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The purpose of Tacitus in writing history was a moral one—"to rescue virtue from oblivion, and that base words and deeds should have the fear of posthumous infamy." (An. III.65.1.) To him, the Roman society was a field of display for characters. For the purposes of preaching and dramatizing, events are selected and represented as backgrounds from which he derives motives for his characters.

His point of view often makes him careless about exact details, geography, and chronology. Because he sensed the emotions of people as individual humans, he largely placed his historical facts around characters influential to Roman history. Tacitus had had no formal psychological training, but any reader of Tacitus will realize that he had a perception and understanding of some of the more fundamental psychological facts and principles. At times he seems very much prejudiced, but when the reader understands that his sources were not the most reliable and that he himself was primarily an orator with a flair for the dramatic, the particular likes or dislikes he reveals must be taken *cum grano salis*—"with a grain of salt."

Tacitus was an aristocrat with a nostalgic admiration for conditions as they were before Augustus. In Book IV.8 of the Histories he puts the words in the mouth of the informer Marcellus that he "admired the earlier period, but adapted himself to the present; he remembered good emperors in his prayers, and endured any sort." In other words,
Tacitus was resigned to the lot of living in an Empire, as long as some of his homesickness could be expressed through his pen. His contempt for the hoodwinked people and nobility is expressed in some of the prejudices he unintentionally allows to creep into his characterizations of certain individuals. His desire was to narrate the history of the Empire sine ira et studio; i.e., "the gospel of things as they were." His view was pessimistic, and, as a result, his Tiberius, Domitian, Livia and Agrippina the Younger may be distorted. Tacitus as a historian had the right to choose his side; it turned out to be the Germanicus Agrippina the Elder faction with which he sympathized, and it may be that it was his interpretation of the propensities of the Roman people which prompted his pro-Germanicus prejudices.

There is no doubt that at times Tacitus acceded to both political and personal prejudices. There were many conditions existent under the Empire which he thought a positive deterioration. The informers with their voluntary activity had replaced the tribunes of the people and the personal interest or public spirit of individuals of the Republic—a voluntary public-spirited police system. Naturally the reward promised the delatores made them only the more dangerous and rigorous in their undertakings to search out and indict criminals.
The people, the ultimate source of authority in the Republic, had been stripped of any effective share in the government, leaving the emperor and the senate possessors of any real power. Gradually Tacitus saw the elections of magistrates transferred to the senate, the edicts of the emperor and ordinances of the senate become the absolute law. (An. I. 15.) Servility was left to the people. As the senate became more servile and obsequious, finally absolute power was vested in the princeps.

Perhaps Tacitus' anti-Tiberius attitude was engendered because of the fact that it was Tiberius who received the "rule for life" which Augustus had received for ten year periods at a time; it was Tiberius who gave the senate more share in government and reduced the power of the comitia (popular assemblies) and the old republican magistracies almost to naught. In toto, Tiberius completed the absolute monarchy.

Tacitus, too, seems to have had personal prejudices, but whether they were because of the individual or because of what the individuals were doing as tools of an emperor is a moot problem. From his writings the conclusions may be formed that close descendants of Germanicus were friends of Tacitus, but as I have stated before, Germanicus was the idol of the Roman people and Tacitus may have been reflecting their sentiments. I am of the opinion that Tacitus allowed his attitudes toward close relatives to be affected
by his feelings toward the ruling members of the family—a sort of "attraction" prejudice.

If an over-all view is taken of his works, it is evident that he is one of the most stimulating, dramatic, thoroughly human and enjoyable of historians, whatever his prejudices.

Instead of the full titles for each of his books, the following abbreviations will be used in the footnotes:

- Agricola—Tac. Agr.
- Germania—Tac. Ger.
- Annals—Tac. An.
- Dialogus—Tac. Dial.

This study just scratches the surface of the psychological principles that lie in Tacitus, but it is an attempt to connect the new with the old by using merely a few of Tacitus' characters as illustrations for psychological generalizations. There are many more, and probably better, examples, but these were of interest to me. I am indebted to Dr. W. P. Clark for his patient reading and rereading of the copy and his many good suggestions.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The purpose of this study will be to evaluate various opinions and assumptions that Tacitus makes in an effort to prove that he himself was aware of certain fundamental psychological generalizations that have been developing into theories in the past century. Although we know that Tacitus gave no formal study to psychology, his insight into people made him a natural interpreter of human nature and character-the frustration, motivation, aggressive tendencies, and forces behind their actions.

"In the delineation of character Tacitus is unrivalled among historians and has very few superiors among dramatists and novelists." By the delineation of character we do not mean the practice of drawing up epigrammatic catalogues of good and bad qualities, and of appending them to the names of eminent men. No writer, indeed, has done this more skilfully than Tacitus; but this is not his peculiar glory. All the persons who occupy a large space in his works have an individuality of character which seems to pervade all their words and actions. We know them as if we had lived with them.

In order to keep a discussion founded on psychological principles from degenerating into a conglomeration of technical nomenclature, a definite procedure must be followed. Different concepts stressing different aspects of human behavior, personality and character must be explained on the basis of a modern definition. Then from the various generalizations must be evolved a whole which will explain the ideas set forth in the study. The generalizations in this study will be based upon material taken from writings in abnormal psychology, dynamics of human adjustment, individual differences, and studies of personality and character. The "plan of action" will be to disclose how Tacitus was aware of motivating drives and needs, individual differences, frustrations, domineering mothers, drives for prestige, qualities of leadership, emotional sex differences, and had developed insight into the broad field of human nature, commonly called "mob psychology."

Statements made by Tacitus will be examined to discover behavior which will conform to fundamental principles in modern psychology. We know that many men consciously—and probably, as we shall see later, a much larger number unconsciously—fail to act up to their declared principles.

---

That fair words can cover an ugly disposition is a common enough experience. The ugly disposition will eventually express itself in deeds. It is evident that Tacitus expresses the deeds of one of his characters and then, with a cryptic remark, places that individual in some psychological category. Characters will be examined in an effort to analyze the motives behind their deeds.

Motive and motivation can be used to refer to a very specific mental state which arouses action. One inquires into a person's motives for performing some deed. In this sense motive refers as much to the planned or conscious end to be gained as to the unconscious needs to be satisfied. Motive includes not only the driving force but also its direction.

Drives, or needs, are powerful stimuli to motivation. Maslow states that in the hierarchy of needs the three groups of needs arrange themselves going from the most elemental and physiological to those which represent the higher development of the individual. He would place needs on five levels: the first level would comprise the basic physiological needs of hunger, sex, and so on; the second, the needs of safety from external dangers; the third, the need for

love, warmth and affection; the fourth, self esteem, self respect as well as respect and esteem of others. Finally, there is the need for self realization, of being able to accomplish and achieve. Gratification of needs on the first, or more basic levels, frees a person for the higher social needs. On the other hand, if these more basic needs are not met, they claim priority, and activities on the higher levels must be postponed temporarily. Therefore, the healthy man is one whose basic needs have been met so that he is principally motivated by his needs to develop and realize his highest potentialities. The maladjusted and neurotic person, then, is one who is dominated by his more basic needs. One might say that a healthy society is one that provides the satisfaction of the needs on the lower levels, enabling men to turn their energies toward goals which will satisfy the needs on the higher levels.

Probably the dominant motivating force to human behavior is frustration in its varying forms and degrees. The first condition for the presence of a frustration is that a need or drive, or tendency toward action be aroused. Secondly, the satisfaction of this need is blocked, inter-

ferred with, or simply is not available. That is, there is a barrier or obstruction to its satisfaction. Although frustration as such can occur only to an individual organism, any given frustrating condition may occur to several individuals at the same time. In such a case, a "group" is viewed distributively rather than as a collective thing.

If all or most of the individuals in a group are hungry, the "group" may be said, in this distributive fashion, to be hungry. Rosenzweig has done much valuable work in classifying the types of frustration. He divides frustrations into two general classes, those which originate in the external environment, and those which originate in the internal environment. Poverty is an all-inclusive privation which Tacitus recognized as an external frustration; oppression by rulers, low army pay, and many threats to freedom and security always have been and always will be frustrating experiences. Tacitus did not deal too extensively with internal frustrations except as far as bodily deformity or disfigurement—stature, inadequate physique, poor complexion—may be frustrating to an individual leader in the

5. Symonds, op. cit., p. 80.
public eye. Such a one was Claudius, who was weak physically and by Tacitus was considered to have some mental weakness or handicap. The natural conclusion to be drawn from this short discussion on frustration is that individuals and groups will strive in various ways to overcome frustration. If a group is subjected to a common frustrating situation, the common drive to overcome that frustration is increased, and, in overcoming the external obstacle, there is likely to be greater friendliness and cohesiveness among the members of the group. Conversely, hostility toward an outsider is increased and group destructiveness is enhanced. Tacitus manifests clearly his objections to the oppression of provincials and the inefficient, greedy administration of the Empire.

Unless the reaction to frustration is adequate, there will be disturbance and commotion aroused as shall be shown later. Seashore and Katz in "An Operational Definition and Classification of Mental Mechanisms," have prepared criteria for evaluating the satisfaction of frustration. They are:

Reaction to frustration is adequate when

1. It enables the individual to attain his original goal, or at least a desirable substitute for it.

8. Symonds, op. cit., p. 76.
2. It increases or maintains the individual's social prestige.

3. It either benefits society, or is at least neutral in that it does not unduly interfere with the interests of other people.

4. It is conducive to a reasonable degree of health, confidence, initiative, and courage to undertake further problems.

Reaction to a frustration is inadequate when

1. It directs the individual away from the original goal or a desirable substitute by retreating from the difficulty and/or attempting to ignore it.

2. It results, at best, in temporary maintenance of status; eventually it lowers the individual's standing.

3. It results in behavior that is either a nuisance or a burden to society, because the individual secures the assistance of other persons without adequate return.

4. It is not conducive to mental or physical health, and either decreases or fails to develop confidence, initiative, skill, and/or courage to undertake further problems.

Tacitus in his writings takes full account of the fact that the world is made up of individuals—humans with individual differences and on the basis of these differences in individuals, there are different reactions to frustrating stimuli. Although psychologically the theory of individual differences is a relatively new concept, Plato recognized individual differences and set up a plan for an ideal state which took them into consideration. In the ideal state, the Republic, men were to be chosen for their several duties with reference to their abilities. Those endowed with superior reason were to be rulers; those endowed with courage, warriors; the rest of mankind were to be artisans, tradesmen, laborers, and slaves—necessary to the state, but lower in rank than warriors and statesmen, as the appetites and senses are lower than courage and reason. Individual differences may be classified into physical, mental, educational, and emotional. Suffice it to say that the majority of writers seem to believe that, as a rule, training increases rather than decreases the extent of differences. Various systems of government hold or at least imply different ideas about

individual differences. Democracy supposedly makes recognition of differences; Monarchies are founded upon the principle of inherent differences. Differences are recognized in all realms—political, social, and economic. The rulers inherit their positions or they are chosen from a royal group. The ruling classes generally dominate the social groups, although there are social distinctions down to the lowest servant class. In Rome the emperor had absolute authority in making war and peace; in this way, similar to Fascism, there is an implied recognition that some have the right to dominate and control the policies of the state. It is when individuals become frustrated and their problems more complicated that conflicts arise between rulers and subjects, and between peoples.

From individual differences arise the drives for prestige and leadership. The normal human individual seeks in some sphere or other, by this method or that, to assure himself of his superiority over other human beings. He craves recognition, distinction, success, power, leadership, wealth, and influence. He wants to be on top; inside the group he considers himself to be the best one, rather than on the fringe. In every walk of life there are struggles.

12. Gilliland, op. cit., p. 516
going on for standing in one's group, i.e., for prestige. Power, dominance, standing, prestige, or whatever you call it, can be measured in terms of one's ability to control his social environment. Whatever impresses an individual with his own inadequacy or failure is reacted to with compensatory behavior, aimed at gaining standing or prestige.

This leads directly into identification which is commonly referred to as modeling oneself in thought, feeling or action after another person. A subtle meaning of identification is found in the case of a person who attempts to live out his wishes in the life of another, such as a mother who lives out her life by seeing her ambitions fulfilled in her child. Very often an individual is unable to attain his desired goal in life for himself; he will strive to attain it through a loved one.

Identification may be reached by some method like the following: first, there are certain desires and impulses within an individual which he is unable to express. These are projected out onto another person who exemplifies the working out of these desires in actuality. As the other person represents the successful accomplishment of these desires,

14. Ibid., p. 429
he then is introjected, and we find that the individual identifies himself with him. The mother may project onto the child her own longings, ambitions, fears, and attribute these same feelings and qualities to the child.

Leadership is an identification as the leader becomes a substitute for the goals and successes which we are unable to attain by our unaided efforts. The tendency to identify with a leader blindly can be prevented by an amelioration of the situation so that the individual feels more confident and secure, and by strengthening of the group and its defense resources so that there is less to fear from the aggressiveness of other groups. As a group grows inherently strong, there is less need to project authority and to identify with a strong leader. There are various types of leaders depending upon their temperament, intelligence, and character. Certain personalities may appeal to some groups, virtuous character to another, and even personal appearance to another. Upon qualities of leadership, leaders are chosen whether they be president, general or chairman on a committee.

Very often when choices of leaders are made, as a

17. Ibid., pp. 334-335
result of frustrating experiences, aggressive tendencies arise which have been pretty well subdued by the iron ruler's restraints, man erected laws, and prohibitions for keeping aggression within bounds. There are four meanings to the term aggression. In its first sense, aggression means self-assertiveness, vigorous activity. The second meaning is to gain possession, either of another person or of an object. The term aggression used in this sense refers particularly to an act of appropriation when it meets opposition, as when a person forcibly takes possession of another person, takes an object away from another person, and, in general, uses considerable energy in acquisition. Aggression in its third meaning signifies an act of hostility, attack, and destruction. In this meaning aggression arises as resistance to control by others and represents all that is violent and destructive.

The fourth meaning of aggression refers to the act of control, dominance, or management of another person or groups of persons, organization, and affairs in general. We speak of a person as being aggressive when he shows capacity for leadership, exhibits tendencies to organize and run things, or attempts to bend others to yield to his wishes and to do his bidding.

19. Symonds, op. cit., p. 82.
Generally speaking, one may conclude that aggression is a response to frustration. Anthropologists report that aggressiveness increases in a society in which there is scarcity, and hence insecurity. The recent world war undoubtedly was stimulated in part because of the unequal distribution of natural resources, and because certain proud nations felt that they were deprived of a chance of establishing a high standard of living. The common pattern of reaction against frustration by aggression is for a group to unite. The rivals, or the enemy, are those toward whom the aggressive trends of the group are directed, and each member of the hostile party is considered an enemy by virtue of membership. Before a war there may be more hostility felt between groups within a country than toward its possible enemies outside. War often helps to externalize aggression and to reduce animosities within a group. Alexander believes that hostility toward the external group is the condition for internal peace. Durbin and Bowlby in their book *Personal Aggressiveness and War*, have analyzed the causes of war. They follow very closely along the lines of this analysis. There are three main causes: one, the possessiveness of nations who are not satisfied with their present wealth and territory.

and cast envious eyes on that which is possessed by their neighbors. This possessiveness leads to overt action. The second factor is economic insecurity. The starved nation will prey upon its rich neighbors. Strangeness is mentioned as the third cause of war. There is a tendency to feel hostile toward people whose customs, language, and ideals differ from our own.

It is impossible to deal with analyses of people and their behavior without examining their fears and emotions. A particular emotion is distinguished more by the general overt behavior in regard to the situation that arouses it than by the accompanying visceral reactions. Probably the most certain indications that conflict is present are the expressions of strong unpleasant emotion. The presence of emotion may indicate merely that a person is frustrated by some external obstruction. Frustration usually produces rage and tendencies toward aggression. There are some who feel that women are more emotional than men and as such are more likely to give in to frustrating conditions by an overflow of emotions. Amongst those emotional forms of conduct

22. Skinner, Charles, op. cit., pp. 244-245
which are generally considered to be more marked in women than in men, mention must be made of that group which has timidity for its central point: addiction to fear, cowardice, and the like. It is instructive to observe how in the case of a large number of women this lack of courage has arisen in the course of life and in the years of childhood. There were girls and young women in ancient Greece who had the courage to train like the boys and young men, and even vie with them in contest. E. G. Fleming reports in "Sex Differences in Emotional Responses" that as a whole there appear to be no sex differences in emotional responses. He further states that there is no reliable difference between the intensity of the emotional responses. A smaller percentage of women than of men change their emotional responses from pleasant to unpleasant, from blameworthy to praiseworthy and from fearful to joyful. The differences are not statistically reliable; but in the case of blameworthy-praiseworthy responses, the chances are 10 to 100 that a smaller percentage of women than of men change their responses from one to the other. Closely allied to the emotions are the defenses against fear which are institutionalized; hence numbers of people can have

The emotions have or seem to have a close relation to morals. Moral concepts are based upon emotions. There are different degrees of badness and goodness, the differences being due to the emotional origin of all moral concepts. Emotions vary in intensity and it may be fairly doubted whether the same mode of conduct ever arouses exactly the same degree of indignation or approval in any two individuals. The emotions are of two kinds: disapproval, or indignation, and approval.

From our earliest childhood we are taught that certain acts are right and that others are wrong. Moral rules are supported by authority, human or divine, and to question their validity is to rebel against either public opinion or against religion. Adam Smith calls the moral faculties the "vicegerents of God within us" who "never fail to punish the violation of them by the torments of inward shame and self condemnation; and, on the contrary, always reward obedience with tranquility of mind, with contentment and self satisfaction."

The majority of people seem to be more afraid of the blame or ridicule of their fellowmen, or of the penalties with which the law threatens them, than of the "vicegerents

of God" in their own hearts.

The feelings with which men regard their fellow creatures, and which are some of the main sources of human happiness and suffering, have often very little to do with morality. A person is respected or praised, blamed or despised, on other grounds than his character. The admiration which is felt for genius, courage, pluck, strength or accidental success, is often more intense than the admiration which is felt for virtue.

It has been stated that the moral emotions are of two kinds, moral approval and moral disapproval. Moral disapproval is a kind of resentment and is similar to anger and revenge; moral approval is a kind of retributive, kindly emotion. It is the moral emotion of revenge with which this study is primarily concerned. Revenge is essentially rooted in the feeling of power and superiority. Consequently, it arises from an experience of injury, and its aim is to enhance the "self feeling" which has been deflated by the injury. By directing force against the aggressor himself, it best answers this purpose.

Nothing more easily arouses in us anger and a desire for revenge than an act of contempt, or disregard of our feelings. The mental suffering caused by injury remains long after the physical injury and demands vengeance.
Vengeance implies a desire to cause pain or destruction in return for hurt suffered.

Moral emotions are felt not only on account of the conduct of others, but on account of our own conduct as well. Moral self-condemnation is a hostile attitude of mind towards one's self as the cause of pain; moral self approval is a kindly attitude of mind towards one's self as a cause of pleasure. Genuine remorse involves some desire to suffer. A person may feel actual hatred toward himself or he may desire to inflict punishment on others. Suicide is one outlet for remorse.

Moral emotions are moral when they are felt with reference to the conduct of other people. It is with this in mind that a study of the moral concepts may be interwoven into the psychological study of Tacitus.

The complete study will be one based upon the application of the above principles to the writings of Tacitus. Material for the conclusions will be taken from his writings: The Annals, Histories, Dialogue, Germania, and Agricola.

CHAPTER II

FRUSTRATION AND AGGRESSION

The general theory is that everybody is, to some degree, frustrated. From the first cry a baby makes to his dying day, life is one frustrating situation after another. Modern times have no monopoly on frustration. During the first century in Rome when slavery, scarcity of food, and small wages were running rampant, many were the frustrating situations. Whenever there is scarcity, as there was there, naturally or artificially created; wherever there are regulations which destroy freedom of expression in any absolute sense, there will be frustration. Frustration will be understood as a deprivation which is also a threat to the personality, particularly to the self-esteem or feeling of security of individuals and groups.

The study of frustration will be made upon the basis of individuals and groups. Although frustration as such can occur only to an individual organism, any given frustrating condition may occur to several individuals simultaneously. In such a case, a "group" is viewed distributively rather than as a collective thing. If all or most of the individuals in a group are hungry, the "group" may be said after this

1. Dollard, op. cit., p. 149.
distributive fashion to be hungry. From the viewpoint of
the group, there were many frustrating situations in Rome.
Repeatedly the army was either near mutiny or mutinying.
Frequently, one feels that Tacitus thought the frustration
was more or less a superficial one. At one time the Pannon-
ian legions mutinied. It is explicitly stated that there
were no fresh grievances, but a change in sovereigns had
excited an idea of licensed anarchy and the hope for gains
to be made from a civil war. Thus, the legions felt that
their status could be bettered by mutiny. But Tacitus goes
on to explain that the soldiers had been given some leisure
time, and, as usual, the cessation of the normal round of
duties made them restless—mischievous.

Et principio lascivire miles; discordare, pessimi
culiusque sermonibus praebere auris, denique luxum
et otium cupere, disciplinam et laborem asperrari.

"From this beginning, a spirit of insubordination and
disorder took its rise; the men lent ready ears to the
talk of the worst among their number; till at length a
longing for ease and idleness set in, with impatience of
work and discipline." Step by step, then, after a leader
had been chosen from amongst the legion, a leader who had

London: John Murray, 1904. Tac, An. I.16.3. Unless other-
wise specified, all translations will be from the source
indicated in this footnote.
been an actor, by surreptitious gatherings, Tacitus tells us how he began to play on the simple minds of the soldiers, already troubled by the death of Augustus. They began to wonder how Augustus' death would affect the conditions of their service; hence an individual, yet also group frustration. When Percennius, the actor leader, had convinced them that even if they did get the discharges they were clamoring for, they would only return to old drudgeries (either a bonus or remaining in the army) or would receive instead of the bonus some swampy morass or mountainside for a farm, he then went into the vicissitudes in the life of a soldier, pointing out that there were no alleviations in sight, but particularly mentioning that the Praetorian Cohorts had an easy life. Trying to find a better job than soldiering, Percennius fails; then Tacitus explains that the soldiers began to display the marks of punishment and age they had received in the long army life. Had not Blaesus, legion commander, convinced them that they were committing an act of disloyalty to the emperor, they undoubtedly would have mutinied for the reasons stated in Tacitus.

There are leaders mentioned in the army who seemed to frustrate the soldiers and drive them to acts of aggression.

7. Tac. An., 1.16.4-5; 17.18.19.
Other companies of the above mentioned legions had been
detailed for the repair of roads and bridges. As soon as
they heard of the commotion in camp, they tore down their
own ensigns and began looting neighboring villages. The
centurions tried to resist the jeers, insults and finally
blows of the soldiers. Aupidiennes Rufus, the camp marshal,
became the chief object of anger. Rufus was one who, accord-
ing to Tacitus, was more ruthless in the iron discipline he
was inflicting upon them because he had endured so much in
the past—vengeance. Many times all the soldiers could do
was hurl invectives at the leaders as they did at Rufus.

"... the strongest instigation, aroused by frus-
tration, is to acts of aggression directed against the agent
perceived to be the source of the frustration." The greater
the degree of inhibition specific to a more direct act of
aggression, the more probable will be the occurrence of
less direct acts of aggression.

The legions of Germany also mutinied at the same time
as the Pannonician legions, and Tacitus says "for the same
reasons." This time the leaders were recruits who were

10. Dollard, op. cit., p. 40
chafing at the hardships of army life. They convinced the older soldiers that the time had come for them to seek overdue discharges, and for the younger ones to seek more generous pay. They even added that revenge should be taken against the cruelty of the centurions. Not until Germanicus, a loved leader, appeared on the scene, did their anger subside—then, when he pretended he was going to kill himself, rather than turn traitor, some of them told him to go ahead; their fury had reached such white heat. At any rate, by making some concessions, this mutiny too was quelled.

All group frustration did not take place within the army. The Roman people were subjected to many frustrating conditions. Within any given state internal hostility to the symbols of authority is a common feature of social life. It is manifested by groups which hope for revolutionary change. Occasionally, it breaks out in the form of riots or insubordinate behavior. In the case of groups of adults taken collectively, as in the nation, there is, of course, the fear of counter-aggression, i. e., warfare. It is true, of course, that this threat serves as a justification of preparation for warfare at the same time.

Vitellius had levied some young BataVian® and

Tacitus recognized the levy as a "gravis" one, but the burdens were made heavier by the greed and license of those in authority. The old and the weak were hunted out in order that they (the authorities) could get bribes for letting them off; children were dragged away to satisfy their lust. Tacitus says "resentment" was aroused, and the people were persuaded by leaders to refuse the levy. The resentment, of course, is moral disapproval and indignation at the rights the authorities could exert over their people. Here, it was the slavery of the Batavians, the greed of the prefects and centurions, and the separation of children from parents and brothers from brothers that forced the Roman state to one of its worst straits.

Many times the Romans reacted to frustration by intraggression and suicide. It is generally recognized that the most primitive form of response to frustration is aggression accompanied by rage and anger. The existence of real frustration always leads to aggression. The problem of aggression has many facets. The individual experiences difficulty in controlling his own temper and often sees others carrying on an unwitting struggle with their hostil-

15. Symonds, op. cit., p. 70.
ities. He fears justified revenge, or writhes at the blow or taunt that appears from an unexpected source. Helpless minorities are persecuted. Aggression may be directed at the object which is perceived as causing the frustration, or it may be displaced to some altogether innocent source, or even toward the self, as in masochism, martyrdom, and suicide. When the individual becomes conscious of the conflict within himself, he turns to suicide as the only means of protecting himself from some catastrophic situation. Suicide was the method that the Roman citizens, singled out by the "delatores" who were "informers" and received pay from their convictions of oftentimes innocent people, used to meet their frustrations. There are more examples than can possibly be examined, but a few will assure us that Tacitus recognized the frustration of individuals and their escape from it.

Probably the most striking illustration of mass and individual frustration with the solution of suicide is in the following passage:

Sequitur clades, forte an dolo principis incertum (nam utrumque auctores prodidero), sed omnibus, quae huic urbi perviolentiam ignium acciderunt, gravior atque atrocior.

"And now came a calamitous fire—whether it was accidental or purposely contrived by the Emperor, remains

17. Ibid., p. 10.
uncertain: for on this point authorities are divided—more violent and destructive than any that ever befell our city."

The fire in all its omnivorous and frustrating ferocity is then described:

Ad hoc lamenta paeentium feminarum, fessa aut rudis pueritiae setas, quique sibi quique aliis consulabant, dum trahunt invalidos aut opperimentur, pars mora, pars festinans, cuncta impediebant. Et saepe, dum in tegum respectant, lateribus aut fronte circumveniebantur, vel si in proxima evaserant, illis quoque igni correptis, etiam quae longinquae crediderant in eodem casu reperiebant. Postremo, quid vitaront quid peterent ambi gui, complevere vias, sterni per agros; quidam amisissent omnibus fortunis, diurni quoque victus, alii caritate suorum, quos eripere nequiverant, quamvis patente effugio interiere. Nec quisquam defendere audirebat, crebris multitum minis restituere prohibentium, et quia alii palam facies inciderant, atque esse sibi auctorem vociferabantur, sive ut raptus licentius exercerent seu iussu.

"The shrieks of panic-stricken women; the weakness of the aged, and the helplessness of the young; the efforts of some to save themselves, of others to help their neighbours; the hurrying of those who dragged their sick along, the lingering of those who waited for them—all made up a scene of inextricable confusion.

Many persons, while looking behind them, were enveloped from the front or from the side; or having escaped to the nearest place of safety, found this too in possession.

of the flames, and even places which they had thought beyond their reach in the same plight with the rest. At last, not knowing where to turn, or what to avoid, they poured into the roads or threw themselves down in the fields: some having lost their all, not having even food for the day; others, though with means of escape open to them, preferred to perish for love of the dear ones whom they could not save. And none dared to check the flames; for there were many who threatened and forced back those who would extinguish them, while others openly flung in torches, saying that they had their orders;—whether it really was so, or only that they wanted to plunder undisturbed."

Here is a picture of desperate people who have actual physical fear; they are face to face with a way out, but because of loss of loved ones, their means of existence, daily bread included, and threats from some who seemed to represent authority, they chose death.

The informers forced many people to death by false accusations.

Nec minus praemia delatorum invisa quam scelera, cum alii sacerdotia et consulatus ut spolia adempit, procurationes aili et interiorem potestiam, agerent verterent cuncta odio et terrore. Corrupti in dominos servi, in patronos liberti; et quibus deerat inimicus per amicos oppressi. Non tamen adeo virtutum sterile saeculum ut non et bona

exempla prodiderit. Comitatae profugos liberos matres, secutae maritos in exilia coniuges; propinqui audentes, constantes generi, contumax etiam adversus tormenta servorum fides; supremae clolorum virorum necessitates fortiter toleratas et laudatis antiquorum mortibus pares exitus.

"Nor were the rewards of accusers less hateful than their villainies; some gained Consulships and Priesthoods as their spoils, some Procuratorships, others influence of a more secret kind, overturning everything, carrying all before them, by the forces of hate and terror. Slaves were bribed to betray their masters, clients their patrons; those who had no enemies were ruined by their friends.

"And yet the age was not so barren of all virtue as not to exhibit some noble examples. Mothers followed their sons, wives their husbands, into exile; some kinsmen showed courage, some sons-in-law were faithful; there were slaves who held out staunchly even against torture, and illustrious men who bore their doom with fortitude; there were death-scenes as noble as those celebrated by antiquity."

Tacitus states positively that men were so frustrated that if they did not or could not find a way out through exile or flight, they chose death. The exile would have been a form of escapism—a sort of avoidance. Others chose the last extremity.

It would be impossible to name the many hundreds who were driven to the last necessity. Some upon whom "reverses of fortune" forced suicide were:

Gnaeus Piso was the local governor of Syria, but when Tiberius placed Germanicus as overseer of all the provinces beyond the sea, the ungoverned passion and insubordinacy of Piso spurred him on to try to remove Germanicus. His wife, Plancina, fired his enthusiasm for repressing Germanicus. After much arguing and demonstration of open hostility, Germanicus became ill. Piso was believed by Germanicus to be poisoning him. Germanicus died and Piso was accused of his death. This accusation did not carry, however, so his previous intrigue-filled career with the soldiers was suggested as an accusation. He was finally accused of corrupting the common soldier and of being ruthless to the best men, especially friends of Germanicus. The people were ready to take the law into their own hands.

Tiberium sine miserations, sine ira, obstinatiurn
clausumque vidit, ne quo aedectu perturberetur
(nullo magis exterritus est).

"But what alarmed him most was to see Tiberius pitiless, passionless, and doggedly resolved to remain impervious to every human feeling." Piso cut his throat.

Libo Drusus had been charged with revolutionary activities, although, in reality, the grievance against him was his weakness for astrology, magic, and dream interpretations. It was not until Libo had solicited the raising of departed spirits that the informers accused him. He denied all accusations; consequently, his slaves were to be sold and tortured. Soldiers were picketing his house. At his last meal he committed suicide. In this case, it was probably his sense of guilt which forced him to believe that suicide was the best way out.

Agrippina was the wife of Germanicus. She had always been a forceful, fierce-tempered woman. After Sejanus had become a good friend of Tiberius, and he had decided he would have to get rid of Agrippina and her children before he could realize all his ambitions for power, he began to direct his efforts against Agrippina. It wasn't hard to get even her friends to despise her haughty temper. First, some of her relatives were accused. Then, the plots against Agrippina became more apparent, and finally, having given up hope, with cruelty persistent against her, she committed suicide.

... de Agrippina auditum, quam interfecto Seiano upe sustentatam provixisse reor, et post-quam nihil de saevitia remittebatur, voluntate extinctam, nisi si negatis alimentia ad simulatus est finis, qui videretur sponte sumptus.
... news came of the death of Agrippina. The execution of Sejanus, I doubt not, had buoyed her up with hope; but when she found herself treated as cruelly as before, she put an end to herself—unless indeed food was denied to her that she might be thought to have died by her own hand."

Cocceius Nerva was a famous jurist. Although his position was intact, and his health was unimpaired, he resolved to die. Tiberius actually tried to dissuade him, but he slowly starved himself.

"Ferebant gnari cogitationum eius, quanto propius mala rei publicae viseret, ira et metu, dum integer, dum intemptatus, honestum finem voluisses."

"Those who knew his mind best reported that his inner view of the evils of the times had filled him with terror and indignation, and that he had made up his mind, to die."

Pomponius Labeo was a governor of Moesia. He had been arraigned for maladministration of his province and had veiled his guilt by slurring Tiberius.

"... per abruptas venas sanguinem effudit; asmulataque est conium Faxaea. Num promptas eius modi morte metus carnificis faciebat, ut quis damnati publicatis bonis sepultura prohibe-"

bantur.

"He opened his veins and bled to death; his wife Paxaea followed his example. For people resorted readily to deaths of this kind from the fear of execution, and also because a man's property was confiscated, and burial was denied to him, if he was sentenced to death."

Sextus Papinius was a member of a consular family. He chose to throw himself from a window.

Isdem diebus Sextus Papinius consulari familia repentinum et informe exitum delegit, iacto in praeceps corpore. Causa ad matrem referebatur, quae pridem repudiata adsentationibus atque luxu perpuliasset iuvenem ad ea, quorum effugium non nisi morte inveniret.

"During these days, Sextus Papinius, member of a consular family, chose an abrupt and indecent end by throwing himself from a window. The motive was referred to his mother, long ago divorced, who, by flattering his taste for dissipation, was supposed to have driven the youth to extremities from which he could find no issue except by death."

One may conclude that there were many reasons for committing suicide in the lives of the Romans. Many suicides were committed because there was just no way out—non effugium. Physical fear, loss of sustenance, the personal loss of loved ones, accusations that, although the accused
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may not have been guilty, they had such strong senses of
guilt that they were driven to the last means of overcoming
that guilt, personal reverses of fortune, and moral inhibi-
tions induced by members of their own immediate families
were all frustrating situations producing suicide.

Suicide seems to be a rather rash outlet for intrag-
gression, but it may be provisionally stated that "the
strength of inhibition of any act of aggression varies posi-
tively with the amount of punishment anticipated to be a
consequence of that act. 27 Hence, some, realizing that either
they must be accused by the informers, or find their own
answer to frustration, chose suicide. Some sought safety
in flight—theirs was not going to be the punishment in
death.

The emperor, Vitellius, when he was extremely anxious
about the outcome of the civil war between his own faction
and Vespasian’s, and when he felt that he was at his wits’
ends, suddenly withdrew from active participation and in-
dulged in pleasures.

Non parare arma, non adloqui exercitique mili-
tem firmare, non in ore vulgi agere, sed umbra-
culis hortorum abditus, ut ignava animalia,
quibus si cibum suggeras, iacent torpentque,
praeterita instantia futura pari oblivione di-
miserat.

"He made no military preparations; he neither encour-

aged his soldiers by addresses, nor hardened them by exercises; he avoided the public eye; and like those sluggish animals which lie torpid when supplied with food, he secreted himself in shady gardens, dismissing with a like oblivion the past, the present, and the future."

This is a substitute response for aggression in meeting a frustrating situation. Some people meet frustrations by changes in their philosophy of life. Vitellius was passing his time hidden in the shade of his gardens, having dismissed any thoughts of time from his mind. A very common defense against anxiety is partial inhibition whereby through some kind of restraint or diminished activity an individual is able to protect himself against the danger of a situation and perhaps, at the same time, work out in a compromise form the wishes which are seeking expression. There are various ways in which this inhibition is translated into passivity and inactivity. Later on, although Vitellius had frequent comebacks, Tacitus remarks:

Tanta torpedo invaserat animum ut, si principem simuisse ceteri non meminissent, ipse obliviscetur.

"Such was the torpor that possessed him that he
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would have forgotten that he had been an Emperor had he not been reminded of it by others."

There were other evidences of Vitellius' deep anxiety and his apparent effort to forget his troubles.

. . . ignarus militiae, improvidus consilii, quis ordo agminis, quae cura explorandi, quantus urgende trahendove bello modus, alios rogitans et ad omnis nuntios vultu quoque et incessu trepidus, dein temulentus.

"Knowing nothing of war, incapable of thinking for himself, he kept asking others how a line of battle should be formed, how scouting should be done, to what extent it would be wise to hurry on or to protract the war; his face, his gait, showed alarm as each new messenger arrived; and finally, he was forever in his cups." Among the methods of escape, which is also of the nature of withdrawal, is the flight to fantasy. This is sometimes accomplished by resorting to drugs or alcohol. When difficulties pile up, and there is no way out, instead of committing suicide, there is flight.

In the same war between the Vitellians and the Flavians, when the Vitellians seemed to be getting the better of the fray, the Flavians were absolutely panic stricken. Their commander was so terrified he could neither speak nor hear. He could not be guided by others' counsel or plan for himself;
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consequently, swayed this way and that, he forbade what he had just ordered, and ordered what he had just forbidden. Then his terror was projected to his men.

. . . . mox quod in perditis rebus accidit, omnes praecepere, nemo exsequi; postremo abiectis armis fugam et fallendi artis circumspectabant.

"Then, as happens when things grow desperate, everyone ordered, and nobody obeyed; till at last the men threw away their arms, and looked around for a chance of slinking away unperceived." All these men felt was left was to flee and get away from a frustrating situation. This is a common reaction found in escape from harm. Either the tendency is to escape or attack—the Flavians fled.

Frustration is omnipresent, and where frustration is found, there may be found aggression or escape. Sometimes the aggression is directed outwardly; sometimes, inwardly, and becomes intragression. Outwardly, aggression may be that of an army against another, or an army against its leader, or of an army against deprivations existing for them and their loved ones. Inwardly, frustration is often met either by trying to flee physically or in fantasy, or by escaping through suicide. The Romans of Tacitus' time were frustrated, and he recognized it as a strong motivation to action.

33. Tac. Hist., III.73.
CHAPTER III

MOTIVATION

The writings of Tacitus may be studied in terms of the human motives undergirding the actions of the individual. Tacitus senses these motives with matchless insight and expresses them powerfully. He seemed to feel that the "proper study of mankind" is the study of men through history. Only through the study of men who make history can motivation be thoroughly understood.

Most psychologists agree that motives include all factors that move to conduct on the part of organisms. Motives include urges, drives, instincts, propensities, and habits. In this sense a motive may be biological, physiological, or social. Man is so much a social animal that even such an organic need as hunger gives rise to a social behavior. Fear and especially anger are oftentimes aroused by other people.

Prestige, self-assertion, and mastery are more aggressive forms of motivation in which there is a striving to command, to lead, to dominate the situation, or to master and manage. As such these motivations are really moral because they have to be felt with reference to their effect

1. Skinner, op. cit., p. 456
3. Ibid., p. 311
upon other people. One may assume that the motivations underlying the actions of some rulers and individuals in Tacitus' writings are largely social moral drives for distinction in some field.

"Such was the state of affairs in Rome, when a mutiny broke out among the troops in Pannonia. There was no fresh cause for this mutiny, beyond the fact that the accession of a new emperor afforded occasion for license, and held out the hope of civil war with all its attendant gains."

"But the fact that Germanicus stood near to the succession only caused him to exert himself all the more strenuously for Tiberius." This is the picture of a man who truly had a moral sense of duty with the good of the other person uppermost in his endeavors.

The full value of incentives is thoroughly understood. In fact, there is a heavy stress laid upon motives underlying the fighting of soldiers:
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adsistentes plerisque matres et coniuges earumque lamenta addunt animos. Nox aliis in audaciam, aliis ad formidinem opportuna; incerti ictus vulnera improvissa; suorum atque hostium ignoratio et montis anfractu repercurseae velut a tergo voces adeo puncta miscuerant, ut quaedam munimenta Romani quasi perrupta emiserint.

"The one side were spurred on by victory already won, or by shame at the thought of yielding; the other drew fresh courage from the extremity of their peril, and the cries of wives and mothers standing by. The darkness which emboldened the one party was a terror to the other; blows fell at random, wounds came none knew whence, none could tell friend from foe; and such was the confusion wrought by an echo which carried what seemed to be the sound of voices from behind, that the Romans abandoned one part of their defences, believing that they had been forced." Often Tacitus refers to the ignominy which accompanies defeat, motivating the soldiers to strain their utmost for victory. The emotional impetus supplied by having wives and children nearby in a fight goaded the soldiers to win.

Emotions are often regarded as the source of motivation. Of the emotions pity is often evoked by the suffering of others.

Corbulo cum suis copiis apud ripam Euphratis

"Corbulo and his army met them on the banks of the Euphrates, but with no such show of arms or decorations as might reproach them by the contrast. Filled with grief and compassion for the lot of their comrades, the maniples could not refrain from weeping, and were scarce able to salute them for their tears. The spirit of emulation and the thirst for glory, which move men in success, were gone: the one feeling that prevailed was pity, and that was felt most in the lowest ranks." Tacitus recognizes two contrasting types of motives in this quotation—the motives of self-assertion that arise from success, which was absent in this particular instance, and the motivation to pity, a moral emotion because it can be felt in relationship to a group of others.

Hate is a strong motivating force to individuals. It is a general term to stand for all negative feelings and attitudes toward persons, objects, events, and circumstances which are frustrating. Emotions are expressed physiologically by some overt action of the subject upon the environment.
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Fear is closely allied to hate, and as such fear prompts aggressive activity.

Opprobriabatur Nero, ut Vestinus quoque consul in crimine attraheretur, violentum et infensus ratus; sed ex coniuratis consilia cum Vestino non miscuerant, quidam vetustis in eum simultatibus, piu- res, quia praecipitem et insociabilem credi- bant. Ceterum Neroni odium adversus Vestinum ex intima sodalitate cooperat, dum hic ignaviam principis penitus cognitam despiciit, ille ferociam amici metuit, saepe asperis faceticis infusus, quae ubi multum ex vero traxere, acerem sui memo- riam relinquunt. Accesserat repente causa, quod Vestinus Statiliam Messalinam matrimonio sibi iunxerat, haud nescius inter adulteros eius et Cassarem esse.

"Nero was waiting for the Consul Vestinus to be incriminated with the rest, regarding him as a hot-headed and disaffected person. But in truth none of the conspirators had taken him into their counsels: some had old quarrels with him; the majority thought him headstrong and impracticable. Nero's fear and hatred of him had sprung out of their close intimacy, during which Vestinus had learnt to appreciate and despise his contemptible character. Nero had often quailed before the rough jests of his outspoken friend; for when lives have much that is true in them, they leave a rankling memory behind. And Vestinus had added a fresh cause of offence by marrying Statilia Messalina, though well aware that Nero was among the number of her lovers."

Therefore, in addition to the contempt and apparent hate which familiarity with Vestinus bred in Nero, there was the personal motive of mistress attachment. This was a hate that arose from feelings of repressed hostility and a failure to adjust in the past. Hate as a moral emotion commonly refers to the attitude of dislike of one person for another, but in a more general sense, hate is the opposite of love which is the recognition of value in others. Hate results in some form of aggression, and only when aggressive tendencies of hate have been directed into certain satisfying channels, can love direct itself into morally accepted situations. Hatred may be aroused if the loved one is attacked.

Hence, just as hate is a strong motivating force, love impels to the strongest limit of endurance. Time and again the Romans expended every effort for their wives and children. Tacitus would have us know that love was a strong force on the battlefield. "We go to the defense of whatever we love--object, ideals or person--by attacking the attacker."

Tacitus felt this love as universal, for the Barbari had the same emotions as the Romans.

Arminium super insitan violentiam, raptu uxor, subjectus servitio uxoris uter us vaecordem age-
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bant; volitabantque per Cheruscos, arma in Segestem, arma in Caesarem possens.

"At all times violent in temper, Arminius was driven to frenzy by the capture of his wife, and the thought of her unborn child condemned to slavery. He flew hither and thither among the Cherusci, calling them to arms against Segestes and against Caesar."

At another time, appealing to the love of soldiers for their native country, Arminius says:

"Si patriam, parentes, antiqua malleant quam domino et colonias novas, Arminium potius gloriae ac libertatis, quam Segestem flagitiaae servitutis ducem sequentur.

"If they preferred their fatherland, their fathers and their fathers' ways, to living under masters in new-fangled colonies, let them follow Arminius to liberty and to glory, rather than Segestes to shame and slavery."

Arminius knew that his appeal was to one of the strongest motives a soldier can possess.

Tacitus admired the Germans very much, probably because he felt they had a society that might well be copied by the Romans in their present state of degradation. In the Germania he remarks:

... quodque praeceps praeceps fortitudinis incitamentum est, non casus, nec fortuita conglobatio turman aut cuneum facit, sed familias et propin-

quitates; et in proximo pignora, unde feminarum ululatus audiri, unde vagitus infantium. Hi cuique sanctissimi testes, hi maximni laudatores, Ad matres, ad coniuges vulnera ferunt; nec illae numerare aut exigere plagas pavent, cibosque et hortamina pugnantibus gestant.

Memoriae proditur quasdam acies inclinatas iam et labantes a feminis restitutas constantia precum et objectu inpatientius feminarum suarum nomine timent, adeo ut efficaciis obligentur animi civitatum, quibus inter obsides puellae quoque nobiles imperantur.

"And what most stimulates their courage is, that their squadrons or battalions, instead of being formed by chance or by fortuitous gathering, are composed of families and clans. Close by them, too, are those dearest to them, so that they hear the shrieks of women, the cries of infants. They are to every man the most sacred witnesses of his bravery—they are his most generous applauders. The soldier brings his wounds to mother and wife, who shrink not from counting or even demanding them and who administer both food and encouragement to the combatants. Tradition says that armies already wavering and giving way have been rallied by women who, with earnest entreaties and bosoms laid bare, have vividly represented the horrors of captivity which the Germans fear with such extreme dread on behalf of their women, that the strongest tie by which a state can be bound is the being required to give, among the number of hostages, maidens of noble birth."

Tacitus felt that women and children were strong emotional motivations to soldiers—even on the battlefront.

The *Agricola*, other than being a biography of Tacitus' father-in-law, deals extensively with motivating influences in the army. The Britons, in talking about the miseries of subjection, expressed their motivations for war as fatherland, wives, and parents. They felt that their motives were strongly contrasted with the morally disapproved motives of greed and profligacy of the Romans. The feeling is strong throughout chapters eleven through nineteen that peace had greatly enervated the Britons, and idleness had demoralised the Roman troops to the point of mutiny. From the *Histories* are examples of impelling drives in the army, too. The following will tend to show what Tacitus felt the main motivations to be:

*Nunc initia causasque motus Vitelliani expediam, Casso cum omnibus copiis Iulio Vindice ferox praeda gloriaque exercitus, ut cui sine labore ac periculo ditissimi belli victoria evenisset, expeditionem et aciem, praemia quam stipendia malebat.*

"And now let me relate the beginnings and the causes of the Vitellian movement. Having destroyed Julius Vindex with all his forces, the army had become elated with the plunder and the glory of a campaign which had given them, without toil or danger, a victory rich in spoil; and deeming

pay not so good as prize-money, they hankered after campaigns and battles."

Igitur Sequanis Aeduisque ac deinde, prout opulentia civitatibus erat, infensi expugnationes urbium, populationes agrorum, raptus penatium hauserunt animo, super avaritiam et adrogantiam, praecipua validorum vitia, contumacia Gallorum irritati, qui remissam sibi a Galba quartam tributorum partem et publice donatos in ignominiam exercitus iactabant.

"Full of wrath against the Sequani and the Aedui and other communities in proportion to their wealth, the soldiers revelled in the idea of storming cities, ravaging fields, and rifling homes, their wrath being stirred against those tribes, not merely because of their rapacity and arrogance—faults common to all powerful communities—but also because of the impudent and insulting manner in which they had boasted of the favours they had received from Galba, one of which was the remission of a fourth part of their tribute."

... sed plurima ad fingendum credendumque materies in ipsis castris, odio metu et, ubi viris suas respexerant, securitate.

"But the chief material for fiction and for credulity lay in the wrath and the fears of the army itself, which looked to its own numbers and felt secure."

Intumere statim superbia ferociaque et pretium itineris donativum, duples stipendium, augeri
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equitum numerum, promissa sane a Vitellio, postulabant, non ut adsequerentur, sed causam seditioni. Et Flaccus multa concedendo nihil aliud effecerat quam ut acrius exposerent quae aciebant negaturum.

"They at once burst out with insolent demands, asking for a donative as a reward for their march, together with double pay, and an addition to the number of their cavalry—things certainly which had been promised by Vitellius, but which they now asked for, not with the expectation of getting them, but to provide an excuse for their defection. Flaccus conceded much; but this only made the men press more urgently for what they knew he would refuse them."

One may conclude that the motivations in the army of Rome were many, but most of them seem to indicate a sort of personal selfishness on the part of the soldier. One of the most common motives was greed—a desire to gain a victory rich in spoils. As stated before, self-interest is probably the strongest motivating force, and in cases like the above one might say the desire in the soldiers was for profit—personal aggrandizement. Anger is another motivating, moral emotion, evoked by moral disapproval, but sometimes it lost its moral implication when the eyes of the men in the army were on the riches to be derived from a campaign. In some instances there was an envy and resentment on the part of the soldiers because of some favor they felt others had received—jealousy.

is a strong moral emotion which leads to hostile acts in attempts to harm the other person, to destroy his prestige, to acquire his property, and to degrade him in the eyes of others. In other instances, the actual realization of their own weaknesses aroused a sense of guilt in the soldiers, and the sense of guilt would only goad them on more strongly to make demands which they knew they would not have filled. Their demands were a cover-up for their own failures, but in their demands the minds of their leaders were distracted and kept from realizing the defection of the soldiers.

Adversity is always a strong force to action. In addition to showing an understanding of mob psychology when he says a mob without a leader is always hasty, timid, and without energy, Tacitus comprehends the significance of the situation by stating that the army dropped its weapons and fled. This adversity bred discord among them and led ultimately to mutiny.

Another strongly stressed motivation is the greed of individuals for popularity and power. Flattery was a practice which seemed to be disgusting to Tacitus, and yet it was a common practice in Rome shared alike by the rulers and the
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Roman people; the former to win popularity and the latter to be "on the in", thereby hoping in some way to keep from being punished for some small misdemeanour, imaginary or real—it didn't seem to matter much.

"How far the idea was new to him is uncertain. He had for some time been courting the favour of the soldiers, either in hopes of the succession, or to pave the way for some daring attempt. During the journey from Spain, on the march or during halts, he would address the older men by name, calling them "comrades", in remembrance of their companionship on Nero's suit; recognising some, asking after others, and offering help in money or in interest. Then from time to time he would let fall hints of grievances against Galba, such as would unsettle the minds of the soldiers." These soldiers were already disgruntled because of hard marches, scanty food, and rigid discipline. Then, too, it flatters people to call them by name. The emperor Otho recognized the value of finding a common ground and

making himself one of the common herd. Money and interest in the other person often wins him over to the side of a leader. Above all, the fundamental truth here expressed is that one man had various ways of motivating the "vulgus."

Any kind of greed is an adverse motivation, morally disapproved, but greed for money is particularly rejected because of the reaction it accomplishes in relation to others. Mucianus, a man of distinguished birth and the grandson of the wealthy Crassus, was selected as an individual whose dominating drive was for more money. He kept saying "money was the sinews of civil war, and regardless of law and justice in his exactions, Mucianus looked only to the amount of a man's wealth. Everyone was informed against; every wealthy man was plundered." He seized all wealthy men;

"oppressive and intolerable methods like these might be excused by the necessities of war; but they were continued also in time of peace." Mucianus was clever; he gave freely from his own personal treasury for public expenses, but he enjoyed freedom of reimbursement from his people.
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According to Symonds, fear is an immediate response to a present danger situation. It is characterized not only by the physiological reaction and its emotional accompaniment, but also by the motor reaction of escape.

Tacitus recognizes fear as a motivation:

Titum inde Vinium invasere, de quo et ipso ambigitur consumpsertine vocem eius instans metus, an proclamaverit non esse ab Othone mandatum ut occidaretur. Quod seu finxit formidine seu conscientiam coniurationis confessus est, huc potius eius vita famaque inclinat, ut conscient sceleris fuerit cuius causa erat.

"Then Titus Vinius was attacked. About him too it is disputed whether instant terror rendered him speechless, or whether he protested that Otho had not ordered his death—a speech which may have been either an invention prompted by fear, or a confession that he was privy to the plot. The latter view—that he was an accomplice in the crime of which he had been the cause—is more in harmony with his previous life and reputation."

The last clause verifies the assumption that Tacitus also realized the possibility that knowledge of guilt and fear of discovery oftentimes lead to a deep-rooted fear. Guilt shows itself most clearly in a variety of fears more or less openly expressed. Perhaps the most basic expression

of guilt is fear.

When the troops of Vitellius, the Emperor, were finally vanquished by the Flavians, Vitellius had to look around for a means of escape. Tacitus makes a remark about Vitellius, but in remarking as he does, he generalizes on the subject of fear:

Dein mobilitate ingenii et, quae natura pavoris est, cum omnia metuenti praesentia maxime displicerent, in Palatium regreditur vastum desertumque, dilapsis etiam infimis servitorum aut occurrsum eius declinantibus. Terret solitudo et tacentes loci; temptat clausa, inhorrescit vacuis; fessusque misero errore et pudenda latebra semet occultans ab Iulio Placidus tribuno cohortis protrahitur.

"Then with his usual inconstancy of purpose, and with the natural tendency of a man who fears everything to be most disquieted by what he sees before him, he returned to the desolate and deserted Palace, where even the lowest of the menials had either slunk away or shrank from meeting him. He was terrified by the solitude and the silence; he tried closed doors, and shuddered at the emptiness. Weared at last with his wretched wandering, he concealed himself in a mean hiding-place, whence he was dragged forth by the Tribune of a cohort, Julius Placidus." It is interesting to note that here is a shunned man, thoroughly terrified by silence and emptiness--fertile grounds for fear.

28. Tac. Hist., III.34.
There is one motivation amongst these Romans that seems to exceed all others—a motivation probably derived mythologically from the old classification of loyalties in which loyalty to the state came first. This was the honorable "mori pro patria." Tacitus recognizes this in many instances, one of the notable ones being when the Praetorian Camp was being defended toward the end of the Civil War between the Flavians and Vitellians. The resistance seemed to make the victors only more eager.

Urbem senatui ac populo Romano, templas die reddita; proprium esse militis decus in castris; illum patriam, illam patriis. . . . Contra Vitellianos, quamquam numero fatigis disparas, inquietare victoriam, morari pacem, domos arasque cruxes fœdare suprema victis solacia amplectebantur. Multi semianimes super turris et propugnaculis moenium expiraverat; convulsis portis reliquus globus obtulit se victoribus, et occidere omnes contrariis vulneribus, versi in hostem; ea cura etiam mortuorum decori exitus fuit.

"They had given back to the Senate and the People of Rome their city, to the Gods their Temples; but the special pride of the soldier was his camp. That was his country, that his home; . . . . The Vitellians, on the other side, although inferior in numbers and with fate against them, made victory dear, holding out to the last, and revelled in befouling altars and hearths with blood as affording the last solace to the vanquished. Many lay half dead upon the towers or battlements of the walls and there breathed their last; the remainder, bursting open the gates, threw themselves

30. Trans. "to die for one's country."
in one body upon the victors, and perished to a man, their wounds in front, their faces to the foe, determined, even in their last moments, to die with honor." Their life was always a question of doing what was honorable—living and dying honorably—a moral sense of duty to their country.

Friendships formed a strong motivating force in the life of the Roman. Friendships with popular men led to prosperous lives as long as popularity lasted. Book IV of the Annals skilfully pictures the punishments of the many friends of Germanicus when Sejanus was in favor.

Iunio Silano et Silio Nerva consalibus foedum anni principum incessat tracto in carcerem industri æquit Romano, Titio Sabino, ob amicitiam Germanici: neque enim omiserat coniugem liberosque sius percolere, sectator domi, comes in publico, post tot clientes unus esque apud bones laudatus et gravis iniquis.

"This year had a bad beginning, Titius Sabinus, an illustrious Roman knight, being dragged off to prison for his devotion to Germanicus. For he had omitted no mark of respect towards his widow and children, visiting them in their home, and attending upon them in public; the one still faithful of all their former following."

Sejanus was in the height of his power when he was having the friends of Germanicus "liquidated." During

31. Tac. Hist., III.84,3-5.
the heyday of Sejanus, when he had a strong influence and
hold over Tiberius, the Emperor, because of his underhand
dealings with him, the friends of Sejanus were treated with
much favor, but upon the death of Sejanus one of Rome's
greatest blood purges took place. Although in one instance
Tacitus reports that "executions had whetted his appetite,"
Tiberius gave orders as follows:

Inritatusque suppliciis cunctos, qui carcer
tattinebantur accusati societatis cum Seiano, ne-
cari iubet. Iacuit immensa strages, omnis sexus,
omnis aetas, inlustres ignobiles, dispersi aut
aggerati.

"At last, excited to madness by all these executions,
Tiberius ordered that every one who was in custody on the
charge of complicity with Sejanus should be put to death.
There lay the victims, in untold number; of both sexes, of
every age, high and low, singly or huddled together." Therefore, regardless of rank or station in life, and regardless
of whether the motive of Tiberius was recognized as a whetted
appetite, friendship with Sejanus was a strong motive for
murder after Sejanus' death.

Any study of motivation in Tacitus' writings is of
necessity very incomplete. He understood motivation through
and through because he was primarily interested in what people

34. Tac. An., Ibid.
did and why they did it. We must remember, however, that it is easy for a person with any prejudice whatsoever to exaggerate the motivation of others. There is no doubt about Tacitus' prejudices, but aside from them, he did report objectively on such motives as hate, fear, love, adversity, popularity, greed, prestige drive, glory, and friendships. He thoroughly understood the causes for the actions of people and was interested in what they did as individuals in their own social environment.
CHAPTER IV

INDIVIDUAL AND RACE DIFFERENCES

Tacitus' primary interest was not in broad principles or even great achievements but was in the people responsible for them, not as humanity in general but as individual humans. His outstanding achievement was in the delineation of character through individualities which seemed to pervade the words and actions of his "personalities."

Studies in human behavior have forced scientists working in the field of psychology to conclude that, although humans are more alike than they are different, there are certain fundamental differences between them. An awareness of differences means that we recognize that there is a trait in one person which, in comparison with a similar trait in another, presents a difference. The differences with which Tacitus deals and which he seems to recognize most readily are chiefly personality. He is aware of marked differences in physical and intellectual makeups as will be pointed out in the chapter on "Leadership." But the emotional, personality differences seemed to interest him most.

The individual differences in personality, however varied their manifestations, are apparently all of them rooted in the total personality. Although they may appear especially in certain traits of character, it seems probable

that the differences are deep-seated, and the whole personality is involved.

Behavior is due in part to innate individual differences. Men, it is true, are more like one another in intellect, character, and skill than they are like dogs or horses. Individual differences in personality traits are undoubtedly conditioned to some extent by differences in physique, health, general and specific learning abilities, and the like.

With the idea of individuality of personality in mind, Tiberius, the son of Livia and later, Emperor, should be studied. His life had never been his own to live. His mother Livia, with an eye to the benefits to be derived, when Tiberius was four years old, consented to marry Octavia. Tiberius, when young, had married Vipsania, the daughter of Agrippa, best friend and right hand man of Augustus; in fact, the husband of his daughter, Julia. Tiberius and Vipsania had a son, Drusus, but he was forced by Augustus, when Vipsania was with child a second time, to divorce her and marry Augustus' daughter, Julia, whose husband, Agrippa, had died. Tiberius saw Vipsania only once after the divorce, but Suetonius says he was so deeply affected that care was taken that he would never see her

2. Ibid., p. 89
3. Ibid., pp. 92-94.
Augustus had a grandson, Germanicus, a much loved leader of the Romans, upon whom Augustus had intended to bestow the Empire, but Livia, by entreaties, persuaded him to adopt Tiberius, and in turn, made Tiberius adopt Germanicus. It is easy, therefore, to understand the fear Tiberius had for Germanicus, who commanded many legions and was the darling of the people.

Germanicus could have been a natural rival of Drusus, whom Tacitus describes as "reveling in bloodshed" and "passionate in temper to a fault and unable to endure a rival." One may conclude, however, from Tacitus that Germanicus was too loving and kind a person to indulge in personal animosities.

Tiberius followed Augustus as Emperor. In his early years Tiberius was secretive—determined in his dealings with the soldiers, full of hypocritical hesitations, hoping that he might deceive both the populace and the soldiers. He had a bent for prolonging commands and for keeping the same men in administrative districts until their dying days. Tacitus felt the motivation behind this was his affinity for treating a decision once made eternally valid,—if he could not avoid making the decision in the first place.

5. Tac. An., IV.57.4-5.
Some felt that he was selfish and did not wish to see too many men enjoying preferment. There were also those who thought his judgment was as slow and undeliberative as his intellect was shrewd. Tacitus remarks that he did not seek eminent men of virtue, and on the other hand, he detested vice. He had a fear of the best men privately, and the worst he feared because of public scandal.

In his dealings with the accused, his countenance often covered feelings that ran too deep for expression. Many times his deep feelings were covered by an excess of liberality which he displayed publicly. At other times, as at the death of Germanicus, all men knew that Tiberius was with difficulty dissembling his joy.

As long as Germanicus was alive, Tiberius did not bestow any favors upon his son, Drusus, but after Germanicus' death, he conferred the Tribunitian Power upon his son. The bestowal of this office upon an individual practically marked out the successor to an emperor. (Quite in line with Tiberius' character it is interesting to note that he did not confer the position as long as he would have had to make a decision between Germanicus and Drusus).

The praising of Sejanus: after his heroic behavior at a fire began or hurriedly impelled the change in disposi-

tion. This, in addition to the death of Drusus, probably poisoned by Sejanus, in 23 A.D., changed the government of Tiberius.

During the rise of Sejanus, we find Tiberius vacillating between mass murders and clemency. Tacitus freely states that the asperity and unusual frankness with which Tiberius took the side of the accusers in one situation was surprising. It was no hard task, however, for Sejanus to induce Tiberius to withdraw from the babble of the multitude, always suspected by the emperor, and the attacks of his malighers. During the indictment of a certain Votienus for the use of language offensive to the emperor, one of the witnesses reported in full the expressions maligning Tiberius. Tiberius was completely unnerved and kept crying out that he would refute them either on the spot or in a trial. It was a difficult task for his friends to restore his equanimity, and they resorted to adulation, a practice usually despised by Tiberius, but his listening now seemed to be a proof of his incipient degeneration.

Tiberius finally, with suggestions from Sejanus, decided to withdraw from Rome. At this time in his life Tacitus gives us a picture of his physical appearance which Tacitus seems to feel made him very self conscious and desir-

15. Tac. An., IV.42.3.
ous of excluding himself from the world. He is described as tall, round shouldered and abnormally slender figured, with a head without a trace of hair, and an ulcerous face, generally dotted with plasters or medication. Tacitus has difficulty in deciding just exactly what Tiberius' motives for withdrawal were. In one instance he states:

Causam abscessus quamquam secutus plurimos auctorum ad Seiani artes retuli, quia tamen caede eius patrata sex postea annos pari secreto coniunxit, plerumque permoveor, num ad ipsum referri verius sit, saevitiam ac libidinem cum factis promeret, locis occultantem.

"Now, although following the authority of most writers, I have asserted that his retirement was brought about by the machinations of Sejanus, yet seeing that he continued to live in equal seclusion for six years after Sejanus was put to death, I am more inclined to believe that the idea was his own: his object being to find some place in which he might carry on his cruelties and debaucheries unobserved."

Seclusion for Tiberius brought an added zest in hidden vice and flagitious leisure, according to Tacitus. For his rashness of suspicion and belief remained, and Sejanus, who even in the capital had habitually encouraged it, was

16. Tac. An., IV.57.3-4. Suetonius in "Tiberius", 68, says Tiberius was tall, broad in the chest, and well-proportioned in all his limbs; he stooped in walking, and carried his neck stiffly; he was fair, with hair long behind; his face was handsome, subject however to occasional eruptions.

17. Tac. An., IV.57.2.
now more actively unsettling his mind.

Undoubtedly Tiberius' was a sensitive nature, and the influence of a forced divorce upon a genuine love left its mark upon him. He had retired to Rhodes after his marriage to Julia "whose irregularities he had to tolerate or elude," 19 Although Tacitus says he retired there to brood over his resentments or to practice hypocrisy and debauchery, 20 Suetonius states that he lived there a quiet, inoffensive life and was studious and kindly, humbly avoiding any occasion of offending. Suetonius does not verify the report of Tacitus on Tiberius' exile at Rhodes, whereas he does verify his report on Capri. Therefore, one may conclude that whatever the true circumstances, his retreat was the result of friction between himself and Augustus, and that this conflict left permanent traces for evil upon the proud and sensitive, yet vengeful, because of resentment, nature of Tiberius. Psychologically, Tiberius may be said to have been forced throughout his lifetime, through his second marriage and his having to put aside his own living son for Germanicus, after Drusus' death, to reveal to the world a sort of selfish, self-love complex. Self-love, or narcissism, is notoriously selfishness. The narcissistic person is self-absorbed. He is proud and vain. These feelings become

19. Tac. An., VI.51.3.
the symbols of his strength, but they are only the shell to cover the emptiness within. Self-admiration may be directed toward the body, or a person may admire his moral virtues and feel proud that he is law-abiding, continent, temperate, and clean. A man may admire his sexual potency and virility. There is the implication made by Tacitus that this was one of Tiberius' pitfalls, but it is ludicrous to assume that a man who lived the continent life Tiberius did for his first seventy years would suddenly change to the lascivious lustful Tiberius at Capri.

Another form of narcissistic expression may be in the tendency to domineer, to demonstrate power, or in the wish to aggrandize oneself by controlling others and bending them to one's will. In this way one demonstrates that he is a strong man and thereby adds to his own self-feeling. He may place demands on others for attention, praise, honor, compassion, or gratitude. He needs praise and admiration from others whether he deserves it or not and frequently hopes to be admired for qualities which do not exist or to be praised for achievements which are not worthy of commendation. As a result of his selfishness, really insecure personally, he is greedy in his demands on others. He may be importunate in his demands for advice or for help in difficulties. Tacitus points out Tiberius' growing reliance on Sejanus.

The narcissistic person is sensitive to neglect, to
belittlement, and to criticism. He worries lest his personal qualities fail to meet his standards of excellence. He is more than ordinarily concerned with his appearance. Tacitus explicitly states that Tiberius was especially sensitive to his appearance and may have withdrawn from Rome for that reason, or that he may have left for reasons mentioned above.

Tiberius was a domineering person. As orator of the "delatores," he forced Rome into more crime, shameful bribery and fear than she had ever known before. The more he became conscious of his crimes, the more he turned his affairs over and relied upon his minister Sejanus, and the more he began to listen to the praise from others. Tacitus praises his unconcern and dislike of sycophancy as a young man, but as he grew older, he craved it. There is little doubt that Tiberius was narcissistic, but it seems apparent that his narcissism was forced on him from the outside—a result of many frustrating circumstances. Tacitus knew there was something wrong with Tiberius, but he did not know the name for it. Modern psychology has named it narcissism.

Another individual, emperor, who is eminent because of certain individual differences, was Claudius—

... animo simul et corpore hebetato.

23. Tac. Ann., IV. 42.2.
Physically, Claudius was unattractive, but he was an easy person to get along with. He was usually, in fact, Tacitus would say always, clement in his dealings with others, especially his wife, Messalina—as well as always being a victim of her charms. Tacitus is forced to admit that Claudius' blindness as far as Messalina was concerned was finally ended, and he was driven to avenge the excesses of his wife. It is characteristic of the weakness of Claudius that he entrusted all the action in the accusation of Messalina to his freedman and chief secretary, Narcissus. His whole government, in truth, was marked by the power or ascendancy he gave freedmen, and the indiscipline, the incapacity, and corruption which pervaded the Empire. Mithradates, who had been encouraged by Claudius to resume the throne of Armenia, is betrayed by the Roman force assigned to him for protection and is allowed to perish. Quadratus, the Legate of Syria, listens to the basest advice rather than take one bold step against a murderer and usurper, Radamistus. Pelignus, the Procurator of Cappadocia, sells himself to Radamistus. Claudius was too feeble to do anything about the turmoil in his own Empire. Despite his weaknesses, Tacitus treats him kindly probably because of his innate physical and mental

There are other kinds of individual differences recognized in Tacitus. The two consuls Trio and Regulus are compared. The former:

"... facilis capessendis inimicitiis et foro exercitus..."

"... who was of an aggressive temper, and versed in the ways of the law-courts." The latter:

"... ille, nisi lacesseretur, modestiae retinens, non modo rettulit collegam, sed ut noxium coniurationis ad disquisitionem trahebat.

"... who, except under provocation, was a man of peace, not only repudiated the charge, but proposed to bring his colleague to trial for having himself taken part in the conspiracy."

The character of Gaius Caesar is one of interest. He had a monstrous character (immanem animum) which was masked with a hypocritical modesty. He seemed to be somewhat of a chameleon as he always matched the mood of Tiberius. Whatever mood Tiberius assumed for the day, his grandson assumed the corresponding attitude and suited his words to the temper of the Emperor. A later epigrammatist Passianus said of Gaius Caesar that "The world never knew a better slave, nor a worse master."

27. Tac. An., V, 11.
Every leader in Tacitus' writings possesses outstanding differences which set him aside from other men, but that is the study of "leadership."

Closely allied to individual differences are race differences. The Woodworth Psychoneurotic Inventory has found distinct race differences. Investigators, however, incline to the opinion that these differences, instead of indicating fundamental trends in racial constitution, are really an expression of varying mores, (customs), and habits of thought and action. In any well-defined "race" or general stock, there are, in spite of the diversities, certain general characteristics which are different from the corresponding characteristics of other stocks. Racial differences in stature, body form, color of skin, eyes and hair, shape of the skull, texture of the hair, and other structural details are obvious and are very little affected by the environment, some of them practically not at all. Differences in resistance to specific disease and to heat and cold are also marked. That there are characteristic national traits--mean differences from other nations--is indisputable. Tacitus acknowledged little peculiarities of different races. He apparently knew the Greeks quite well when he stated:

.. . . promptis Graecorum animis ad nova et mìra.
"... the love of the Greek mind for all that is strange and marvellous."

It was this avidity for the new that made the Greeks pioneers in all the arts and sciences. In another place he reported:

... desidiam licentiamque Graecorum retinebant.
"... it remained Greek in indolence and licence."

Again and again, the barbarians are classified as some particular kind.

Et barbaris cunctatic servilis, statim exsequi regium videtur.

"Barbaric sentiment brands delay as slavish, and expects instant action from a king."

... barbarorum impetus aures cunctatione languescere aut in perfidiam mutari.
"... even though the enthusiasm of barbarians is lively, delay chills it or changes it into treachery."

The Parthians are characterized as tolerant of princes when absent and fickle to them when present. The Seleucians are represented as great flatterers. They, unlike many foreign groups to Tacitus, had not degenerated into barbarism. Indi-

32. Tac. Hist., III.47.
33. Tac. An., VI.32.3.
34. Tac. An., XII.12.4.
35. Tac. An., VI.36.5.
vidual differences seemed great to them.

"It has a Senate of three hundred citizens, selected for their wisdom or their wealth; and the people have 36 powers of their own." Although the wealth is a rather superficial difference, it may be based upon the ability of some to acquire it. Of course, Tacitus is taking advantage of an opportunity here to satirize the Roman Senate, too. In another instance, he is satirizing Rome by comparison:

"... nam populi imperium iuxta libertatem paucorum dominatio regiae libidini proprior est.

"... for whereas popular rule is closely allied to liberty, domination by the few is near akin to kingly absolutism." Where there is liberty and freedom in a country, there will be greater recognition of individual differences, but where there is absolutism, little recognition of individual differences. This sentence above arose from the many quarrels the Seleucians had with the Parthians, and in one of the last altercations, Artabanus, the king, had sacrificed the populace to the aristocrats, a procedure felt by Tacitus to exist in Rome.

This statement is made of the Arabs:

\[\ldots\ldots\text{ mox Acbarus Arabum cum exercitu abscedunt, levitate gentili, et quia experimentis cognitum}\]

36. Tac. An., VI.42.1.
37. Tac. An., Ibid.,3.
est barbaros malle Roma petere reges quam habere.

..., soon Abararsh, King of the Arabian, deserted
with his following; partly from the natural fickleness of
their race, partly because experience had taught them that
the Parthians were more inclined to fetch their kings from
Rome than to keep them when they came. " The Arabs were
on the side of the Parthians who had brought Meherdates,
one of their own Roman trained princes, back to their own
land to fight the tyranny of a certain intolerable Gotarzes,
who finally, insidiously, corrupted the fidelity of the
various forces fighting him. Tacitus thought that the
fickleness of the Arabs was innate and that they would have
deserted anyway, but that is probably a question open to debate.

The problem of the Jews has always been an interesting,
argumentative one. The Jews were granted much of what remains
to us of the fifth book of the Histories. From the viewpoint
of the Christian and the conflict that then raged and always
has raged between the Jews and gentiles or other groups,
Chapter V is particularly informative.

Hi ritus quoque modo inducti antiquitate defenduntur;
cetera instituta, sinistra foeda, praeitate valu-
ere. Nam possimus quisque aetate religionibus
patris tributa et stipes illuc congerent, unde
auctae Iudaeorum res, et quia apud ipsos fides
obstatuta, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus
omnis alios hostile odium, separati epulis, dis-
creti cubilibus, proiectissima ad libidinem gens,


"These rites, whatever their origin may have been, are excused by their antiquity; but their other practices, which are unclean and revolting, have been adopted out of sheer depravity. Their wealth has been built up out of tribute and contributions from the vilest of mankind, who have renounced the religion of their own country. Compassionate and unflinchingly loyal to each other, they hate all other men with a deadly hatred. They take their meals apart; they sleep apart; and though as a race they are prone to lust, and deem nothing among themselves unlawful, they have no intercourse with foreign women.

They practise circumcision to have a distinguishing mark from other nations. Their proselytes adopt the same
practice; and indeed the first lesson which they learn is to despise the gods, to abjure their country, and to esteem parents, children, brothers, as of no account. Yet the Jews take thought for the increase of the race; they deem it wicked to slay any additional infants born to them. The souls of those who have perished in battle or by torture they hold to be immortal; hence their passion for raising offspring, and their contempt of death.

"They follow the Egyptian custom of burying their dead, in preference to that of burning them: their beliefs also as to the world below are the same as those of the Egyptians, though not as to things in heaven. The Egyptians worship many animals, some with composite forms: the Jews worship with the mind alone. They believe in only one God—a God supreme and everlasting, who may not be portrayed, and who will never die; and they deem it impious, out of mortal matter, to fashion effigies of Gods after the likeness of men. No images therefore are permitted in their cities, much less in their Temples; they bestow no such flattering distinction upon either Kings or Caesars.

"There are some who have thought that because their priests sing to the accompaniment of flutes and cymbals, wearing chaplets of ivy, and because a golden vine was found within the Temple, the God whom they worship must be Father
Liber, the conqueror of the East. But there is no resemblance between the rites of the two religions. Those ordained by Liber are festive and joyous; those of the Jews have neither charm nor dignity." The main differences, as Tacitus saw them, therefore, between the Romans and Jews hinged upon the religions, but Tacitus seemed to feel that the Jews were just "different."

This is a cursory review of individual differences and race or nationality differences as found in Tacitus. The point is that Tacitus was looking at each individual like Tiberius and Claudius as having something that set him apart from others. Of course, there was a true physical weakness and mental incapacity behind his evaluation of Claudius, but it seems that Tiberius developed his differences as a result of the life that was forced upon him. Race differences should be viewed from the angle that most of such differences are based upon custom, but Tacitus seemed to look at them from the viewpoint of a Roman, and tried to find differences on that basis. However, Tacitus recognized differences, and made use of them in his delineation of individuals and peoples.
CHAPTER V

LEADERSHIP

Closely interwoven with individual differences is leadership. It is the ability to lead which segregates an individual from the common run, but Tacitus made such a point of certain characteristics to be found in leaders that this subject deserves special attention.

Too often men with wealth and without ability, men with "pull," men who promise much and give little, men who gain positions of responsibility only because they have a pleasing appearance get into control. This is one reason why there is so much social unrest. At times the Romans found themselves with a physically attractive, eloquent leader who was not at all the man they thought he would be. The man who is physically outstanding presents the appearance of having strength, vigor, force, power—all in his favor when it comes to dominating a social situation.

The monarch or dictator, upon whom prestige is bestowed by any means, is expected by all to act the part of a national hero.

The trait of ascendance is of paramount importance in leaders. Ascendance of manner is usually combined with physical power. Tallness of stature, although not

always necessary, is an advantage to leaders. It is true, however, that many leaders have been small or frail men. Lack of physical size is sometimes a direct basis for the development of compensatory traits of great energy and endurance. Other traits valuable to leaders are high motility, tonus shown in gesture and ring of the voice, erect, aggressive carriage, tenacity, face-to-face mode of address, and the reinforcement of energy flowing from a fairly high emotional level. Feeling and outward action are, however, under perfect control; they are governed by a certain restraint which gives the impression of an unlimited reserve of power behind them. Physique seems to play a dominant role in the qualities of leadership. Then, too, in order to lead, it is necessary to "hold back."

This principle of leadership refers to holding the feelings and emotions under control and to the conserving of energy. Uncontrolled impulses, feelings, and emotions produce excesses, blinded judgment, and lowered status. To hold emotions in check not only gives great reserve power but also creates inscrutability. Not to disclose one's feelings is often disarming and gives personality a quality which can neither be plumbed nor fathomed.

Inhibition is a holding back of energy. It keeps a person from becoming over-aggressive. Inhibition con-

---

tributes to leadership by holding the egoistic tendencies in check. It conserves personal energies in order that they may be used effectively in crises. Leaders usually secure their power through suggestion and crowd control, rather than through reason.

Tacitus seemed to realize that certain characteristics set leaders aside from others. In speaking of a monarch of the Thracians, he says:

... neque exuerat pædorem, ut vulgum miserations adverteret. Non fraud, non preces, nihil omissum, quo ambiguos illiceret prompti firmarentur.

"... even his person he left unkempt as it was, to attract the compassion of the multitude. Nothing that trickery or entreaty could do was left untried to allure waverers or confirm supporters." Hiero, the leader in this case, understood his people, and there is quite an exchange of understanding when he assumes his pose to win their sympathies.

Corbulo was another general who realized he had to put himself on a common ground with his men. He did not accomplish this, however, by going unkempt. He was fighting the Iberians, and although the men had sustained

5. Allport, op. cit., p. 421.
6. Tac. An., VI.44.2-3.
no casualties in battle, they were beginning to feel the strain of "K" rations and hardship. In fact, theirs was a flesh diet whereas the legions' customary diet was grain. Moreover, there was a shortage of water, a blazing hot sun, and long marches. Tacitus says the only mitigating circumstance was

... patientia duois, eadem pluraque gregario milite tolerantis.

"... the patience and endurance of the General, who bore all that the common soldiers bore, and more besides." Nobody regarded the name of Corbulo with bitterness or rancour.

Non infensum nec cum hostili odio Corbulonis nomen etiam barbaris habebatur, eoque consilium eius fidum credebant.

"Now the barbarians had no angry or hostile feeling against Corbulo, and for that reason trusted his advice."

Nobility of lineage was another factor which prompted certain choices in leadership. Gaius Cassius was outstanding because of a hereditary fortune and austere character. It was these two traits that led to his persecution by Nero. Silanus, a friend of Cassius, was on Nero's black list because:

Silanus claritudine generis et modesta iuventa praecellebat.

"Silanus was distinguished for his noble blood and well-ordered youth." Silanus had also brought Nero's wrath upon his head by honoring a bust of Gaius Cassius with the inscription: *Duci partium*—"To the leader of factions." That sounded like revolt to Nero; so it was just the impelling motive Nero needed to attack both Cassius and Silanus, a youth who, aside from his noble lineage, really had a temper to match revolution.

A certain Asiaticus is mentioned who had proved himself a leader in the assassination of Gaius Caesar. He had not hesitated to avow his complicity to the Roman people. Consequently fame in Rome was his and he was chosen as a leader to foment trouble in Germany.

"... quando genitus Viennae multisque et validis propinquitatibus subnixus turbare gentiles nationes promptum haberet.

"... Born at Vienna, and having the support of many powerful connections there, he had it in his power to bring about a rising among his own tribesmen." Therefore his lineage was to be used as a foundation from which he could identify himself with his people. Although he was Roman-trained, his lineage would lend him influence among his own people. Many times youths had been trained in Rome and had gone back to their own countries to rule.

Usually a leader of this type was not received with favor unless he had been thoroughly versed in the customs of his own people. If he could indulge in their sports, banquets and lascivious pastimes, he was received.

Eloquence was another desirable trait in Roman leaders. A man distinguished because he was both a great official and an eloquent orator. His celebrity was due to his practice as a pleader. Many men during the first century acquired their claim to leadership through their ability to plead cases.

The power of eloquence to sway the mob is depicted in Germanicus' speech to a group of soldiers ready to mutiny.

Non mihi uxor aut filius patre et republica cariores sunt, sed illum quidem sua maestas, imperium Romanum oeteri exercitus defendent. Coniugem et liberos meos, quos pro gloria vestra libens ad exitium offerrem, nunc procul a fur- entibus suamoveo, ut quidquid istud sceleris imminet, meo tantum sanguine pietur, neve occisus Augusti pronepos, interfecta Tiberii murus no- centiores vos faciant.

"Neither wife nor son are dearer to me than my father and my country; but my father is safe in his Imperial Majesty, and the other armies of Rome will protect the Empire. My wife and children, whom I would freely offer
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up to death for your glory, I am now removing from your rage; that whatever crime you may yet be meditating may be wiped out by my blood alone, and that you may not add to your guilt by the slaughter of the great-grandson of Augustus, the murder of the daughter-in-law of Tiberius." Germanicus could speak and knew just what subjects would touch the hearts of the soldiers. He soon had them groveling to him.

Supplices ad haec et vera exprobrari fatentes, orabant puniret noxios, ignosceret lapsis et duceret in hostem.

"This speech turned the soldiers into suppliants. Humbly acknowledging the justice of these reproaches, they implored him to punish the guilty, to forgive those who had been led astray, and to lead them out against the enemy." Germanicus well knew his power over the soldiers—not only a certain lovable quality but also an eloquent rhetorical ability to sway them.

One of the most important determinants of leadership was the physical attributes of the leader. Many times mental and emotional attributes were affixed to an individual because of his physical characteristics, or Tacitus' particular dislike of deformities. One such was Claudius.

Tacitus ascribes to him the characteristics of
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inminuta mens, "mental imbecility," when the successor
to Tiberius was under consideration. Then troubles arose
with the Iberians, he was characterized as an ignavo prin-
cipi, "feeble emperor,"—probably mentally, again. Another
"weakness" of Claudius might be considered his emotionality
as far as his wife was concerned. Often Tacitus mentions
Claudius' ignorance of his own matrimonial fortune and
leads us to believe it is his low mentality which makes him
so blind. His blindness to Messalina's profligacy is
attributed to his debility and his bondage to his wife—
hebetem Claudium et uxoris devinctum. He is represented
as a lenient, clement individual, thoroughly in love and
satisfied with one wife, but quick to wrath as far as she
was concerned. The emotionality of Claudius when he was
finally convinced of his wife's unfaithfulness and treachery
is conveyed by his bewildering terror which prompted his
repeated inquiries as to whether he was really emperor and
whether Silius, his wife's paramour, was really a private
citizen. The weakness of Claudius is feared by his helpers,
particularly his freedman Narcissus, in convicting Messalina.
They feel that as soon as she appeals to his emotions as
the mother of his son and daughter, he will weaken, unless

they keep her debaucheries in front of him all the time. He, at one time, weakened by wine and full of good food, was on the point of giving in and, as Tacitus said, even went so far as to say, "poor woman"—misereae.

Then, too, there is the expression of the feeling of Tacitus that Claudius was too docile to his wife and too impatient of living alone after she was gone. Despite the fact that Tacitus doesn't fail to mention what he feels are the weaknesses of Claudius as a leader and ruler, the reader may assume that Tacitus really felt he had genuine qualities of leadership and actually admired him. His admiration may have been based upon a pity for his weaknesses, but at least he dealt kindly with him.

quippe fama, spe, veneracione potius omnes destinabantur imperio quam quem futurum principem fortuna in occulto tenebat.

"For the very last man that rumour, expectation, and public esteem were then marking out for sovereignty, was the man whom Fortune was keeping in reserve as future Emperor." There is the feeling here that Tacitus was enjoying a little trick he thought "Fortune" was playing on the Romans, especially the relatives of Claudius.

Hence, it appears that the physical qualifications

Claudius did not designate him as a leader. But his panegyric by Nero was one concerning the antiquity of Claudius' family, the triumphs of his ancestors, and how seriously he was taken by himself and others. His literary attainments and his reign free of foreign reverses were praised. Not until Nero mentioned his foresight and wisdom did the audience have difficulty in suppressing smiles.

There was another deformed person who stood out as a leader of gladiatorial spectacles. He was considered one of the foulest of his district. He was an alumnus of a shoemaker's shop, with a distorted body and scurrilous wit. From the first he was assumed as a mark for buffoonery; then when he taunted the most decent of men, he became the most influential, wealthy, and harmful of villains. From this description we know that Vatinius was not considered a fit leader, but he had managed through chicanery to elevate himself to a leader in gladiatorial contests.

There was also the only surviving grandson of Augustus, Agrippa Postumus, who should have been in line for the principate in Rome upon the death of his grandfather, had he not been an uncultured youth with nothing but brute bodily force to recommend him. Augustus had adopted him on the same day as Tiberius; then he disinherited Agrippa
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because he was savage, and finally as he became no more manageable, he sent him into seclusion at Surrentum. His was the first murder in the reign of Tiberius. Tiberius blamed Augustus, but Tacitus blamed Tiberius and his mother Livie.

Moreover, Julius Paelignus, a procurator of Cappadocia, was doubly rejected because of deformities and contemptible character. Of course, comeliness and physical strength would lead people to choose certain men as leaders just as the characteristics of the men mentioned above would tend toward their rejection. There were leaders in Tacitus who were definite contrasts to Claudius, Agrippa, and Paelignus.

Erat Pharaesanis filius nomine Radamistus, decorum proceritate, vi corporis insignis et patris artes edoctus, claraque inter accolas fama.

"Now Pharaesanis had a son called Radamistus, a tall and handsome youth of great bodily strength, well versed in the arts of his country, and bearing a high name among his neighbours." He had "everything."

Segestes was another outstanding leader. He had done much fighting against the Germans, and Tacitus remarks of him, "There was Segestes himself, a man of imposing mien, undismayed in the consciousness that he had been true to Rome." This, despite the fact that Segestes was a German himself.
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Nero, before Claudius' death, is spoken of as:

... nunc iuvens nobilis dignitate formae, 
vi mentis ac propinquus consulari maiorem ad 
spem accingi; ... .

"... there was a noble, handsome, and capable youth, with the Consulship before him, girding himself for a still higher destiny." Not only physical manliness but mentality to match was his. He was truly a future leader for the paramour of his mother, Messalina, to fear. Nero disappointed his people, however, because they did not feel that the aesthetic abilities of emperors should be so highly developed as his. Before Nero turned so persistently to song, he made the statement:

Concertare equis regium et antiquis ducibus 
factitatum memorabant, idque vatum laudibus 
celebre et deorum honoribus datum.

"Chariot-racing had been an ancient diversion for kings and generals; it had been extolled by poets, and practised in honour of the Gods." He was trying to establish a firm foundation for his greater indulgence in stage performances which he knew he was going to promote. The reaction

of the Romans to Nero's behavior is aptly expressed.

Postremo flexus genu et coetum illum manu veneratus sententias ludicum apperiestur ficto pavor. Et pleb quidem urbis, histrionum quoque gestus iuare solita, personatab certis modis plauoque composito. Credores laetari, ac fortasse laestabatur per incuriam publici flagitii.

"Last of all, on bended knee, and with a gesture of deference to the assembly, he awaited with assumed diffidence the verdict of the judges. The city mob, accustomed to cheer the performances of actors, greeted him with rounds of measured and modulated applause. You would have thought that they were delighted; and, as they cared nothing for the public scandal, perhaps they were." Nero, however, with many promises of good qualities for leadership didn't seem to mature in them.

The energy of leaders is often the subject of a remark. For instance, a certain Petronius, an author and authority on matters of taste in Nero's inner circle, had displayed vigor as a consul.

"... et mox consul vigenter se ac parem negotiis ostendit.

"... and afterwards as Consul, he proved himself a man of vigour, and one capable of affairs." In his later life he passed his day in sleep, his night in social duties. Yet, he possessed enough vigour to "dally" himself

Another, Curtius Rufus, who was apparently a self-made man who had pulled himself up by his bootstraps from a son of a gladiator to the position of consul, after he had received a vision:

. . . largitione amicorum, simul acris ingenio quae stiriam et max nobilis inter candidatos praetoriam principis suffragio adsequitur, cum hisce verbis Tiberius dedecus natalium eius velavisse: "Curtius Rufus videtur mini ex se natus," Longa post haec senecta, et adversus superiores tristi adulatione, acrogans minoribus, inter pares difficulis, consulare imperium, triumpfi insignia ac postremo Africam obtinuit;

". . . through his own talents, and by help in money from his friends, he gained the quaestorship, and after that the Praetorship. That office he obtained, among noble competitors, on the recommendation of the Emperor Tiberius, who screened his low origin by the remark:—"Curtius Rufus seems to me to have been his own father.' Servile, and yet surly, to his superiors, insolent to his inferiors, ill-tempered towards his equals, he lived to a great age, gaining the Consulship, the triumphal ornaments, and last of all, the province of Africa," Thus his acris ingenio, "energetic spirit," prodded him to leadership.

As before Claudius', so before Nero's death, surmises were begun as to Nero's successor. The name most often suggested was Rubellius Plautus, who was a noble of the

Julian house on his mother's side. He was severe in appearance, had led a clean, secluded private life, and had kept a retirement because of fear over former attempts at revolution. All had brought him fame. Then, too, his father had been a knight from Tibur. All these, coupled with an omen that happened to Nero near Tibur, influenced the public to choose Plautus as a leader. This did not please Nero, so he exiled him, and later on plotted and effected his death. An interesting side light grows out of situations like the above. Tacitus states that Plautus found many supporters among those men who have the eager and deceitful ambition to be the first parasites of a new and wobbly power. This implies a deep understanding of human nature.

The average human being craves recognition, distinction, success, power, leadership, wealth, and influence. He wants to be on top instead of being the underdog. In every walk of life there are struggles going on for standing in one's group, i. e., for prestige. Tacitus was well aware of this motivation. The instant an individual with a reasonable amount of leadership ability was proposed for an office, by sycophancy and applause a long list of parasites quickly began to fall into line behind him. An excellent example
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of such sycophancy is found in the Roman people after the murder of Agrippina, wife of Germanicus.

Nero still kept dallying among the towns of Campania. He was uneasy about his entrance into the city:—Would the Senate be obsequious? would he be welcomed by the people? But his advisers of the baser sort—and what Court ever so abounded in that tribe?—assured him that the people hated the name of Agrippina, and that their love for him had been quickened by her death; craving permission to precede him, they urged him to go boldly in, and present himself for public veneration. All turned out even more favourably than had been promised. The tribes poured out to meet him; the Senate appeared in festal attire; there were crowds of women and children, arranged according to age and sex; tiers of seats were erected along his route, as for a triumphal show. Elated by this conquest over the servile city, Nero
proceeded to the Capitol, presented his thanks, and then plunged into all the excesses which his regard for his mother, bad as she was, had hitherto in some sort held in check."

Tacitus makes it quite apparent that the court was a mob of reprobates—the largest court of reprobates the world had ever seen. These "deterissimi" convinced Nero that Agrippina was hated and, as he went, the adulation was far more than he had expected. The phrase of particular interest is publici servitii victor—"victor over the national servility." It is little phrases like that with which Tacitus emphasizes the dependence of the Roman "mob."

When he mentions the amusements to which these same people were invited, the most important feature of their actions is their laudibus extollere, "to extol by praises."

Another peculiarity of the "common run" of people is subtly and facetiously portrayed when Piso and Antonia were plotting the murder of Nero:

Sed mirum quam inter diversi generis ordinis, aetatis sexus, ditis pauperes taciturnitate omnia cohita sint . . .

"How perfectly the secret was kept among persons of different birth, rank, age and sex, rich and poor alike, was a marvel; . . . ." News is quick to be noised abroad when

men share a secret, and it was a surprise to Tacitus that the Roman people were able to keep the planned murder a secret.

At the time when Agrippina was returning home after the death of Germanicus, Tacitus presents a vivid picture of the reaction of the crowd to her arrival.

> Interim, adventu eius audito, intimus quisque amicorum et plerique militares, ut quique sub Germanico stipendia fecerant, multique etiam innoti vicinis et municipiis, pars officium in principem rati, plures illos secuti, ruere ad oppidum Brundisium, quod naviganti celerrimum fidissimumque adpulsi erat.

"During this interval, at the news of her approach, there was a rush of her intimate friends to Brundisium, which was the nearest and safest port at which to land. Among the number were many officers who had served in various positions under Germanicus; many even who had never known him flocked in from the neighbouring towns, some as a matter of duty to the Emperor, some merely doing as others did."

The mourning, for the most part, however, was sincere. Tacitus recognizes the sincerity of the *idem omnium gemitus*—

"one cry of grief from the entire multitude."

Contrasted with the grief over the death of Germanicus was the clamor demanding the death of Otho. In this

---
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the fickleness of a mob is clearly portrayed. On this same day, Tacitus leads us to believe, this mob, in whose demands there was neither sense nor honesty, would have clamored for the opposite with equal vigor. Many a time a leader has lost his power with startling suddenness. He no longer represents his people, and they cast him aside. The usual formula in speaking of this is a reference to the fickleness of the mob. But, since personality is the subjective aspect of culture and since every leader is the expression of the life and thought of his people, he is ever dependent on the masses and cannot hope to be followed when he presents that which they do not desire. As usual, flattery of the emperor, whoever he might be, was the motto, with freedom of shouts and senseless zeal.

At another time the procurator of Corsica was trying to organize the Corsicans under Vitellius to fight the despised Otho. Tacitus remarks that the people would have been an assistance of no value anyway. When the procurator met some opposition, he ordered the opponents killed. The immediate reaction was terror to the witnesses and along with them:

... simul ignara et alieni metus socia imperatorum turba in verba vitellii iuravere.

---

"... the ignorant populace, ever ready to share the fear of others swore allegiance to Vitellius," Therefore, the people were frightened into following the leader, but the implication is that the reason was the fact that they were ignorant.

The various characterizations in this same story are interesting. Some accepted Vitellius because long peace had broken their spirit, and they were ready for every kind of servitude, an easy prey to the first comers and careless as to who were the better leaders to follow.

In other instances, the mob is called the stolidum vulgus, "the stupid rabble;" vulgus credulum, "credulous commoners," vulgus tamen vacuum curis et sine falsi veri-que discrimine, solitas adulationes edoctum clamore et vocibus adstrepebat, "the careless and unable to distinguish between truth and lies rabble," studiis vulgus, "enthusiastic,"

Probably more than any other adverse characteristic, the fickleness of the mob—their fawning spirits so readily changed to base cowardice—was stressed in the *Annals* and
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the *Histories*.

As far as mob psychology is concerned, it is the leadership involved that is important. The people are brought together by a common interest preparing them for a certain type of action. The harangue of the leader, or similar stimulus common to all, increases this preparation to the point of breaking forth. When action and emotion are under way, the sights and sounds of others' reactions facilitate and increase further the responses of each individual. Fear is one of the chief motivating forces in the mob. Fear develops aggression. The mob members do not demand a victim merely in order to shed blood, but to restore their thwarted responses to their normal operation. The individual in the crowd behaves just as he would behave alone, only more so. Mob members are susceptible in the hands of the leader; but the suggestion must always be in the direction of some compelling response of the individuals. The common notion of the fickleness of mobs must be better understood. In the mob the individual assumes an attitude of the most complete submission and conformity, but easily shifting.

Tacitus seems to have been aware of these concepts of mob psychology, and although he does seem to stress the fickleness of the Roman mob, he brings out the fact that

at times if the stimulus were sufficient and worthy, the Roman mob was sincere. Of course, the sincerity depended upon whether the leader involved in their stimulus was a respected individual. Germanicus was always sufficient stimulus to arouse sincere responses.

"Amid talk like this, came news of the death; which so moved the populace that before the magistrates could issue an edict, or the Senate a decree, all business was suspended, the Courts were deserted, and private houses closed. Everywhere silence, broken only by lamentations; there was no parade of grief, no show; and although men did not fail to exhibit all the outward marks of mourning, the sorrow in their hearts was deeper still.

\* It chanced that some traders who had left Syria when

49. *Tec. An.,* II.82.1-2, *i.e.,* news of Germanicus' illness, plots against him by Piso, meetings of Plancina with Livia, the faithfulness of Germanicus to the Roman people.
Germanicus was still alive brought better news of his condition. This was at once believed, and spread abroad; catching up the good tidings on the slenderest hearsay, men passed them on to every one they met, and these again to many more, in an extravagance of joy. They ran through the city and burst open the doors of temples: night fostered men's credulity, and darkness gave fresh confidence to assertion. Tiberius did nothing to contradict the false report, leaving it to die away through time. And then the people grieved all the more, as though Germanicus had been taken from them a second time. "There was no fickleness in the sorrow felt here because of the death of Germanicus. This is the usual suggestible mob, however—probably the more suggestible because the news brought to them by the traders was what they wanted to hear. Young states that hearing a remark from two or three distinct sources, or hearing it with the added suggestion that "They are saying it", generally produces in the listener an impression that the statement is being universally accepted and widely discussed.

Though heard only as a rumor, it is believed and passed on to another as a fact. It is not, however, communicated with accuracy. Faulty assimilation, as in conversation
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through the habits of the transmitter, personal repressions given escape through magnifying unconventional details, and effort to create a sensation—these are some of the factors which account for the distortion of rumor during its spread. When emotions are at a high pitch, the tendency is to hear what one wants to hear and to pass it on in its modified fashion. Hence, the suggestibility of this Roman mob founded upon sincere grief and mourning for Germanicus.

Leadership was an important phase of living in first century Rome. It is closely allied to individual differences since the traits that make a man stand out from the "common run" are often what make him a leader. Tacitus was aware of the presence of leadership qualities in some and the absence of these same qualities in others who, despite their incapacities, became leaders. He gave credit to the Roman public, when credit was due, for their choice of good leaders like Germanicus, but he also recognized their fickleness and suggestibility to varying stimuli. We know that leaders are important to any nation, and we might conclude that the manner of choice of leaders and the resulting leader had much to do with the princes Tacitus found so unsatisfactory.

52. Young, op. cit., p. 395.
It is commonly thought that men are more aggressive than women and that this is a constitutional difference between the two sexes. But opinion, however, today holds that there is no constitutional difference between the two sexes in this regard, and that apparent differences are due to cultural influences. The younger the child the more similar boys are to girls in this matter of aggressiveness. However, at a very early age parents begin to train girls to different standards from boys. Girls are expected to be less boisterous than boys, and little girls are not expected to fight or use physical violence. Although these more direct methods of showing aggressiveness are denied girls through their training, they learn subtle substitutes and acquire methods of gaining their ends and overcoming rivals by persuasion and employment of their charms. Aggressive impulses in girls are early subject to both external and internal repression and inhibition. It is this inhibition of aggression which gives woman her characteristic femininity. Terman and Miles have made an intensive study of masculinity-femininity in which they recognize also the possibility of biochemistry as a basis for temperamental

sex differences. Their conclusion is:

"At present no one knows whether the M-F deviant is primarily a problem for the neurologist, biochemist, and endocrinologist or for the parent and educator. The final answer cannot be obtained until both endocrinology and psychometrics have advanced beyond their present stage. . . . It should be emphasized, however, that failure to find the sought-for correlates can never be taken as conclusive proof that they do not exist." 2

It is evident, therefore, that the "nature-nurture" problem would occupy a central position in any theory of sex temperament were there more facts to back up the "hunch" that now exists.

There is, however, deeply ingrained in woman the idea of inferiority resultant from childhood experiences in which boys seem to hold the preferred position in a family. Many times the role of the mother in the family convinces the girl that hers, too, is an insignificant role. As a result of her feeling that success, importance, greatness and power fall to man alone, and that her place is in the background, she develops a deep rooted sense of inferiority, and the "masculine protest" arises in her. This means that she revolts against her position, and from this revolt arise feminine aggressive tendencies.

Before a discussion of the different women who seem to have had a profound influence upon the Empire, there are

some modern theories of personality which tend to indicate that there are some sex differences in personality. It is rightly said that women are more personally emotional in their interests than men. Here, in fact, as far as modern studies are concerned, lie the only known significant psychological differences of sex. These differences are more probably due to early influences and the pressure of a man-made double standard of morals than to innate factors. From the start the girl is denied opportunities for development which are held open to the boy. Human feeling rather than natural law becomes her guiding principle of life. The fruits of inhibition, conflict, and overshielding are seen in the mature woman.

When sex differences are subjected to actual measurement, they are discovered to be far fewer than is commonly believed. Terman and Miles, however, still maintain that the sexes differ fundamentally in their instinctive and emotional equipment and in their sentiments, interests, attitudes, and modes of behavior. In modern Occidental cultures, the typical woman is believed to differ from the typical man in the richness and variety of her emotional life and the extent to which she allows her emotions to affect her everyday life. She is believed to experience

more tender emotions like sympathy, pity, and parental love; to be more prone to cherishing and protective behavior of all kinds. Compared with man she is more timid and more readily overcome by fear. She is more religious, but at the same time more given to jealousy, suspicion, and injured feelings. Sexually she is naturally less promiscuous, is coy rather than aggressive. Submissiveness, docility, and inferior steadfastness of purpose reflect her weaker conative tendencies. Her sentiments are more complex than man's and dispose her personality to refinement, gentility, and preoccupation with the artistic and cultural. These, in general, are the differences with which Terman and Miles worked. Although practically every attribute alleged to be characteristic of either sex could and has been questioned, the whole pictures yielded by majority opinion stand out with clearness.

The women in Tacitus' writings were prompted by strong prestige drives, because they themselves were unable as women to rule, to acquire the power for their sons. The mother, for instance, may project onto the child her own longings, ambitions, fears, and attribute these same feelings and qualities to the child. Prestige motivation is an impelling force in the desire of a mother for her child.
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After the projection of her ambitions, fears, or longings upon her child, she then identifies herself with her child and feels that she is actually performing the duties as her child attains some of the goals delineated by the mother in the first place. The mother directly attempts to live out her wishes in the life of her child—she hopes to achieve some of her unfulfilled ambitions by seeing them fulfilled by her child. In Tacitus, the mother is quite often found identifying herself with her son.

Livia, the mother of Tiberius and wife of Augustus, was so determined to have Tiberius rule the Roman Empire that she set no limit on what she would do—even, according to Tacitus, going so far as to having men "removed", particularly the sons of Augustus.

"But first Agrippa died; then the two Caesars were cut off—whether by an untimely fate, or through the machinations

---

of their step-mother Livia—the younger of them on his way to join the Spanish army, the elder when returning wounded from Armenia. Tiberius was now the sole surviving step-son of Augustus; for his brother Drusus had perished long before. On him therefore all hopes were centred. He was adopted as a son, made colleague in the "Imperium," admitted to share the Tribunitian Power, and exhibited to all the armies; his mother no longer intriguing for him in secret, but affording him open encouragement.

"For Livia had acquired such an ascendancy over Augustus in his old age, that he cast out on the island of Planasia his only surviving grandson, Agrippa Postumus: an uncultured youth, no doubt, with nothing but brute bodily strength to recommend him, but one who had never been found guilty of any open misdemeanour." She did not rest easy until she had overthrown every impediment to her attaining her prestige through her son. The projection of her own ambitions and the subsequent identification with her son is much of the remainder of Livia's story.

Throughout his books Tacitus uses a stock clause in mentioning some of the women, quidam scelus uxoris suspectabant, "some suspected foul play on the part of the wife." When Augustus is suffering from some malady, that is the

remark concerning Livia. The motivation behind the prestige drive of Livia, or drive for self assertion, was the strong element in her character. Livia is the force behind all the moves of her son, Tiberius, in his early career.

... vixdum ingressus Illyricum Tiberius properis matris litteris accitut.

"Tiberius had scarcely reached Illyricum when he was recalled in haste by a message from his mother."

She was responsible in this instance for getting her son back to Rome toute de suite. Livia had gone as far as to surround the house and street with pickets, and the same report announced that Augustus had expired and Tiberius was ruler of the Empire. As ruler of the Empire, Tiberius was soon recognized by the Romans to be under the control of Livia.

... gravis in rem publicam mater gravis domui Caesarum noverca.

"... a very scourge to the Commonwealth as a mother, no less a scourge to the house of the Caesars as a step-mother."

At another time during the rule of Tiberius, a certain Piso who was obtaining a summons against a friend of the court, Urgulania, was appeased only after Livia
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ordered the money which he sought to be paid.

Livia's influence over Tiberius toward people accused by Tiberius himself is clearly demonstrated in her power to keep Plancina, who was instrumental in, and Tacitus feels largely responsible for, Germanicus' death, from destruction. It was Livia, who by secretis precibus, "secret entreaty," aided her in gradually disassociating herself from her husband whose fortune she had sworn to share, good or bad.

Livia's dominance over her husband was so strong that Tacitus thought he was driven even to retire from the city. Of course, one may conclude that Tiberius may have been looking for an excuse for seclusion, but according to the historian there was some basis for the belief that Livia was partially responsible.

Traditur etiam matris impotentia extrusum,
quam dominationis sociam aspernabatur neque de- pellere poterat, cum dominationem ipsam donum eius accepisset.

"Some said that he had been driven away by his mother's imperious temper: he could neither shake her off, nor endure to share his power with her, though that power had come to him as her gift." Tacitus goes on to state that Livia made good use of her "gift" by forever casting it in his teeth, and "demanding of him repayment."

12. Tac. An., II.34.
15. Tac. An., Ibid., 5.
Another outstanding Roman woman was the older Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus, who was definitely a favorite of Tacitus. Although she was fierce-tempered, domineering, prestige conscious and haughty, Tacitus respects her because of her power over the soldiers, her loyalty to her husband, and her fertility. He respects her stamina when she returns to Rome with her children after Germanicus is killed.

She is displaying none of the tearful emotionality which Tacitus usually implies as characteristic of women like Marcia, who had mourned and lamented loudly at her husband's funeral because she felt responsible for his death. He dwells on the chastity and fecundity of Agrippina, praising her chastity because she maintained it so rigidly, contrary to the laws of human nature and her own strong sex drive, after the death of her husband.

Tacitus recognizes Agrippina's ability to draw people to her and lead them in his discussion concerning the rise of factions in her behalf and the necessity of keeping men from joining her party. The love drive, both sex and maternal, in Agrippina was strong, and Tacitus senses that only when her children are threatened, is her animosity and anger deeply

16. Tac. An., I.69;52.3.
17. Tac. An., II.75.
20. Tac. An., IV.17.4.
aroused. Here again, when she becomes frustrated in her attempts at preserving her family, she reverts to the more primitive need—the most important one in the hierarchy of needs.

At Agrippina pervicax irae et morbo corporis implicate, cum viseret eam Caesar, profusis diu ac per silentium lacrimis, max invidiam et preces oritur; subveniret solitudini, daret matrimonium; habilem aeduju inventam sibi, neque aliud probis quae ex matrimonio salaciam; esse in civitate, Germanici coniugem ac liberos eius recipere dignarentur. Sed Caesar non ignorant, quantum ea re petetur, ne tamen ira offensionis aut metus manifestus foret, sine response quamquam instantem reliquit. Id ego, a scriptoribus annalium non traditum, repperi in commentariis Agrippinae filiae, quae Neronis principis mater vitam suam et eas suorum posteris memoravit.

"But Agrippina abated nothing of her resentment. When Tiberius came to see her, on the occasion of some illness, she received him with an outburst of tears, and for some time said nothing; then beginning in a tone of mixed entreaty and reproach, she implored him to take pity on her lonely state, and find a husband for her. She was still young and active, and an honest woman could find no comfort save in marriage. There were plenty of men in Rome who would deem it an honour to take to their homes the wife and children of Germanicus. Tiberius saw all the significance of such a demand; but not wishing to evince either re-

21. Tac. An., IV.52.3.
sentiment or apprehension, he left her without an answer, in spite of her importunity. This anecdote, which is not related by the historians, I have found in the memoirs of Agrippina the younger, the mother of Nero, who left behind her a record of her own life and of the fortunes of her family."

Tacitus respected Agrippina, but she, like others of his women characters, submitted to her sex drive for security when she realized her dominance and prestige had subsided with her husband's death. Then would these women resort to aggressive sex tendencies to try to overcome their insecurity. Aggression occurs when an individual is dethroned from a dominant role with its accompanying frustration, insecurity, and feelings of inferiority.

It may be that Agrippina was feigning her illness just to try to get some attention from Tiberius and to try to get him to take some action concerning her living alone. Then, too, it is of interest to note that Tacitus quotes his authority for this anecdote. The incident strikes him as probable and natural; but as it is not recorded by the annalists he usually follows, he quotes his authority, in order that we may take the story for what it is worth.

Another woman, not unlike Livia in prestige drive for her son and indirectly for herself through identification with her son, was the younger Agrippina, daughter of Germanicus and the older Agrippina. Tacitus is definitely anti-Agrippina in his sentiments, but there is some basis psychologically for his characterization of her.

The first mention made of the younger Agrippina was that Tiberius conferred upon Gnaeus Domitius the hand of his grandchild, Agrippina. Then Tacitus treats her kindly by stating that growing pity was felt for her because of her persecution by the wife of Claudius, Messalina. Messalina was motivated by a powerful love drive and had become enamoured with a Gaius Silius almost to the point of insanity. Psychologists recognize this sexual maladjustment and this particular difference between the sexes. Man loves ardently but for a short time only, and then is off about other business. In the life of woman love is the perpetual theme. This difference, or rather the failure to adjust to it, is one of the chief causes of unhappiness in married life.

Messalina was persecuting Agrippina because of certain attractions she thought Agrippina had for Claudius, and yet she herself was involved in a potent illicit love.

affair. Perhaps her very involvement made her the more suspicious of Claudius and Agrippina.

After Messalina's execution because of her "affair," there was the matter of a choice of wife for Claudius. The bases of judgment in choice were nobility, charm, and wealth. Agrippina had more points in her favor since her son Nero was the grandson of Germanicus, always a name that lent prestige, because she was a princess of proved fecundity, and because she was still young and of noble birth. She displayed her charms so ably to her uncle Claudius that he was soon captivated. No sooner did she feel sure of her footing, although the Romans really did not morally approve incest, than she began to plan a marriage between her son Nero and Claudius' daughter, Octavia. From this time on Tacitus began to become anti-Agrippina because the crime of killing Octavia's betrothed, Lucius Silanus, great-grandson of Augustus, was going to be necessary for the completion of her plans.

The deciding factor in the overlooking of the incestuous relationship that would exist between Claudius and Agrippina was Vitellius' convincing the people that Agrippina, distinguished by birth, by motherhood, by purity of character, by fruitfulness, by moral excellences, and above

27. Tac. An., XII.1-3.
all by a proposed union with a prince with experience of no marriage bed but his own, was the "people's choice." The question of incest was settled by the decision that it was normal in other countries; (he doesn't mention which ones) usage accommodated itself to utility.

Versa ex eo civitas et cuncta feminae oboedient. Aquam et quasi virile servitium: palam severitas ac saepeius superbia; nihil domi impudicum, nisi dominationi expediet.

"And now a change came over public affairs. All was dominated by a woman who held the reins with a firm and masterful hand. Her manner in public was severe, and often arrogant; her private life correct, save where she saw that power was to be gained." The motivation of Agrippina had been her prestige drive, and having once attained her goal, her rule became almost a virile tyranny, with nothing overlooked that might attribute to power—not even unchastity.

From this point Agrippina becomes intense in her hatreds and jealousies, punishing her ex-rivals. She arranged for the planting of colonies, and she finally set herself up as the equal of Claudius in judging at tribunals, sitting on one tribunal conspicuously, not far from Claudius. Released prisoners addressed her with the

28. Tac. An., All.6.5.
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same terms of praise and gratitude with which they addressed the emperor. In her drive for self-assertion, she was establishing precedents—this particular one that of a woman sitting in state before Roman standards.

Ipsa semet parti a maioribus suis imperii sociam ferebat.

"Agrippina deemed herself partner in an empire won by her own ancestors."

At this particular time in the life of Agrippina the sex drive has been subdued by her identification with her husband Claudius as ruler. After she attained outward equality with Claudius, she began to spend her time in intrigue and plot; she tread slowly at first because she lacked courage. The lack of courage was one of the weaknesses Tacitus usually attributed to women. She finally, however, worked through Claudius to have a man who would be servile to her appointed to be in charge of the praetorian cohorts, the Emperor’s picked bodyguard.

Suum quoque fastigium Agrippina extollere altius: carpento Capitolium ingredi, qui honos sacerdotibus et sacris antiquitus concessus venerationem augebant feminae, quam imperatore genitam, sororem eius, qui rerum potitus sit, et coniugem et matrem fuisse, unicum ad hunc diem exemplum est.

"Agrippina exalted her own position also. She would

30. Tacitus forgets that he had already commented bitterly on Plancina for being present at the exercises and manoeuvres of the troops. II.55.5.
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drive up to the Capitol in a chariot—an honour which in olden days had been reserved for priests and holy things, and which attached a kind of sacredness to one who as daughter of an Imperator, and sister, wife, and mother of reigning Emperors, held a position unexampled to this day."

Her prestige was reaching limitless bounds. Not long thereafter, at the display of a particular project of public works, she and Claudius presided, he in a gorgeous military cloak, she, not far away, in a Greek mantle of gold cloth. Tacitus emphasizes these facts about the younger Agrippina to substantiate the assertion that she was completely mastered by her drive for prestige. As she began to feel more sure of herself, she began to submit to the fundamental sex drive of woman, and soon Tacitus attributes to her many plots, infidelity, and finally the intended murder of Claudius.

After the death of Claudius, she identifies herself with her son and would have gone so far as to ascend the imperial seat to take her place beside him, but Seneca, Nero's friend and teacher, saved the day by motioning to Nero to meet his mother under the cover of filial respect. The Roman people and Senate were now beginning to feel insecure because they

---
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had no hopes in the youth, Nero, swayed by a woman. Finally, there is the picture of a mother, who, after all her drive for power is played out, finds herself insecure because of loss of control of her son. She is prepared to take flight to the ends of the earth, (escape mechanism), to get away from her son and his power, a son who has set a pattern that she fears for herself by murdering his step-brother. She fears that after he has killed Britannicus, and after he realizes how powerful he really is, he will not have any qualms about killing her.

Thus, Agrippina, a psychological study in her drive for prestige with the normal sex drive of woman subdued until her prestige is slipping, finally, in insecurity, resorts to the sex drive as her last hope, and when that fails, all that is left is, after one attempt to murder her fails, utter frustration and submission to murder.

There are certain characteristics which Tacitus attributes to women as differences which modern psychology frowns upon. Mental and physical sex differences are easily measured and distinguishable, but emotional differences and differences in enthusiasm are harder to evaluate. It is generally agreed that most sex differences are acquired by the individual during his lifetime and are not

36. Tac. An., XIV.4-5.
handed down through the germ plasm. However, Tacitus thought there were some differences, and he repeatedly in trite phrases mentions muliebris fraus, "female treachery," the imbecillem, "weak," sexus impar laboribus, "lack of endurance," saeva, "hard," ambitiosa, "ambitious," or "intriguing," potestatis avida, "greedy of power."

Although Tacitus doesn't express these traits in a discussion, he has a Roman senator state them, and as stated earlier in this paper, most of the speeches were those of Tacitus, who in reality was an orator himself and enjoyed dramatizing any situation he possibly could. He also mentions in another discussion that there were certain limits defined by custom and society to the actions of women which restrained a woman. Hence, he deals harshly with Plancina, the wife of the Piso who was accused of murdering Germanicus.

Nec Plancina se intra decora feminis tenebat.

"Nor did Plancina confine herself to matters that befitted her sex."

Tacitus seemed to think that there were differences between nations in their treatment of women. Most psychologists report that race differences are assumed during the lifetime of the individuals of that race. Amongst the
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Germans women played an important part in the fighting of their soldiers.

Memoriae proditur quasdam acies inclinatas iam et labantes a feminis restitutas constantia precum et objectu pectorum et monstrata comminutae captivitate, quam longe impatientes feminarum suarum nomine timent, adeo ut efficaciis obligentur animi civitatum, quibus inter obsides puellae quoque nobiles imperantur. Inesse quin etiam sanctum aliquid et providum putant, nec aut consilia earum asperrantur aut responsa neglegunt. Vidimus sub divo Vespasiano Veledam diu apud plerosque numinis loco habitam; sed et alim Albrunam et compluris alias venerati sunt, non adulatone nec tamquam facerent deas.

"Tradition says that armies already wavering and giving way have been rallied by women who, with earnest entreaties and bosoms laid bare, have vividly represented the horrors of captivity, which the Germans fear with such extreme dread on behalf of their women, that the strongest tie by which a state can be bound is the being required to give, among the number of hostages, maidens of noble birth. They even believe that the sex has a certain sanctity and prescience, and they do not despise their counsels, or make light of their answers. In Vespasian’s days we saw Veleda, long regarded by many as a divinity. In former times, too, they venerated Albruna, and many other women, but not with servile flatteries, or with sham deification."

These women were treated almost reverently by the German men, and their mentality was recognized as well as

43. Tac. Ger., Tran. by Church and Brodribb, 8.
a supposed ability to foretell.

Tacitus also mentions that it is the peculiarity of women lugere honestum est, viris memorisse, "It is thought becoming for women to bewail, for men to remember, the dead." Psychologists tend to agree with what Tacitus is suggesting here; namely, women are superficially emotional. He went further to say, however, that they forget quickly, too.

One German tribe is mentioned that was bold enough to have a woman as a ruler.

... in tantum non modo a libertate sed etiam a servitute degenerant.

"So low have they fallen, not merely from freedom, but even from slavery itself." He didn't think it was the privilege of a woman to rule, but again, he is basing his judgment on Roman criteria.

About the British he states:

His atque talibus in vicem instinciti, Boudicea generis regii femina duce (neque enim sexum in imperiis discernunt) sumpsere universi bellum;

"Rousing each other by this and like language, under the leadership of Boudicea, a woman of kingly descent (for they admit no distinction of sex in their royal successions), they all rose in arms." Tacitus believed in sex differences and accepted them without questioning what he had

44. Tac. Ger., 27. Ibid.
45. Tac. Ger., 45. Ibid.
Sex differences are not an established psychological theory. Tacitus knew that women like the Agrippinae and Livia reacted in certain ways to their environment. He tried to make generalizations in respect to them that would hold true for all womankind. He perceived that their emotions kept them from being as brave and courageous as men. He thought some of them were the backbones, so to speak, of the rulers, at different times aiding or impeding imperial government, depending upon whether he thought she was a morally important or unimportant woman. What any reader of Tacitus must keep in mind, whether he is making an inquiry into the problem of motivation, aggression, individual differences, or sex differences, is that the study will be based upon the writings of a man who expressed opinions colored by the social and political conditions in which he lived—conditions which he considered were inferior to the "good old" days of the Republic.
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APPENDIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genealogical Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUGUSTUS</strong>-Livia Augusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Scribonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrippa-Julia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIBERIUS Drusus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Vipanio m. Antonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaius Lucius Agrippa Agrippina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drusus-Livia Germanicus CLAUDIUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postumusm. Germanicus m. Agrippina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. Domitius-Agrippina Nero Drusus GAIUS(Caligula) Drusilla Julia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>