolumis*, which gives reason to believe that Iugurtha was

⁵⁰ See chapter 3.C.iii

⁵¹ See chapter 3.C.ii.e

⁵² “Thereafter, on the following day, Iugurtha, in a conversation with Aulus, said: ‘even if he held himself close with the army by hunger and sword, still mindful of human affairs, if an agreement was made with him, he would let everyone go unharméd under the yoke; after this he would depart Numidia as soon as in ten days.’ ” (Iug.38.9)

fairly skilled in Latin rhetoric. The terms presented are Iugurtha's own, and it comes after he has defeated Aulus in battle. *Incolumis*, and its dependency on Iugurtha's will, certainly indicate that Iugurtha is fully aware of his position and power, but the conditions by which to obtain this state, even if somewhat disgraceful to the Romans, are acceptable, which indicates that he was just. Sallust definitely paints a flattering picture of Iugurtha and his intellectual ability here, and *incolumis*, with its diversity, helps strengthening this idea of him.

3.C.i.d: Suetonius (TLL: *incolumis* I.A.1)

1. *saluti fuit, quod qui desiderabatur repente comparuit **incolumis** ac sine iniuria* (Aug.14.1).⁵³

The man in question had allegedly been tortured and killed, and *incolumis* is in this passage the opposite of *iniuria*, which gives reason to believe that it should be interpreted as nothing more than a contrast. It seems that one should only read “unharmd,” or “safe and sound” in this use of *incolumis*, as a clear reference to injury in its comparison (*sine iniuria*) is made. It might seem a bit simple compared to the examples presented from Tacitus, Livy and Sallust. Could this be because of the genre differences? Would one not expect an equally complex language in biographies as one would in histories? In this passage, at least, *incolumis* is very easy to interpret. There are no apparent connotations of dependency, reputation or quantity, as we have seen above in Tacitus, Livy and Sallust.

3.C.i.e: Summary of TLL: *incolumis* I.A.1

I will take on neither entry I.A.1.a.β nor I.A.1.b, as none of the writers I focus on made use of *incolumis* in these contexts. It may still be worth noting that according to I.A.1.b *incolumis* may also be used to describe specific parts of the body (*de corporum partibus*).

From *incolumis*' use in the passages above, we can conclude that it is no doubt a loaded word. It is rarely used without multiple meanings. Entry I.A.1.a.α stated that *incolumis* could be used, and was used in the examples above, in order to express the physical state of a person. The basic translation was “unharmd,” or “safe and sound,” and even “whole.” These meanings of the word seems to have been applied in all the examples above, but it is definitely reasonable to state that there are more meanings attributed to the word in all

⁵³ “He was saved because the man, who was longed for, suddenly appeared unharmd and without injury.” (Aug.14.1)

occasions in Tacitus, Sallust and Livy, from which it is justifiable to conclude that *incolumis* in Roman histories could be used with polysemy.

The following entries and examples are of a different nature, but furthers my belief that *incolumis* is a loaded word, that it would not be used simply to express a state of being, that one ought to examine the subtle connotations present in the word, that it was often used sarcastically and metaphorically, and that one may discover, through studying how it is used, the presence of the author and his opinions.

3.C.i.f: Livy (TLL: *incolumis* I.A.2)

Entry I.A.2 of *incolumis* in the TLL states that the word may be used *de rebus variis corporeis*, which could indicate *incolumis* used to describe various corporeal things/parts. If so, one would assume that one should take the overarching meaning of *incolumis*⁵⁴ into consideration, and use this *de rebus variis corporeis*. This meaning of *corporeis* seems unlikely though, as the three entries of Livy used as examples of this particular use of *incolumis* appear to use it describing either objects of various sorts (Liv.5.14.7), a building (Liv.5.53.9), or a city (Liv.5.53.3). One may argue that the all three entries include people, as there may have been people involved in each of the destructions in question. However, the more sensible meaning one could derive from *de rebus variis corporeis* here, is *incolumis* used to describe various physical things (OLD: *corporeus* 3).

1. *Duo summi imperatores, Potitus a Faleriis, Camillus a Capena praedas ingentes egere, nulla incolumi relictis re cui ferro aut igni noceri posset* (Liv.5.14.7).⁵⁵

Incolumis is used to describe *nulla re* in the aftermath of the sacks of two cities. In this passage *incolumis* refers to what was not deemed fit to plunder. What was not plundered, yet could still be destroyed, was destroyed. In this particular setting, *incolumis* functions as a stark contrast to complete devastation, albeit as a non-existing contrast. The phrase in itself functions to emphasise the brutality of the plundering, expressing how everything was senselessly destroyed. In this example *incolumis* seems to fit with OLD: *corporeus* 3. Interestingly also here the state of *incolumis* is depending on some external factor, namely the

⁵⁴ Being *salvus* and *integer*, as can be seen above.

⁵⁵ “The two commanders, Potitus of Falerii and Camillus of Capena, conducted enormous plunders, not leaving one thing unharmed that could be damaged by swords or fire.” (Liv.5.14.7)

two generals, only here, the decision was not to preserve the state of *incolumis*, as opposed to the examples above where there looms an uncertainty of the matter.

*2. vos, etiamsi tunc faciendum non fuerit, nunc utique faciendum putatis: ego contra – nec id mirati sitis, priusquam, quale sit, audieritis–, etiamsi tum migrandum fuisset incolumi tota urbe, nunc has ruinas relinquendas non censerem (Liv.5.53.3).*⁵⁶

In this Livian example in entry I.A.2, *incolumis* is used to describe the past intact state of the city of Rome in the aftermath of the famous Gaulish sack in 390 BCE. As one would expect, *incolumis*, describing something in a past scenario, dramatically altered in the contemporaneous situation, figures in a temporal ablative absolute clause. The phrase itself is part of a recited speech, originally performed by the Marcus Furius Camillus, the Second Founder of Rome,⁵⁷ and one may observe Livy strengthening the legend. Camillus gives the impression that many of the Romans are beginning to give up their city, their home, yet he urges them not to give up hope. He stresses that Rome is more than just a city, he never seizes to believe that Rome again will be strong and powerful. One gets the impression that he alone was the reason the Romans stayed in Rome, that they chose to rebuild the city, rather than move to a new one, and he is portrayed as one of the chief contributors to the forming of a Roman identity.

This use of *incolumis* agrees with the concept of describing a physical thing, here being the entire city of Rome, and functions to stress that Rome is equally valuable in ruins as it is intact. Rome is more than just buildings and walls, its importance goes beyond this. *Incolumi tota urbe* is the direct contrast to *has ruinas*, agreeing with *incolumis* portraying something erect and strong, in this case a city, or rather **the** city. Concerning the state of *incolumis*, however, there appears to be no connotations of dependency in this passage, as it would be a stretch to claim that the destruction of Rome was at one time depending on whether or not the Gauls would succeed. *Incolumis* appears to be the absolute contrast to utter devastation, which resembles the absolute contrast to the devastating plunders in Liv.5.14.7; this leads one to believe that it would not have been used had Rome come out of the war victorious over the Gauls, but with some damage to the city. Considering that the citation is

⁵⁶ “You, even if then it was not ought to be done, now at least think it ought to be done: I, on the contrary, and be not astonished at this, before you have heard of what kind it is, even if then, when the entire city was intact, [we] had ought to migrate, now recommend that these ruins are not left behind.” (Liv.5.53.3)

⁵⁷ τῆς Ῥώμης ἀναγραφεῖς δεῦτερος (Cam.1.1).

from Livy, one could also consider *incolumis* expressing an additional meaning of freedom, even if freedom was restored shortly after the sack, when the Gauls were driven out of the city again.

In Liv.5.53.3 one could also argue that *incolumis* refers to the people of Rome, that *tota urbe* indicates the entire population of Rome, although this is stretching the meaning of *urbs* quite far. If so, *incolumis* could here have two intended meanings, meaning both “when the city was [still] intact” and “when the people of the city were [still] safe and sound/unharmd.” It is at least feasible that the latter of the two meanings may have been implied. Considering this, *incolumis* in this instance could just as well go with entry I.A.1.a.α of the TLL. However, it appears more sensible to read the TLL’s understanding of the word in this particular context as the most likely alternative. There is no doubt that *incolumis* is attributed to the city, and the idea of an underlying connotation to *urbe*, would still not diminish the original meaning of the word. Hence, I.A.2 would fit *incolumis* here anyway.

3. *nos Capitolio atque arce incolumi, stantibus templis deorum aedificare*⁵⁸ *incensa piget?* (Liv.5.53.9).⁵⁹

This phrase is part of the same recited speech, originally performed by Camillus, as in the example above (Liv.5.53.3), but here it describes the citadel on the Capitoline Hill in Rome, and the contrast between this and the rest of the city, which was destroyed by the Gauls. Its meaning seems to be exactly like in Liv.5.53.3, with the same possible connotations. Here the *capitolio atque arce incolumis* are stark contrasts to the rest of the city, which was not left undamaged in the aftermath of the sack. In this instance, *incolumis* is associated with hope, as the most important parts of Rome remain unharmed, there is reason to rebuild, rather than move to a new city.⁶⁰

3.C.i.g: Summary of TLL: *incolumis* I.A.2

The common denominator with these examples is that *incolumis* always functions as an absolute contrast to complete destruction, which provides a new interpretational dimension to

⁵⁸ Usually one would translate *aedificare* with “build/construct,” however, it has also been used by Livy (here, and in other instances) to express “to rebuild something that was destroyed,” which can be seen at OLD: *aedifico*, 2.b.

⁵⁹“Is it shameful that we, when the Capitol and the citadel is [still] intact, when the temples of the Gods are [still] standing, rebuild [what was] burnt down?” (Liv.5.53.9)

⁶⁰ The alternative to rebuild Rome was to move the capital to Veii (Liv.5.49.8).

incolumis. It gives the impression that *incolumis*, when attributed to physical objects (buildings, cities etc.), would only be used in comparison with complete destruction. In the two examples from Liv.5.53, *incolumis* primarily mean to describe the very buildings in Rome as standing erect and strong before the sack, as opposed to after the sack, but it may also describe the people of Rome and the people on the Capitol as unharmed and safe. In this sense Livy did not exactly use *incolumis* metaphorically, but *incolumis* may have a dual meaning in these Livian examples, agreeing both with entry I.A.1.a.α and I.A.2 of the TLL. One may also observe these additional meanings of *incolumis* in Liv.5.14.7, but in this particular example, one should also consider how this phrase presents *incolumis* as depending on an external factor, i.e. two generals.

3.C.ii: *Incolumis* I.B: *specialia*

Following the above comes the next subcategory, I.B, called *specialia*, which indicates the special *corporaliter* uses of *incolumis*. This is followed by I.B.1, which presents us with *incolumis* describing someone or something considered of maintained life, as in “living,” a direct contrast to “dead.” Interestingly enough it also states that this is usually used in describing human beings or bees,⁶¹ however absurd this combination of species may seem.

The first thing that strikes me when I read through the references in I.B.1 is that H.1.46 and H.2.1 does not figure here. I will return to these particular references in 3.C.iii, but these two are, as previously mentioned, what sparked my interest in the polysemy of *incolumis* in the first place, and *incolumis* is by some considered to mean nothing more than “alive” in them, which would agree with this TLL entry. There are, however, still five examples from Livy here, along with three others from Tacitus and two from Suetonius.

3.C.ii.a: Tacitus (TLL: *incolumis* I.B.1)

1. *non a Caesare Pompeium, nob ab Augusto Antonium **incolumis** relictos, nisi forte Vespasianus alteriores spiritus gerat, Vitellii cliens, cum Vitellius collega Claudio foret* (H.3.66).⁶²

⁶¹ *Respicitur vita conservata ([opp. mortuus, defunctus, perditus sim.] fere de hominibus; de apibus*

⁶² “Pompey was not left unharmed by Caesar, Antonius not by Augustus, so perhaps by chance Vespasian, a dependent on Vitellius when Vitellius was a partner in office to Claudius, would bear a loftier spirit.” (H.3.66)

It is interesting, in this passage of the *Historiae*, that all three men that are described as *incolumis* suffered embarrassing deaths and a damaged reputation *post mortem* (to the extent one can argue that Vitellius had a good reputation as emperor, or even before he became emperor): Pompey was decapitated; Marc Antony was enchanted by a woman, which, even if it was by Cleopatra, still was not very honourable for a Roman general,⁶³ and was later forced by Octavian to kill himself; Vitellius was dragged along the streets of Rome, beaten to death by a mob, desperately pleading for his life. A possible interpretation of *incolumis* here may be that it applies to more than just the life of the individual it is associated with, that it also applies to his reputation and memory. This would resemble the interpretation one could expect in entry II.C, which will be further examined at 3.C.iii, as mentioned above.

There is little doubt, either way, that *incolumis* here figures in direct speech. The speech is performed by unnamed Vitellian followers, as they heap doubt upon the idea of Vespasian sparing his life if he surrenders. However, as Tacitus never presents the reader with an identified speaker, and hence no source for this vocabulary, one could assume that Tacitus would employ a particular style of eloquence formed by a broad generalization of Vitellian followers. The wish itself seems rather naive, and highly unrealistic; but it still gives the impression that the speaker was fully aware of this fact. *Incolumis* is entirely depending on Vespasian and his leniency, which there is no good reason whatsoever to believe exists.

As mentioned above, *incolumis* in this passage could seem to point at the reputation of Vitellius, as well as to his physical state of being. It appears that the Vitellians are indeed hoping for his reputation to be left “unharméd”, but that their primary concern still is that he be kept “alive.” Accordingly, this point at Vitellius’ reputation, which may be identified in *incolumis*, is a welcome addition to their aspiration, but it is not an absolute necessity, which is probably why the TLL used this example in this entry, and not entry II.C. Considering this, one could interpret the wish like this: Primarily they hope that Vespasian keeps Vitellius alive, secondly that he keeps him unharméd, and finally that he lets his reputation be left undamaged.

2. aut *incolumis* fidem legionum retinebo aut iugulatus paenitentiam adcelerabo
(A.1.18).⁶⁴

⁶³ Plutarch presents Antony’s affections towards Cleopatra as pathetic and ridiculous. (Plutarch, p. 497)

⁶⁴ “Either unharméd I will retain the fidelity of the legions, or murdered, hasten repentance.” (A.1.18)

This is part of a speech performed by Blaesus, a Roman general, during the mutiny of Pannonia. In this particular phrase *incolumis* figures as a stark contrast to the state of being dead, or rather “murdered” than simply “dead,” agreeing with entry I.B.1 of the TLL. This is made evident by the juxtaposed *iugulatus*, which works together with *incolumis*, and together they form two opposite scenarios, the reality of which Blaesus state that his legions are in control of. Hence, one may observe that *incolumis* conveys a sense of dependency in this passage, indicating further that Tacitus would not use *incolumis* if it was a certainty, or if the current state was not the opposite. Blaesus eventually was able to restore control of his troops, at least until Drusus, Tiberius’ son, and Sejanus, Blaesus’ nephew, and some Praetorian cohorts came to his aid. In the latter part of his life, however, he was implicated in the conspiracy trial against his nephew, and chose to take his own life rather than being executed dishonourably by Tiberius. If this passage can be read in light of future events, Tacitus’ use of *incolumis* may reflect Blaesus’ endeavours to preserve his reputation and honour. As such the passage might reflect that he will retain the fidelity of his legions not merely by staying alive, but by remaining intact both bodily and in relation to the opinion towards him held by others.

3. *quo tunc exemplo Tiberius Drusum summae rei admovit, cum **incolumi** Germanico integrum inter duos iudicium tenuisset* (A.3.56).⁶⁵

The idea that Tiberius valued Germanicus and Drusus equally may appear somewhat ironic, as Tacitus certainly implies that Tiberius had something to do with the death of Germanicus. The use of *incolumis*, however, seems rather clear. It agrees with the descriptions presented in this particular entry, and expresses the time when Germanicus was still alive. Tacitus yet again uses *incolumis* to describe the living past of a person who later suffered an unnatural death by the hands of an adversary, in this instance Germanicus was poisoned by a foe supposedly working under the orders of his own adoptive father. It seems increasingly characteristic that Tacitus never used *incolumis* to describe the past condition of someone who died a natural death, which indicates that he would add extra meaning to the word when he in fact used it. It seems that one could, when reading Tacitus, predetermine if a person would be murdered, or would die prematurely if *incolumis* was at one time applied to said person’s state of life. Beyond the ironic use of *incolumis* here, it seems that one should ascribe no additional meanings to the word.

⁶⁵ “Then, from this example, Tiberius moved Drusus near the throne, even though he had valued the two of them equally when Germanicus was still alive.” (A.3.56)

Bearing in mind the posthumous honours of Germanicus, one should probably not read this passage in the same vein as A.1.18 above, where it not only describes the physical state of an individual, but also his reputation, as the state of *incolumis* in this particular passage is considered ended. Germanicus did not suffer dishonour or a damaged reputation in any way after his death, but rather his status seems to have flourished *post mortem*.

3.C.ii.b: Suetonius (TLL: *incolumis* I.B.1)

1. *horum omnium uix duos anne tres incolumis praestitit, ceteros alium alia de causa perculit, inter quos cum plurimorum clade Aelium Seianum;* (Tib.55.1).⁶⁶

In this passage *incolumis* refers to some of Tiberius' advisers, in an event where Tiberius arranges the deaths of almost all his close associates. *Incolumis* functions as an absolute contrast to the death and destruction Tiberius caused to all other than these two or three hypothetical men, and hence the interpretation of *incolumis* here expressing "alive" seems to fit. The fact that Suetonius avoids presenting the survivors with names,⁶⁷ might be a rhetorical way to stress that they are not important, and that one should rather focus on Tiberius' actions and their brutality.

The aforementioned connotation of the reputation of the referent of *incolumis* seems to apply in some manner also here. Considering that the event leading up to these actions was the conspiracy trial against Sejanus and all his suspected accomplices, one could expect that Tiberius did all in his power not only to get the conspirators executed, but also to destroy their names and *post mortem* reputations. Applying *incolumis* to these two or three unnamed men is not really important for the phrase, it is more important that *incolumis* is not applied to the others. Tiberius let them live, and let them retain their positions.

Considering that the lives of these hypothetical men clearly seem to be in Tiberius' hands, the notion that the state of *incolumis* depends on an external factor, as seen before, seems appropriate. Yet again, the fact that *incolumis* is not applied to the others is what is important. It illustrates how Tiberius has the power to eliminate, both with respect to the life and the status of a person, even when politically significant, as well as it emphasises his

⁶⁶ "Of all these, scarcely two or three he kept alive, the rest of them he struck down, some for this and some for that reason, among these [was] Aelius Seianus, [along] with the destruction of many [others];" (Tib.55.1) Meaning that he took many with him in death.

⁶⁷ Tacitus, however, does name some of these survivors, and also applies *incolumis* to the state of their life (see 3.C.iii.a below).

unforgiving and ruthless character, considering that among those he destroyed were his closest advisers and associates.

From this point, it is quite clear that one should not expect *incolumis* in biographies to be less loaded than in history, as was hinted at with Aug.14.1 above. Suetonius here demonstrates his awareness of the polysemy of *incolumis*, and applies it in a most excellent manner. In this passage *incolumis* certainly complies with the definition of TLL: *incolumis* I.B.1, in which this passage is listed as an example. However, it also complies with the connotations found in TLL: *incolumis* II.A.1, and additionally shows an awareness of the connotations of dependency, which has also been demonstrated by Livy, Sallust and Tacitus.

2. denique magna pars hominum **incolumem** grauissime detestata mortuum laudibus tulit, ut uulgo iactatum sit etiam, Galbam ab eo non tam dominandi quam rei p. ac libertatis restituendae causa interemptum (Otho.12.2).⁶⁸

Yet again, *incolumis* is used to describe the past living state of a man who committed suicide as a result of losing a war. This is not, however, the most important aspect of its use here. In this particular sequence, *incolumis* works together with *grauissime detestata* in order to form a clear contrast to *mortuum* and *laudibus*. What Suetonius tries to emphasise is the difference between the public opinion of Otho before and after his death. He presents this with Otho's life coupled with "immense hate," and his reputation *post mortem* associated with "praise." The huge gap between his life's status is perfectly complimented by the huge gap between his reputation. *Incolumis* is no doubt intended to primarily express "alive" here, which fits well with this particular entry, but it is, however, still interesting to see how the word is rarely ever used to describe the past life of someone who died a natural death. The TLL indicates that Suetonius uses *incolumis* in the same way in both these examples, which indicates that the basic meaning, being "alive," is the same. However, the particular contexts and objects to which *incolumis* is connected are vastly different in the two examples.

It is interesting to see how a connotation of reputation in *incolumis* here makes the juxtaposition of his reputation before and after his death more complex and intriguing. The immediate understanding of *incolumis* in this passage is, as explained above, the contrast to

⁶⁸ "Finally, a greater part of the men, who hated him greatly when he was alive, heaped praise upon him in death, to the extent that it was even the talk of the public that Galba had been killed by him, not so much for him to rule the republic, but for the republic and liberty to be restored." (Otho.12.2)

mortuum; but, when considering connotation of reputation, it also emphasises how impressive this change was. *Incolumis* pointing to the standing of Otho expresses that these men hated him even when his status as emperor was intact and undamaged. Considering this interpretation one would read two juxtapositions in the same phrase, first the juxtaposition of *incolumem* (alive) and *mortuum* (dead), but also the juxtaposition of *incolumem grauissime detestata* (hated him while he was alive [and while his reputation and fame was undamaged]) and *mortuum laudibus* (heaped praise upon him [and his fame and reputation] when he was dead). This second juxtaposition truly emphasises the contrast between these two situations, and the death of Otho is made all the more venerable, because the reasons for it rendered Otho praiseworthy even to the men who hated him when he was a reputable emperor.

3.C.ii.c: Livy (TLL: *incolumis* I.B.1)

1. *ut quidem tu, quod petisti per pactionem, habeas, tot cives incolumes, ego pacem, quam hos tibi remittendo pactus sum, non habeam, hoc tu, A. Corneli, hoc vos, fetiales, iuris gentibus dicitis?* (Liv.9.11.9)⁶⁹

This passage is an excerpt from a recited speech, originally performed by Pontius, a Samnite general to whom a Roman army surrendered and made a settlement, in which it was agreed that the Romans give Pontius hostages in exchange for their army to leave unharmed, albeit under the yoke. Liv.9.11.9 is part of the discussions between Pontius and the Roman fetial, Aulus Cornelius, on the terms of the surrender. The immediate meaning of *incolumis* in this passage is “alive” or “unharmed,” which is reasonable considering that it is part of the terms of one side in a parley. The state of *incolumis* clearly depends on the leniency of Pontius, and as such a connotation of dependency, which appear to be more and more frequent, seems to apply also here.

One should also consider connotations of reputation, as seen in II.A.1, especially when bearing in mind what eventually happened to the Roman army. The primary goal of Cornelius was to save the lives of his soldiers, but he was also seeking their surrender without disgrace and a damaged reputation. The result was that Pontius let them live, but that he took away their weapons, which was an enormous disgrace for a Roman soldier, and only let them leave

⁶⁹ “That you indeed should have what you asked for in this agreement, all of these civilians unharmed, and that I should not, for which I stipulated [in exchange for] releasing these to you, have peace; this you, Aulus Cornelius, and you, fetials, tell the nations is right?” (Liv.9.11.9)

under the yoke. This action would eventually result in a retaliatory attack by the Romans, where they defeated the Samnites, and sent **them** home under the yoke. Had Pontius let them leave honourably, he would probably have ended up with true peace and a strong ally. Had he executed them, he would have seriously weakened a dangerous enemy. This middle-way ultimately resulted in the Samnite loss, and the expansion of the Roman empire.

The polysemy of *incolumis* here, especially considering the point at reputation, functions to stress the improbability of Pontius allowing it. Allowing the Romans to leave in the state of *incolumis* might have been more beneficial than what eventually happened, but it would also have been a failure to recognise that it was in fact the Romans who surrendered and the Samnites who were the victors, even if there were never actually a battle. Allowing the Roman army to depart *incolumis*, would probably have been considered a weakness of Pontius, which was unacceptable. Considering this, one would, by this use of *incolumis*, expect the actions made by Pontius (i.e. allowing the Romans to live and leave, but under the yoke, disgraced and with a damaged reputation).

2. atque in ipso itinere haud plus quadraginta equitibus conlectis cum in Maesulios palam iam, quis esset, ferens venisset, tantum motum cum favore pristino tum gaudio insperato, quod, quem perisse crediderant, incolumem cernebant, fecit, ut intra paucos dies sex milia peditum armatorum, quattuor equitum ad eum convenirent, iamque non in possessione modo paterni regni esset, sed etiam socios Carthaginiensium populos Masaesuliorumque fines—id Syphacis regnum erat—vastaret (Liv.29.32.12-14).⁷⁰

Liv.29.32.12-14⁷¹ talks of an incredible journey made by Masinissa, when he, injured and believed dead, cured his wounds by herbs and returned to reclaim his kingdom. The joy his people felt at seeing him safe and alive gave him an instant army of several thousand men.

⁷⁰ “and with no more than forty horsemen collected on his journey, when he had arrived among the Massylians, immediately disclosing who he was, he caused such a great commotion, just as much by old favour, as by an unexpected delight to see him, whom they believed to have died, safe and sound, that, in just a few days, six thousand armed foot soldiers, and four thousand horsemen assembled for him, and now he was in possession of not only his paternal realms, but he also laid waste to the allied nations of the Carthaginians and the bordering territories of the Massylians (that was the kingdom of Syphax).” (Liv.29.32.12-14)

⁷¹ The TLL reference states Liv.29.32.13, but the *incolumis* actually figures as the first word of Liv.29.32.14 according to the Teubner edition of the *Ab Urbe Condita*.

Incolumis clearly expresses how he was “alive” when he arrived among the Massylians, but it appears to refer to the state of Masinissa’s reputation as well. Masinissa would never have been able to assemble an army of several thousand soldiers had his reputation in some way been damaged by his alleged death. That he is met with delight by the Massylians indicate that the death had been lamented, and that his reputation and fame in no way whatsoever got hurt in the aftermath.

The translation of *incolumis* seems to be in accordance with the TLL entry I.B.1, as it is primarily the fact that he was “alive” it seeks to express. He was severely injured before he was able to make his way to the Massylians, and he was only just able to endure the pain of moving, which leaves the interpretation of “in good health” quite inappropriate. Masinissa went on to have a successful campaign, and ended up a very valuable ally of the Roman armies in the Second Punic War (218 – 201 BCE.). He eventually became the first king of a united Numidia after the defeat of Syphax. This is one of the rare times *incolumis* is used to express the state of someone’s life (both with respect to health and reputation), where said state prevailed. Here, *incolumis* does not foreshadow imminent events or a change of fortune. Masinissa lived a good life after he became king, and his reputation was not damaged after his death.

3. *et cum ego et Perseus nunc nobilia maxime sortis mortalium exempla spectemur, ille, qui ante se captivos captivus ipse duci liberos vidit, incolumes tamen eos habet;* (Liv.45.41.10).⁷²

In this speech, originally performed by Lucius Aemilius Paulus in his triumph, where his captive, king Perseus of Macedonia, was displayed, we are presented with a bitter *incolumis*. Aemilius had four sons, two of which were adopted by venerable families, and two that were destined to continue his house. These two died at a young age, right before his victory, and he used this speech to address his frustration with the fact that his family would end with him. The meaning of *incolumis* in this passage is “alive,” and it seems that one should not read any connotations regarding the reputation of the children described here, as they certainly did not retain their honour and good reputation. Perseus’ sons, to whom *incolumis* applies, were displayed alongside the king in the triumph.

⁷² “Both I and Perseus could now certainly be considered noble examples of the mortal lot, he, who, himself a captive, saw his children captives, led before him, nevertheless has them alive;” (Liv.45.41.10).

We should, however, consider the contrast that the word suggests in this case. *Incolumis* describes the children of Perseus, as previously mentioned, in order to form a clear opposite to and poignant reminder of the state of Aemilius' children. While two of them still lived, they were no longer part of his family as they were given away for adoption. Perseus' living sons, while captive, evoke for the reader Aemilius' two lost children, and accordingly that he is the last of his line. *Incolumis* illustrates a contrast between Aemilius' and Perseus' children, and also between the state of their family names' future.

Incolumis also emphasises that the house of Perseus will live on, as Aemilius laments his own name's destiny. To that extent, one could argue that the word implies a change or augmentation in reputation as well. The reputation of the family will remain "alive," but bearing in mind that Perseus' family dropped from Macedonian royalty to Roman subjects, one could hardly claim that it remained "unharmful."

4. *at hercule non solum incolumi et victore sed praesente te, cum ploratum prope coniugum ac liberorum nostrorum exaudire et flagrantia tecta posses conspicere, ita sumus aliquotiens hac aestate devastati, ut M. Marcellus, non Hannibal vicisse ad Cannas videatur, (Liv.23.42.5).*⁷³

In this recited speech, frustrated Hirpini and Caudine Samnite ambassadors appear before Hannibal. Their description of him as *incolumis* arises from disappointment and frustration. Hannibal and Carthage were the allies of the Hirpini and the Caudine Samnites, and were considered their protector. Still, their lands were devastated by Marcellus, a Roman general situated in Nola, while Hannibal did nothing. *Incolumis* contrasts the difference between Hannibal and the lands of the Hirpini and the Caudine Samnites. Indeed, it appears that they are insulted by Hannibal's healthy physical state, as it implies that he did nothing to help them.

It appears, however, that there is no foreshadowing irony related to Hannibal's reputation here. Hannibal has clearly lost face in their eyes, as it was he who was supposed to be the protector of their cities, but Marcellus that did whatever he wished with them. Hannibal may have stayed unharmful with respect to his health, but his reputation certainly took some

⁷³ "Yet, by Hercules, not only are you alive and victorious, but you are present [among us], when you could almost hear the wailing of our wives and children, and when you could see the houses on fire; this summer we have been devastated so many times, that Marcellus, not Hannibal appears to have won at Cannae." (Liv.23.42.5)

damage. Accordingly, it seems that one here primarily should consider *incolumis* to express “alive and unharmed,” bearing in mind the frustration associated with this fact.

5. *nec me nec te incolumi Macedoniam suam futuram sperant;* (Liv.40.10.5).⁷⁴

In this speech, originally performed by Perseus of Macedonia before his father, King Philip V, an accusation of his brother’s alleged attempt at killing him, *incolumis* yet again expresses “alive and unharmed,” but additionally appears to refer to, not necessarily the reputation and social status, but the actual political power of the King of Macedonia. In this particular phrase, Perseus indicates that it is only himself and his father that truly have the best interest of Macedonia at heart, and that his younger brother, Demetrius, blindly wishes to sit on the throne, and hence would even be willing to submit to Rome. It is interesting to note that within *incolumis*’ meaning here, lies not only a reference to the physical state of Perseus and his father, but a reference to the state Macedonia, as this was associated with them. Perseus implies that if he or his father is killed and dethroned, Macedonia will suffer equally.

Perseus did not succeed in having his brother executed in this particular trial, but he managed to create suspicion and jealousy in his father’s mind, which in the end resulted in the poisoning of his brother. Quite ironically, Perseus, when King of Macedonia, was eventually forced to submit to Rome, and the Kingdom of Macedonia was turned into a Roman province.

Even if the state of the political power of the subject to which *incolumis* here applies initially seems to overshadow any reading related to reputation, a closer reading suggests its relevance. The political power of both Philip and Perseus would surely depend on the condition of their social status and reputation. Examining all of the shades of meaning in *incolumis* here, one may conclude that Livy, to some extent, aimed to present Perseus as an eloquent character. The phrase, in its entirety, is quite strong, as it does not only imply that the lives of Perseus and his father are at stake, but also that the prominence of their name and the safety of their nation was at risk.

3.C.ii.d: Summary of TLL: *incolumis* I.B.1

In what would initially seem a rather simple use of *incolumis*, where it at first glance should merely express “alive and unharmed,” *incolumis* in these passages often takes on many shades

⁷⁴ “With either me or you alive, they do not hope that Macedonia will be theirs;” (Liv.40.10.5).

of meaning, rather than expressing a simple fact. Indeed, there is little doubt that it expresses “alive” in all the examples of the TLL entry I.B.1, but additional meanings and interpretations could and should be read in each and every example. The three of the four examined writers referred to by the TLL in this entry all seem to have their own individual characteristic uses of *incolumis*.

The three Tacitean examples give reason to believe that Tacitus would only use *incolumis* expressing “alive” in examples where the exact opposite of said state was what would inevitably happen, or had already happened. In all three examples, *incolumis* describes a person who would eventually die an unnatural death. Two, Vitellius and Germanicus, were murdered, and one, Blaesus, committed suicide. It seems unlikely that this parallel use of the word was coincidental. Considering these common denominators of *incolumis* in the Tacitean examples, one must not forget that there are also several individual traits of the word in each example. In all three examples there are several meanings to be understood. Not only does this truly demonstrate Tacitus’ skill with the Latin language, but it also demonstrates that one, in order to fully understand occurrences *incolumis*, needs to examine them separately. One cannot read *incolumis* with some interpretational template as there are too many nuances of it one needs to consider in each occasion. There are some basic aspects of *incolumis* (i.e. connotations regarding reputation and dependence), but these rarely apply equally in each example.

The Suetonian examples are quite possibly the most complex of this entry. In both examples *incolumis*, similarly to the examples of entry I.A.2, functions as a contrast to an extreme opposite, namely death, and unlike the Tacitean examples, in Suetonius this opposite is duly presented as an alternative. Another common denominator of the Suetonian examples is that *incolumis* is used in a phrase that seeks to emphasise some fact concerning the emperor (Tiberius’ power and the virtue of Otho’s death). The two examples encourage different interpretations. Tib.55.1 is quite unique in that *incolumis* and the people it applies to are not of importance, it is the fact that *incolumis* does not apply to the others that should be focused on. In Otho.12.2 it is the clever juxtapositions in which *incolumis* figures that are quite unique. Here *incolumis* expresses one thing in the first juxtaposition, and then another in the second.

In all but one of the Livian examples, *incolumis* figures in direct speech, and the interpretations of it should primarily be considered in the examining of Livy’s presentation of the speakers. In the first example, Liv.9.11.9, some aspects of *incolumis* came to fruition, while others did not; that is to say, the prime expression of *incolumis*, at least according to the

TLL, namely “alive,” here came to fruition, while its various additional meanings did not. Connotations of reputation could be read in *incolumis* here, as well as in Liv.32.12-14 and Liv.40.10.5.

In Liv.45.41.10 and Liv.23.42.5 one does not find this connotation of reputation, but other meanings can be read. In Liv.45.41.10 *incolumis* expresses bitterness that the family of the defeated survives, while the family of the victor does not. In Liv.23.42.5 *incolumis* conveys frustration that Hannibal dares to be alive and unharmed, while nations that he is obliged to protect are frequently devastated by Roman raids.

All examples of I.B.1 give further reason to believe that *incolumis* was used to express a lot more than it initially appears to, and that it is a very loaded word with several different meanings and connotations one needs to consider individually. The Tacitean examples certainly strengthens my claim that Tacitus would use *incolumis* in order to express more than what initially meets the eye, and that one may, by interpretation of *incolumis* in its different contexts, observe Tacitus’ presence and opinions in his own works. That is not to say that this only applies to Tacitus, as it seems that the same would apply to the three other writers, perhaps to Roman writers in general.

3.C.ii.e: Livy (TLL: *incolumis* I.B.2)

Continuing on to I.B.2, which takes on the special *corporaliter* uses of *incolumis* in which one seeks to use *incolumis* to express someone, or something considered of a great amount, or number, that is to say, “not diminished.”⁷⁵ I.B.2 is immediately divided even further, into I.B.2.a, which presents us with *incolumis* used in this sense to describe the living (*animantium*). Only Livy of the four writers under consideration is referred to in this entry, and there are six different Livian examples, half of which are from the 21st book.

1. *re publica felicissime gesta atque liberatis sociis, vectigalibus restitutis, exercitum salvom atque **incolumem** plenissimum praeda domum reportavit;* (Liv.41.28.9).⁷⁶

This Livian example is an excerpt from a tablet inscription commending the success of the Roman commander, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, who conquered and plundered Sardinia. Considering that it is a citation from a tablet, one might assume that the phrasing is exact, as

⁷⁵ *Respicitur quantitas seu numerus fere i.q. non deminutus.*

⁷⁶ “With a most happily managed republic and freed allies, with restored taxes, he brought back home the army saved and complete, filled with plunder.” (Liv.41.28.9)

the tablet would be available for comparison. Richardson (1992, p. 246) acknowledges that this tablet was to be found in the Mater Matua temple; but, quite amusingly, can only give Livy as a source of its existence. Nevertheless, the tablet was probably real, and one would therefore assume that the citation is more or less accurate.

It seems reasonable to interpret the use of *incolumis* in this paragraph in the manner I.B.2.a would suggest, that is as “in full number,” mostly because it is coupled with *salvus*, which expresses the safe-being of the army. It certainly refers to a quantity of the living, being the army, and it expresses that said army is complete and in full strength, even if such a circumstance would be highly unlikely after a campaign, especially one where it is stated that the number of enemies killed in the conflict exceeded eighty thousand. However, exaggeration in order to fully express the talent of the army leader is to be expected.

In this passage *incolumis* seems to refer to the reputation of the army it describes. The success of the army is the focal point of the phrase, and the initial meaning of *incolumis* should be, as commented above, that it was still strong and in full number; however, in the aftermath of a war, where an army has succeeded to such an extent, one would also assume that its fame, honour and reputation would be soaring. Not only has it increased immensely, following such a devastating victory, but it is standing strong, healthy and unharmed. Yet again considering that the health of the army is referred to by *salvus*, one is inclined to believe that *incolumis* aims to express the state of some other aspect of the army.

2. *deinde, postquam interrumpi agmen vidit periculumque esse, ne exutum impedimentis exercitum nequiquam **incolumem** traduxisset, decurrit ex superiore loco et, cum impetu ipso fudisset hostem, suis quoque tumultum auxit* (Liv.21.33.9).⁷⁷

Working with *exercitus*, *incolumis* again expresses the state of an army. Here referring to Hannibal’s army, while they are crossing the Alps. In this particular sequence, they are attacked by Gaul mountaineers, causing panic among the Carthaginian soldiers, and more importantly, among their animals. Hannibal, calculating the dangers of his army losing its beasts, and with them their baggage, concludes that rash actions are needed to attempt to

⁷⁷ “Thereafter, when he saw that the column was breaking up, and so that he had not in vain led the army over [the mountain] in full number, stripped of its heavy baggage, he hastened down from the higher ground, and, when he routed the enemy by this very energy, he also increased the confusion of his own [men].” (Liv.21.33.9)

thwart the enemy. His actions are a gamble, but they succeed, and he is soon able to calm his army again.

As far as the translation goes, the concept of it expressing the full number of the army seems applicable. Livy documents Hannibal's frustration of having managed to get his army this far across the Alps, without loss, only to start losing men when they have traversed the mountains and have begun their descent. In the ensuing chaos, the Carthaginian army does not lose a high number of soldiers and beasts, but some, which, to some extent, suggests that *incolumis* here might be a contrast of a future condition, at least considering that it should express "in full number" here. The army loses some soldiers, and some beasts; hence, *incolumis* expressing "in full number" does not apply anymore. However, the losses of the Carthaginian army are so small, that in effect the army is still unharmed in the regard that the losses does not render the army any weaker, as its size initially was quite enormous. Consequently, it does not appear that *incolumis* offers an ironic foreshadowing of a future state of the army in this particular Livian passage.

One should also consider *incolumis* here conveying a sense of dependency, as it is made obvious by Livy that the state of the army is entirely depending on Hannibal and his skills as a commander. He succeeds in routing the enemy, and as such succeeds at keeping the strength of his army unharmed, to which *incolumis* would apply, but the initial meaning of it here, that of the army being "in full number," is something he fails to maintain. However, one should doubt that Livy with this intended to highlight any failings of Hannibal as a leader. He did indeed ultimately lose to Rome, but this happened several years later, and he is largely considered one of the greatest military leaders and strategists of Antiquity.

3. nisi creditis, qui exercitu **incolumi** pugnam detractavere, eos duabus partibus peditum equitumque in transitu Alpium amissis qui plures paene perierint quam supersint plus spei nactos esse (Liv.21.40.7).⁷⁸

This passage also refers to Hannibal's army, and to the losses it suffered while crossing the Alps. The phrase is part of a speech originally performed by Publius Cornelius Scipio,⁷⁹ one of the Roman consuls of this year (218 BCE), and leader of the army sent to hinder

⁷⁸ "Unless you believe that those, who rejected a battle when their army was at full strength, with two thirds of their foot-soldiers and cavalry lost while crossing the Alps, now that almost more have died than have survived, have found more confidence/hope." (Liv.21.40.7)

⁷⁹ Father of Scipio Africanus, the general who ultimately defeated Hannibal in the Battle of Zama in 202 BCE.

Hannibal's entry into Italy. This primary task they failed at, as Hannibal was able to cross the Alps. Scipio engaged in battle immediately after Hannibal entered Italy in order to strike him before he was able to gather strength. This also failed, as the Roman army was soundly beaten and Scipio severely wounded.

It seems that *incolumis* expressing an army being in "full number" is very applicable. Additionally the word appears to convey an ironic contrast to future events, as there is made a quite evident reference to the size of the army before and after the crossing of the Alps. *Incolumis* represents the state of the army before they began their ascent, and *duabus partibus* refer to how great a part of the army perished in the mountains. The climb proved devastating for the Carthaginians, but they were still more than strong enough, both with respect to their numbers and their military capability, to emerge victorious from several decisive battles in Italy on their way south towards Rome.

The speech illustrates Scipio's failure at estimating an enemy army's strength, although one needs to consider that it was largely Hannibal's tactical genius that won the ensuing battle, and that most other Roman generals would have done exactly the same as Scipio did. Nevertheless, by using *incolumis* here, as a contrast to the present state of the army, Scipio hints that the army is weaker than ever, and not standing strong and stable. Indeed, *incolumis* primarily refers to the numbers of the army, but within the word lies the connotations of strength and vigour as well. This will no doubt have been an encouraging thought for the Roman soldiers, but one could also assume that it might have led them to believe that the task at hand was far simpler than it actually turned out to be. Livy expresses here, by this use of *incolumis*, some of Scipio's failings as a leader. Had a more cautious approach been considered by Scipio, in which he would not have given his soldiers reason to believe that the war was basically won, one should assume that the Roman army would have been able to if not win, then most definitely hand the Carthaginian army a more destructive blow.

4. *Et ut quisque audierat exercitum hostium imperatoremque occisum, legiones Romanas incolumes, salvos consules esse, extemplo aliis porro impertiebant gaudium suum* (Liv.27.51.4).⁸⁰

⁸⁰ "And when everyone had heard that the army of the enemy and their general were destroyed, that the Roman legions were in full number, that the consules were safe, they immediately shared their delight further with others." (Liv.27.51.4)

Here *incolumis* is applied to *legiones Romanas*, but whether or not it appears to express the quantity of the army, or it being full in numbers depends on how we interpret *occisum*. *Incolumis* functions as a contrast to the description of the *exercitum hostium imperatoremque*, which is *occisum* (slain/destroyed), and how we interpret *incolumis* clearly depends on the intended expression in *occisum*. If we read it as “destroyed,” the army should be considered a body of people, of which a destruction would imply this body of people being greatly reduced and as such suffering a loss in numbers, to which *incolumis* expressing the complete quantity of the army would be applicable. However, if we interpret *occisum* here to express “slain,” we should rather consider each member of the army, and the physical state of this body of individuals. It may seem, however, that *occisum* here has a dual meaning, one applying to the army, the other to the general, which in that case would also give *incolumis* a dual meaning, one where it contrasts *exercitum hostium occisum*, and one where it contrasts *imperatorem hostium occisum*. It would then be reasonable to read “destroyed” with *exercitum*, and “slain” with *imperatorem*. This gives reason to interpret *incolumis*, in reference to the Roman army, as expressing both that the army was in full number, and that the soldiers were unhurt.

In addition to the contrast with *occisum* that the word provides, *incolumis* in this case might also be read in terms of the reputation or standing of the Roman army, again similar to the connotations we find in TLL: *incolumis* II.A.1. As such, *incolumis* could be read as a comparison not only of the physical state of the armies, but also of their reputation after the battle. The Romans did not only win a decisive victory from which they emerged unharmed and in full number, as opposed to the enemy army, which was destroyed and slain; but they also emerged from the battle with unharmed fame and honour and with a strong reputation, whereas the enemy army was humiliated by the decisiveness of their defeat.

5. *classis Romana incolumis, una tantum perforata navi, sed ea quoque ipsa reduce, in portum rediit* (Liv.21.50.6).⁸¹

In this passage there is little doubt that *incolumis* refers to the quantity of the Roman fleet, as it is specified that even the one ship that was damaged was brought back, and as such the fleet was still complete. The fact that Livy points out that they even brought back this damaged ship emphasises how the fleet would not have been considered *incolumis* without this ship. Accordingly, one should not expect *incolumis* to express the strength of the fleet, as one ship

⁸¹ “The Roman fleet returned to the port in full number, only one ship had been perforated, but even this was brought back.” (Liv.21.50.6)

lost hardly would have affected the combined strength of the fleet. However, *incolumis* is here concerned with the ships of the fleet, as is made evident when the *una navi* is referred to, which makes it interesting that the TLL would consider this phrase an example of entry I.B.2.a, which is concerned with the *animantium*. Had there been no mention of this ship, one could have assumed that *incolumis* expressed the quantity of the marines, but as it is, *incolumis* here seems to refer to the Roman ships, and not the people working on them.

In this passage, *incolumis* can also be read in relation to the reputation of the fleet, at least when one considers the entire context of the events documented. The Roman fleet, considerably bigger and stronger than the Phoenician fleet, easily captures seven enemy ships, and forces the rest of the enemy to flee, simply because they are too few to do any damage whatsoever. This complete superiority translates easily into great fame, honour and reputation, which remain undamaged when the ships return to the port, as they return with seven captured ships, and without having lost a single one themselves. Consequently, *incolumis* also contrasts the two navies, as the Roman fleet is compared here to the Phoenician fleet, which, as mentioned above, lost seven ships to the Romans and were forced to flee. The state of being in full number is one of the main points of the comparison, and using *incolumis* to express the state of the Roman fleet removes the need to point out the state of the Phoenician fleet any further.

6. *ita haudquaquam pari certamine digressi, Hispani fere omnes incolumes, Romani aliquot suis amissis in castra contenderunt* (Liv.22.18.4).⁸²

This phrase is part of a passage that relates the events of a combat between the Roman general, Quintus Fabius Maximus, and Hannibal. Fabius holds the advantage, but Hannibal is helped by a Spanish cohort, which is more accustomed to fighting in the mountains, giving Hannibal the victory. This phrase relates the immediate aftermath of the battle.

It is quite strange that this Livian example has been used for entry I.B.2, as it does not appear to be concerned with quantity. The quantity of the Spaniards is referred to by *fere omnes*, which translates to “nearly all.” Accordingly it would have been quite strange if *incolumes* then expressed “in full number,” as it is clearly stated that not all the Spaniards made it. Additionally, *incolumes* modifies *omnes*, and should therefore be considered an

⁸² “Thus having left they made for their camps, the struggle [having been] by no means equal, nearly all of the Spaniards unharmed, [while] the Romans had lost several of theirs.” (Liv.22.18.4)

expression of the physical state of the Spaniards who actually did survive. Hence, *incolumes* should be read as “unharméd” primarily.

However, there are other aspects of the word one also needs to consider here; first and foremost the way in which the Spanish army contrasts with the Roman. The Spaniards are here compared to the Romans who lost several men, and *incolumis* points out the manner of the loss of the Romans. Not only did they emerge as the losers of the battle, but from *incolumis* describing the Spaniards, we can assume that the surviving soldiers of the Roman army did not escape unharméd, and that they, also considering a connotation of reputation, suffered a damaged reputation and honour. *Incolumis* does not express that the Spaniards are still “in full number,” but it still implies that they are basically at full strength, that their surviving soldiers are unharméd and that their honour is intact following the battle.

However one decides to interpret Livy’s use of *incolumis* in these six instances, he is fairly consistent in that he only uses it in reference to armies and other military units. He appears to prefer using *incolumis* in exaggerations, in order to emphasise the brilliance, or lack thereof, of leaders, armies and nations. This is also why I would argue that a writer with knowledge of the Latin language would not have used it to express someone merely being alive, but that the physical state of, or, as we have seen possibilities of in other instances, the reputation and memory of the individual in question would be an important condition to whether or not one would use *incolumis* instead of *vivus*. This leaves much room for *incolumis* to be used sarcastically, and also illuminates the possibility of the word being used to convey fragments of one’s own opinions without them being an important part of the story being told.

3.C.ii.f: Sallust (TLL: *incolumis* I.B.2)

We continue with I.B.2.b, in which we are presented with the use of *incolumis* expressing things (*res*), i.e. inanimate objects, considered complete or in full number (I.B.2). This is further divided into I.B.2.b.a, in which we are presented with the general use of *incolumis* with these specifications, *in universum*. The only reference to one of the four writers under consideration here is an extract from Sallust’s *Iugurtha*.

1. *Si omnia, quae aut amisi aut ex necessariis aduersa facta sunt, incolumia manerent, tamen, si quid ex inproviso mali accidisset, uos inplorarem, patres conscripti, quibus pro magnitudine imperi ius et iniurias omnis curae esse decet* (Iug.14.16).⁸³

In this passage we are presented with a recited speech, originally performed by Adherbal of Numidia before the Roman senate. This phrase is quite complex when analysing the different meanings of *incolumis*; first of all because *incolumis* applies in different ways to different parts of the phrase. In order to illustrate this, one needs first to observe how the phrase is partitioned. The main clause, itself the protasis of a conditional sentence, is *omnia incolumia manerent*, with the two subordinate clauses *quae amisi* (sc1) and *quae ex necessariis aduersa facta sunt* (sc2). The subordinate clauses define *omnia* in the main clause, and help illuminate some of the dimensions of *incolumis* which needs to be considered here.

Incolumis in the main clause expresses Adherbal's longing for everything to return to how it was before. In this particular context, *incolumis* is far less limited than it becomes in the subordinate clauses, which will be examined shortly. Considering the circumstances leading to Adherbal addressing the Roman senate, one should definitely consider connotations of contrast and reputation. Adherbal, along with his brother, Hiempsal, and his half-brother, Iugurtha,⁸⁴ inherited the leadership over Numidia following the death of their father, king Micipsa of Numidia, in 118 BCE. However, Iugurtha wanted this throne for himself and set in motion a conspiracy, in which he killed Hiempsal and forced Adherbal out of his own nation and into exile. Accordingly, Adherbal's social status and fame was severely damaged, as he lost control of his nation and his title. *Incolumis* here functions as a stark contrast to the present state of things, and should hence be understood to express a past time when Adherbal's fame and social status was unharmed and at its peak, whereas it in the present state had suffered a damaging blow, leaving his reputation and name "damaged." As we can see, *incolumis* relates a contrast between Iugurtha and Adherbal in the main clause, which not only refers to the state of safety and physical condition, but also conveys the difference

⁸³ "If all that I have lost, or all that has become adverse out of necessity, remained unharmed; I would still, if anything evil was to happen unexpectedly, call you to assistance, conscript fathers, to whom, for the greatness of the empire, all justice and injustice ought to be the objects of care [a matter of concern]." (Iug.14.16)

⁸⁴ Iugurtha was originally the grandson of king Masinissa of Numidia, and nephew of king Micipsa, but he was adopted by Micipsa, probably by influence of Scipio Africanus, in 120 BCE.

between Iugurtha's and Adherbal's standing. Also implied by *omnia* is the life of Adherbal's brother, Hiempsal, by which we should acknowledge the contrast between life (Iugurtha) and death (Hiempsal) in *incolumis*.

A reference to quantity, which the TLL suggests that one should read in *incolumis* here, may be observed in both sc1 and sc2, albeit in different ways. In sc1, reading "all that I have lost," one should understand Adherbal's wealth and earthly possessions. Considering that he was forced into exile by Iugurtha, one would also assume that, not only did he lose control of the Numidian treasury, but also that he lost control of his family fortune and possessions. When one acknowledges a reference to quantity in *incolumis* as it applies to sc1, one should understand Adherbal's aspirations to be that his wealth was restored to its "full quantity," and that his possessions remained "unharmmed." *Incolumis* also clearly conveys a contrast here, as does it with the sc2, as *incolumis* represents the complete opposite of the current state of things, which, according to sc1, means "wealth," as opposed to "no wealth."

In sc2, also considering this reference to quantity and reading "all that have become adverse [to me] out of necessity," one should consider *omnia* to represent the Numidian people and the Numidian army, which, at the time before Adherbal's exile, would have been loyal to him, but, considered him an enemy after his exile as loyalty to the current government required this. Accordingly, *omnia* appears to express the citizens and soldiers loyal to him, and *incolumis* the preferred, yet unreal situation where they were of the same quantity as they were when he was still in full power in Numidia. This army concept could resemble the notion of quantity in *incolumis* as it is applied by Livy, see Livy (I.B.2), but considering that Sallust never mentions an actual army, this is more up to the readers' own interpretation. The use of *incolumis* and the content of the sc2, however, gives good reason to assume that Sallust, or rather Sallust's Adherbal refers to the Numidian army.

It is interesting to note that the main clause alone could have expressed all this without the subordinate clauses defining *omnia*. *Incolumis* alone could represent everything these subordinate clauses are intended to express, but it would call for a more attentive analysis of the phrase. Considering that it is part of a recited speech, one could see this as Sallust's way to inform the reader that Adherbal was well aware of his audience, and their initial interest in his cause. There was no obvious reason for Rome to intervene in Numidia at this point, Iugurtha had been a valuable member of Scipio Africanus' conquest in Africa and was not initially considered an enemy of Rome. Adherbal needed to convince the senate that Iugurtha did not bode well for the Numidian allegiance to Rome.

One could also see this as a way for Adherbal to emphasise the gravity of the situation. First of all, he flatters the senate, and the role they play in his decision making, by stating that he would have come to them for help even if all was well. However, this pointing out of the current situation, illustrated by *si omnia incolumia* and further emphasised by the two subordinate clauses, seeks to demonstrate the destructive power of Iugurtha. Even if he never actually repeats anything in this phrase, except the relative pronouns introducing the subordinate clauses, there is a sense of repetition in the different expressions of *incolumis*. This would seem quite clever, as Adherbal appears to be aware of his audience, and to what an extent he can plea before them without them getting bored with him, while still pointing out how grave the situation actually is.

The result, however, was not very successful, as the Roman senate decided to divide Numidia between Adherbal and Iugurtha. Following this, Iugurtha continued his actions, declaring war on Adherbal. Rome did not enter the conflict until Iugurtha, in a massacre of Numidia's capital, Cirta, in which he also killed several Roman citizens, forced them to respond. This conflict one might claim could have been avoided had Adherbal's warnings been taken more seriously.

3.C.ii.g: Summary of TLL: *incolumis* I.B.2

The common denominator of entry I.B.2.a and I.B.2.b, is that *incolumis* is used to express the quantity of something being complete, or in full number. The difference being that I.B.2.a refers to the living, and in the cases of the examples I have examined, to an army of some kind, while I.B.2.b states that *incolumis* can also be used to express the full quantity of inanimate objects. And in the Sallustian example above, this seems to refer to wealth and possession.

However, from all the examples I have examined as part of entry I.B.2, one may conclude that *incolumis* is not used solely to express the quantity of something, but rather that this is one of the dimensions of *incolumis* in these occasions. The Livian examples, all of which figured under entry I.B.2.a, all use *incolumis* in order to express some fact about different armies. In every example, save one (Liv.22.18.4), there is little doubt that *incolumis* refers to the quantity of the army it modifies. In some instances it illustrates how an army has lost men over time, as in Liv.21.33.9, where *incolumis* describes the state of the Carthaginian army before an attack, in contrast to its state after the attack. And similarly, in Liv.21.40.7, *incolumis* is used to express the quantity of the Carthaginian army before they began their ascent of the Alps, in contrast to their state after they had crossed the mountains.

In other cases *incolumis* was used to express the state of one army's quantity compared to another's. In Liv.27.51.4 *incolumis* describes the Roman legions, contrasting their state to that of the Carthaginian army and its leaders. Liv.21.50.6 contrasts the Roman fleet, to which *incolumis* is applied, with the Phoenician fleet, which was devastated by a Roman attack. Both examples clearly point to the fact that the *incolumis* army is in full number, whereas their opposition is not. Liv.41.28.9 also refers to the quantity of an army as well as its health, but said army is not compared to another army.

Liv.22.18.4 is the odd example of these six Livian citations, as it does not seem to fit under this particular TLL entry. Other parts of the phrase *incolumis* appears in remove the possibility of a reference to quantity in *incolumis*. This does not remove the analytical possibilities of *incolumis*, but it is strange that the TLL would compare the use of it in this example with the other five Livian examples. Here, *incolumis* never explicitly relates to an army, but rather insinuates it by referring to the "Spaniards," and as said above, it is not a reference to quantity that makes this passage comparable to the other examples, as this meaning of *incolumis* does not seem to apply, but rather, *incolumis* expresses the state of health and reputation, and contrasts the state of the Spaniards with the Romans, illustrating how the Romans fared in the battle.

The Sallustian example, Iug.14.16, is somewhat complex and very interesting when analysing the use of *incolumis*. When interpreting *incolumis*, one has to divide it into three different phrases, all of which use *incolumis* differently. The reference to quantity figures in two of these, both subordinate clauses, and in two variations, the first, adhering to entry I.B.2.a, which refers to the living, and the other to entry I.B.2.b, which refers to inanimate objects. The *incolumis* of the main clause also offers the meanings of the subordinate clauses, but the subordinate clauses are added to the phrase for emphasis. Additionally *incolumis* appears to relate connotations of the reputation and the physical state of Iugurtha, and it offers a contrasting comparison with Adherbal, and to some extent Hiempsal.

With the exception of Liv.22.18.4, all examples present a reference to quantity in *incolumis*, albeit in somewhat different ways. This adds yet another dimension to the word, which ought to be considered when analysing it in other instances. That is not to say that *incolumis* at all times refers to the quantity of its referent, but it is a possibility, and should not be disregarded without thorough analysis.

Entry I.B.2.b.β states that one may use *incolumis* in order to express things (*res*) as complete or in full number, particularly when speaking of familiar things.⁸⁵ However, there are no examples from the studied writers in this entry, even if one could argue that some parts of the Sallustian example in I.B.2.b.α would adhere to this meaning of *incolumis*. Nonetheless, we will move along to entry II, where we are presented with the use of *incolumis* modifying the incorporeal (*incorporaliter*).

3.C.iii: *Incolumis* II.A: *de hominibus*

Entry II on *incolumis* in the TLL, in stark contrast to entry I, which dealt with the *corporaliter*, treats the *incorporaliter* uses of *incolumis*. This is further divided into entry II.A.1, where part A informs of this particular incorporeal use of *incolumis* when talking of human beings (*de hominibus*), and 1 tells of *incolumis* when talking about human beings and their external positions or states, especially concerned with respectability, fame among citizens, power, and authority.⁸⁶ In this specific entry there are four Tacitean references, and three Livian. The first impression one gets from this entry in the TLL is that *incolumis* is being used in these different examples with a broader meaning than in previous entries. At first glance, *incolumis* still expresses “unharméd” and “safe and sound,” and other similar translations, yet it also refers to the position of the people it applies to. The people *incolumis* applies to are all powerful and of high rank, and the aftermath of their death plays a part in how we are to interpret *incolumis*.

3.C.iii.a: Tacitus (TLL: *incolumis* II.A.1)

1. *Haec, mira quamquam, fidem ex eo trahebant quod unus omnium Seiani adfinium **incolumis** multaue gratia mansit, reputante Tiberio publicum sibi odium, extremam aetatem magisque fama quam ui stare res suas (A.6.30).*⁸⁷

In this passage *incolumis* refers to a Roman general, Lentulus Gaetulicus, in Germania, who was an associate of Seianus, but that was left alive in the aftermath of Tiberius’ prosecution of

⁸⁵ *speciatim de re familiari.*

⁸⁶ *de statu externo: respicitur honestas, fama inter cives, potentia, auctoritas sim (TLL: *incolumis*, II.A.1).*

⁸⁷ “This, although unusual, obtained credibility from the fact that he, the only one of all of Seianus associates, remained unharméd and in high favour, with Tiberius considering the people’s hatred for him, his extreme age and the fact that his government was supported rather by fame than by power.” (A.6.30)

Seianus and his followers.⁸⁸ *Incolumis* primarily expresses that Gaetulicus was kept alive, as the only one of Seianus' associates, and one may accordingly observe how *incolumis* contrasts him to the others. All the other associates of Seianus were prosecuted and killed, which emphasises a sense of exclusiveness in *incolumis*. One may also notice that *incolumis* is coupled with an expression that states the authority and power of Gaetulicus was kept unharmed, and so reputation is at play in this passage, as Tiberius feared the reactions his death would have caused. That Gaetulicus' power and authority was left intact is made evident by his role in the conspiracy against Caligula, in the aftermath of which he was eventually executed. This could resemble the Tacitean use of *incolumis* noted before in the summary of I.B.1,⁸⁹ where *incolumis* can be read to foreshadow future events, in which the complete opposite of *incolumis* will occur.

In this passage, Gaetulicus' state of *incolumis* relies entirely on Tiberius, and is never a certainty, however, Gaetulicus' popularity and the number of soldiers dedicated to him made it highly unlikely that Tiberius would ever charge and kill him. Tacitus also uses *incolumis* as a contrast to "dead" in this passage, as *incolumis* describes Gaetulicus in a comparison to several other individuals, all of whom did not survive.

The next three Tacitean examples of this particular use of *incolumis* are basically the exact same constructions, yet neither of them resembles A.6.30 above with respect to the construction itself. Two of the examples concerns the emperor Galba, and one Maecenas.⁹⁰

2. *Omnia deinde arbitrio militum acta: praetorii praefectos sibi ipsi legere, Plotium Firmum e manipularibus quondam, tum uigilibus praepositum et incolumi adhuc Galba partis Othonis secutum* (H.1.46)⁹¹

This first example of *incolumi adhuc Galba* occurs in the immediate aftermath of his death, when the citizens and soldiers ran through the streets of Rome, declaring their allegiance to Otho. Associates of Galba were captured, and their executions were demanded, and Otho did

⁸⁸ The same prosecution Suetonius handled in Tib.55.1 (see 3.C.ii.b), where also he used *incolumis* in the same manner. However, Suetonius abstained from naming the survivors of the prosecution.

⁸⁹ See chapter 3.C.ii.d

⁹⁰ One of Octavian's most trusted friends and advisers, perhaps most known for his love of poetry and patronage of Vergil and Horace.

⁹¹ "Thereupon everything was ordered after the authority of the soldiery: the praetors picked the prefects for themselves, Plotius Firmus, formerly from their division, was put among the watchmen, and while Galba was still alive he followed Otho's side." (H.1.46)

not have any real control over his newly acquired people. The barbarism and sheep-like tendencies of the citizens, senators and soldiers are documented by what appears to be a disgusted Tacitus.

3. *Titus Vespasianus, e Iudaea incolumi adhuc Galba missus a patre, causam profectionis officium erga principem et maturam petendis honoribus iuventam ferebat, sed uolgens fingendi auidum, disperserat accitum in adoptionem* (H.2.1).⁹²

The second example of *incolumi adhuc Galba* refers to when Titus Vespasian, the eldest son of Vespasian, who was the fourth and final emperor during the civil wars of 69, was sent to Rome and to the current emperor, Galba. It was rumoured that he was being sent to the emperor in order to be adopted, although the official reason was for him to take on a political career in Rome, and to pay tribute to Galba.

Considering the man in question, there appears to be a sarcastic intention behind using *incolumis* here. At one time *incolumis* may have been a fitting description of Galba, but the past Tacitus here refers to is when Galba was emperor, the few months it lasted. At this point in Galba's life, *incolumis*, expressing not only a man that is alive, but one that is of good health, considering the original meaning of the word, where it expresses a column standing erect and strong, and how Galba was too weak to stand on his own feet while bearing armour,⁹³ would certainly not seem to be the most suitable adjective. Further on, if we read *incolumis* with the intended meaning we are presented with in II.A.1, one could hardly consider Galba to be a man with great authority and public renown at this point. His soldiers were disloyal, some of his close friends were conspiring against him, and the people hated him. All in all, *incolumis* referring to Galba when he was emperor is probably one of the least appropriate adjectives, and still, Tacitus evokes the exact same phrasing, really emphasising this particular description of Galba during his short-lived reign.

Even if one should interpret the phrase as sarcastic, one may still observe different meanings of *incolumis* in it. First of all, *incolumis*, translating to "alive," contrasts the current state of Galba, which is "dead." This part of the interpretation might be the least sarcastic, but the emphasis on the contrast could also be seen to heighten the sarcasm in the other meanings

⁹² "Titus Vespasian, sent by his father from Iudaea while Galba was still alive, the allegiance to the emperor the cause of his journey, and he claimed he was mature of age for seeking a public office, but the people, eager to fabricate stories, spread rumours that he was summed for adoption." (H.2.1)

⁹³ See comments on H.1.35 (...*sumpto thorace*...) below.

of the word. *Incolumis* again puts the reputation of its referent in play, from which one might observe Tacitus' sarcasm. Considering this connotation of reputation, *incolumis* refers to Galba's social status, authority and fame, which would be perfectly applicable considering the defamation he suffered *post mortem*, when his body was decapitated and dishonoured, displayed in some sort of a triumphant procession. Still, the use is very sarcastic in that Galba at the time immediately before his death in no way was a man of a great reputation or fame. The little authority he did have was only for display, as all decisions he took were first contemplated and agreed upon by his three advisers, Titus Vinius, Cornelius Laco and Icelus Marcianus, of whom Tacitus has nothing positive to say.⁹⁴ These three were the decision makers because Galba was too frail and weak to strain his mind in political matters alone. One might also interpret the *incolumis* here as a way to truly emphasise the extent of Galba's defamation after his death, considering the state of his fame, authority and reputation when he was alive. Using *incolumis* to describe his reputation while alive as a contrast to what happened to his reputation after his death, could be expressing the extremity of his defamation.

The sarcasm may also be observed when reading the original meaning of *incolumis*, which is commented above, as the TLL states that the primary expression of *incolumis* that of describing something as "erect and strong." Tacitus makes a point of Galba's lack of ability (physical and psychological)⁹⁵ to withstand an agitated mob forcing their way into the imperial palace, and he attributes this lacking ability to his age:

sumpto thorace Galba inruenti turbae neque aetate neque corpore resistens sella levaretur (H.1.35).⁹⁶

I would agree with Cynthia Damon (Damon, p.173) that there is more than just Galba's physical ability to stand up with the added weight of the breastplate at stake here, but I would consider this factor as well. This description of Galba makes the *incolumis* applied to him later on, in order to describe him while he was alive, after he has died, even more ridiculous, supporting the notion that it is used sarcastically.

There is also the possible interpretation of *incolumis* referring to the quantity of its referent, expressing some object as being "all in one piece," or "complete," according to the

⁹⁴ Tacitus on Titus Vinius and Cornelius Laco: *alter deterrimus mortalium alter ignavissimus* (H.1.6), "the one the most worthless of mortals, the other the most spiritless."

⁹⁵ "It is not Galba's ability to stand that is important here, but his ability to withstand the pressures, both physical and psychological, that surround him." (Damon, p. 173).

⁹⁶ "having put on his breastplate, Galba, because he, from age and body, could not withstand the mob rushing in, was lift up in a chair" (H.1.35).

TLL entry I.B.2.a.β. Considering this use of *incolumis*, and the fact that Galba, after he was killed, and his body was reduced to an inanimate object, was decapitated, one would have to accept the sarcasm and dark humour of Tacitus. Especially when reading this connotation of *incolumis*, the addition of *adhuc* (still) makes it all the more ironic. Tacitus probably would have been fully aware of all possible connotations associated with *incolumis*, and his choice of words would attest to this. The *incolumi adhuc Galba* phrase sums up Tacitus' judgement of Galba's imperial abilities, and should be read, as argued here, as an expression of the author's opinion.

It is only natural to follow this with asking why Tacitus would want to make use of this obvious sarcasm when writing about Galba's short-lived rule. Was there any good reason for resentment towards Galba? Reading Tacitus' brief comment on how Galba affected his career,⁹⁷ or the obituary of the emperor,⁹⁸ there is little evidence that Tacitus resented Galba in particular. Still, only Galba receives this kind of remark. This is not to say that Tacitus withheld any resentment he felt towards the other emperors in the *Historiae*, nor that he usually refrained from sarcasm, which he certainly did not, but I use this particular example to demonstrate how the use of a single word, *incolumis*, could, and perhaps even should, be interpreted as a means to express personal opinion, be it resentment or favour towards someone, without much risk. Using one word that at first glance appears innocent enough, is a subtle way to bypass one's own ideals of objectivity, as *incolumis* could easily be interpreted solely along the lines of *salvus* and *validus*.⁹⁹ However, it is interesting to note that Tacitus never makes use of a simple adjective like *vivus* when referring to a person as alive in a past scenario. Yet, if one searches through the Tacitean corpus, one will not find any occurrences of Tacitus describing someone's living past, who is temporarily dead, without *incolumis* delivering a fitting description of said past, or with an obvious sarcastic undertone to it, as it sometimes does not fit at all, as seen in the passages concerning Galba.

The fact that Tacitus did experience the rule of Galba, gives reason to believe that he had opinions of the man that he would like to express, even if subtly. Maecenas, however, lived and served under Augustus, long before Tacitus was even born, yet the somewhat similar ablative absolute construction necessitates a thorough comparison between the two Galba phrases, and the following on Maecenas.

⁹⁷ *Mihi Galba Otho Vitellius nec beneficio nec iniuria cogniti* (H.1.1).

⁹⁸ *magis extra vitia quam cum virtutibus* (H.1.49).

⁹⁹ A word that figures often in Tacitus' works with an impressive 33 occurrences in just the *Historiae* and more than 100 in his complete corpus. However, this particular word would only include comments on the position of Galba, with respect to popularity and authority.

4. igitur *incolumi* Maecenate proximus, mox praecipuus, cui secreta imperatorum inniterentur, et interficiendi Postumi Agrippae conscius, aetate provecta speciem magis in amicitia principis quam vim tenuit (A.3.30).¹⁰⁰

There are some aspects of this phrase which do not initially encourage comparison to the Galba-constructions in the two examples above. First of all, Maecenas was never murdered in a similar way, and he was not dismembered and dishonoured after his death. Maecenas was also never emperor of Rome, albeit he was one of its caretakers when Augustus was on a campaign. Whether or not he had many enemies is not certain, but unlike Galba, he did have several supporters among the people, the senate and even among the soldiers. There was no general detestation of Maecenas, as there appears to have been of Galba. One should also note that Tacitus does not use *adhuc* in this passage, which makes the phrase rather different than that found in H.1.46 and H.2.1 with reference to Galba.

It is difficult to argue that Tacitus bore any sort of personal resentment towards Maecenas, considering how many years laid between their lives. However, if one considers Maecenas' reputation *post mortem*, an interesting reading of the passage emerges. Maecenas' reputation and power suffered somewhat when he, having confided in his wife of an uncovered conspiracy of which he was not to speak to anyone (Edwards, p. 78), lost favour with the emperor. In a passage in Velleius it is commented that he was regarded as more effeminate than a woman, but still a very wise and watchful leader (Vell.2.88.2), which indicates that he was respected in some ways, but not completely. Maecenas' role as patron to some of the great Roman poets is unlikely to have inspired any resentment towards him on Tacitus' part. It would seem that any irritation Tacitus could have felt towards Maecenas would have been strictly based on moral principle, and even this would hardly have been a strong feeling of resentment. Maecenas was the adviser of what at the time was considered the best emperor in Roman history, Augustus, and there are no indications that Maecenas ever put this empire in great jeopardy, or that he contributed to its deterioration.

It seems most probable that Tacitus here uses *incolumis* in reference to the position of Maecenas (i.e. with his reputation in mind), and if one reads a foreshadowing effect in *incolumis*, this may reflect on the fact that he never held a higher rank than that of equestrian,

¹⁰⁰ “So, when Maecenas was [alive and] influential, he [Sallustius Crispus] was close [to him], and soon [he was] the first to whom the secrets of the emperor were entrusted, and he was an accomplice to the murdering of Postumus Agrippa; and old in age, he held rather the look than the essence of friendship with the prince.” (A.3.30)

and that his influence on Augustus waned after the conspiracy attempt by his brother-in-law, even if it did not deteriorate their friendship. His partner in rule over Rome while Augustus was on campaign, Agrippa, eventually married Julia, and became the son-in-law of Augustus. Two of their children were adopted by Augustus and mentioned as possible and probable successors to the throne (Suetonius, 2008, p. 75-76). Compared to his friend and colleague, one has to say Maecenas' reputation and rank increased the least, even decreased, in the aftermath of the conspiracy. However, that Maecenas' public status did not increase was, according to Velleius, by own choice.¹⁰¹

Considering this connotation of Maecenas' reputation, one would also have to consider the contrast relating to the word, as *incolumis* here presents the state of Maecenas' political power and authority as a past state which is no longer a reality. This complies with a Tacitean use of the word, as seen before, where *incolumis* foreshadows future events that are contrary to the meaning of the word. If we are to read connotations of reputation in *incolumis* here, the time reference cannot simply be to when Maecenas was alive; it must be to when he was alive and at the height of his social status. His position dropped before he died, hence reading *incolumis* in accordance with this notion of undamaged reputation, gives a more definitive date for the event, although the time reference is not the most important part of *incolumis* here.

Quite interestingly Martin and Woodman's (1996, p. 273) commentary of this passage states that *incolumis* definitely could not be interpreted as expressing the state of Maecenas' influence or power. The commentary reads: "The abl. abs. = 'while M. was still alive' and is picked up by *mox*, which in turn is picked up by *aetate prouecta*; the phrase can scarcely = 'while M. was still influential', because that would imply a subsequent lack of influence which would anticipate, and be made redundant by, *idque... acciderat* below(4)." (Martin & Woodman, 1996, p.273).¹⁰²

I would argue to the contrary, that it is "while M. was still alive" that one should consider redundant by the fact that the progression of Sallustius' relationship with the emperor does not need this as a time reference. However, emphasising the similarity between Maecenas and Sallustius Crispus, and their careers and relationship with the emperor, which

¹⁰¹ *nec minora consequi potuit, sed non tam concupivit* (Vell.2.88.2).

¹⁰² Accordingly, translating the passage according to Martin and Woodman's commentaries, it would look something like this: "So, when Maecenas was still alive, he [Crispus] was close [to him], and soon the first to whom the secrets of the emperor were entrusted; and he was an accomplice to the murdering of Postumus Agrippa; and in old age, he held rather the look, than the essence of friendship with the emperor" (A.3.30)

reading a reference to reputation in *incolumis* does, makes the comparison which follows in *idque... acciderat*¹⁰³ all the more powerful. Indeed, *incolumi Maecenate* anticipates the following phrase, but I would argue that this is a calculated emphasis. The time reference is an unnecessary, although not unwelcome additional note that *incolumis* supplies.

As such, I would encourage reading and translating this example as “while Maecenas was influential”, or, perhaps more fitting the strength of *incolumis* “while Maecenas was alive and influential,” pointing out both aspects of it. I struggle with accepting that one should refrain from reading the “influence” or “power” of Maecenas in this particular sentence because his loss of influence is commented further below on the same page, and because the entire passage here is a comparison between Maecenas and Sallustius Crispus, and how they went from close and trusted friends of the emperor, to lose their influence and power. I do, however, agree that *incolumis* here does not solely refer to the position and power of Maecenas, but I believe that Tacitus emphasised a connotation of reputation in *incolumis* in this particular context.

The lifestyle of Maecenas does not necessarily go hand in hand with the virtuous ideal of Tacitus, as he dabbled with poetry¹⁰⁴ and loved luxury and leisure whenever he had any spare time. This could definitely spark some resentment from Tacitus, as he despised all sorts of vice, but any kind of heartfelt contempt for Maecenas seems unlikely. The reference to reputation still seems to be the primary intention of Tacitus’ use of *incolumis* in this passage. Nevertheless it is too easy and too simple, considering the circumstances, that it merely means “alive” here, and it seems to me that Martin and Woodman has rushed their interpretation of this section. However one sees it, it seems unlikely that Tacitus in this passage uses *incolumis* with the same irony as he did with Galba in the two examples above. Maecenas did not die an ugly death, like Galba, he was not generally detested in Rome, and he was not emperor. The omitting of *adhuc*, which differentiates this phrase from that applied to Galba, strengthens the claim that *incolumis* is used towards different rhetorical ends in the two phrases.

3.C.iii.b: Livy (TLL: *incolumis* II.A.1)

1. *liberi atque incolumes desiderate patriam*; (Liv.22.60.14).¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ *idque et Maecenati acciderat* (A.3.30). “This happened also to Maecenas.”

¹⁰⁴ Not to be confused with being a patron of famous poets, which I doubt Tacitus would have resented.

¹⁰⁵ The TLL refers to Liv.22.60.15, but the actual *incolumis* phrase occurs at 22.60.14. Translation: “[When] free and unharmed, long for your fatherland!” (Liv.22.60.14).

This phrase is part of a recited speech, originally performed by the conservative and austere Roman senator, Titus Manlius Torquatus, advising against ransoming for Roman soldiers that had been taken hostage by the Carthaginians, as he considered them unworthy of ransoming, because they had refused to attempt any sort of escape from the Carthaginian camp, even when they were not under any considerable guard. In the he speech criticises their cowardice, and declares that they have lost their Roman civil rights, as they are now without any sort of honour. This reference to their loss of honour, is key to how one should interpret *incolumis*. The phrase itself is a rhetorical exhortation to the captured Roman soldiers, in which Torquatus points out how they no longer have the right to yearn for their country, as they gave up a chance to return to it. *Incolumis* should then be read as “when you still had honour,” indicating that they had lost it, which resembles several other instances, where *incolumis* alone compares and contrasts reality. There is also a reference to the status of the soldiers’ health, but the main point of *incolumis* is to illustrate that the soldiers are no longer honourable Romans, and should therefore not be ransomed for.

2. *iis eadem fere, quae Romae egerant, verba sine fide rerum iactantibus nihil iam perplexe, ut ante, cum dubiae res **incolumi** Philippo erant, sed aperte denuntiatum,* (Liv.33.34.2-3).¹⁰⁶

In this passage *incolumis* refers to a period when king Philip was still unharmed and with undamaged authority and power. The fact that Livy emphasises how the circumstances were different at the time referred to, indicates that he has lost this power. Considering that Philip was not dead at this point in time, one should probably not focus too much on the “health” reference in *incolumis* in this example. This encourages a focus on connotations of reputation again, as Philip was defeated in war, but allowed to live, which rendered his state of authority and repute considerably weaker than before. As a result, one should also consider how *incolumis* points to a state of dependence, as Philip’s life and authority have been put solely in the hands of the Romans. There is an obvious time reference in the phrase, pointing towards a past time when Philip still had power, and had not submitted to the Romans.

¹⁰⁶ “They [delivered] nearly the same words, which they had delivered at Rome, without honesty, now there was no reply confusedly given, as before, when the circumstances were uncertain and Philip was unharmed, but he was openly warned,” (Liv.33.34.2-3).

3. *non solum liberos, sed etiam immunes fore Issenses et Taulantios, Dassaretiorum Pirustas, Rhizonitas, Olciniatas, quod incolumi Gentio ad Romanos defecissent* (Liv.45.26.13).¹⁰⁷

Yet again we are presented with a time reference, in which the time referred to is a past time when someone was more powerful than contemporarily. The phrase is part of a recited speech originally performed by Anicius, a Roman praetor, who conducted and won the war against the Illyrian king, Gentius. In this case, *incolumis* does not contrast or foreshadow imminent death, as Gentius was brought back to Rome as a prisoner after his defeat, which further encourages reading connotations of reputation in this phrase as well. Losing a war would not necessarily be considered weak and dishonourable, as there are certainly instances when the defeated are praised for their valour and strength, albeit often to emphasise the greatness of the victor. However, considering that Gentius was captured and brought back to Rome, intended to be displayed as something of a trophy of war, a demonstration by the Romans of the Gentius' fall from power and authority, *incolumis*, expressing the past state of Gentius, as a contrast to his current state is quite fitting, especially when one considers his reputation. As with the Livian example above, one should consider how *incolumis* points to dependency here, because Gentius' life and authority has become completely dependent on the Roman will.

3.C.iii.c: Summary of TLL: *incolumis* II.A.1

Perhaps the most important note on this section of the TLL is that Tacitus here really emphasises the sarcastic potential of *incolumis*. What is striking about this sarcastic potential, is that one may still express documented and serious facts, adding the sarcasm as something of a side note. This is made possible by the polysemy of *incolumis*. Tacitus demonstrates a highly eloquent and clever use of *incolumis* in H.1.46 and H.2.1, in which he presents, in what at first glance might appear to be a simple time reference, a very sarcastic stab at Galba's health, authority, popularity, and even *post mortem* physical state.

The other two Tacitean examples do not offer a similar sarcastic stab at the referent of *incolumis*. The two Galba phrases present the possibility of a multi-layered interpretation of *incolumis*. Tacitus appears to take all aspects of *incolumis*' meaning into account when he

¹⁰⁷ "They will not only be free, but also exempt from taxes, the Issenses and Taulantii, Pirustae of Dassaretia, the Rhizonae and the Olcinatae, because they revolted to the Romans when Gentius was at the height of his power." (Liv.45.26.13)

applies it, and the Galba phrases are good examples of the potential meanings one may convey through *incolumis*.

The Livian examples are somewhat less interesting with respect to the complex application of the different aspects of *incolumis*, which can be witnessed in Tacitus. The Livian phrases used as examples in this TLL entry, presents a somewhat simpler use of *incolumis*; meaning that Livy appears not to go out of his way to express several aspects of it. In all three examples, it is quite evident that in Livy, *incolumis* refers to reputation, and that one should read it as a presentation of a past state of things, which is no longer a reality. One should be careful to call Livy a less experimental writer, but one could claim that his language in the II.A.1 examples is more to the point, than that of Tacitus.

The two following entries in the TLL¹⁰⁸ are concerned with the state of the mind or the soul (II.A.2: *de animi qualitate*), and more specifically the condition of the mind (a: *de condicione mentis*) and orthodox belief (b: *de fide orthodoxa*). However, none of the four authors figure in any of these entries, and hence we move forth to II.B.

3.C.iv: *Incolumis II.B: de re publica sim*

Entry II.B. is concerned with the state, be it Rome or any other, and have no more specific definitions and subcategories. All examples of interest to this thesis are by Livy, as he was the only one of the four selected writers to have used *incolumis* in this way. In total, there are ten Livian examples, but the analysis of them will be brief, as they are all pretty similar.

3.C.iv.a Livy (TLL: *incolumis II.B*)

1. *Veniam civitati petebant civium temeritate bis iam eversae, **incolumi** futurae¹⁰⁹ iterum hostium beneficio; (Liv.30.16.6).¹¹⁰*

At first glance, it seems rather straight forward, they (i.e. the Carthaginians) plead for their city to be spared, by the mercy of their enemy (i.e. the Romans). However, as is later revealed this plea, is merely a distraction in order that they might bring Hannibal back to Carthage so that he may fight off the Roman armies (although he does not succeed). Either way, the intent of the plea is to keep their city safe, and hence, there is at first glance no apparent added

¹⁰⁸ II.A.2.a and II.A.2.b.

¹⁰⁹ Most likely a typographical error, should be *futurae*.

¹¹⁰ “They begged for a favour for a city, now twice completely plundered, [caused] by the temerity of its citizens, that it would be [kept] safe a second time by the favour of their enemies.” (Liv.30.16.6)

meaning to *incolumis* in this passage. However, one might read it as a foreshadowing of a future event and future state that is the opposite of *incolumis*, similar to previous occasions. As mentioned, this plea was merely a distraction. They betrayed the Romans' trust, and was duly beaten and destroyed.

Incolumis applies to the city itself, and one should therefore not try to read more than the condition of the buildings of the city. The people, it would seem, are not included. *Incolumis* is part of the indirect speech construction presenting the Carthaginians' plea, and gives us Livy's impression of how they performed the plea. By utilising *incolumis* Livy indicates that the Carthaginians are fully aware that this state will depend completely on the Romans, and is by no means certain.

2. *quid prodesse, si **incolumi** urbe, quae capta ultima timeantur, liberis suis sint patienda?* (Liv.3.47.2).¹¹¹

This example is part of a short recitation of the words of Virginius, where he stresses the importance of his presence as protector of the city. It could seem almost a threat from Virginius to the citizens, so that they will be appreciative of his deeds. Also here, *incolumis* seems dependent on an external factor, i.e. Virginius, and could give the idea that this use might be Livian. Unlike in the passage above, *incolumis* here seems to describe not only the city and its buildings, but also the state of its inhabitants. The addition of *liberis suis sint patienda* gives good reason to believe that one should also consider the people of the city, particularly the children. Within the same parenthesis of the entry, in which all examples presents *incolumis* modifying some version of *urbs*, are two more Livian examples:

3. *apparere vobis, Quirites, puto, qui meministis ante Gallorum adventum salvis tectis publicis privatisque, stante **incolumi** urbe hanc eandem rem actam esse, ut Veios transmigraremus* (Liv.5.53.2).¹¹²

¹¹¹ "What use was it, if, while the city [still] stood safe, what they feared most [if it was captured], was for their children to suffer." (Liv.3.47.2)

¹¹² "I think it is clear to you, citizens, who remember that before the arrival of the Gauls, when the both the public and private buildings were all right, while the city [still] stood undamaged, this same matter [question] was presented, that we should move to Veii." (Liv.5.53.2)

4. *ita agros ademinus, ut agrum locumque ad habitandum daremus, urbem innoxiam stare **incolumem** pateremur, ut, qui hodie videat eam, nullum oppugnatae captaeve ibi vestigium inveniatur* (Liv.31.31.15).¹¹³

The first example might resemble a few previous examples of *incolumis*, in which *incolumis* foreshadows future events that contrasts its own meaning, and as such quite resembles a few of the Livian examples from entry I.A.2¹¹⁴ where *incolumis* primarily functions to demonstrate that the present state of things is the exact opposite of *incolumis*. The passage is taken from a speech by Camillus, in which he, after the Gaulish sack of Rome, encourages the Romans that they should stay in Rome, even if the circumstances might seem grim.

The second passage is part of a speech by a Roman delegate, in which he stresses the leniency of Rome towards her enemies. The phrase is similar to Liv.30.16.6 and 3.47.2, as *incolumis* appears dependant on an external factor, and is part of a recited speech where the speaker intends to portray the Romans as a merciful and kind people. One gets the impression that the people and the city, defined by *incolumis*, does not deserve to be *incolumis*, but that the mercy of Rome still allows it.

5. *tamen id imperium ei ad puberem aetatem **incolume** mansit;* (Liv.1.3.1).¹¹⁵

Liv.1.3.1 tells of how the state was kept safe on behalf of Ascanius, son of Aeneas, until he reached manhood. To some extent one could argue that *incolumis* is dependant on an external factor also here, as the nation was kept safe by Ascanius' mother, Lavinia, and this safety was entirely dependent on her skill and of her will to keep the nation safe. This will, one would assume, was unquestionable however. Nevertheless, one should primarily read the "safety" of the nation from *incolumis* here. Additionally, it seems that one could also read the "safe-keeping of the governing power," referring to the political power of Rome's early leader.

¹¹³ "And so we took away their fields, but in a way that we gave them a field and place to live, and we allowed [their] harmless city to stand undamaged, so that no one, who today sees it, would discover any trace there of its assault or capture." (Liv.31.31.15)

¹¹⁴ Of which two are also from Liv.5.53.

¹¹⁵ "Nevertheless that empire remained safe for him [Ascanius], until he arrived at the age of puberty." (Liv.1.3.1)

6. *dum tribuni consulesque ad se quisque omnia trahant, nihil relictum esse virium in medio: distractam laceratamque rem publicam; magis quorum in manu sit, quam ut incolumis sit, quaeri* (Liv.2.57.3).¹¹⁶

This Livian example is interesting, as it is quite different from the previous examples of this entry. The phrase is part of a speech in a quarrel concerning where the power should lie, during a crisis and chaos in Rome. Here, *incolumis* appears to have been forfeited, accepted as a non-existent condition for the state. The possibility of it being obtained, however, still seems to be depending on one man and his power to make it so, only that in this occasion, said man has yet to present himself. There is much uncertainty looming over *incolumis*, and of its possible attainment.

The primary meaning of *incolumis* appears to be the “safety” of Rome, and not necessarily the physical state of the city. However, it seems that one should also read the state of public order in this utterance, as public order in Rome is portrayed as somewhat chaotic, and *incolumis* represents a preferable future contrast to this present state.

7. *nullam autem incolumem esse orbatam publico consilio crederet, rationem iniit, qua et senatum servaret et obnoxium sibi ac plebi faceret* (Liv.23.2.4).¹¹⁷

In Liv.23.2.4 the state of *incolumis* yet again depends on an external factor. Here *incolumis* applies to Capua, and it is sought by Pacuvius Calavius through something of a reconciliation between the people of Capua, and the Capuan senate, as Calavius considers it more likely for the city to remain safe and undamaged if the government and the people work together. In addition to the physical state of the city itself, *incolumis* here seems also to refer to the reputation and status of the city, as, according to Calavius, a city could not be considered powerful and strong without a functioning public council.

One should probably read not only the physical state of the city being unharmed, but also that the state of calm and public order was intact. Accordingly it appears that *incolumis* functions as a contrast to chaos. The special circumstance concerning this particular phrase

¹¹⁶ “While the tribunes and the consules each claimed everything for themselves, there was no power left in the commonwealth; the state broken up and torn to pieces; rather in whose hands it was, than how it could be safe was to be asked.” (Liv.2.57.3)

¹¹⁷ “but he believed that no [state] could be safe, [if] bereaved of the public council, [so] he formed a plan, which would both preserve the senate, and make it dependent on himself and the people.” (Liv.23.2.4)

defends this notion, and, considering this aspect figuring in the previous example (Liv.2.57.3) as well, it could add another dimension to *incolumis* which one would have to consider in other interpretations as well.

8. *mirari se, quonam ore Ardeates Aricinique, cuius agri ius numquam usurpaverint incolumi Coriolana re, eum se a populo Romano, quem pro domino iudicem fecerint, intercepturos sperent* (Liv.3.71.7).¹¹⁸

In Liv.3.71.7, where *incolumis* applies to the state of Corioli, it refers to a time before Corioli was conquered by Rome and to its actual existence. Implied in this phrase, is that Corioli must have had some considerable power over the Ardeans and Aricini, as they would not have dared put forth such a request to the Romans had Corioli persisted. Hence, one should not only read the physical state in *incolumis* here, but also consider the reputation of the kingdom. It might seem unusual to use *incolumis* for the reputation of a kingdom or a city, and not to a person, but within the concept of Corioli, lies also the government of Corioli, whose power and authority *incolumis* here reflects.

The chaos contrast does not apply here, as there appears to be no indicators of Corioli existing anymore, which would make chaos within the kingdom quite difficult. The fact that *incolumis* refers to a kingdom, and not a city in particular, furthers the notion that one should not compare too much of this Livian passage with the one directly above. If we are to consider a connotation of reputation in this passage, one would have to consider the reputation of Corioli to have been severely damaged when it was destroyed, which certainly is plausible. It was definitely destroyed, and being an opponent of Rome, one would have to assume losing a battle to them would have to be considered a loss in reputation as well.

9. *Masinissa hostis vobis ante quam socius fuit, nec incolumi regno cum auxiliis suis, sed extorris, expulsus, amissis omnibus copiis, cum turma equitum in castra confugit vestra:* (Liv.37.53.21).¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ Continues a long section of accusative with infinitive constructions: “That he wondered, by what conceivable boldness the Ardeans and the Aricini, whose territory they had never claimed right of when the kingdom of Corioli was unharmed, hoped to appropriate this [territory] for themselves from the Roman people, whom they would make judge in stead of owner.” (Liv.3.71.7).

In this example we are presented with a speech by King Eumenes of Pergamum, in which he speaks of King Masinissa of Numidia, referring to the Kingdom of Numidia and its past state as *incolumis*, as a contrast to the state it was in when King Masinissa switched sides in the Second Punic War. It seems that *incolumis* should be regarded as concerning not only the safety and state of the kingdom itself, but also the state of its armies. The speech demonstrates the frustration and anger of Eumenes, as he finds Masinissa's timing of surrender and change of sides a bit too convenient, considering that he had basically lost the war. He sees little point in an ally of this sort, as he can provide little, if any, help in the continuing war with the Carthaginians.

As already stated, one should, in addition to reading the state and safety of the Numidian kingdom, read the state of the Numidian army. *Incolumis* is not solely applied to its referent, and one should accordingly consider a reference to quantity in *incolumis* as well, as it applies to the army. As opposed to the examples from entry I.B.2, where such a quantity reference was the primary use of *incolumis*, it does not modify a noun here which directly translates into "army," or anything associated with an army. However, the army is referred to in the following clause, which, as the *incolumis* clause, is a temporal subordinate clause, determining the circumstances and time when Masinissa came to the Roman camp. Accordingly, *incolumis* is never actually part of a clause where it refers directly to an army of any kind, but the following clauses, which work together with the *incolumis* clause, give reason to believe that the *regnum* comprises the army and command thereof.

10. *victamne ut quisquam victricis patriae praeferret sineretque maiorem fortunam captis esse Veis, quam **incolumibus** fuerit?* (Liv.5.24.10).¹²⁰

The phrase itself figures in a recited speech, which was originally performed by Roman nobles, who were opposed to the idea of half the senate moving to Veii. Here *incolumis* refers to the citizens of Veii, a neighbouring city of Rome, and it refers to more than just their state of well-being as it appears that one should also acknowledge a reference to their freedom. This is made evident by the reference to their captured state, which is uttered in *captis*, and in that *incolumibus* serves as a contrast to *captis*. Their well-being seems to serve a less

¹¹⁹ "Masinissa was your enemy before he was your ally, and not when his kingdom was safe, with his auxiliaries, but exiled, driven out, and with every troop lost, he fled to your camp with one [single] horse troop." (Liv.37.54.21).

¹²⁰ "Could anyone [really] prefer a conquered to a conquering nation, and allow the captured Veii to have greater fortune, than when they were safe [and free]." (Liv.5.24.10)

important role in the expression of *incolumis*, than the state of their liberty. Associated with their liberty, would also be their reputation and social status, one would assume. Hence, *incolumis* also points to the reputation of the Veii.

This example is also set apart from the others as *incolumis* here refers to citizens, and not the city which they inhabit. While the citizens of the respective cities mentioned in the examples above are clearly implied in the concept of the city itself, it is only in this example *incolumis* modifies the citizens specifically. The plural form of *incolumis* removes the possibility of it modifying the state of a city, which would have required a singular form. As such, one could question this passage being an example in this particular TLL entry, but its inclusion in the TLL would still not alter the manner in which one should interpret *incolumis*. All examples should be examined and interpreted individually, as there is no guarantee that the TLL entry would cover every aspect of *incolumis* in all the examples.

3.C.iv.b: Summary of TLL: *incolumis* II.B

Finding a common denominator for entry II.B was made considerably more difficult by the tenth Livian example, which was quite different from the other examples. However, this particular example, one could argue, should not have been part of this entry in the first place. As for the other nine examples, *incolumis* always modifies either a city, a state or a kingdom, all of which agree with the initial description of the entry. The common meaning of *incolumis*, which applies to all of these nine examples, is the “safety” or the “undamaged state” of its referent.

However, there are some additional meanings of *incolumis* that only applies to certain examples. Most importantly is the meaning of “intact public order,” which occurs for the first time in this entry. This contrasts to chaos and demonstrates yet another factor one needs to consider when examining and interpreting *incolumis*. However, it does not seem very applicable in phrases presenting the state of people, nor in phrases where *incolumis* modifies something larger than a city (i.e. a state or a nation). This aspect of *incolumis* appears to require the modifying of a city. Frequently *incolumis* foreshadows a contrast to its own meaning in the near future, this applies to the concept of order vs. chaos, but also with regard to reputation or physical state.

Other frequent meanings also figure in the examples of this entry, of which a conveyance of dependency is the most common. In many of the examples, the safety of a city, a state or a kingdom is presented as depending on a man, woman or some superior group (i.e. the Romans in Liv.30.16.6).

Incolumis also points to reputation in some of the II.B examples, but in the sense that *incolumis* represents the authority and power of the government of a city (Liv.23.2.4) or a kingdom (Liv.3.71.7). Usually, when *incolumis* points to reputation, it is modifying a person of some significance, but as this aspect of *incolumis*' meaning might also reflect power and authority, it seems reasonable that one might apply it to a city or a kingdom, which would need a governing body, which in turn would need power and authority.

Finally, of the first nine examples, there is one (Liv.37.54.21) where a reference to quantity appears again, to some extent resembling the examples of I.B.2. However, whereas in I.B.2 there was always a clear reference to an army in the noun *incolumis* modified, in this example, there is none. *Incolumis* modifies the kingdom of Numidia, and not explicitly its army. The army is implied in the kingdom, and is referred to in a following clause. The quantity reference is not the primary meaning of *incolumis* here, but it is certainly one of the intended connotations.

The tenth example, Liv.5.24.10, does not compare very well to any of the nine other examples because it does not present *incolumis* modifying a city, state or kingdom, but rather the citizens of a city. Additionally incomparable is the primary meaning of *incolumis* in this particular phrase, which is somewhat unlikely, as it is a reference to the aforementioned citizens' freedom. In cases where there have been a reference to freedom expressed by *incolumis*, this has not been the primary meaning, but rather an additional connotation. In this example, the reference to the safety/health of its referent appears secondary, and not even particularly important.

3.C.v: *Incolumis* II.C: *de rebus incorporeis*

This is the final entry on *incolumis* in the TLL, and in it are the last four references of this thesis. Considering entry I.A.2, where it was concluded that the TLL by *de rebus variis corporeis* meant "of various physical things," one can only assume that the TLL with *de rebus incorporeis* means "of non-physical things." There are two Livian examples in this entry, one Suetonian and one Tacitean.

3.C.v.a: Tacitus (TLL: *incolumis* II.C)

*filia atque uxore superstitibus potest videri etiam beatus **incolumi** dignitate, florente fama, salvis adfinitatibus et amicitiiis futura effugisse (Agr.44).¹²¹*

This Tacitean example marks the only instance of *incolumis* in the *Agricola*, and it figures in the summary of Agricola's life and of his exemplary and virtuous greatness, where Tacitus emphasises how lucky Agricola is to have died at the summit of his fame. Here *incolumis* clearly refers to the social status and memory of Agricola, much in accordance with II.A.1. However, there is no doubt that Tacitus admired this particular subject, Agricola, whom Tacitus regarded as one of, if not the very best and most virtuous Roman to have ever lived. This gives reason to suspect that when Tacitus applied *incolumis* to Galba and Maecenas, as seen in II.A.1, he did so with a sarcastic, and at the same time critical, implication. In this earnest summary of Agricola, Tacitus directly attributes *incolumis* to the *dignitas* of Agricola, whereas with Galba and Maecenas he applies *incolumis* to their very names.

Considering many of the other observations of *incolumis*, in particular those concerned with the physical state of something, it seems that it often describes something that once was, but no longer is “undamaged” or “standing erect.” Also considering the undisputable meaning of *incolumis* in Agr.44., it would definitely be reasonable to assume that Tacitus in H.1.46 and H.2.1 illustrated that the state of *incolumis*, with respect to the individual to whom it applied's reputation and life, ceased to be a reality, concerning Galba, both with respect to his social as well as his physical stature. Expressing that Galba, while he was respectable at some point, eventually turned away from a venerable and admirable life. Comparing him to Agricola, he, according to Tacitus at least, certainly comes up short with respect to virtues, earned fame, and honour. However one sees it, it is hard to argue against the polysemy of *incolumis* as it is used by, and considering his rhetorical and oratorical skill, one hardly suspects that his phrasing was accidental.

3.C.v.b: Livy (TLL: *incolumis* II.C)

1. *quod **incolumi** Hernico nomine missitaverant simul cum iis Samniti auxilia (Liv.9.45.5).¹²²*

¹²¹ “And he can be regarded even more fortunate, having been survived by his daughter and wife, to have avoided what was to be [i.e. to have died], with his honour undamaged, his fame flourishing, his family and friends unhurt.” (Agr.44)

Following Tacitus is a couple of Livian examples. In the first example, Livy is referring to the Hernici¹²³ and the pre-conquered condition of their nation, in an explanation of why Rome attacked the Aequi.¹²⁴ Again a reference to the freedom of *incolumis*' referent, as in Liv.5.24.10 above, appears to have been intended. The use of *incolumis* is nonetheless quite unproblematic here, and it resembles how Livy often used it in reference to nations and tribes. The primary expression is that of the safety and physical state of the Hernician nation, and it is presented as a past state of things, in contrast to the present.

2. *spem factam a te civitati video, fide incolumi ex thesauris Gallicis quos primores patrum occultent, creditum solvi posse* (Liv.6.15.5).¹²⁵

This Livian example, however, is quite extraordinary. Kraus (1998), in her commentary notes that: “*incolumis* + abstract noun is Ciceronian, but *i. fides* is not attested elsewhere before the third century A.D (TLL)” (p. 181). Livy’s use of *incolumis* here is certainly curious, considering that he seems to be the very first Roman writer to apply it in this exact way. It certainly does agree with the TLL-term *de rebus incorporeis*, as the abstract *fides* certainly falls in the category of non-physical. *Incolumis* seems to express something as being “undamaged,” which works well with entry II.C.

Reading more into it, it appears yet again that *incolumis* is used here to indicate that its realisation is highly improbable, and it thus appears to have been used rather sarcastically. It is worth noting that this occurrence *incolumis* is part of a speech, and as such represents Livy’s conception of how Camillus would have spoken. The speech is an accusation of Marcus Manlius, who has promised the commoners that their debts will be paid by the Gaulish spoils, something which Camillus objects. This state of *fide incolumi* is presented as entirely depending on the will of Camillus, as he at this time was dictator of Rome, and demonstrates his acknowledging his own power. The sarcasm appears quite clear, and would no doubt have given a clear image of the likeliness of the debts being erased. From the

¹²² “...because, when the Hernician nation was still undamaged [free], they had together with them repeatedly sent help to the Samnites at the same time.” (Liv.9.45.5)

¹²³ A people from the Latium area.

¹²⁴ Neighbouring people of the Hernici.

¹²⁵ “I see that you have created hope in the citizens that the loan can be paid back, with no damage to credit, from the treasury of the Gauls, which the prominent fathers are hiding.” (Liv.6.15.5)

speech, one may already comprehend the end result of this conflict. Camillus will never pay the commoners debts, as they are still theirs to pay, and he blames Manlius for giving the impression that he would. This results in Manlius being dragged off to prison and sentenced to death, and later being tossed from the Tarpeian Rock.

3.C.v.c: Suetonius (TLL: *incolumis* II.C)

1. *sub exitu quidem uitae palam uouerat, si sibi **incolumis** status permansisset, proditurum se partae uictoriae ludis etiam hydraulam et choraulam et utricularium ac nouissimo die histrionem saltaturumque Vergili Turnum* (Nero.54.1).¹²⁶

Concluding TLL's *incolumis* entry is Suetonius, where he tells of Nero's final days, illustrating the frivolity of the infamous emperor. There is little doubt here that *incolumis* concerns the social status and reputation of Nero. What makes it different from the other examples is that it is here part of a conditional clause, thus emphasising that the state of *incolumis* is uncertain, and depending on someone else. The conditional clause also indicates that Nero must have been aware of his uncertain position, which would lead one to believe that his promises of amazing shows and games was a last, desperate act to keep power and control. As such, one could claim that *incolumis* to some extent here conveys a sense of dependency.

Even if the phrase itself refers to Nero's social status, one could argue that *incolumis* does not necessarily point to his reputation, like in several other passages where it describes reputation, as the *status* of Nero is explicitly mentioned, and *incolumis* appears only to modify this to the extent of being "unharmd." However, *status* is a word that gives room for as much, if not more, interpretation as given by *incolumis*, and together they make this plea of Nero multidimensional. Primarily one associates *status* with position, both politically and socially. Additionally, *status* might refer to the physical condition of someone. Coupled with *incolumis*, one should consider Nero's plea to be for his life, for physical condition to remain safe and unharmed, and for his position to remain the same. One could argue that *status* is an unnecessary part of this phrase, as the combination of *incolumis status* could just as easily have been expressed through *incolumis* alone. The combination of the two words, multidimensional as they both are, makes for an intriguing construction, however,

¹²⁶ "Near the end of his life, he vowed publicly that, if his position remained undamaged, he, in spectacles of victory that he created, he would deliver an organ-player, a flutist and a bagpiper, and on the last day he, as the actor, would perform Vergil's Turnus." (Nero.54.1).

emphasising that Nero wanted both his life and position to remain unharmed, but that he would still prefer remaining alive even if he could not remain emperor.

3.C.v.d: Summary of TLL: *incolumis* II.C

Entry II.C does not have one apparent common denominator, as all examples employ *incolumis* in quite different manners. The entry description supports this, however, as *incolumis* “concerning various non-physical things” allows a considerable range of uses. The Tacitean passage presented the only occasion of *incolumis* in the *Agricola*, and in the passage he applied the word to one of his most appreciated heroes, namely Agricola, his father-in-law. The phrase clearly applied *incolumis* to Agricola’s reputation, status and honour, and further encouraged one to read the Tacitean examples of section II.A1 as somewhat ironic, or sarcastic.

There were also two Livian passages in II.C, both of which were different from the Tacitean example, but also different from one another. The first passage, Liv.9.45.5 is rather similar of other Livian examples in which he applies *incolumis* to nations or tribes, primarily using *incolumis* to express “safe” or “unharmed.” Additionally, a reference to the freedom of *incolumis*’ referent, a dimension of the word that, based the examples of the TLL, seems unique for Livy, applies in this example.

The other Livian passage, Liv.6.15.5, does not really resemble any of the other examples of the entire TLL entry. Here *incolumis* is applied to an abstract noun, *fides*, and refers, for the first time, to economics. As previously stated, this certainly agrees with the entry description, and adds yet another dimension to *incolumis* as used in historical writing. What is striking, however, is that Livy appears to have been the first Latin writer to apply it in this exact way. Indeed, Cicero was an ardent user of *incolumis* with abstract nouns, but he never used it with *fides*.

The final passage in my examination of *incolumis*, and its various applications in Roman prose, is Suetonian. In Nero.54.1 *incolumis* is used in a reference to Nero’s social status, illustrating, to some extent, the immaturity and political ignorance of the emperor. *Incolumis* is intelligently coupled with *status*, another word with several dimensions, demonstrating and emphasising Nero’s hopes of retaining both his political position and social status, as well as staying alive. *Status* should primarily be read as a reference to the political position of Nero, but with the additional note that he at least wants to be kept alive.

3.D: *Incolumis*: the intent of the author

Through this comparative analysis of how *incolumis* was used by Livy, Sallust, Suetonius and Tacitus, one can easily conclude that the polysemy of *incolumis* is extensive, and that it was seldom used in order to convey simple meanings. I would claim that one may, by analysing the particular uses of this word, observe the author's personal presence in his own literature, and in some occasions, even his own opinions. That is not to say that one may observe the author's presence through this word in all instances. This analysis has documented that each author appears to have his own characteristic manner of using *incolumis*.

There is, however, one aspect of *incolumis* that figures in the corpus of all four authors, namely when *incolumis* does not appear to describe a person that is whole, or unharmed etc. on its own, but through the actions of someone else. This is definitely the most common usage of *incolumis*, and expresses how the state of *incolumis*, be it on behalf of a person, a people, a city or a nation, depends on an external factor,¹²⁷ often a general or ruler of some kind, but also a rival nation, or even the gods.¹²⁸ What may also be concluded from *incolumis* used like this, is that the referent, which *incolumis* describes, appears unlikely to obtain this state, and is often even undeserving of escaping a situation in this state of being.

Another frequent aspect of *incolumis* is that of a past complete contrast to the contemporaneous state of something, or someone, by which I mean that *incolumis* could be used to express something as unharmed or undamaged when describing the past state of its referent, but foreshadowing a contrast to this state in the future/present (e.g. *incolumis* for "alive," but contrasting the subject's present state). This applies to nations and cities¹²⁹ to the extent that one does not need a description of the contemporaneous state of the city or state if the past has been described with *incolumis*, as this would only be used to characterise certain conditions, i.e. imply that *incolumis* is no longer contemporarily valid as a description. This meaning of *incolumis* is also frequently possible with people,¹³⁰ where describing them with *incolumis* often foreshadows a contrast to this in the near future.

Perhaps the most exciting aspect of *incolumis*, is the way in which it can cast light on the reputation of its referent, which in many instances gives an additional meaning to a

¹²⁷ e.g. in H.1.75 (see chapter 3.C.i.a) where Vitellius' mother and children's state of being is entirely in Titianus' hands; or in Tib.55.1 (see chapter 3.C.ii.b), where the state of *incolumis* for three unnamed associates of Tiberius depends on him.

¹²⁸ e.g. Hannibal praying to the gods in Liv.26.41.16

¹²⁹ e.g. Liv.1.3.1 or 3.71.7 in chapter 3.C.iv.a.

¹³⁰ e.g. H.3.66 (chapter 3.C.ii.a) when *incolumis* foreshadows the death of Vitellius, as he is compared to other prominent figures that died at the hands of their enemy.

phrase. This connotation of reputation does not only refer to a person's reputation, but also to his social status, his honour, his fame, and even his power, influence and authority.¹³¹

Describing the reputation of its referent is occasionally the primary meaning of *incolumis*, but it may also be used as an additional connotation; e.g. the primary meaning might be a reference to when a politically significant character was "still alive," the additional connotation being a further time reference to the time when he was "still alive **and influential**."

Considering these three, most frequent, additional aspects of *incolumis*' original meaning, one is left with a good basis for researching the individual author's use of the word. This concluding section will focus on Livy, Sallust and Suetonius, whereas Tacitus will be given a more thorough summary in the conclusion of the thesis. As far as Sallust and Suetonius are concerned, however, there is little to conclude, considering that they made use of *incolumis* very sparingly.

Of the five total instances of *incolumis* in Sallust, there are only two passages used as examples in the TLL entry, both from the *Bellum Iugurthinum*. The two passages do not resemble each other in any significant way. The first one, Iug.38.9, presents *incolumis* in a speech performed by Iugurtha, and demonstrates Sallust's conception of Iugurtha, his intellect, and his eloquence. It is a flattering image Sallust paints, in which he does not take the political views and choices of Iugurtha into consideration. He portrays a clever and rhetorically skilled leader, who knows how to use a speech to his advantage.

The second passage is perhaps still the most intriguing one. Here Sallust demonstrates many of the possibilities of *incolumis* excellently. He applies the word to three different clauses, a main clause, and its two subordinate clauses, and each clause utilises *incolumis* differently. From the two Sallustian examples, one gets the impression that Sallust, like Tacitus, was well aware of the polysemy and potential of *incolumis*, as he deploys several of the different meanings of the word.

Suetonius also illustrates a profound skill in the Latin language, and in the application of *incolumis*, as he demonstrates several dimensions and uses of *incolumis* in the four (out of six total instances) examples used in this thesis. From simple constructions where *incolumis* is intended to express only one fact, namely the state of being unharmed (Aug.14.1), to the very complex constructions where *incolumis* applies in different ways to different clauses (Otho.12.2). He uses *incolumis* to demonstrate that it is not those to whom it applies that is the

¹³¹ e.g. Liv.29.32.12-14 (chapter 3.C.ii.c), where *incolumis* reflects not only the physical state of Masinissa, but also the state of his reputation and standing.

focus of a statement, but rather those to whom it does not apply, and he uses it in combination with another polysemic word (*status*), in order to emphasise different meanings (Tib.55.1).

Livy is by far the most cited of the four authors under consideration in this thesis, but also among the most cited in the TLL in general, and this also goes for the entry on *incolumis*. To some extent, he touches on every connotation I have commented. There are some meanings, however, that might seem unique for Livy; primarily I refer to a reference to the freedom of *incolumis*' referent, in which the state of being "safe" and "unharmmed" is closely associated with being free. He is also the only one of the four writers I have examined that made use of *incolumis* in phrases where it exclusively referred to an army and its state of being in "full number."

It seems perfectly reasonable to claim that *incolumis* is polysemic, and that its application in a text presented the author with several opportunities. From the four writers I have examined, it is likely to assume that the Roman prose writers of Antiquity was well aware of the polysemy of *incolumis*, and employed it accordingly. In several examples, one might suggest that the writer would use *incolumis* precisely with the intention of applying the several connotations of the word. I would state that one could, and should, in some occasions, consider the use of *incolumis* as a manner for the author to present, in addition to the historical documentation, personal opinions and thoughts concerning the historical events in question. This is not to say that every occasion of *incolumis* expresses an author's personal opinion, but that one should always keep the polysemy of *incolumis* in mind, and examine phrases where it figures thoroughly.

4. Conclusion

This thesis began with a consideration of the phrase *incolumi adhuc Galba*, a phrase that occurs in Tacitus' H.1.46 and H.2.1, and it suggested that a close reading of this phrase might offer insight into Tacitus' opinions. I read *incolumi adhuc Galba* not only as overtly sarcastic, as *incolumis* is not a suitable adjective for a frail old man, but, as I see it, it also foreshadows Galba's ugly death and decline of reputation. I also read the phrase as a demonstration of Tacitus' personal contempt and disappointment of what Galba became and for the system that allowed for a Galba to become emperor.

Reading the commentaries presented in the *Cambridge Green and Yellow Classics* versions of the *Historiae*, one gets the impression that there is either no awareness of the meanings conveyed in the phrase, or that it is considered irrelevant for the general understanding of the text. I would, to the highest degree, question omitting an examination of the phrase, as I consider it imperative for one to understand Tacitus' observations of Galba's reign, and also to understand Tacitus' sarcastic wit.

I read *incolumis* as a reference to both Galba's life and to his fame and glory, and would argue that one should in these two passages consider how *incolumis* conveys the past state of Galba as a foreshadowing of his future state, indicating that Tacitus acknowledged that Galba had at one time been a man of venerable social status, but that he at the same time expresses critique for him turning to a lesser, corrupt opposite. This is made all the more poignant by the addition of *adhuc* to the phrase, which clearly indicates that the state of *incolumis* was applicable at one point in time, but no longer is. By emphasising "while Galba was **still** *incolumis*," Tacitus seems to be underscoring the irony in this description, considering the events that come after. The obvious sarcasm, ridiculing the death of Galba, only furthers the notion that Tacitus in these phrases let his personal opinion flavour the language.

The fact that he evokes the very same phrasing I believe suggests that it was Tacitus' intention that one should detect his resentment towards Galba. It is not that Tacitus regarded Galba a worse emperor than the other three of the civil wars in 69, but rather that he almost felt betrayed by the fact that Galba had at one time been a virtuous and venerable man, yet had turned from this manner of life, only to be reduced to the same moral level as his adversaries. There could have been a good emperor after Nero, but the ignorance of Galba and his morally corrupted advisers rendered him equally incompetent to rule Rome.

The TLL suggests that the *incolumis* of A.3.30 (*incolumi Maecenate*) should be read similarly to H.1.46. and H.2.1, and the comparable ablative absolute construction at first

glance also encourages this. Tacitus does not, however, evoke the exact same phrasing again, as he omits an important part of the Galba phrases, namely *adhuc*. *Adhuc* truly emphasises the foreshadowing effect of *incolumis* in the Galba phrases, and it underscores the irony of *incolumis* as a description of Galba, considering the events that followed. I read no obvious sarcasm concerning the life and death of Maecenas, but one may detect something of a foreshadowing effect also here, as history tells us that Maecenas, to some extent, lost some of his reputation and friendship with the emperor. Nevertheless, one should not consider the application of *incolumis* in the Galba phrases particularly similar to the Maecenas phrase, even if the TLL to some extent hints at this.

In the thesis, I argue that Martin & Woodman (1996) have misinterpreted the *incolumis* of A.3.30, as they claim that one should only read “alive” in it, and specify that one should not read Maecenas’ reputation. Interestingly, it appears that they consider *adhuc* to be implied in *incolumis* here, as they encourage a translation that says “while Maecenas was **still** alive.” Hence, it seems that they acknowledge the foreshadowing effect of *incolumis*. This makes their reading even more improbable, considering that Maecenas never died an unnatural death, which my analysis indicates is a condition for Tacitus when he uses *incolumis* as a foreshadowing of death.¹³² Using *incolumis* to foreshadow the untimely, or unnatural death of its referent is not solely Tacitean, and may also be observed in Suetonius.¹³³

Reading H.1.46 and H.2.1 as an ironic stab at Galba, in which Tacitus expresses his disappointment in what Galba became as an emperor, and frustration with the system that allowed for Galba to become emperor in the first place, one could look to the *Agricola* for a contrast to Galba. *Agricola*, or at least an aspect of *Agricola* is also described as *incolumis*. *Agricola* is said to have died with undamaged honour in Agr.44 (*incolumi dignitate*). In the passage Tacitus directly attributes *incolumis* to *Agricola*’s honour and reputation (*dignitas*). Reading the *Agricola*, one gets the impression that Tacitus values virtue and honour, defined by deeds benefitting the state above anything, even during difficult periods of rule, more than anything. These virtues are made evident in his praising of *Agricola*, which Lund (1981, p. 15) summarises quite well:

¹³² In addition to the Galba phrases, *incolumis* foreshadows the unnatural deaths of its referent in A.1.18 (Blaesus, who committed suicide), in A.3.56 (Germanicus, who was poisoned), and in A.6.30 (Gaetulicus, who was executed).

¹³³ In Otho.12.2 *incolumis* refers to when “Otho was alive,” and could be seen as a foreshadowing contrast to his suicide.

“I Tacitus’ idealistiske lovprisning af Agricolas dygtighed finder vi alle de karaktertræk repræsenterede, der tilsammen skaber den ideelle kolonisor og statholder: *militært geni, personligt mod, flid og udholdenhed, konsekvens i handlemåde, arbejdsomhed, disciplin, fornuft og* – det for det moderne menneske uhåndgribelige, men for Romerne nødvendige – *krigslykke.*”¹³⁴

Considering these traits, which for Tacitus represented the ideal man, and the fact that *incolumis* was also applied to Agricola by Tacitus, one could see how Galba reflect an extremely disappointing and frustrating transition from good to bad. As a general, he benefited the Empire by fighting back the Gauls, and by bringing order to the regions in Germania and Africa. Galba’s government of Spain showed early signs of his transition, his rule at first being strict and severe, but later becoming idle and silent in order not to generate harsh reactions from Nero. His ignorance and advisers were his fall, and Tacitus is well aware of this; but he was still emperor, and the well-being of the empire was, after all his responsibility. He failed his empire, and was one of the primary causes for a devastating civil war that nearly destroyed it. This could not be forgiven; and the fact that he bore promise of so much more makes the feeling of betrayal all the more strong.

Even if the two Tacitean passages concerning Galba at entry II.A.1 are those I found the most interesting for an analysis of *incolumis*, and constitutes the foundation of my claim, they do not represent a general application of *incolumis* by Tacitus. From the ten examples used in the TLL and in my thesis, he often presents *incolumis* as a state of being which is not under the control of its referent, but rather that it is up to the will of some external factor: a general, an emperor or some other authority or power. Of the ten total passages, five of them have the characteristics conveyed by *incolumis* as depending on some other factor.

Tacitus also often (six times) used *incolumis* pointing at its referent’s reputation and standing. This is often coupled with *incolumis* foreshadowing a contrast to itself in the near future, from which one may observe the sarcasm Tacitus applied to subjects described as *incolumis*. He acknowledges that the subjects were, at one point in time, *incolumis*, but rarely applies it if the current state of things is not the exact opposite. This may be with regards to the physical state of someone, to their standing, or their strength.

¹³⁴ “In Tacitus’ idealistic praise of Agricola’s skill, we find all the characteristics, which together form the ideal coloniser and governor: *military genius, personal courage, diligence and stamina, consistency in behaviour, industriousness, discipline, reason and* – that which for the modern man is hard to understand, but to the Romans was necessary – *enthusiasm in warfare*” (Lund, p. 15).

Tacitus' use of *incolumis* is not only a good demonstration of his sarcastic language in documentations of historical events, it also provides the reader with potential insight into how he thought about and observed Rome, and the Roman ruling class. In turn, if we in Tacitus' sarcasm can see a sense of disappointment, then a better understanding of Tacitus' own disposition is imperative if one is to understand his works as they were intended, and a way to achieve this is through deft analysis of his language. My analysis of *incolumis* aims to demonstrate the importance for Tacitean studies in general of coming to terms with Tacitus' opinions and point of view.

The basic overview of *incolumis* I have presented here gives good reason to regard and observe this word more attentively than is commonly done. The analysis I performed provides an overview of how *incolumis* was used by Livy, Sallust, Suetonius and Tacitus; four important figures of Roman prose. However, especially as far as Livy goes, there are numerous other examples of *incolumis*, and an even more expansive analysis would be desirable. The research on *incolumis* is by no means completed, and this thesis should only be considered a foundation of what will hopefully entail a far more comprehensive study of Tacitean Latin and vocabulary.

6: Bibliography:

Primary literature:

- Ahlberg, A.W. (1919) *C. Sallusti Crispi: Catilina, Iugurtha, Orationes et Epistulae Excerptae de Historiis*, Leipzig, Teubner [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0002> (1st access: 13.09.2012)
- Fisher, C.D. (1906) *Corneli Taciti Annalium: ab excessu divi Augusta libri*, Oxford, E. Typographeo Clarendoniano [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0077> (1st access: 20.08.2012)
- Fisher, C.D. (1911) *Corneli Taciti Historiarum Libri*, Oxford, E. Typographeo Clarendoniano [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0079> (1st access: 13.08.2012)
- Furneaux, H. (1900) *Cornelius Tacitus, De Vita Iulii Agricolae*, In: Furneaux, H. red. *Opera Minora, Cornelius Tacitus*, Oxford, Clarendon Press [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0084> (1st access: 23.08.2012)
- Furneaux, H. (1900) *Cornelius Tacitus, De Origine et Situ Germanorum Liber*, In: Furneaux, H. red. *Opera Minora, Cornelius Tacitus*, Oxford, Clarendon Press [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2007.01.0090> (1st access: 23.11.2012)
- Furneaux, H. (1900) *Cornelius Tacitus, Dialogus de Oratoribus*, In: Furneaux, H. red. *Opera Minora, Cornelius Tacitus*, Oxford, Clarendon Press [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2007.01.0089> (1st access: 01.10.2012)
- Ihm, M. (1908) *C. Suetoni Tranquilli opera, 1, De vita Caesarum libri VIII*. [1907], Leipzig, Teubner, [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0061%3A1ife%3Djul.> (1st access: 13.08.2012)
- Plutarch (1959) *Καμύλλος*, In: Perrin, B. *Plutarch's Lives Vol. II: Themistocles and Camillus, Aristides and Cato Major, Cimon and Lucullus*, [1914] Cambridge (Ma.), Harvard University Press, pp. 94-207

- Velleius, P. (1961) *Historiae Romanae*, In: Shipley, F. *Velleius Paterculus – Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, [1924] Cambridge (Ma.), Harvard University Press, pp. 2-329
- Weissenborn, W. Müller, H. J. (1898) *Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri editionem primam curavit Guilelmus Weissenborn editio altera auam curavit Mauritius Mueller Pars I. Libri I-X. Editio Stereotypica*, Leipzig, Teubner, [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0169> (1st access: 11.09.2012)
- Weissenborn, W. Müller, H. J. (1884) *Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri editionem primam curavit Guilelmus Weissenborn editio altera auam curavit Mauritius Mueller Pars II. Libri XXI-XXX. Editio Stereotypica*, Leipzig, Teubner, [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0170%3Abook%3D21s> (1st access: 11.09.2012)
- Weissenborn, W. Müller, H. J. (1911) *Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri editionem primam curavit Guilelmus Weissenborn editio altera auam curavit Mauritius Mueller Pars III. Libri XXXI-XL. Editio Stereotypica*, Leipzig, Teubner, [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0172> (1st access: 07.01.2013)¹³⁵
- Weissenborn, W. Müller, H. J. (1911) *Titi Livi ab urbe condita editionem primam curavit Guilelmus Weissenborn editio altera auam curavit Mauritius Mueller Pars III. Libri XXXI-XL. Editio Stereotypica*, Leipzig, Teubner, [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0174> (1st access: 25.09.2012)¹³⁶
- Weissenborn, W. Müller, H. J. (1911) *Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri editionem primam curavit Guilelmus Weissenborn editio altera auam curavit Mauritius Mueller Pars IV. Libri XLI-CXLII Fragmenta*, Leipzig, Teubner, [Online] Available from the PDL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0140> (1st access: 24.09.2012)¹³⁷

¹³⁵ Books 31-38

¹³⁶ Books 39-40

¹³⁷ Books 41-45

Secondary literature:

- *A Greek-English Dictionary* (1996) 10th ed. [1843] New York, Oxford University Press
- Ash, R. (2007) *Tacitus: Histories, book II*, New York, Cambridge University Press
- Blundell, J. (1990) *Introduction to the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, In: De Gruyter, W. *Praemonenda de rationibus et usu operis*, ISBN: 978 3 598 70765 0
- Breisach, E. (2007) *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, [1983] Chicago & London, The University of Chicago Press
- Damon, C. (2003) *Tacitus: Histories, book I*, New York, Cambridge University Press
- Earl, D. C. (1966) *Sallust* [1961] London, Cambridge University Press
- Edwards, C. (2008) *Suetonius: Lives of the Caesars: A New Translation by Catharine Edwards*, [2000] New York, Oxford University Press
- Hurley, D. (2001) *Suetonius: Diius Claudius*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Jackson, J. (2006) *Tacitus: Annals, books XIII-XVI*. [1937] Cambridge (Ma.¹³⁸) & London, Harvard University Press
- Krauss, C. S. (1998) *Livy: Ab Vrbe Condita, Book VI* [1994] New York, Cambridge University Press
- Krebs, C. B. (2009) *A dangerous book: the reception of the Germania*, In: Woodman, A. J. *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp. 280-299
- Luce, T. J. (1993) *Reading and response in the dialogus*, In: Luce, T. J. and Woodman, A. J. *Tacitus and the Tacitean tradition*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, pp. 11-38
- Luce, T. J. (1998) *Livy: The Rise of Rome, Books 1-5: A New Translation by T. J. Luce*, New York, Oxford University Press
- Lund, A. A. (1981) *Tacitus Agricola*, Odense, Odense Universitetsforlag
- Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, New York, Cambridge University Press
- Martin, R. (1981) *Tacitus and the contemporary scene*, In: Martin, R. *Tacitus*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, pp. 26-38
- Martin, R. H. & Woodman, A. J.

¹³⁸ Massachusetts

1. (1996) *The Annals of Tacitus Book 3*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
 2. (2006) *Tacitus: Annals Book IV* [1989] New York, Cambridge University Press
- Mellor, R. (1993) *Tacitus*, New York and London, Routledge
 - Melve, L. (2010) *Historie: Historieskriving frå antikken til i dag*, Oslo, Dreyer Forlag
 - Moore, C. (2006) *Tacitus: Histories Books I-III* [1936] Harvard University Press
 - Oakley, S. P. (2009) *Style and language*, In: Woodman, A. J. *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp. 195-211
 - *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (2005) 16th ed. [1982] New York, Oxford University Press
 - Plutarch (2000) *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans, Volume 2*, Westminster, USA, Modern Library [Online] Available from ebrary:
<<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/bergen/docDetail.action?docID=10067582>> (1st access: 02.10.2012)
 - *Perseus Digital Library*. Ed. Gregory R. Crane, Tufts University. [Online] Available from: <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>> (1st access: 13.08.2012)
 - Ramsey, J. T. (2007) *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae* [1984] New York, Oxford University Press
 - Richardson, L. (1992) *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore and London, The Johns Hopkins University Press
 - Syme, R. (1967) *Tacitus* [1958] London, Oxford University Press
 - *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Volumen VII, Pars Prior, I-Intervvulsus* (1964), Germany, Teubner
 - Thomas, R. F. (2009) *The Germania as literary text*, In: Woodman, A. J. *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp. 59-72

7: Sammen drag av mastergradsoppgaven

Denne oppgaven undersøker en spesifikk setning fra Tacitus' korpus, hvor den figurerer to ganger. Jeg påstår at denne setningen er bevisst tvetydig, og at den viser Tacitus' smarte retorikk. *Incolumi adhuc Galba* (H.1.46 og H.2.1) kan man observere i Tacitus' *Historiae*, og er vanligvis tolket og oversatt som "mens Galba fortsatt var i live." Denne tolkningen er for all del korrekt, men den viser ikke alle meningene man kan observere i denne setningen. Jeg påstår at Tacitus bevisst bruker disse eksakte ordene for å presentere en personlig mening om Galba som person og leder. Ikke bare gjennom sarkasmen jeg argumenterer for at man kan finne i setningen, men også ved at han bruker denne eksakte beskrivelsen bare for Galba.

Dersom man anerkjenner dette som et uttrykk for personlig mening fra Tacitus' side kan dette gi verdifull innsikt i Tacitus' stil, og det kan hjelpe å forstå bedre hvordan han tenkte. For å hjelpe å forstå det bemerkelsesverdige potensiale til *incolumis*, har jeg foretatt en komparativ analyse av ordets bruk i Tacitus, Livius, Suetonius og Sallust. Utdragene jeg har brukt i analysen fant jeg i oppslaget til *incolumis* i *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, den mest omfattende latinordboken vi har. Jeg er overbevist om at å begrense analysen min til bare fire forfattere ikke kan ha gitt meg full forståelse for hvor stort potensiale *incolumis* har, men med tanke på at man bare har ett år på å skrive en mastergradsoppgave var visse begrensninger å forvente.

Basert på denne analysen og på mine studier, vil jeg videre påstå at man av og til burde anerkjenne muligheten for forfatterens tilstedeværelse i klassisk prosa, hvor han gir uttrykk for egne meninger og oppfatninger av hendelser, og at denne tilstedeværelsen kan bidra til å skape en forståelse av den spesifikke forfatteren, dette igjen kan bidra til økt forståelse for det han skriver om. Dypere kunnskap om forfattere og deres verk øker også kunnskapen om deres tid og deres samfunn.

Før den komparative analysen av *incolumis* og dets meninger, så jeg det nødvendig å ha en grunnleggende forståelse for romersk historiografi og metode, slik at man er obs på forskjellen mellom en forfatters karakteristiske trekk, så vel som typiske trekk ved sjangeren han skriver innenfor. Kapittelet på romersk historiografi er forholdsvis kort, og har hovedsakelig bare til formål å gi en kort oversikt over noen av aspektene ved romersk historiografi.

I tillegg til denne korte innføringen i noen av de grunnleggende trekkene til romersk historiografi, blir de fire forfatterne denne analysen fokuserer på (Livius, Sallust, Suetonius og Tacitus) alle bli introdusert, Tacitus mer dyptgående enn de andre tre.