

TABLE 3

OBLIQUE CASES OF MONOSYLLABIC SUBSTANTIVES		N
- \bar{o}	1.04%	96
- $\bar{V}t$	9.21%	76
o.r.=9.64 p=.014		

We see that the odds for a monosyllabic substantive in an oblique case are over nine and a half times greater before pyrrhic verbs in $-\bar{V}t$ than before pyrrhic verbs arising from $-\bar{o} > -\bar{o}$. This result is statistically significant: as the value of p shows, there is only a little more than one chance in a hundred of the observed association arising at random.

The strong preference for nonlexical monosyllables before pyrrhic verbs arising from $-\bar{o} > -\bar{o}$ is not merely an artifact of the substantial frequency of parenthetical, semantically reduced verbs such as *puto* and *rogo*, the syntactic properties of which might have been considered as a skewing factor. If parenthetical verbs are excluded from the test, there is still a strong and statistically significant tendency to avoid lexical monosyllables before semantically full pyrrhic verbs arising from $-\bar{o} > -\bar{o}$ ($\chi^2 = 6.10$ for Ovid and Martial combined). In fact, two of the three lexical monosyllables in the $-\bar{o}$ class of verbs in Martial occur before parenthetical verbs (1. 5. 2 and 3. 55. 4).

In summary: the presence of a preceding monosyllabic word and particularly a (prepositive) nonlexical monosyllabic word promotes the shortening $-\bar{o} > -\bar{o}$ in iambic verbs.

LAURENCE STEPHENS
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill

TACITUS *ANNALS* 2. 8. 2

In the second volume of his commentary,¹ F. R. D. Goodyear devotes four pages to "the worst crux in these books." He prints: "classis Amisiae relicta laevo amne, erratumque in eo quod non subvexit transposuitque militem dextras in terras iturum: ita plures dies efficiendis pontibus absumpti." He takes *Amisiae* as genitive with *laevo amne*, which is interpreted as "on the left hand side of the stream of the Ems." *Transposuitque* is a conjecture (falsely attributed to

1. *The "Annals" of Tacitus Books 1-6*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 208-12.

Nipperdey-Andresen)² for the manuscript's *transposuit*. None of this is credible. The hyperbaton *Amisiae relicta laevo amne* would be acceptable only if *Amisiae* were strongly emphatic, which it is not (the stress in the phrase should be on *laevo*, contrasted with *dextras*).³ If *Amisiae* referred to the river, it would be necessary to move it to the position *laevo Amisiae amne* (which permits *laevo* to be emphatic, as Lenchantin's *Amisiae laevo amne* does not), and suppose that it fell out through *saut du même* (*am-* to *am-*), and after marginal or interlinear correction became inserted in the wrong position. But after *ad Amisiam flumen* in the preceding sentence, the genitive is otiose in any position; and the combination *classis relicta* is barren without something of importance intervening.⁴ The last objection applies as well to Nipperdey's deletion of *Amisiae*: Tacitus, and most competent writers of Latin, would have said *classis laevo amne relicta*.⁵ Seyffert's *classis Amisiae <ore> relicta* offends both by being otiose and by making *Amisiae* emphatic.⁶ A simple *classis ore relicta* would be unobjectionable Latin, and a case could be made for the error if conjecture were really necessary.

But the transmitted text is perfectly good Latin, and such as Tacitus writes. The colon division must be *classis Amisiae relicta* | *laevo amne*, with *Amisiae* a locative, and emphatic (specifying the place where the fleet was left), and *laevo* also emphatic at the start of its own rhythmic colon, in a phrase clarifying the position of *Amisia*. *Amisia* here must be a town, located near the mouth of the Ems (as 8. 2. 3 *prima aestuaria* makes clear). In fact most commentators before Ritter (1848) understood the word as a locative: so Ernesti (1772), giving credit to Cluverius and Freinsheim, Brotier (1771, repr. 1796), Valpy (1834), and Orelli (1846), all taking *laevo amne* as "on the left bank." Rycke (1687) had identified the town with Emden; Brotier identified it with "Wester-Emden," in which he was followed by Valpy; Orelli favored Delfzyl or vicinity. Ritter noted that Emden is on the right bank (east and north), and objected that the town Ἀμῶσσια mentioned by Ptolemy (2. 11. 27) is in the wrong location.⁷ Indeed the

2. Actually *transposuitque* was printed by F. Ritter (ed.), *C. Cornelii Taciti "Annales"* (Bonn, 1834). Nipperdey (*Cornelius Tacitus: Ab Excessu Divi Augusti* [Leipzig, 1851]) secluded *Amisiae* and *subvexit*, and retained *transposuit*. In the later edition of Nipperdey-Andresen (Berlin, 1892) *Amisiae* and *subvexit* are retained, and *transposuit* is secluded, as suggested by Ernesti.

3. Attempts to justify the emphasis, or claim that the position is not emphatic, are all faulty. Goodyear (*"Annals,"* p. 209) claims that Tacitus "occasionally trajects words for no good reason," but cites no example. K. Meister ("Der Bericht des Tacitus über die Landung des Germanicus in der Emsmündung," *Hermes* 83 [1955]: 99) claimed that *Amisiae* is not emphatic, and compared Wackernagel's law for unemphatic pronouns (which adopt an enclitic position, second in clause or rhythmic colon). But nouns do not behave like enclitic pronouns (nor would an order *classis eius relicta* be acceptable, if *eius* referred to the preceding *Amisiam* and modified *amne*). A noun removed from its word group in prose (and placed right before the verb) is always emphatic. For the repetition of proper names, Meister cited examples such as *Hist.* 3. 6. 2 "primus ac Varus . . . Opitergii et Altini laetis animis accipiuntur. relictum Altini praesidium," where *Altini* is needed to distinguish from *Opitergium*. On the contrary, remove *Amisiae* from 2. 8. 2 and there can be no doubt of the reference of *amne*: only one river has been mentioned. A word which can be removed without altering the sense may not be placed in an emphatic position (and usually would not be used at all).

4. For Tacitus' use of local modifiers with *relinquo*, see Appendix A below.

5. Or some permutation, such as *classis laevo relicta amne*, which placed a properly emphatic word in emphatic position and produced an acceptable colon.

6. Correct order in sequence would have been *classis ore Amisiae relicta*: since *ore* contains the new information in the phrase, it would deserve the more emphatic initial position.

7. In the edition of O. Cuntz (*Die Geographie des Ptolemaeus* [Berlin, 1923]), Ἀμῶσσια is read here (269. 2 Müller), and MSS are recorded as having Ἀμῶσσια and Ἀμεισσία. The river is printed (in the

latitude given by Ptolemy would put the town near the source, not the mouth, of the Ems.⁸ But Tacitus' language cannot reasonably be understood as anything but a reference to a town (since *Amisiae* makes good Latin only as a locative), and a town located near the mouth of the Ems (since from there an estuary is crossed in 2. 8. 3). Since the evidence of the transmitted text of Tacitus is supported by the existence near the mouth of a town bearing essentially the same name as the river, and affording the best harbor in the region, the text of Tacitus should be believed, whether or not Ptolemy's attribution of latitude is disbelieved: Tacitus' *Amisia* should be identified with Emden. Ritter's interpretation of *Amisia* as the river was followed by most commentators after him, including Orelli (1849, a change from his edition of 1846) and Nipperdey (1851). Nipperdey stated: "*Amisiae* kann nur den Fluss bezeichnen. Denn einen Ort dieses Namens erwähnt Tac. nirgends; er hätte also hier, wenn er mit diesem Namen einen solchen bezeichnen wollte, dem Leser eine Andeutung davon gegeben." The statement is in justification of seclusion of *Amisiae*, but it is repeated in Nipperdey-Andresen (1892), where *Amisiae* is retained. Meister ("Bericht," p. 96) claimed: "Wenig bekannten Ortsnamen pflegt Tacitus bei der ersten Erwähnung ein kennzeichnendes Appellativum hinzufügen, z.B. a. 4, 72, 3 *castello cui nomen Flevum*, a. 16, 9, 1 *municipio Apuliae cui nomen Barium est*, h. 4, 28, 2 *in vico Marcoduro*. Nur wenn der Name bald darauf wiederholt wird, kann das Appellativum fehlen." As I illustrate in Appendix A, Meister's claim that the appellation cannot be omitted on first occurrence of the name is completely false. Goodyear states that "T. would surely, as Furneaux says, have contrived to avoid utter ambiguity, adding *oppido* vel *simm*." In fact a combination *Amisiae oppido* would not be Tacitean. Tacitus adds an appellation to a locative only in order to convey information other than status as city or town. Status as city or town is adequately conveyed by the case, which is restricted to cities, towns, and small islands (see Appendix A). "Ambiguity" exists only for those who fail to perceive that *Amisiae* in the given sequence can only be a locative.

Almost all commentators, with Lewis and Short and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, have taken *laevo amne* to mean "on the left bank" (which should mean on the west or south bank of the Ems). But even if *laevo amne* could mean "on the left side of the stream," does that mean "on the left bank," or rather, does leaving the fleet on the left side of the stream preclude disembarking troops on the right bank? And what general is so stupid as to disembark troops on the left

genitive) as Ἀμισίου on its first occurrence in 2. 11 (248. 2 M.), but as Ἀμισίου in the second (256. 5 M.). In the Latin version of Ptolemy 8, the Ebner MS of ca. 1460 (published in facsimile by E. L. Stevenson, "*Geography*" of *Claudius Ptolemy* [New York, 1932]) in the fourth map of Europe gives in the text *Amasia*, listed first (in alphabetical order) among four *Magnae germanie civitates insignes*; but on the map, the city is spelled *amisia*. Similar testimony is given in plates from a variety of MSS published by J. Fischer, *Claudii Ptolemaei "Geographiae" Codex Urbinas Graecus* 82, vol. 2: *Tabulae* (London and Leipzig, 1932): in maps of the Latin version, the city is given as *amisia*, the river as *amasius* or *amasus*.

Stephen of Byzantium attests: Ἀμισα (Ἀμισσα Α), πόλις Γερμανίας. Μαρκιανὸς ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἐπὶ τὰς διασήμεους πόλεις, τὸ ἔθνικόν Ἀμισαίος.

8. The mouth of the river is given at 39° longitude, 55° latitude, the source at 32° longitude, 52° latitude (248. 2–3 M.); the city is placed at 31° 30' longitude, 51° 30' latitude (269. 2 M.); the position of the city would then be 30' south and 30' west of the source of the river.

bank, and immediately have them build a bridge to cross to the right side?⁹ It is not a reasonable choice when the best harbor is on the right bank, as it has been at least for many centuries at Emden. It is claimed that security for the fleet dictated leaving it on the left bank, while securing a route for retreat dictated building a bridge. But if the right bank was hostile, there was all the more reason to unload the bulk of the army on it to safeguard the building of the bridge; whereas in 2. 8. 3 it seems to be the whole army that crosses the estuary. And how would conveying the troops upstream (*subvexit*) have improved the situation?¹⁰ The inland region would, if anything, have been more hostile.

The advantages of Emden as a harbor are clear in M. Faber's map of the Ems mouth (1642);¹¹ essentially the same picture is presented in C. Picquet's map of Emden (1807).¹² The Ems, which generally flows north, makes a bend to the west shortly before Emden. Emden is located in a bay on the north side of the bend, with the entrance to the harbor protected by the island Nesserland. It is a harbor such as Virgil described (*Aen.* 1. 159–61), in short, an ideal harbor in Roman eyes. There is no harbor to compare with it in Faber's map, certainly not on the west or south bank. The outer mouth is dotted with islands, but adjacent to them and the outer banks of the Ems are dangerous, shifting shoals. Picquet's map does show a small harbor at Delfzyl, barely visible in Faber's map. Today the land mass south of Emden has been extended to include Nesserland. The Ems is held back by dikes, with much of the land in and around Emden below sea level. A series of waterways (canals and "Tiefs") conspire to make Emden and vicinity a virtual island. It is not possible (at least by philology) to reconstruct the condition of the terrain in Germanicus' day, but the geography (with the land around Emden all low or below sea level) is compatible with passage of one or more channels of the Ems to the (now) inland side of the city, at least at high tide. For my suggestion of the route, see Appendix B. Whether there was indeed in Germanicus' day a "right" channel of the Ems, bypassing Emden to the east and north, or Tacitus merely assumed that there was from Germanicus' need to cross a tidal inlet or tributary of the river (the *aestuaria* of 2. 8. 3), it seems best to understand *laevo amne* as "on the left channel."

This is in fact the most natural translation of *laevo amne*. The expression is without close parallel in any sense, so the lack of a parallel does not suffice to exclude any interpretation. In support of his interpretation, Goodyear compared Virgil *Aeneid* 5. 170 *radit iter laevum interior*, Persius 2. 53 *pectore laevo*,

9. It is clear from 2. 8. 3 *prima aestuaria* that the crossing was at or near the mouth of the river. The Ems, by the way, is about five kilometers wide at Delfzyl (on the west bank), and much wider farther out.

10. This objection is aimed at Ritter's *subvexit transposuitque*, printed by Goodyear, or Ernesti's *subvexit [transposuit]*, which I believe right. With Ritter's reading, setting the troops on the other side is linked to bringing them upstream, whereas the troops could easily have been set on the other side at the mouth, without sailing upstream. The objection would not apply to Nipperdey's [*subvexit*] *transposuit* or to *subvexit aut transposuit*, but neither of these readings is likely to have been corrupted to the transmitted text. The punctuation *subvexit: transposuit*, often printed, and favored by Meister, is incomprehensible: as 2. 8. 3 makes clear, Germanicus did not disembark the troops on the other side of the estuary; and *subvexit* needs *militem* as object.

11. See W. Lang, "Martin Faber's Map of the Ems Mouth," *Imago Mundi* 9 (1952): 78–82, with reproduction of the map on p. 78.

12. *Carte topographique d'Allemagne*, vol. 1.

Tacitus *Histories* 2. 24. 3 *dextra fronte*, 35. 1 *amne medio*. But Virgil's *iter laevum* does not mean "the left part of the course," but "the course on the left" (acc. of effect); if the other three proved that Romans said *laevo amne* for "on the left part of the stream," then the English expressions "left breast," "right front," and "in midstream" would prove that we said "in leftstream" with the same meaning. The use of *medius* to mean "middle of" with a wide variety of expression (as *in foro medio*) is not in question, but the use of *laevus* and such for "left part of" seems limited to certain expressions: these include the examples cited by H. Heubner with *frons*;¹³ they may even include *acies*, but in the example which Heubner cites (Livy 27. 48. 8 "dextra omnis acies extra proelium eminens cessabat") *dextra* is probably ablative; they include parts of the body, particularly those which may be used in the plural where in English we use a singular, as at Horace *Satires* 1. 5. 61 *laevi frontem . . . oris* ("the brow of his left face," by hypallage for "the left brow of his face") and Statius *Thebaid* 8. 747 *laevoque super cervice* ("on his left shoulder"). Though *medio mari* means "in mid-sea," when Tacitus wanted to say "the left part of the sea" he said not *laevum mare*, but (*Hist.* 2. 2. 2) *laeva maris*; when he said (*Ann.* 12. 27. 3) *laevum iter*, he meant not "left part of the route," but "left route." Such expressions as *laevum iter* and *laeva via* provide the closest analogies to determine the meaning of *laevus amnis*. The objections of Heubner and Goodyear ("*Annals*," p. 208), that "when *amnis*, *flumen*, *simm.* are used of river-mouths, a plural is normally found and a number," carry no weight. If one can say (Valerius Flaccus 8. 90) *septem proiectus in amnes Nilus*, and the other expressions cited by Meister ("Bericht," pp. 97–98), one can say *laevo amne* and mean by *amnis* the arm of a river.

Meister so argued, but took the left arm of the Ems to be the equivalent of one of the branches (Osterems and Westerems) that exits on either side of the island Borkum, known to Pliny *Naturalis Historia* 4. 97 as *Burcana*. But I think it most unlikely that Germanicus disembarked his troops at Borkum (now about twenty kilometers from the mainland), not only because Tacitus has said *Amisiae* and not *Burcanae*, but because protection from the elements, best afforded at the site of Emden, should have dictated that the fleet not be left in the outer mouth. Nevertheless, knowledge of the river's double exit may have influenced Tacitus' use of the expression *laevo amne*. Tacitus' language indicates that he believed that if the troops had sailed farther upriver, where the river flowed in a single channel, it would not have been necessary to build a bridge to cross a right channel.¹⁴

As Goodyear has well argued, the combination *subvexit transposuit* transmitted by the codex cannot stand, and punctuation does not produce a satisfactory text. The combination has the look of a conflation of variants, and between the two it is *subvexit* which should stand, and *transposuit* which should be secluded, as Ernesti wanted. The obscurity of *subvexit* (it is not immediately clear how sailing upriver would prevent the need for a bridge) prompted the

13. "Tacitea II," *Gymnasium* 63 (1956): 355.

14. We may suppose that the right channel was not suitable for navigation and the unloading of troops, particularly if low tide would have left the ships beached and unusable for a quick escape.

generation of *transposuit*, whether as a substitute or as a gloss: the word, written in the margin or above *subvexit*, would then readily be misunderstood by a subsequent scribe as an insertion, with the conflation resulting. The process is frequently observed in MSS, but would not have operated the other way, to add an obscure *subvexit* to a clear *transposuit*. Who, upon reading *non transposuit militem*, would suppose that Tacitus had meant to say that the fleet should have sailed upstream? Not in a context which contained *laevo amne*, and referred to the building of bridges.

Goodyear could not see any reason for the insertion of *transposuit*, and so adopted *transposuitque*. A reading *subvexit transposuitque* (besides producing a division of cola inferior to *quod non subvexit militem | dextras in terras iturum*) works with neither his interpretation of *classis Amisiae relicta laevo amne*¹⁵ nor mine. In my interpretation, Germanicus unloads his troops at Amisia on the right bank of the left stream; sailing upstream to a point before the division of the river (real or supposed) would eliminate the need to bridge a right channel, but *transposuit* ("set on the other side")¹⁶ would have no point.

The problem with the division of cola in *subvexit transposuitque* is that the division must now be *quod non subvexit transposuitque | militem dextras in terras iturum* (to include *militem* with the preceding would make too much of a mouthful). Now the participle appears attributive rather than circumstantial (or descriptive): "the army which would go into the terrain to the right" rather than "in that he did not carry upstream the army, although it would go into the terrain to the right." The implication of the attributive use (which defines and limits *militem*) would be that there was another army which was properly unloaded at the mouth and *laevo amne*. Circumstantial participles with their modifiers and predicates regularly form separate rhythmic cola, as do descriptive relative and other circumstantial clauses in English.

With the text and interpretation which I advocate, note the balance: "*classis Amisiae relicta, laevo amne . . . quod non subvexit militem, dextras in terras iturum.*" *Classis* starts its colon (not because of great emphasis, but because initial position is normal for subjects), and balances and contrasts with *militem*, at the end of its colon. *Amisiae* is in a moderately emphatic position, in front of the verb (the emphasis is appropriate for the town, but not for the river, since the former has not been mentioned, while the latter has just been indicated as the fleet's location). *Laevo* starts its colon, in emphatic position, balancing and contrasting with *dextras*, which is emphatic both because of initial position in its colon and because of the hyperbaton. I submit that this is excellent style, while interpretations of *Amisiae* as the river and attempts to retain both *subvexit* and *transposuit* produce at best bad style and at worst bad Latin.

Most arguments in our field are arguments from probability. I see no way in which *Amisiae* can be anything but a locative. My interpretation of *laevo amne*

15. See above, n. 10.

16. Heubner ("Tacitea," p. 364) points out the relatively late attestation of *transponere* in the meaning (*flumen*) *traicere*. Goodyear ("Annals," p. 211, n. 3) responds correctly that this is no evidence against its use by Tacitus. But once on other grounds it is decided that the word cannot stand, it is reassuring to note that the diction suits the period of potential interpolation: see the examples cited by Heubner with the introduction, "Bei noch späteren Autoren werden die Belege etwas zahlreicher."

and identification of Amisia with Emden have been argued as most likely, but the nature of the evidence prevents certainty. The seclusion of *transposuit* seems far and away the best solution for the textual problem presented by *subvexit transposuit*. The lines mean: "The fleet was left at Amisia (Emden) on the left channel. And a mistake was made in that he did not transport the army upstream, although it was to march into the terrain to the right."

APPENDIX A: TACITUS' USAGE

The claim that Tacitus could not have used the simple *Amisiae* of the town has been made and repeated so often that it seems advisable to document Tacitus' actual practice with the names of towns and cities. Some of those making such statements are doubtless concerned merely with the "ambiguity." But if, as I argue, a native speaker could understand *Amisiae* in sequence only as a locative, a construction restricted to names of towns and small islands, there could be no possibility of confusion with the river.

First let me document Tacitus' usage with *relinquo*: *Hist.* 1. 64. 3 *cohortem XVIII Lugduni, solitis sibi hibernis, relinqui placuit*; 2. 36. 2 *relicto Placentiae modico praesidio*; 2. 52. 1 *dein Mutinae relicta*; 3. 6. 2 *relictum Altini praesidium*; 3. 50. 1 *milites . . . Veronae relictis*; 3. 58. 1 *parte copiarum Narniae cum praefectis praetorii relicta*; *Ann.* 3. 9. 1 *relictis apud Anconam navibus*. These, plus *Ann.* 15. 12. 1 *parte copiarum apud Syriam relicta*, 6. 31. 1 *qui gazam a Vonone relictam in Syria Ciliciaque reposcerent*, *Hist.* 5. 3. 1 *vulgus postquam vastis locis relictum sit*, 2. 57. 1 *pauci . . . in hibernis relictis*, *Ann.* 12. 15. 1 *relictos in novo regno Cotyn . . . et paucas cohortium*, 4. 48. 1 *relictis apud priora munimenta Thraecibus*, and *Hist.* 2. 66. 3 *relictis passim ignibus*, 4. 35. 3 *relictorum illic militum*, *Ann.* 12. 16. 1 *relicto ibi praesidio*, are the only occurrences of *relinquo* in Tacitus with a local expression. The latter group contributes no evidence of Tacitus' usage with cities and towns, but reinforces the evidence of the first group that expressions of place are normally positioned between the subject and the verb or participle (in either order): deviation occurs only in *Ann.* 6. 31, where there is a larger enclosure of subject and verb. Seclusion of *Amisiae* in *Ann.* 2. 8 would only get us further from Tacitean (and normal Latin) usage. The first group (which includes the first or sole appearance of Narnia, Altinum, and Ancona in the work) illustrates the lack of generic attachment to the name of cities or towns. Only *Lugduni* (in the first example) gets an apposition, and that not to identify it as a city but to convey relevant information which could not otherwise be guessed. An equivalent function is performed by the parenthesis in *Hist.* 1. 63. 1 *Divoduri (Mediomatricorum id oppidum est)*; but in *Hist.* 4. 79. 2 *Tolbiaci in finibus Agrippensium* the information is conveyed without benefit of a generic. There is no example in Tacitus of attachment of a simple generic *oppidum* or *urbs* to a locative. In the same category as the above are *Hist.* 2. 1. 3 *Corinthis, Achaiae urbe*¹⁷ and *Ann.* 2. 57. 2 *Cyrri demum apud hiberna*. Elsewhere in the *Histories* and *Annals* no generics are found with locative names of towns:¹⁸ *Hist.* 1. 59. 2 *Lugduni*, 1. 76. 3 *Carthagine*, 2. 23. 2 *Bedriaci*, 2. 63. 1 *Ostiae* (but already 1. 80. 1 *e colonia Ostiensi*), 2. 81. 3 *Beryti*, 2. 100. 3 *Patavi*, 3. 6. 1 *Optirgii et Altini*, 3. 57. 1 *Minturnis*, 4. 15. 1 *Mogontiaci*, 4. 33. 1 *Asciburgii*, 4. 61. 3 *Vindonissae*, 5. 20. 1 *Arenaci* . . . *Batavoduri*, *Ann.* 1. 58. 6 *Ravennae*,

17. "Corinthus" can be confused in pronunciation and scribal tradition with Corythus of Etruria.

18. In this list, as, for the most part, in the following lists, I exclude examples in which the name has occurred before in the work. The usage in the minor works is the same, but examples are excluded for simplicity.

2. 83. 2 *Antiochia* . . . *Epidaphnae*, 3. 41. 2 *Lugduni*, 15. 31. 1 *Ecbatanis*. Both common and uncommon names are usually presented without generic attachment when the name is in the locative case. In fact generic attachments, which are usually found in Tacitus with names of rivers, mountains, and such, are far from the rule with names of cities and towns even in other cases. As with locatives, the conveyance of relevant information frequently results in employment of a generic, either so that a modifier can attach itself to a suitable noun, or so that a status as colony, fort, camp, winter quarters, *municipium*, or capital can be specified. The following fall into one or both of these categories: *Ann.* 2. 63. 1 *Forum Iulium, Narbonensis Galliae coloniam*, 5. 10. 3 *Nicopoli, Romanam coloniam*, 12. 32. 2 *colonia Camulodunum*, 13. 31. 2 *coloniae Capua atque Nuceria* (there are also examples of *colonia* with adjectives, as in *Hist.* 1. 80. 1 above), 2. 7. 6 *inter castellum Alisonem ac Rhenum* (parallelism would otherwise confuse), 4. 27. 3 *castello cui nomen Flevum*, 12. 45. 2 *in castellum Gorneas*, *Hist.* 5. 20. 1 *Grinnes Vadamque, cohortium alarumque castra*, 3. 1. 1 *Poetovionem in hiberna tertiae decimae legionis*, 1. 66. 3 *Luco (municipium id Vocontiorum est)*, 1. 70. 1 *firmissima Transpadanae regionis municipia, Mediolanum ac Novarium et Eporediam et Vercellas*, 2. 15. 2 *Antipolim Narbonensis Galliae municipium*, 2. 50. 1 *e municipio Ferentio*, 4. 5. 1 <e> *Caracinae municipio Cluviis*, *Ann.* 3. 48. 1 *apud municipium Lanuvium*, 16. 9. 1 *municipio Apuliae, cui nomen Barium est*, *Hist.* 1. 68. 2 *Aventicum gentis caput*, 2. 78. 4 *discessere Mucianus Antiochiam, Vespasianus Caesaream: illa Syriae, hoc Iudaeae caput est*, *Ann.* 1. 56. 4 *Mattio (id genti caput)*, *Hist.* 3. 47. 2 *Trapezuntem, vetusta fama civitatem*, *Ann.* 6. 7. 4 *e Santonis Gallica civitate*, *Hist.* 4. 84. 4 *Seleucia urbe Syriae*,¹⁹ *Ann.* 2. 53. 1 *apud urbem Achaiae Nicopolim*, 2. 54. 1 *Perinthumque ac Byzantium, Thracias urbes*, 2. 58. 2 *Pompeipolim, Ciliciae maritimam urbem*, 2. 79. 2 *Laodiciam urbem Syriae* (distinguished from the following), 14. 27. 1 *ex inlustribus Asiae urbibus Laodicea*, 6. 41. 2 *Nicephorium et Anthemusiada ceterasque urbes quae Macedonibus sitae Graeca vocabula usurpant, Halumque et Artemitam Parthica oppida*, 12. 50. 1 *urbesque Armeniorum Artaxata et Tigranocerta*, 12. 16. 1 *Sozam, oppidum Dandaricae*, 14. 27. 1 *vetus oppidum Puteoli*, 15. 22. 2 *celebre Campaniae oppidum Pompei*. The generic is often used with undeclinable nouns: so with *Artaxata* in *Ann.* 2. 56. 3, 6. 33. 1, 12. 50. 1 (cited above), 13. 39. 6, but not in 13. 41. 1 and 2, or 14. 23. 1. The simple generic *urbs* or *oppidum* is never attached to the name of a city or town in the *Histories* or *Minor Works* (and even in the lists above the words are rare, with *municipium* preferred in the *Histories*).²⁰ But starting with the first words of the *Annals*, *urbem Romam*, we do find such attachment. Besides *Romam*, and the examples distinguished above, we find (at least on first occurrence): *Ann.* 1. 5. 3 *apud urbem Nolam*, 3. 38. 4 *urbemque Philippopolim*, 12. 16. 2 *urbem Uspen*, 2. 60. 1 *oppido a Canopo* (to distinguish from the man Canopus), 3. 1. 2 *ad oppidum Brundisium* (but 2. 30. 1 *Brundisium usque*, without generic), 4. 24. 1 *Thubu<r>s</>cum oppidum*, 11. 21. 1 *in oppido Adrumeto*, 12. 12. 3 *apud oppidum Edessam*, 13. 39. 1 *Pontico mari et Trapezunte oppido* (to balance *mari* and avoid confusion), 15. 5. 2 *apud oppidum Nisibin*, 15. 46. 1 *apud oppidum Praeneste*, 15. 53. 2 *Ferentino in oppido*. But with most cities and towns there is no generic added on their first or sole appearance; so, besides those cited above: *Hist.* 1. 31. 3 *Alexandriam*, 1. 50. 2 *Pharsalliam Philippos et Perusiam ac Mutinam*, 2. 4. 3 *Hierosolymorum*, 2. 17. 2 *apud Cremonam . . . inter Placentiam Ticinumque*, 2. 33. 2 *Brixellum*, 2. 46. 3 *Aquileiam*, 2. 50. 2 *apud Regium Lepidum*, 2. 53. 2 *Bononiam*, 2. 66. 3 *Viennam*, 2. 83. 2 *Byzantium . . . Dyrrachium . . . Brundisium Tarentumque*, 2. 100. 3 *Hostilium . . . Ravennam*, 3. 6. 2 *Patavium et Ateste . . . ad Forum Alieni*, 3. 43. 3 *Ariminum*, 3. 57. 2 *Tarracinam*, 3. 72. 2 *Suessa Pometia*, 3. 76. 1 *apud*

19. Distinguished from the Seleucia of Babylonia (*Ann.* 6. 44. 2), and the Seleucia of Cilicia.

20. So *Hist.* 2. 50. 1 *e municipio Ferentio*, but *Ann.* 15. 53. 2 *Ferentino in oppido*.

Feroniam, 3. 79. 2 *ultra Fidenas*, 4. 2. 2 *Ariciam* . . . *intra Bovillas*, 4. 5. 1 *Misenum apud*, 4. 19. 2 *Bonnam*, 4. 26. 3 *Novaesium*, 4. 70. 4 *Bingium*, 4. 71. 4 *Rigodulum*, *Ann.* 1. 20. 1 *Nauportum*, 2. 40. 1 *Ostiam*, 2. 41. 1 *apud Bovillas*, 2. 47. 3 *Hierocaesariam*, *Myrinam*, *Cymen*, *Tmolium*, 2. 53. 3 *Athenas*, 2. 54. 2 *Ilio* . . . *Colophona*, 2. 54. 3 *apud Delphos*, 2. 60. 2 *veterum Thebarum*, 2. 61. 2 *Elephantinen ac Syenen*, 2. 69. 2 *Seleuciam*, 3. 2. 3 *Tarracinam*, 3. 5. 1 *Ticinum usque*, 3. 9. 2 *ab Narnia*, 3. 61. 1 *Delo*, 3. 63. 2 *apud Pergamum*, 6. 1. 1 *Sarrentum*, 6. 12. 3 *Samo*, *Ilio*, *Erythris*, 6. 44. 2 *Seleucia* (different from 2. 69. 2), 11. 23. 4 *apud Alesiam*, 11. 24. 2 *Alba* . . . *Camerio* . . . *Tusculo*, 12. 12. 2 *apud Zeugma*, 12. 58. 1 *Troia*, 14. 10. 3 *Neapolim*, 14. 12. 4 *Tarentum*, 15. 26. 2 *apud Melitenen*, 15. 34. 1 *apud Beneventum*, 15. 46. 2 *a Formiis*, 16. 9. 1 *Naxum*, 16. 19. 1 *Cumas usque*. This list contains seventy-three names, of which twenty-two (twenty-three with *Ann.* 2. 30. 1 *Brundisium usque*) are accusatives of limit of motion—a construction with limitations similar to the locative. But even in the remaining constructions the generic is usually omitted, with famous and obscure towns alike. The accusatives in the preceding list of names to which the simple *urbs* or *oppidum* is attached are all objects of prepositions or of a verb compounded with *circum*: in *Ann.* 3. 38. 4 “*regem urbemque Philippopolim*, a Macedone Philippo sitam, circumsidunt,” *urbem* was needed to balance *regem*, and reminiscence of the combination probably influenced the choice at 4. 24. 1 *Thubursicum oppidum circumsidet*, and 12. 16. 2 *circumveniunt urbem Uspen*.

Since omission of the generic is the rule with cities and towns (except where further information is to be conveyed), it may not be clear that use of the locative is a deterrent to attachment of the generic. This we can see most clearly with names of islands, which in most constructions are almost invariably introduced with the generic attachment *insula*, but not when a locative is used. So in the first occurrence in the *Annals*, we find the simple *Rhodi* (1. 4. 4; also 2. 42. 2, 3. 48. 1, 4. 57. 2), but in the fourth occurrence (2. 55. 3) *apud Rhodum insulam*.

In brief, since the location of the town is clear from Tacitus' narrative, it would violate his normal practice to attach *oppido* or such to *Amisiae*. In fact, the combination *classis Amisiae relicta*, with *Amisiae* understood as a locative, is in perfect conformity with Tacitus' attested usage.

APPENDIX B: THE GEOGRAPHY

The geographic uncertainties reflect the limits of what can be established by philology alone. But I have attempted to determine first what the Latin should mean, whether or not it agrees with known geography. We can never exclude the possibility that Tacitus himself was confused. But, as I have indicated, that is not necessary. Meister (“Bericht,” p. 93, n. 2, and p. 94, n. 1) has referred to several works on the historical geography of the Ems and the coast of the North Sea. More recent than most of these, and probably more useful as a record of the past history of the river and coastal region, is K. Brüning, *Atlas Niedersachsen* (Bremen, 1950). As can be seen from plates 4 and 54 of this work, if one drew a line from Leer (about 20 kilometers southeast of Emden, and about 5–6 kilometers south of the river's bend to the west) through Norden (about 25 kilometers north of Emden), virtually all the land to the left of this line (passing about 10 kilometers east of Emden) consists of marshland, much of it below sea level, and none of it more than 1.25 meters above sea level (as indicated on plate 14). So far as elevation is concerned, a right stream of the Ems could have passed through any part of the area to the left of this imaginary

line. But the best candidate for a route would follow the area of "marshy-clay and river clay" marked in blue on plate 43. This flanks the Ems for the fifteen or so kilometers of its path south of Leer. But five or six kilometers north of Leer, where the Ems begins its bend to the west, the line of clay heads inland in a generally north-by-northwest direction until it meets the coastal inlet (Leybucht) between Emden and Norden. A record of older abandoned dikes (plate 14) attests that even in relatively recent times the ocean invaded from Leybucht about ten kilometers more to the southeast than it does today, precisely through the area of "marshy-clay and river clay." A line drawn from a point on the Ems five or six kilometers north of Leer through the middle of this area of "marshy-clay and river clay," through the area rimmed by abandoned dikes, and terminating at Leybucht, would give a credible route for an ancient right stream of the Ems, the *aestuarium* crossed in *Ann.* 2. 8. 3: "sed eques quidem ac legiones prima aestuarium, nondum adcrecente unda, intrepidum transiere."²¹

CHARLES E. MURGIA
*University of California,
 Berkeley*

21. In modern use, an estuary refers to an area where fresh and salt (ocean) water mix. The ancients seem to have regarded tidal action as the determining element, whether or not there was fresh water. Either definition would fit both the suggested channel and the record of Tacitus' usage elsewhere. Tacitus applied the term to the Firth of Tay (*Agr.* 22. 1 *ad Taum*—*aestuario nomen est*), to the mouths of the Rhine (*Ann.* 4. 73. 1 *proxima aestuarium*), and to the canal known as the *fossa Drusiana* with its linking natural bodies of water (*Ann.* 11. 18 *per aestuarium et fossas*—explained by Gerber and Greef as "*fossa Drusiana et lacus adiacentes*"). In *Ann.* 14. 32, he used it of the Thames, reporting a reference to the reflection of Colchester appearing in its estuary (*visamque speciem in aestuario Tamesae subversae coloniae*). This I take to be not a distant mirage, but an example of Tacitus' imprecision; for Colchester is actually located on the river Colne, north of the Thames.

I am grateful to R. Knapp, R. Renehan, and the Editor for their criticism of this paper.