The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Note on Tacitus *Agricola*, 33. 2

W. Warde Fowler

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 01 / February 1904, pp 43 - 44

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209177, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209177

How to cite this article:

W. Warde Fowler (1904). Note on Tacitus *Agricola*, 33. 2. The Classical Review, 18, pp 43-44
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209177

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE MANUSCRIPT PROBLEM IN THE *SILVAE* OF STATIUS.—ADDENDUM.

SOME observations upon my paper in the October No. of the *Classical Review* courteously communicated by Mr. A. C. Clark and Dr. A. Klotz make it necessary for me again to advert to this question.

1. Mr. Clark tells me that the *Matritensis* of Manilius is in the same handwriting as the *Matritensis* of the *Silvae*, and not in a different one as I had assumed, *i.e.* pp. 347–8. The comparison of a photographed page of the Manilius, which Mr. Clark was good enough to lend me, with a similar reproduction of a page of the *Silvae* has convinced me that this is the case.

My argument did not, however, depend on the diversity of the script in the two cases; but on the insufficiency of the proof which was drawn from the ignorance of the scribe. The fact that the scribe of the two *Matritenses* was a very ignorant man by no means proves that he was Poggio's 'ignorantissimus uiuentium.' Crass ignorance is by no means so uncommon as that.

2. Dr. Klotz informs me that he and Dr. Krohn lay a great deal more stress on the resemblance of the writing of the corrector in the *Matritensis* of the *Silvae* (M^2) to that of the *Matritensis* of Asconius and Valerius

Flaccus (class mark X. 81, Klotz Praef. p. xlix.) than on its resemblance to that of *Hamiltoniensis* 166. I am sorry if I have misrepresented the German scholars' views. But I certainly thought that the appeal was ultimately to the *Hamiltoniensis* which is in the undoubted writing of Poggio. X. 81 has indeed a *scriptio*, ending *Nos quod potuimus egimus Poggius Florentinus*, which may, unlike a number of other *subscriptiones*, be an autograph. But how is it proved to be such? If the proof be not the similarity of its script to an undoubted Poggian MS, I do not know what it is; and if so, then it is surely more logical to compare M^2 with the writing by which we have determined that of X. 81 to be Poggian. In fine two propositions must be established: (1) that M^2 is the handwriting of the scribe of X. 81; (2) that this scribe is Poggio himself. Of these two propositions I still await the proof. But it is a matter of indifference to my argument whether it be furnished or not, as I showed on p. 347*b*; and, as I said there, I am quite prepared to 'accept Herr Krohn's opinion.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

NOTE ON TACITUS *AGRICOLA*, 33. 2.

The first words of Agricola's speech stand thus in the MSS: 'Septimus annus est, commilitones, ex quo virtute et auspiciis imperii Romani, fide atque opera nostra, Britanniam vicistis.' Recent editors seem to have found much difficulty in the words 'virtute et auspiciis imp. Rom.'; and as I gather from Furneaux' edition, Peter alone has tried to explain them (wrongly, as I think) by making 'imperii Romani' equivalent to 'imperatoris,' and understanding the auspicia as those of Domitian. Furneaux adopts Nipperdey's conjecture, 'ex quo virtute vestra, auspiciis imperii Romani, fide atque opera nostra,' which is open to the serious objection that Tacitus would hardly have wedged in the auspicia between the virtue of the soldiers and the fides and opera of Agricola. Urlichs' 'auspiciis imp. Rom., virtute et fide vestra atque opera nostra' is not only violent, but spoils the rhythm of the sentence.

I venture to suggest that the MS reading is right, that the combination of virtue and auspicia is not un-Tacitean, that the words should be understood in a general sense and not of the Emperor, and that Tacitus was here thinking of the familiar passage of Virgil (Aen. VI. 781), 'En hujus, nate, auspiciis illa incluta Roma Imperium terris, animos aequabit Olympo.' Just above (29. 4) he has used words from this same book of the Aeneid, 'quibus cruda ac viridis senectus'; (Aen. VI. 304), and I am inclined to guess that his 'imperialist' feeling led him to the great 'Heldenschau' of his favourite poet at the moment when he was about to describe the contribution of Agricola towards the extension of the Roman dominion, for in it he would find in poetic combination the ideas of auspicia, virtue, and imperium. That auspicia could be used in a general sense, without special reference to an individual magistrate, seems

proved by Liv. 30. 14 (quoted by Orelli on this passage): 'Syphax *auspiciis populi Romani* victus captusque est': i.e. S. had not been defeated under the auspices of Masinissa, but under those of the Roman people: or Aen. IV. 102, where Juno says to Venus 'Communem hunc ergo populum paribusque regamus Auspiciis.' By his

'virtus et auspicia' I believe that Tacitus meant that combination of human excellence and divine approbation which had made Rome great: and I doubt if any Roman who knew his Aeneid well would have had any difficulty in following him.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

NOTE ON THE ROMAN PORTORIA.

It is commonly stated in writings on Roman finance that the Emperor Pertinax during his brief reign swept away the *portoria*, which were reimposed by his successors. Marquardt, in the *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, ii. p. 262 n., makes the assertion without qualification, while Cagnat in *Les Impôts Indirects chez les Romains*, p. 11, does mention a differing opinion which was advanced, but not confidently, by Burmann in his work *De Vectigalibus*. The only direct reference to the matter in ancient literature is made by Herodian ii. c. 4 § 7. It has no doubt occurred before now to readers of the passage that the inference which Marquardt and Cagnat drew from it was not justified. But as their view is quoted to this day without question, it seems worth while to offer an examination of the one passage on which it rests. This runs as follows:

τέλη τε πάντα τὰ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῆς τυραννίδος ἐς εὐπορίαν χρημάτων ἐπινοηθέντα ἐπὶ τε ὄχθαις ποταμῶν καὶ λιμέσι πόλεων ἐν τε ὁδῶν πορείαις, καταλύσας ἐς τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ ἐλεύθερον ἀφήκεν.

Herodian must have meant by the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς τυραννίδος that the taxes abolished by Pertinax were established by Commodus. This writer, like others of the imperial time, usually distinguished between *τυραννίς*, that is a despotism such as Caligula, Nero, Domitian, and Commodus exercised, and *βασιλεία*, the orderly imperial government. In i. c. 16 § 1 Herodian speaks of the Roman empire under Commodus as *τυραννομένη*, and in ii. c. 3 § 1 the fall of Commodus is described as *τῆς τυραννίδος μεταβολή*. The words ἐς τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ ἐλεύθερον apply very well to the time which preceded that of Commodus. As is well known, *libertas* to the subjects of the empire meant nothing but normal government under imperial forms (though the name of *libertas* was sometimes taken in vain by the despots themselves). The legend *liberatis civibus* is on the coins of Pertinax; and the

senate set up a statue of *Libertas* to commemorate the tyrant's death. Cagnat renders τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ ἐλεύθερον by 'l'antique franchise.' What could this mean? There can be no thought of the brief period at the end of the Republic, during which the ports of Italy were freed from dues, because it is evident that the measure of Pertinax was not restricted to Italy; and such a reference is on other grounds improbable. It appears then that Commodus, to support his extravagance, raised the amount of the dues payable at the frontiers (maritime or inland) of the provinces and Italy, and also of certain internal tolls. The proposed abolition of these sur-taxes by Pertinax accorded with his promise to govern like Marcus Aurelius (τῆς Μάρκου ἀρχῆς ζήλω τε καὶ μιμήσει, Herodian ii. c. 4 § 2). Another exceptional device of Commodus for extorting money is mentioned by Dio lxxii. c. 16. It took the shape of a 'benevolence' presented to the despot annually on his birthday, so much a head from senators, their wives, and the members of their families; and this was not only exacted from senators at Rome but from *βουλευται* ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀπάσαις πόλεσι, apparently all over the empire. Pertinax of course undertook to do away with this exaction, although the fact is nowhere definitely stated. And doubtless in other directions he proposed to bring back finance ἐς τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ ἐλεύθερον. But it is to be observed that circumstances were too strong for him at the moment: 'cum tantam penuriam aerarii haberet ut praeter decies sestertium non se invenisse fateretur, coactus est ea exigere quae Commodus indixerat, contra quam professus fuerat' (Capitol. Vit. Pert., c. 7 § 6). The word *fateretur* here points to some speech of Pertinax, in which he excused himself for not keeping his word, and (most likely) bound himself to give effect to it in the future.

J. S. REID.