Tacitus and the Speech of Claudius on the *Tabula Lugdunensis*

S. J. V. MALLOCH

Summary: In A.D. 48 Claudius delivered a speech in support of a petition from Roman citizen elites of Gallia Comata for admission to the senate. Part of that speech survives on the *Tabula Lugdunensis* and in a version by Tacitus in his account of the Gauls' petition in *Annals* 11. This paper demonstrates how Tacitus transforms, while respecting, his Claudian source, and offers some methodological considerations about his handling of speech.

1 Introduction

The ability to read Tacitus alongside the *Tabula Lugdunensis* offers a rare opportunity to explore his handling of source material and speech.[1] Tacitus normally emerges from the comparison with his authority confirmed and, indeed, augmented: he is said to have reproduced and improved a long-winded and meandering speech of Claudius, whose performance, represented on the *Tabula*, contributes to his low historical reputation. In 1954, however, K. Wellesley asked a bold question, 'Can you trust Tacitus?'. His answer was a firm 'no, you can't'. For Wellesley, 'the brutal fact is that only with the greatest difficulty can

[1] An invitation from Casper de Jonge to deliver a lecture on this subject at the OIKOS text-in-context day dedicated to the *Tabula Lugdunensis* (Leiden, 2021) provided a welcome opportunity to present and nuance the analysis recently published in my edition of the *Tabula* (2020). This abbreviated print version also incorporates revisions made for a second airing in the seminar series on historiographical style held by John Marincola at Oxford in June 2022. For these invitations I am grateful to Professors de Jonge and Marincola, and for feedback to S. M. Adema, C. de Jonge, and J. W. Rich.

we find any resemblance at all' between Tacitus's 'strange travesty' of Claudius in *Annals* 11 and the speech of the *Tabula*.[2] Wellesley's hyperbole is characteristic of a thoroughly tendentious argument. Forced to concede that Tacitus replicates Claudius's themes of constitutional innovation, the value of immigrants to Rome, and the shortness of Rome's war in Gallia Comata, Wellesley concentrates on Tacitus's omissions and alleged inventions. Tacitus, he claims, must have totally invented some of the content that he put into Claudius's mouth; equally, he must have resorted to 'wholesale cutting' by necessity 'in order to accommodate in... chapter 24 of the speech, quite artificially, the replies to the opposition arguments crowded into the privy council story of the preceding chapter 23. Tacitus has woven a tangled web... in first venturing to tamper with his sources.'[3] Wellesley can only claim so baldly that Tacitus invented material because of the minimalist position that he adopts on the size of the *lacunae* in the *Tabula*. He infers that the *lacunae* at the top of each column were small, when they are likely to be significantly larger.[4] Wellesley also errs in arguing that Tacitus's compression of his Claudian source condemns the credibility of his version and his reliability as an historian. Wellesley does not explain what a 'faithful' version would look like. He seems to assume that Tacitus should have followed Claudius's speech

[2] Wellesley (1954: 13, 31). Wellesley took his lead from J. Carcopino: see e.g. (1930: 116, 119, 122) = (1961: 192–3, 196, 200).

[3] Wellesley (1954: 27).

[4] Wellesley (1954: 19) concludes from a number of observations that little is missing from the *Tabula*: (1) the 'wording' of the first surviving line of column I; (2) *ciuitatem* at the bottom of column I effects a 'ready transition to the next topic' at the start of the surviving column II; (3) the 'whole tablet' probably bore 'at its head a line or lines of preamble in larger letters'. None of these reasons, alone or in combination, has any bearing on the size of the gaps in the speech itself. The epigraphic space occupied by Claudius's statements and his expansive treatment of his subject suggest rather that the surviving *Tabula* is around half its original size and probably lacks a second tablet. See Malloch (2020: 19-24).

very closely – so closely, in fact, that his method would have been alien to the ancient norms of representing long speech in historiography. In fact Tacitus's method is consistent with generic conventions. To adapt a phrase by J. Marincola, Tacitus felt free to modify and recast Claudius's speech based on his own approach and the needs of his own history.[5] He was never going to produce a long set-piece of *oratio recta* (direct speech) verbatim; equally, as we shall see, he did not produce a totally free composition, but evidently observed limits imposed by the survival of Claudius's speech. Tacitus wrote, not a distorted, but a representative version of Claudius's speech. He respected Claudian authorship and ideas at the same time as he refashioned the speech to fit its narrative context, a rhetorical antithesis with 11.23, and to suit the style and audience of the *Annals* more broadly.

2 *Annals* 11.23: the *consilium* of Claudius

At 11.23.1 Tacitus reports that an embassy of leading Gallic Roman citizens from Gallia Comata arrived in Rome ahead of Claudius's revision of the list of senators in AD 48 to seek admission to the senate. The petition prompted various *rumores*, doubtless about the merits and outcomes of the petition, and generated views on both sides in the *consilium* of Claudius. At 11.23.2-4 Tacitus distils the views of councillors opposing the petition into one sequence of *oratio obliqua* (indirect speech). Critics of the petition argued that Italy was still capable of supplying senators to Rome. Kindred peoples in Italy, they claimed, had once been content for Rome to rule over them. Pride in that ancient arrangement was illustrated by the enduring relevance of ancient examples of Roman *uirtus* and *gloria*. On the other hand, they argued, the Gauls' record of violence against Rome, above all the sack of Rome in 390, provided

[5] Marincola (2009: 129). See also Adema (2017) on the different ways of representing speech in Latin (8-32), and on some narrative techniques which use speech (76-107).

sufficient reason to reject the petition. Rome risked another sacking with the arrival of contemporary Gauls on the senatorial scene. The nobility of Rome and the *pauper* senator from Latium would be denied office, if the city were to be occupied by a new wave of wealthy Gauls whose ancestors slaughtered the armies of Rome and besieged Julius Caesar. This new wave of Gauls would put at risk Rome's cherished memory of the sack of the city.[6] The Gauls, the opponents conclude, should be content with Roman citizenship and not cheapen the 'ornaments of senators and the decorations of the magistracies' (11.23.4). The opponents offer an argument fundamentally pro-Roman, pro-Italian, and anti-Gaul that endorses the status quo with *exempla* drawn from ancient as well as more recent history.

It is often assumed that Tacitus could not have had access to any reliable account of the views expressed in this meeting of the *consilium*. The argument is that he compiled the case against the petition exclusively from Claudius's speech delivered in the senate (and partly preserved on the *Tabula*).[7] This interpretation is unconvincing for two reasons. Firstly, there are bound to be resonances between what Tacitus has critics claim and what the historical Claudius argued, since twice, at the top of column I and at the top of column II, he deals with objections. Claudius was responding to objections made in his *consilium* by forestalling such criticism in the senate. Transforming these resonances into Tacitus's source material exaggerates the similarities between 11.23 and the *Tabula*. Secondly, this interpretation does an injustice to Tacitus's construction of the episode. Tacitus crafts the two speeches of 11.23.2-4 and 11.24 as a rhetorical antithesis, the summary argument against the Gauls' petition in *oratio obliqua,* the argument in favour in a longer set-piece of *oratio recta*. From an array of arguments against the petition Tacitus presents those points that were pertinent to the speech he gives Claudius – dislike of change, the primacy of Italy in

[6] Assuming that Bach's *morerentur* is right for M's *orerentur* at 11.23.4: see Malloch (2013: ad loc.).

[7] See Malloch (2020: 58-9).

supplying senators, the Gauls' wars with Rome. Tacitus might have conjured these arguments out of thin air, as Syme held,[8] but the gestures of the historical Claudius to opposing views suggest that they were authentic concerns which found their way into contemporary texts forming Tacitus's source material.[9] Where we can pinpoint 'invention' is in the packaging and presentation of those concerns in 11.23. Tacitus's audience will have assumed the artificiality of his presentation without crying 'fiction!' at the circumstances and content.

3 *Annals* 11.24: Tacitus's version of Claudius's speech

Tacitus reports that Claudius was unconvinced by these arguments against the Gauls' petition, responded immediately, and then moved the petition to the senate. There Tacitus has Claudius deliver an extended speech in *oratio recta*:

11.24.1 The experience of Claudius's ancestors encourages him to apply the same approach – the transferral to Rome of outstanding talent from abroad.

11.24.2-3 That process saw families transferred to Rome from Italy, whose expansion brought together as Romans individuals, lands, and peoples. In time Rome's empire was refreshed by the integration of elite provincials. Do we regret, Claudius asks rhetorically, that 'the Balbi came over from Spain and men no less illustrious from Gallia Narbonensis'? Their posterity remain in Rome, and are just as loyal as ethnic Romans/Italians.

11.24.4 What else ruined the Spartans and Athenians, Claudius again asks rhetorically, but the exclusion of defeated enemies? Wise Romulus turned defeated enemies

[8] Syme (1999: 9).

[9] There is some evidence to suggest that the proceedings of a *consilium* could be documented, but in any case accounts clearly emerged to leave a trace in contemporary texts. See further Malloch (2020: 60).

into citizens. Foreign kings reigned at Rome. Giving magistracies to the sons of freedmen was not a recent innovation but a custom of old.

11.24.5 ‘But [says Claudius, imagining objections] we fought with the Senones: of course [he replies] the Vulsci and the Aequi never drew up a battle line against us. We were captured by the Gauls: but we gave hostages to the Etruscans and we passed under the yoke of the Samnites.’

11.24.6 Of all the wars waged, none was waged more quickly than the war against the Gauls: thereafter enduring and loyal peace. Now that the Gauls are joined with Romans in ‘customs, the arts, and marriage’, Claudius proclaims, they should transfer their wealth to Rome rather than keep it to themselves.

11.24.7 In climax, Claudius turns explicitly to a constitutional argument: ‘everything, conscript fathers, which is now believed to be most ancient was new: there were plebeian magistrates after patrician, Latin after plebeian, those of the rest of the peoples of Italy after the Latin’. The resolution to admit the Gauls to the senate will also ‘grow old, and what we defend today by *exempla* will take its place among *exempla*’.

Tacitus reproduces the main ideas of the speech as preserved on the *Tabula*: the recruitment of eligible provincials whatever their background; the integration of provincials into politics at the highest level; Rome’s ‘living’ constitution; the peacefulness and loyalty of the Gauls. In the process, Tacitus refashions the speech. He shortens Claudius’s overall performance, and the compression also extends to the level of sentence construction, which does not display the same complexity that characterises the speech on the *Tabula*. While Tacitus uses linguistic and stylistic touches to evoke the historical Claudius (as we shall see below), he dispenses with the deeply personal and contemporary aspects of the original speech. For example, he omits Claudius’s mention of the ‘prodigy of the wrestling ring’ (II.14-17). This ‘prodigy’ was probably D. Valerius Asiaticus, the Narbonensian magnate

who had died under a cloud in 47: by alluding to him, Claudius perhaps sought to forestall an objection based on a topical anti-*exemplum* he could not decently ignore, but Tacitus was free to omit this awkward detail tied so closely to the context of 48.[10] Absent too is the cautious and deferential posture of the *princeps* towards his senatorial audience that characterises the inscribed speech. Tacitus's changes should not be designated 'improvements', which implies his dissatisfaction with an 'inferior' performance by Claudius. There is no criticism of Claudius in Tacitus's presentation of the speech, as there is in speeches he attributes to Claudius in *Annals* 12.[11] Tacitus's interest in this episode rested on an appreciation of a speech that he respected in his transformation of it.

The argument of the *princeps,* as far as it survives on the *Tabula,* has two aspects. One is the claim that Roman history is characterised by constitutional innovation. This claim is stated at the top of column I and supported with historical examples from regal and republican history. It is also evident at the top of column II (1-4) in Claudius's mention of the innovative policy of Augustus and Tiberius in recruiting senators from the 'colonies and *municipia* everywhere'. A second aspect concerns the integration of foreigners and provincials into Roman government. In column I (8-24), part of Claudius's constitutional argument involves demonstrating that some of Rome's kings were originally outsiders. In column II (7-8), Claudius's invocation of his predecessors' approach to senatorial recruitment

[10] The fall of a Gallic grandee in 47 was clearly topical a year later in the context of Gallic political integration, and Asiaticus's proximity to the imperial family would have added salt to Claudius's wound (see *Annals* 11.1-3 with Malloch (2013)). Allusion to Asiaticus is therefore explicable in 48, but how was Tacitus to incorporate mention of this counterproductive *exemplum* which later readers might judge trivial in light of significant disturbances in Gaul after the fall of Nero? It was easier to omit such contemporary or personal details; cf. other omissions: Claudius's British campaign (I.37-40), the recommendation of Lucius Vestinus (II.10-11), the personal apostrophe (II.20-2), and the singling out of Persicus (II.23-6).

[11] See the passages cited below in note 17.

foregrounds his own commitment to integrating eligible provincials. Focussing on the Gauls, he cites two colonial centres already supplying senators, Vienne in Gallia Narbonensis and Lugdunum in Gallia Comata, before arguing for senatorial recruitment from Gallia Comata more broadly (II.9-29). By the end of the extant text of the *Tabula*, Claudius has moved from placing significant weight on constitutional innovation to illustrating and urging the extension of senatorial recruitment from the provinces.

Tacitus transforms this emphasis. As we have seen, critics of the Gauls' petition proclaimed the virtue of a senate composed of Romans and Italians and opposed the integration of wealthy elites from Gallia Comata. This is a nativist argument that implies a concern with constitutional propriety: the ancient ways are the best and should be adhered to (11.23.2). Tacitus's Claudius meets this objection by focussing on Rome's history of assimilating and integrating foreigners into the body politic. He hitches this history to the story of empire to provide these processes with a continuity over time that the historical Claudius applies to the history of constitutional innovation. He has Claudius start his speech with the claim that the precedent of his *maiores* encourages him to adopt the same policy of transferring to the senate of Rome 'what is excellent everywhere' (11.24.1). He combines the concepts of assimilation and integration in illustrating this aspiration: he refers to families from Italy who entered the senate and to the absorption into citizenship of individuals, lands, and people when Italy was extended to the Alps (11.24.2). Tacitus's Claudius presents the expansion of empire in broad terms: from Italy into Transpadane Gaul and further into the provinces, where 'under the cover of legions settled throughout the world an exhausted empire was relieved by the most able of the provincials' (11.24.3). He illustrates recruitment from Spain with reference to the Balbi, from southern Gaul with reference to the Narbonensians, and his declaration that their contemporary descendants are loyal to the *patria* succinctly expresses a running concern of the *princeps* in column II of the *Tabula*: the

recruitment of Narbonensians, their service, and the fine reputation of most of them (II 9-12, 17-19, 23-9).

Tacitus's Claudius then turns to the policy of Romulus, the greatest ancestor of all, who turned enemies into citizens and so set Rome apart from Athens and Sparta, whose the restricted citizenship policies ultimately ruined them (11.24.4). After Clausus, Romulus is the second ancient *exemplum* Tacitus has Claudius invoke to respond to the use of ancient precedents by critics in the *consilium*. Mention of Romulus prompts the observation that foreign-born kings ruled Rome: notoriously, Tacitus condenses seventeen lines of the speech on the *Tabula* into a statement of majestic simplicity, *aduenae in nos regnauerunt*, 'foreign kings reigned over us' (11.24.4).[12] Tacitus's Claudius observes that the sons of freedmen were permitted to hold magistracies regularly in early Rome, not only recently (11.24.4). This example may seem out of place – is it not a point about constitutional flexibility? – but it serves to demonstrate the *antiquity* of Rome's openness to outsiders. The invocation of freedmen suits a *princeps* notorious for his association with them, and the accompanying historiographical comment ('as many are mistaken in thinking') is a neat personalising touch.

Tacitus's Claudius now counters the opponents' charge of Gallic violence against Rome with examples of Italy's wars against Rome. Tacitus has Claudius use the same rhetorical figure as the *princeps*, hypophora (hypothetical objection and response). Both employ Italy in their use of the hypophora, but to different effect. At the top of column II (5-7) Claudius imagines critics' preference for recruitment from Italy: the point seems designed to shift that issue to another occasion and to maintain the focus on recruitment from the provinces. Tacitus, on the other hand, has Claudius cite examples of Italian aggression against Rome to counterbalance examples of Gallic aggression against Rome cited by the

[12] Tacitus's use of *aduena*, which does not occur on the *Tabula*, may be a glance at an analogous claim in one influence on Claudius's speech, the speech of Canuleius in Livy (4.3-5). See further Malloch (2020: 49-51).

opponents in the *consilium* – another sign of the close relationship between the speeches of 11.23 and 11.24. A similar refashioning characterises the response to the Gauls' record of violence against Rome. Tacitus uses the same grammatical construction as the historical Claudius, a conditional clause, but makes changes in content and emphasis. The *princeps* balanced ten years' war against Gaul with a century of ensuing peace and loyalty (II.32-5). Tacitus has Claudius emphasize the shortness of that ten-year war and the enduring peace and loyalty which followed. Wellesley was wrong to damn Tacitus's version on the grounds that 'the real Claudius' does not make the point or 'anything like it'.[13] Tacitus retains the implication of Claudius's historical claim, that the Gallic wars were short, and he sharpens the point by comparing the length of those wars not only to the subsequent tranquillity of Gaul, but also to the length of *all* Rome's wars. Tacitus condenses Claudius's remarks on Gallic peace (II 33-8) to bring out its consequences – assimilation and the welcome availability of Gallic wealth at Rome. In his handling of this Gallic material Tacitus echoes the speech of the historical Claudius in style and content and fashions it also to respond to the criticisms urged in *consilium* at 11.23.

In column I of the *Tabula*, Claudius asks his audience not to fear the novelty of his proposal to admit Comatan Gauls to the senate since novelty characterises the constitutional history of Rome. This statement probably came in the first half of the speech. In contrast, Tacitus has Claudius address the subject of Rome's constitutional flexibility at the end of his speech: 'Everything, conscript fathers, which is now believed to be most ancient was new: there were plebeian magistrates after patrician, Latin after plebeian, those of the rest of the peoples of Italy after the Latin. This too will grow old, and what we defend today by *exempla* will take its place among *exempla*.' This statement represents Claudius's claims about the

[13] Wellesley (1954: 30).

Roman constitution and Rome's absorption of outsiders. Tacitus omits Claudius's concern with the long-term development of magistracies and repeats only the final stage in that process, the extension of offices to the plebeians (cf. I.31, I.36-7). This manoeuvre allows Tacitus to illustrate the integrative aspect of this constitutional history: the expansion of offices moves from the plebeians to those *outside* Rome, the Latins and other peoples of Italy. The mention of Italy returns the reader to the mention of Italy at 11.24.1, thereby closing an argumentative framework focussing above all on foreign assimilation and integration.

By elucidating the ethnic dimension of Rome's constitutional history – as indeed the *princeps* did in column I – Tacitus has Claudius again address views voiced in the *consilium*. Critics of the Gauls held that the customs of the ancient Roman state remained a guide for contemporary approaches to senatorial recruitment: admit Romans and Italians, rather than Gauls. Tacitus has Claudius meet this assumption with considerable stylistic sophistication: an antithetical *sententia* that is sharper than the conclusion of 11.23.4. Starting from the perspective of the critics, he counters that 'Everything…which is now believed to be most ancient was new' and then turns the antithesis old ~ new on its head: this new measure too will become old. The result is a chiastic progression (old ~ new, new ~ old) which is flipped in the last part of the sentence: 'What we defend today by *exempla*' (new supported by old) 'will take its place among *exempla*' (old will in time support new). This circular approach to time, confounding the categories of ancient and modern, subverts the opponents' reverence for antiquity and substitutes a forward-looking view of a dynamic constitutional order, equally supported by *exempla*.[14] At the top of column I of the *Tabula* Claudius himself took a stand against opponents who disliked constitutional novelty. Tacitus fashions this argument

[14] Griffin (2009: 181).

to provide a strong climax with an antithetical *sententia* that marks the speech as his re-performance of the Claudian source text.

4 Conclusion: Tacitus's programme and methodology

Tacitus's constitutional interest in Claudius's speech

The outcome of Claudius's speech is the senatorial decree granting the Gauls their petition (11.25.1). The result might have been a foregone conclusion in view of Claudius's strong lead – going beyond putting the question to the senate, he argued strongly in favour of the petition. But Tacitus does not present the result as a foregone conclusion. He seems to revel in the ideological conflict at its heart. He presents an indignant opposition wielding arguments based on the most ancient *mos maiorum* and on ethnicity, and appealing to sensational *exempla* such as the sack of Rome. He provides Claudius with a rebuttal which effectively engages the critics of the Gauls' petition on their own terms and implicitly represents their stance as a distortion of history. From the point of view of the early second century, when the *Annals* was composed, Tacitus found in the episode a definite moment in, and an imperial 'policy statement' about, the history of integrating outsiders into citizenship and politics at Rome. The process ultimately accounted for Tacitus's presence in the senate, if his background was indeed Narbonensian, and for the elevation of a *princeps* from the provinces, the Spaniard Trajan.[15] The history of Rome's absorption of outsiders was rich in contemporary resonance.

[15] Griffin (1982: 406-07, 418). On Tacitus's background see Birley (2000). On the historical process of integration see Malloch (2020: 37-42).

Tacitus was, like Claudius, interested in this process in constitutional terms. The petition of the Gauls to sit in the senate was probably prompted by the revision of the membership of that institution soon to be conducted by Claudius as censor (11.25.2-3). Here was material of considerable constitutional interest to Tacitus: his version of Claudius's speech can be read as a micro-history of the expansion of Roman citizenship and membership of the senate. While also reflecting Claudius's approach in *his* speech, Tacitus adopts the same broad historical perspective characterising his treatment of legal and institutional features of the Roman state sprinkled throughout the *Annals*. This interest in Rome's constitutional order was central to Tacitus's historical project. It must have been a key factor in his decision, during his composition of the *Histories*, to turn not to the contemporary history of Nerva and Trajan (cf. *Histories* 1.1), but back to the origins of contemporary history under late Augustus and his successors, the subject of the *Annals*. Once he started writing that history he evidently wished to treat those origins under Augustus more broadly (*Annals* 3.24.3).

Tacitus's handling of speech in the Annals

In his surviving historical works, Tacitus does not make a single grand methodological statement about his handling of speech. Nonetheless he sometimes makes revealing programmatic comments. During his narrative of the Pisonian conspiracy in *Annals* 15 (48-74), he declines to paraphrase the last words of Seneca because they were available 'to the public in his own words' (15.63.3 *et nouissimo quoque momento suppeditante eloquentia aduocatis scriptoribus pleraque tradidit, quae in uulgus edita eius uerbis inuertere supersedeo*). A few chapters later Tacitus does report in *oratio recta* the answer given by the tribune Subrius Flavius to Nero's question about his motives because, 'they were not made

public, as Seneca's were' (15.67.3 *ipsa rettuli uerba, quia non, ut Senecae, uulgata erant*). Two methodological points can be derived from these comments. Firstly, Tacitus evidently favoured reporting speech that was not generally available or well known to the public.[16] Secondly, Tacitus evidently had access to historical speeches which had not been widely circulated in written form or were not widely available to the public of the second century A.D. These considerations allow us to suppose that Tacitus's reproduction of Claudius's speech implies that it was not well known since its delivery in 48. How Tacitus knew the speech is uncertain. He evidently had access to copies of Claudius's speeches which he regarded as reliable, since in some cases he points out details omitted by Claudius.[17] Among these copies must have been the text of Claudius's speech on the Gauls. The existence of the speech limited the extent to which Tacitus was able to rework it, while its apparent inaccessibility complemented generic demands to put his own stamp on it.

Tacitus's claim to quote Subrius Flavius's actual words is an assertion that his reportage is reliable.[18] He is simultaneously asserting the authenticity of those words: he did not invent them.[19] Flavius's utterance lent itself to verbatim reproduction because it was brief. The availability and variable accuracy of such *bons mots* encouraged authorial assertions of accuracy. Longer speech was handled differently. Tacitus does not vouch for the reliability of his version of Claudius's speech because he offered not a verbatim transcription but a representation. He was exercising an artistic freedom customary to ancient

[16] Brock (1995: 210-12).

[17] See, for example, *Annals* 12.11.1, 12.61.2; Griffin (1990: 483).

[18] Mayer (2010: 137-42).

[19] Similarly, Tacitus's pronouncement on his selection of senatorial *sententiae* at *Annals* 3.65 implies that the *sententiae* were authentic (or at least that Tacitus judged them to be so).

historiography. That freedom could even extend to the total invention of speech.[20] The miraculous survival of the *Tabula* proves, however, that Tacitus's version was *not* a total invention: he represented a lengthy speech which had an historical basis. The existence of Claudius's speech imposed limits on Tacitus's creative freedom. Did Tacitus normally base lengthy speech on historical *orationes*? Did he normally observe such limits to his creative freedom? Tacitus's handling of Claudius's speech on the Gauls offers an invaluable clue to answering these general methodological questions.

Department of Classics and Archaeology
University of Nottingham
Nottingham. NG7 2RD. Verenigd Koninkrijk
[no email]

Bibliography

Adema, S. M. 2017. *Speech and Thought in Latin War Narratives*. *Words of Warriors*. Leiden-Boston

Birley, A. R. 2000. 'The Life and Death of Cornelius Tacitus', *Historia* 49, 230-47.

Brock, R. 1995. 'Versions, "Inversions" and Evasions. Classical Historiography and the "Published" Speech', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 8, 209-24.

Burden-Strevens, C. 2020. *Cassius Dio's Speeches and the Collapse of the Roman Republic. The* Roman History, *books 3-56*, Leiden-Boston.

[20] See, for example, Marincola (2009: 129-30); Mayer (2010: 130, 142). A probable example of total invention is the dialogue of Cicero and Philiscus at Dio 38.18-30: cf. Millar (1964: 50); Rich (2019: 220); and, on Dio's speeches generally, Burden-Strevens (2020).

Carcopino, J. 1930. Review of P. Fabia, 1929, *La table claudienne de Lyon*, Lyon, in *Journal des savants*, February, 69-81, and March, 116-28 = 1961, *Les étapes de l'impérialisme romain*, Paris, 174-208.

Griffin, M. 1982. 'The Lyons Tablet and Tacitean Hindsight', *Classical Quarterly* 32, 404-18.

Griffin, M. 1990. 'Claudius in Tacitus', *Classical Quarterly* 40, 482-501.

Griffin, M. 2009. 'Tacitus as a Historian', in A. J. Woodman (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, Cambridge, 168-83.

Malloch, S. J. V. 2013. *The* Annals *of Tacitus, book 11*, Cambridge.

Malloch, S. J. V. 2020. *The* Tabula Lugdunensis. *A Critical Edition with Translation and Commentary*, Cambridge.

Marincola, J. 2009. 'Speeches in Classical Historiography', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Oxford, 118-32.

Mayer, R. 2010. '*Ipsa uerba*: Tacitus' Verbatim Quotations', in T. Fuhrer and D. Nelis (eds.), *Acting with Words. Communication, Rhetorical Performance and Performative Arts in Latin Literature*, Heidelberg, 129-42.

Millar, F. 1964. *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford.

Rich, J. 2019. 'Speech in Cassius Dio's *Roman History*, Books 1-35', in C. Burden-Strevens and M. O. Lindholmer (eds), *Cassius Dio's Forgotten History of Early Rome. The* Roman History, *Books 1-21*, Leiden-Boston, 217-84.

Syme, R. 1999. *The Provincial at Rome* and *Rome and the Balkans 80 BC-AD14*. Ed. A. R. Birley, Exeter.

Wellesley, K. 1954. 'Can you Trust Tacitus?', *Greece and Rome* 1, 13-33.