THE FORMS OF THE SENTENTIA IN QUINTILIAN VIII. v. 3—24*

by D. M. Kriel

(University of South Africa, Pretoria).

Literary discussions of Quintilian’s views on the rhetorical *sententia* are usually confined to his very sensible precepts on the *use* of this device given in paragraphs 25—34 of *Inst. Or.* VII.v. Particular attention has not been given to his rather confused treatment in the preceding paragraphs (3—24) of the *forms* in which these *sententiae* may be cast, and Bonnell could certainly not have had this section in mind when he described the fifth chapter of bk. VIII as one of the ‘lehrreichsten Kapitel seines Lehrbuchs’. Since it is difficult to find a logical pattern in paragraphs 3—24, a closer examination of these neglected but very important paragraphs seems justified, and in this article an attempt will be made to analyse them and to discern the system underlying Quintilian’s treatment.

Spalding’s ‘analysis’ of par. 3—24 is of very little assistance. He merely says: ‘Γνώμαι; 3—8. Clausula; 9—14. Magis nova sententiarum genera; 15—17. Geminatione fieri sententias; 18—19. Vitiocmes horum generum; 20—24.’ Cousin goes into greater detail, but he is primarily concerned with Quintilian’s sources, and his analysis is therefore incidental to his main theme. He deals with par. 3—8 together as referring to the *γνώμαι*, and then mentions the *enthymema*, *epéphonema*, *noema* and *clausula* (par. 9—14), each on the same level as the *γνώμαι* (i.e. as further, independent forms of *sententia*). Of pars. 15—19 he says that the rhetoricians invented other forms of *sententiae* which rely for their effect upon surprise, allusion, quotation, doubling of a word, antithesis and comparison. He summarises pars. 20—24 by saying that Quintilian brings the ‘bad’ *sententiae* to the attention of his students: ‘ce sont ceux qui reposent sur un jeu de mots, qui sont tiris de trop loin, qui renferment une ambiguïté choquante, qui presentent des exagérations de toutes sortes et surrouent une dépense d’esprit vraiment superflue.’ The scheme of Cousin’s cursory analysis may therefore be presented as follows:

(i) *γνώμαι* (3—8)

(ii) enthymema (9—10)

---

* This paper is based on the second chapter of a dissertation entitled *Die sententia as retorische begrip by Quintilianus*, accepted for the M.A. degree at the University of Pretoria in March, 1961, under the supervision of Prof. H. L. Gonin.


2 The use of *sententiae* is also dealt with in bk. XII. x. 48. (J. W. Duff *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age* p. 405 refers only to this paragraph).

3 E. Bonnell M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus, 5e Auflage von F. Meister, Berlin 1882, p. 11.
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In the course of this article it will become clear that this analysis is not in all respects a satisfactory one.

Our main difficulty with the paragraphs under discussion is to determine which of the technical terms dealt with or mentioned by Quintilian are to be understood to introduce new types of sententia, and which are merely species subordinate to the main genera. Unfortunately the examples provided do not always show the distinctive formal differences that may help us to make the necessary classification. In the following discussion we shall examine the text of each of these paragraphs (3–24) in order to determine whether a particular line of thought can be traced in them.

(i) The gnomic sententia

par. 3: At the beginning of this paragraph Quintilian states that there are different forms of sententia that are all rightly called sententiae, but that the oldest of these forms is the Greek γνώμη. This 'gnomic' sententia is the expression of a universal truth which is 'deserving of praise' even when used out of its original context, and which may sometimes refer merely to things and sometimes to persons.

par. 4: The first word hanc can obviously refer only to the gnomic sententia. In this paragraph the form of the γνώμη is discussed: this γνώμη may be a part of an enthymema, or it may be the premise or conclusion of an epichirema, but because it is not invariably one of these, Quintilian prefers a 'more correct' classification. In his opinion the gnomic sententia is either (a) simplex,
or (b) *ratione subiecta*, or (c) *duplex*. The *sententia simplex* resembles the conclusion of an *epichirema*, the *sententia ratione subiecta* resembles the *entbyrhema* in so far as the latter is a *sententia cum ratione*, or also the premise of an *epichirema*, and the *sententia duplex* is apparently 'double' because it usually consists of two antithetical co-ordinate clauses (although asyndeton or even ellipsis may be employed).

par. 5: In the introduction to this paragraph we are confronted with our first problem: does the word *genera* in 'sum etiam qui decem genera fecerint' refer to *sententiae* in general or only to the gnomic *sententia*? The key to this problem is found in par. 7-8: in par. 7b Quintilian says: 'In hoc genere custodiendum est ... ne crebrae sint, ne palam falsae ...', herewith introducing some precepts on the use of 'hoc genere'. Now 'in hoc genere' can clearly refer only to the gnomic *sententia*, firstly because the only alternative would be that it refer only to what immediately precedes ('vertit ad personam Cicero ... ita quae erant rerum, propria fecit hominis'), and this has nothing to do with a particular type of *sententia*; secondly because the lengthy example in par. 7 is far less of a *vox universalis* than all the preceding examples, while *in hoc genere* in 7b refers specifically to *universalia* (καθ'όλου); and thirdly because Quintilian would hardly have devoted more than sixty words to a discussion of the use of a 'type' of *sententia* which he has dealt with in a few words and to which he does not even give a name (he does not have anything to say about the use of the other 'styles', if indeed there were other styles, in pars. 5-6). Finally the remarkable correspondence between par. 8 and Aristotle’s warning about the use of γνώματα in *Rhet. I*. 22. 9 is a further indication that pars. 7b—8 refer to the γνώματα.

To return to par. 5: if par. 8 is still concerned with the gnomic *sententia*, it follows that the 'decem genera' in par. 5 do not denote new styles of *sententia* in addition to the gnomic *sententia*, but merely refer to finer distinctions of the latter. Of these ten sub-divisions Quintilian names only five, and even these he does not illustrate with examples. They are gnomic *sententiae* based on (a) *interrogatio*, (b) *comparatio*, (c) *infitiatio*, (d) *similitudo* or (e) *admiratio*. The reason why he does not even name the remaining five is that this division is so arbitrary that it would justify the inclusion of far more than

10 This division closely resembles that of the *auctor ad Herennium* (IV.xvii), with the happy omission of the latter's cumbersome and extremely artificial 'duplex sententia cum ratione'.
12 Namely that the use of γνώματα is best suited to the aged and to people with authority.
13 *Cp. bk. IX.i. 6—16.*
14 *Cp. bk. VIII.vi. 8—9.* It appears from this passage that Quintilian does not really distinguish between *comparatio* and *similitudo* (the fourth of the five figures in question). In the *ad Herennium*, too, the term *similitudo* is mainly used, although *comparatio* (IV. xxxii. 44) and *imago* (IV.xlix. 62) are also mentioned.
15 This seems to be the only instance in Quintilian where the term *infitiatio* is used as the name of a figure of speech. It is probably the same as the *negatio* of *ad Herennium* IV.xvi. 57, 59.
16 The only additional information that we have from Quintilian on *admiratio*, is a detailed account of the gesture best suited to its delivery (XI.iii.100). The term is used incidentally in IX.i. 10 and XI.iii. 71, 83.
the ten classifications: for a sententia can be cast in any figure of speech. The five that he does name are indeed so diverse that we cannot but endorse his objection to this classification.

The gnomic sententia ex diversis which is mentioned in the last sentence of par. 5 may conceivably be taken to be one of the remaining five figureae. The words 'illud notabile ex diversis' may, however, just as easily refer to one of the 'plura genera', which may, according to Quintilian, be presented on the same principle as the 'decem genera'.

par. 6: It is not clear how this paragraph links up with the preceding one. Do the words 'ac rectae quidem sunt tales' still refer to sententiae ex diversis, or do they introduce a new group which is a continuation of the 'decem genera' or the 'plura genera'? It seems that the words 'ac ... tales' must be interpreted as: 'And there are, moreover, such direct (gnomic) sententiae: ...'. If this is the case, pars. 6 and 7a must be seen as a further, somewhat diffuse discussion of yet other forms in which the gnomic sententia may be cast: not main genera (for Quintilian has already indicated in par. 4 what he considers to be the three main genera), but species of the genera. An example of a sententia recta is: 'tam deest avaro quod habet, quam quod non habet'. Now Spalding can hardly be right in interpreting 'recta' here as (i.a.) 'absque tropo, sine figura' for Quintilian's example is certainly not 'sine figura'. Most probably rectae here simply means 'direct', i.e. 'in the usual (word-) order,' in the sense in which Quintilian uses this adjective in bk. II. xiii. 5: '(narratio) recta an ordine permutato'. Spalding is then obliged, for the sake of consistency, to interpret the words 'sed maiorem vim accipit et mutatione ... et translatione a communi ad proprium' as: 'Accipiam emutationem, quam efficit figura, non quam patitur', i.e. the mutation consists in making figurata a sententia that was previously 'sine figura'. In view of the abovementioned example of Quintilian, this argument appears to be unacceptable. Quintilian does not contrast figureae with rectae sententiae in this paragraph: the rectae sententiae may indeed be figureae, but their main characteristic is that their word order is more conventional and direct. Mutatio figureae simply means that a different figure of speech is being employed. Quintilian gives an example illustrating how the figure ex diversis becomes interrogatio: the reflexion 'mors misera non est, aditus ad mortem est miserum', according to him, acquires greater force through such a change of figure in Virgil's 'usque adeone mori miserum est?' (Aen. XII. 646). A sententia recta can also be made more effective by applying a general statement to a particular person.

17 In any case Cousin (op. cit. p. 433) can hardly be correct in stating that Quintilian gives examples taken from Publilius Syrus, Virgil, Cicero and Ovid to illustrate each of the five figures (i.e. interrogatio, comparatio, etc.) that he does mention. Whatever these examples illustrate it is certainly not the five figures.

18 Pars. 4 to 7a are perhaps the least coherent paragraphs of the entire chapter.

19 Syrus Sententiae,Diehl p. 163 fr. 71.

20 Spalding has emutatione, others read ex mutatione, but these variants do not affect the present argument.

21 The technical term ex diversis is not used elsewhere: possibly it differs from ex contrariis in that it contrasts different but not opposite matters.

22 Cp. Quint. IX.ii. 6—16.
par. 7: 'Vertit ad personam Cicero' — are these words a continuation, a further illustration, of 'translatio a communi ad proprium', or is this a third way in which a sententia recta may be made more effective? Quintilian's example is: 'Nihil habet, Caesar, nec fortuna tua maius quam ut possis, nec natura melius quam ut velis servare quam plurimos' (Cic. pro Lig. XII. 38). On the face of it the word 'persona' must here be understood to refer to a particular person, since the sentence is addressed specifically to Caesar. But immediately after the example Quintilian explains 'ita quae erant rerum, propria fecit hominis', and here the contrast is clearly between person (in general) and thing. Butler interprets 'vertit ad personam Cicero' as 'Cicero again gives the general statement a personal turn', in other words he considers it to be a variation of 'translatio ad proprium'. The old variant nominis for hominis is attractive (even though Radermacher did not see fit to include it in his apparatus criticus); it so happens that Quintilian's example of 'translatio a communi ad proprium' is also a translatio from thing to person ('nocere - facile est, prodesse difficile' became 'servare potui: perdere an passim, rogas?'), and the example after the words 'vertit ad personam Cicero' differs from the previous one mainly because the name of a person has now been given. Nominis would therefore fit in quite neatly.

pars. 7b and 8: We have already seen in our examination of par. 5 above that this discussion of the use of sententiae deals only with gnomic sententiae. This paragraph requires no further elucidation.

We may now conclude that pars. 3—8 refer only to the gnomic sententia (γνώμη) with all its rhetorical ramifications.

(ii) Enthymema ex contrariis

par. 9: Although Quintilian has obviously brought his treatment of the γνώμη to a close in par. 8, he nevertheless returns to the enthymema in par. 9, presenting it as a new type of sententia, whereas in par. 4 he states that the γνώμη could be a 'part of a sententia'. However, it appears from bk. V.x. 1—3 that the term enthymema may be interpreted in three ways, viz. (a) as a mente concepsum, i.e. anything conceived in the mind of the speaker — but in this sense it is non-technical, and may be ignored; (b) as a sententia cum ratione (where the term sententia is non-technical: 'proposition or thought'); (c) as a 'certa quaedam argumenti conclusio vel ex consequentibus vel ex repugnantibus' (on this point there is some controversy, Quintilian tells us, since there are some people who consider the conclusion 'ex consequentibus' to be an ephichirema, while most critics hold that the enthymema is a conclusion 'ex repugnantibus').

It is clear that in par. 4 of the present chapter Quintilian refers to the second of these three meanings, i.e. a 'sententia cum ratione'; in par. 9, however, it is clear (as will also be shown by the example in the following paragraph) that the term is used in the third sense, i.e. an 'argumenti conclusio ex repugnantibus'. (The possibility of ex consequentibus need not here be taken into account.

23 H. E. Butler The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian, IV volumes, L.C.L. 1953.
24 Cp. Spalding ad loc.
since, as we have seen, Quintilian himself says that some people hold the view that the conclusion *ex consequentibus* is an *epichremata* — V. x. 2).

It is therefore clear that in his discussion of the *gnomic sententia*, Quintilian used the term *enthymema* in the sense of a 'conclusio *ex consequentibus*' (or *sententia cum ratione*), whereas he is presenting a completely new type of *sententia* in par. 9, viz. the *mente conceptum* *ex contrariis* (*ex contrariis* and *ex repugnantibus* are here completely synonymous).  

*pars. 10:* It is not only in this respect, however, that our new *sententia* differs from the *enthymema* of which the *γνώμη* may be a part: in par. 10 Quintilian emphasises the possibility that this *enthymema* *ex contrariis* be employed not only for argumentation, but also solely for *ornatus* 23. An analysis of the example shows that it is an *enthymema* *ex contrariis* of the following order:  

(a) It would be inconsistent for *S* to be *M* and not also to be *P*  
(b) But *S* is *M*  
(c) Therefore *S* is also *P*.  

If this quasi-syllogistic form is applied to the example, we find the following:  

(a) It would be inconsistent that in your clemency you should leave their deeds unpunished and not also their words unpunished.  
(b) But in your clemency you did leave their deeds unpunished.  
(c) Therefore you will also leave their words unpunished.  

When Cicero employed these words in his *pro Ligario*, he did not do so because they contained a new argument — the inconsistency of such conduct on the part of Caesar had already been demonstrated by other arguments — but he added it in the *clausula* as an *epiphonema* (a final exclamation). The function of demonstration had obviously not fallen away, but this was not the immediate *aim* of the *enthymema*: the immediate aim was rhetorical *ornatus*.  

*par. 11:* Although it is remarkable that Quintilian gives two examples of an *epiphonema* 26, he does not indicate clearly that he regards this figure as a mere rhetorical ornament, was not even considered by Aristotle. For the author of the *ad Herennium*, on the other hand, the *contrarium* (i.e. *enthymema*) is properly an 'exornationis genus', with logical demonstration and persuasion as its secondary and rather incidental *aim* (*Rhet. ad Her. IV. xviii. 25*).

26 Quintilian has obviously here used the word *sententia* in its non-technical sense, and I have therefore replaced it with *mente conceptum* in order to avoid confusion. It is indeed strange that Quintilian has chosen to use the word *sententia* in its ordinary meaning of '(any) thought' in a discussion of the rhetorical-technical term *sententia*, and even more strange that no editors have to my knowledge commented upon it. The fact remains, however, that Quintilian is here practically transcribing from Cicero *Topica* xiii. 55, and there is no reason whatsoever for assuming that Cicero suddenly used *sententia* in its rhetorical sense in that passage, or that Quintilian understood it in that way.  

24 Quintilian uses *ex contrariis* in the present passage, *ex repugnantibus* in V.x. 2, and *ex pugnantibus* in V. xiv. 2. It is clear from the context that the three terms mean exactly the same thing in these three passages. (Spalding's note on V.viii. 5 refers to 'a contrariis seu pugnantibus'.)  

25 The use of the *enthymema* — which for him was the *σῶμα τῆς πλειονότητος* — as a mere rhetorical ornament, was not even considered by Aristotle. For the author of the *ad Herennium*, on the other hand, the *contrarium* (i.e. *enthymema*) is properly an 'exornationis genus', with logical demonstration and persuasion as its secondary and rather incidental *aim* (*Rhet. ad Her. IV. xviii. 25*).  

26 ἐπιφόνημα, a phrase added to a statement or proof by way of exclamation and as a final touch. Cousin has omitted the Greek term from his second volume (*Vocabulaire Grec de la terminologie rhétorique dans l'institution oratoire*), probably because most editors have Latinised the word.
further type of sententia (in addition to the entbyhema); it is not improbable that his reference to the entbyhema which is added in the clausula 'epiphonematis modo' led to the purely incidental explanation of the epiphonemai. Demetrius 30 states unequivocally that although the entbyhema may be placed at the end ἐπιφονηματικός, it is not an epiphonema, and that the γνώμη is also not an epiphonema, although it resembles it in certain respects. While it must be conceded that Demetrius's remarks need only apply to the gnomic sententia, it seems probable that Quintilian's reference to the epiphonema was suggested to him by Demetrius's allusion to it, and must therefore not be interpreted as the presentation of a new type of sententia of the same order as the gnomic sententia and the entbyhema. Cousin, however, does interpret it thus 31.

(iii) Noema 32

par. 12: That the noema is of the same order as the entbyhema ex contrariis is clear from the similarity in the presentation of the two figures: of the entbyhema Quintilian says: 'est omne quod mente concepimus', and of the term noema: 'qua voce omnis intelletus accipi potest'. The later rhetoricians used the latter term for that figure 33 in which they implied what they did not wish to say directly, or as Turnebus 34 put it: 'quum alius dicitur, et alius intelligitur'. In this sense of 'allusion or innuendo', the noema is a third type of sententia.

Although this term is otherwise virtually unknown in Roman rhetoric 35, we may infer from the relatively important place given to it here by Quintilian, that the concept must have been fairly generally known; it therefore seems probable that the term noema is here used as a synonym for emphasis 36.

The example given of a noema is an expression used by a sister in addressing her gladiator brother who had brought an action against her, under the lex talionis, for cutting off his thumb while he slept because she objected to his sword-fighting: 'Eras dignus ut haberes integrum manum', thereby implying 'ut depugnares' 37.

(iv) Clausula

par. 13: A fourth main type of sententia is that which is known as a clausula. (Spalding apparently takes it to be a second main type, since he does not mention the entbyhema and the noema but gives pars. 9—14 the general heading Clausula).

30 Demetrius de Eloc. 106—111.
31 Cousin op. cit. Tome 1, p. 434: 'Outre la γνώμη, il y a l'entymème...; il y a l'épiphanème ...
32 I have preferred to use the Latinised form — a not uncommon practice (cp. Cousin op. cit. Tome 2, p. 106 s.v. νόημα).
33 Properly a trope — see Caplan on Rhet. ad Her. IV. xxxi. 42, and Quintilian's definition of tropus in VIII.vi. 1.
34 In Burmann's edition, Leyden 1720.
35 Quintilian mentions it in passing in bk. II.xi. 1.
36 Cp. Spalding ad loc.: 'νόημα Fabianum multam habet affinitatem cum ἐπιφάνεια, quam rhetor Herennianus vocat significationem.' Quintilian must have had noema in mind in IX.ii. 65: 'Huic (i.e. emphasi) confinis vel eadem est, qua nunc utimur plurimum... (id genus) in quo per quandam suspicionem quod non dicimus accipi volumus, non utique contrarium, ut in ἐπινοεῖ, sed alius latens et auditori quasi inveniendum.'
37 'to fight unto death'; cp. Plautus Cas. v. 344; Cicero pro Sestio xx. 46. Butler's 'to be a gladiator all your days' seems to be a misinterpretation.
Quintilian points out that there are two views on the use of the *clausula* as a sententia:

A. The word *clausula* was originally used for a sententia only in the limited sense of a *conclusio*. The *autore ad Herennium* defines conclusio as follows: 'conclusio est quae brevi argumentatione ex iis quae ante dicta sunt aut faca, conficit quid necessario consequatur' 38. It is this logical *conclusio* that Quintilian considers to be 'permissible (recta) and in some cases even necessary', clearly meaning that *usus as a sententia* it may be permissible and even necessary. The original context of the example he quotes, illustrates in what way this example is a logical conclusion: 'Habes igitur Tubero quod est accusatori maxime optandum; confitentem reum, sed tamen hoc confitentem, se in ea parteuisse, qua te, qua virum omni laude dignum, patrem ruum. Itaque prius de vestro delicto confiteamini nescisse est, quam Ligarii ullam culpam reprehendatis' (Cic. *pro Lig.* i. 2). In syllogistic form, this argument runs as follows:

(a) According to you, people who supported Pompey are guilty (M=P)
(b) But you and your father also supported Pompey (S=M)
(c) Therefore you and your father are also guilty (S=P).

B. However, Quintilian's contemporaries tended to turn every 'clausula', not only the logical *conclusio* but also the close of every period, into a sententia. It was the fashionable thing to end each period with a clausula 'that strikes the ear' not only because of its effective rhythmic pattern, but particularly because of the pithiness of its expression.

par. 14: It was considered almost indecent to pause for breath 39 in a speech without a *sensicus* designed to call forth applause.

It is not quite clear what Quintilian is driving at by making this separate classification of the *clausula* as a further type of sententia: only the *conclusio* could conceivably be described as a type of sententia, but the term *clausula* as such only indicates the possible *place* of a sententia (and this Quintilian has already pointed out in par. 2). Perhaps he merely wants to show that the sententia can also be employed 'ad probationem' when it appears in a *conclusio*; the rest of pars. 13 and 14 would then be no more than a brief digression on the excessive striving after point which characterised the style of his contemporaries. Cousin, however, does not mention *conclusio* in his résumé, and considers the *clausula* to be a further type of sententia: 'il y a enfin la clausule : pensée brève, faible et de mauvais goût, que l'on cherche en dehors du sujet et qui termine la période' 40.

(v) *Magis nova sententiarium genera*

Pars. 15–24 may be divided in different ways. However, since Quintilian

---

38 Rhet. ad Her. IV.xxx. 41. Also cp. Cic. *Top.* xiii. 54; xiv. 56, 57; Quint. *V.*x. 2 and *V.*xiv. 1, 20.
39 Cp. Cicero *de Orat.* III.xliv. 173: 'interpirationis enim, non defatigationis nostrae neque librariorum notis sed verborum et sententiarum modo interponitas clausulas in orationibus esse voluerunt.'
40 Cousin *op. cit.,* Tome 1, p. 434.
is apparently indulging in rhetorical hairsplitting which can contribute very little to our understanding of the sententia, the bare classification of the main headings in this section will be sufficient for our purposes 41.

pars 15—19: The first three of these paragraphs deal with three 'magis nova sententiarum genera', viz. those that are *ex inopinato* 42, *alia relata* 43 and *aliunde petita* 44. But what are we to make of *geminatio* 45, which is discussed in pars. 18—19a? Must it be understood to be a new heading independent of the 'magis nova genera' (as Spalding’s analysis implies), or must it be included in this group? The fact that Quintilian’s three examples of *geminatio* are taken from Cicero, whereas his other examples of 'magis nova genera' belong to the Silver Age, supports our acceptance of it as a completely new category. But it does seem strange that Quintilian should have taken his treatment of the sententia as far as the 'magis nova genera' and then suddenly turned back to an 'older' type. Such a reversal would be even more illogical if par. 19b. *et seq.* can be shown to be a continuation of the 'magis nova genera'. This possibility will now be considered.

pars. 19b—24: Quintilian closes par. 19 with the words: 'sed horum quidem generum et bonae dici possunt, et male.' The words 'horum generum' probably refer only to the 'magis nova genera', and not to all the categories of sententia that have preceded par. 15; in other words, we are to understand that it is the four 'newer' types, viz. *ex inopinata*, *alia relata*, *aliunde petita* and *geminatio* (with its sub-divisions), which may equally well be good or bad. But there are other types of sententia (pars. 20—24) that are always 'bad', viz. (a) *sententiae a verbo* 46, (b) *minimae inventivunculae* 47, (c) *vana* 48 and (d) *nimia* 49, and these 'vitiourea sententiae' should therefore be regarded as a second group of 'magis nova genera'. In other words, pars. 15—24 deal with two categories of 'newer' sententiae, the first of which may be either good or bad, whereas the second is always bad.

The above analysis may now be presented as follows:

---

41 A detailed analysis of this section is given in the unpublished dissertation on which this article is based.
42 cp. Demetrius de Bloq. 152: "Εὔτε δὲ τις καὶ ἢ παρὰ τὴν προσθολὴν χάρις . . .
43 It is difficult to see any difference between the *sententia alia relata* and the *noema.*
44 Apparently this is a quotation used as a sententia out of its original context, but whether the example given was actually a quotation we do not know.
45 Pars. 18 and 19 deal with three forms of *geminatio*, viz. (a) *sola geminatio* (simply repetition), (b) *geminatio qua ex contraris vult*, and (c) *geminatio qua alia comparatione clareciti.* Spalding therefore correctly groups these two paragraphs together as 'Geminatione fieri sententias'; Cousin’s division into three independent categories, *geminatio*, antithesis and comparison, respectively of the same order as the preceding three *nova genera*, misses the relation between the last three categories as subdivisions of one *genus.*
46 Puns, of which three degrees of 'reprehensibility' are discussed in pars. 20—21.
47 Unless the three examples contain subtleties beyond the perception of a modern reader, these inventions are indeed 'most trifling'.
48 Trivialities or platitudes.
49 Exaggeration. The classification of *nimia* under *vitiourea sententiae* does not imply that Quintilian disapproves of *all* hyperbole: he also knows a 'decens veri superiectio' (VIII.v1. 67).
Genera Sententiarum

(i) Γνώμη (pars. 3—8)
(ii) Enthymema ex contrariis (pars. 9—11)
(iii) Noema (par. 12)
(iv) Clausula (pars. 13—14)
(v) Magis nova sententiarum genera (pars. 15—24)
   (a) Quae et bona dici possunt, et male (pars. 15—19)
       1. ex inopinato
       2. alio relata
       3. aliunde petita
       4. geminatio
   (b) Quae semper vitiosae sunt (pars. 20—24)
       1. a verbo
       2. minimae inventiunculae
       3. vana
       4. nimia

When the 29 examples of sententiae which are given in pars. 3—24 are subjected to a critical analysis, it appears that they fall into two main categories, namely those that contain a universal truth (maxims) and those that do not. The nine examples of gnomic sententiae all contain or imply general truths, whereas not one of the other examples (i.e. of enthymema ex contrariis, noema, clausula and the magis nova genera) are of universal application; it would therefore be incorrect to translate the term sententia in any of these latter cases as 'maxim' or 'general reflection'; at most they are pithy expressions (pointes).

We are therefore justified in concluding that Quintilian interprets the rhetorical term sententia in two different ways. In the first place it is a neat formulation of a general truth, and in the second place it is any pointed expression which relies for its effect on antithesis, word-play, hyperbole or mere witticism.
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60 The two examples of epifphonemata in par. 11 have not been included, because, as we have seen, there is no clear indication that Quintilian regarded them as sententiae.
61 This has been done in my dissertation.
62 A very few may perhaps be understood to imply a general truth, e.g. those in pars. 10, 13 and 19. The words 'sententia universalis est vox' in I.ix. 3 can therefore refer only to the gnomic sententia.
ROMAN ATTITUDES TO THE 'EXTERNAE GENTES' OF THE NORTH*

by D. B. Saddington

(Witwatersrand University)

The great emphasis placed upon racial and national differences in modern times cannot be paralleled in the Roman world. Yet the Roman empire contained peoples of many different races and cultures and material for racial antagonism was present. Physical differences, as between the tall, fair Gauls and Germans of the north and the shorter, darker peoples of the Mediterranean coastlands, were observed and commented upon. Different customs in different tribes were fully discussed in Roman ethnographical literature. But there was no biological theory of race in the modern sense, and peoples were classified as cultural units. The process of absorption into the fabric of the Roman empire must be seen mainly in cultural terms. The attitudes which the Romans adopted towards the peoples whom they conquered and those held by the conquered towards them were a not unimportant factor affecting this process of assimilation.

It is the aim of this article to investigate Roman attitudes to the largely Celtic tribes of Europe who became the inhabitants of the western provinces of the empire. Roman opinions concerning them are of particular interest as this was the least civilized region of the empire before its conquest and yet one where Romanization was most complete. Many features of provincial life throw light on the question, but only the literary evidence can be considered here. Discussion will be confined to the period before the second century A.D. After an investigation of some terms commonly found in contexts referring to foreign peoples and some general remarks on the place of the provinces in Roman thinking, the attitudes of various authors to specific peoples can be distinguished.

The Roman view of 'barbari' was not nearly as exclusive as that of the

---

* The substance of this paper was read to the Fourth National Conference of the Classical Association of S.A., at Grahamstown on Febr. 2, 1961.

1 The apparent exception of the Jewish troubles in the Roman empire is to be explained in religious terms.

2 On 'race' in antiquity cf. Radin, M: The Jews among the Greeks and the Romans, Philadelphia 1915, 48 ff.: 'The term race then denoted a sum of national and social traits which it might be difficult to acquire in one generation, but which could be readily acquired in two'.


5 Evidence from the poets has been left out of account because it is more highly stylized. Some of the passages discussed in Christ, F: Die römische Weltherrschaft in der antiken Dichtung (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, XXXI) Stuttgart — Berlin, 1938, esp. 78 ff, 144., may be compared.
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The Roman state was constantly being enlarged by the inclusion of non-Romans, with the result that the term 'barbarus' could not acquire a rigid signification. Essentially a barbarian was someone who could not be understood, as the complaint of Ovid in exile makes clear:

'barbarus hic ego sum, qui non intellegor ulli, et rident stolidi verba Latina Getae'.

Cruelty and savagery were often associated with barbarians, especially in times of war. The brutality ascribed to barbarians was often exaggerated by the irrational fears and hatred experienced in battle. Roman writers stress the irresponsibility and stupidity of 'barbari': in general they were regarded as morally inferior. The abstract term 'barbaria' covered both these senses of cruelty and ethical inequality. Originally its connotation had been geographical, as in the phrase: 'non solum Graecia et Italia sed omnis barbaria'. But the ethical sense is predominant in Seneca's strictures on the 'barbaria' of the Sullan proscriptions. Cicero found an 'inveteratum quandam barbariam' in Gades, which probably refers to the city's Punic origin and its proximity to the uncivilized tribes of Spain. However it is significant of the Roman attitude to foreigners that degrees of barbarism were recognised. Seneca, for example, speaks of the 'barbaris . . . humanioribus' of Corsica, and Suetonius describes the Gauls whom Caesar introduced into the senate as 'semibarbari'.

The derogatory senses of 'barbarus' largely derive from the Greek origin of the word. 'Exterus' or 'externus' was the Roman term for 'foreign'. The original meaning was geographical and had no ethical overtones. But since most of the 'externi' with whom the Romans came into contact were militarily or culturally inferior to them, 'externus' took on many of the associations of 'barbarus'. Tacitus applies the term 'externos mores' to the actions of Vitellius' army in 69 A.D., and in Cicero it is made to cover both Greek decadence and barbarian savagery: 'externi sunt isti mores aut levium Graecorum aut immanium barbarorum'.

Less civilized peoples were usually called 'gentes' or 'nationes'. 'Populus' and
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7 Ovid, Tristia V, 10, 37 f.
10 Cic. Fin. II, 15, 49.
11 Sen. Ira III, 18, 1.
13 Sen. Polyb. 18, 9.
15 Cf. Walser, o. c., n. 6, 67 and n. 304: 'Die Angehörigen der nationes externe, der Staaten ausserhalb des römischen Reiches, waren gegenüber dem römischen Bürger selbstverständlich Menschen minderen Rechtes, aber den Bezeichnungen externus und externus haftete nicht der abschätzige Beiklang des griechischen barbarus an'.
16 Tac. H. II, 73.
17 Cic. Lig. 4, 11. There is a similar contrast between foreign values and Roman 'gravitas' and 'clementia' in Tac. Ann. XII, 11 (the advice of Claudius to a Roman nominee for the Parthian throne).
'civitas' were more formal terms suggesting a certain degree of political organization and accordingly implying some respect. In late republican usage 'gentes' have been defined as 'those people who fell within the sphere of influence of Roman military dominance'\textsuperscript{18}. Roman writers tended to classify them either as hostile or loyal\textsuperscript{19}. In military contexts 'gentes' are often described as savage and wild: the tribes of Britain, for example, appear as 'gentes barbaras' on a triumphal inscription of Claudius\textsuperscript{20}. The intention no doubt was to enhance the magnitude of Roman victories. 'Natio' was used in the same way as 'gens'\textsuperscript{21}. These terms survived to describe foreign peoples even after they had been incorporated within a province, as in Cicero's\textsuperscript{22} declaration: 'nulla gens est quae non . . . aut ita domita ut quiescat, aut ita pacata ut victoria nostra imperioque laetetur'. In fact it is mistaken to regard the Roman empire as a well-defined territorial entity, with a strong distinction between those within its formal boundaries and those without. This was a conception that developed in the late imperial period as a result of the barbarian invasions\textsuperscript{23}.

In the early imperial period and even more so in republican times the distinction was drawn between Rome and Italy and what lay beyond, rather than between Rome and her provinces and the independent peoples on the frontiers. Tribes and cities were connected to Rome with differing degrees of closeness. Cicero\textsuperscript{24} gives the order at the end of his speech \textit{De Domo Sua}: 'Si senatu, si populo Romano, si cunctae Italiae, si provinciis, si exeriis nationibus . . . gratum et iucundum meum reditum intellegitis esse'. 'Exterae' here cannot mean completely foreign, otherwise the 'nationes' would hardly have been concerned in Cicero's return from exile. The reference is probably to client kingdoms. Indeed 'externae gentes' often means the wilder peoples within the Roman empire itself. The adjective 'domesticus'\textsuperscript{25}, which is frequently contrasted with 'externus', is used only of urban Roman affairs, not of those of the provinces as well. 'Exterus', then, does not mean foreign to the empire, but foreign to Rome and Italy.

These were the main significant terms used by the Romans to designate foreign peoples. We may now ask in what light the Romans regarded the 'externae gentes' under their control. Basically they were completely indifferent to them. Rome was the undisputed centre of every true Roman's political aspirations\textsuperscript{26}: 'Ita multa Romae geruntur ut vix ea quae fiunt in provinciis audiantur'\textsuperscript{27}. Nor did Rome cloak her world-wide dominion. The Roman people

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{19} Cic. Balb. 13, 30.
\textsuperscript{20} I.L.S. 216. For 'gens' in inscriptional language cf. Augustus in R.G. 3; 26 ff; Tac. Ann. II, 22 (for the triumph of Germanicus); 41.
\textsuperscript{21} Cf. Cic. Font. 5, 13: 'Est in eadem provincia Narbo Martius, colonia nostrorum civium, specula populi Romani ac propugnaculum istis ipsis nationibus oppositum et obiectum.' The position at Massilia was the same, as Livy XXXVII, 54, 21, shows.
\textsuperscript{23} Christ, K., loc. cit. n. 4, 287 f. A supposed 'moral barrier' on the Rhine has been posited in too rigid terms in Alfeldii, A.: \textit{The Moral Barrier on Rhine and Danube}, art. in Birley, E., ed: \textit{The Congress of Roman Frontier Studies 1949}, Durham 1952, 1 ff.
\textsuperscript{24} Cic. Dom. 58, 147. Cf. Cluent. 56, 154; Balb. 4, 9.
\textsuperscript{25} Cic. Sest. 23, 51; Balb. 24, 55.
\textsuperscript{27} Cic. Planc. 26, 65.
\end{footnotesize}
was 'dominus regum, victor atque imperator omnium gentium'\(^{28}\). Rome’s control was absolute, and could not be questioned. Even the Romans acknowledged the hatred engendered by the insolence and pride of their generals and magistrates abroad, the 'paene ... iustum odium imperi nostri'\(^{29}\). The Romans had few scruples about exploiting the provinces for profit. Meyer\(^{30}\) has shown how often even Cicero was prepared to refer to them as 'praedia' and 'vectigalia'. This was in spite of his nobler concept of a 'patrocinium orbis'\(^{31}\) to be exercised by Rome, and at variance with his own actions as governor of Cilicia and with his advice to his brother in \textit{Ad Quintum Fratrem} I, 1. Although certain improvements were made in provincial administration in the imperial period, the Roman attitude of superiority died hard. A speech delivered by Paetus Thrasea at the trial of a certain Claudius Timarchus of Crete during the reign of Nero is significant in this connection. A plea was made for the restoration of Roman dignity: ‘Ergo adversus novam provincialium superstium dignum fide constantaque Romana capiamus consilium ... Olim quidem non modo praetor aut consul sed privati etiam mittebatur qui provincias viserent et quid de cuiusque obsequio videretur referrent; trepidabantque gentes de aestimatione singulorum: at nunc colimus externos et adulumur ...’\(^{32}\). It is important to note that Thrasea struck a sympathetic note with his fellow senators: ‘magnus adsensus celebrata sententia’. It was this sort of opposition that Claudius had to face when he attempted to introduce the ‘primores Galliae’ into the senate. Surely there were sufficient senators in Italy: ‘suffecisse olim indigenas consanguinei populi’\(^{33}\). Gauls were to be content with the mere title of citizenship, but not to aspire to the dignity of office at Rome. ‘Externi’ could not hope for complete acceptance by the Romans even after they had become citizens.

The arrogance of Romans in the provinces and the prejudice against ‘externi’ whose citizenship was of recent origin must be borne in mind when considering statements concerning the civilizing mission of Rome. Even Vergil’s\(^{34}\) famous description of the task of Rome is characterized by ‘splendid arrogance’:

\[
\text{‘tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento (hsec tibi erunt artes), pacisque imponere morem, parcere subjiciis et debellare superbos.’}
\]

‘Imponere’ is a strong term that does not leave much room for co-operation from the other side. Caesar’s ‘clemency’ in Gaul, exercised only after ‘pacification’ had been secured, springs to mind as an example of this attitude. The elder Pliny\(^{35}\) in a famous passage urged the Romans to work for the unity of

\(^{30}\) Meyer, o. c. n. 26, esp. chapter vi.
\(^{32}\) Tac. \textit{Ann.} XV, 20—22. It is important to note that Claudius Timarchus, as his ‘gentilicium’ shows, was a Roman citizen, even if of recent origin.
\(^{33}\) Tac. \textit{Ann.} XI, 23.
\(^{34}\) Verg. \textit{Aen.} VI, 851—3. The reading adopted is that of the Oxford text. ‘Paci’ for ‘pacis’ weakens the idea considerably, but may be right. Fletcher ad loc. quotes the phrase ‘splendid arrogance’ from Page.
\(^{35}\) Pliny, \textit{N.H.} III, 3, 59; cf. XXIV, 1, 3; Sherwin-White, o. c. n. 18, 262.
mankind, to spread the use of Latin and to make men more humane and cultured. But the initiative was left firmly in Roman hands. There can be no question concerning the justness of Rome's claim to act as a civilizing force and to rule with tolerance and mercy. As Vogt remarks, the brutalities of conquest were soon replaced by a wise organization. However, the Roman attitude was never more than paternalistic. The word 'servitus' was often applied to the condition of subjects in the empire, not only by Tacitus. Rome's pride and consciousness of power must have had a strong influence upon her relation to the peoples of her empire.

It is against this general background that Roman attitudes to the 'externae gentes' of the north must be viewed. The tribes of Europe, especially the northern barbarians, proved to be the most formidable of Rome's enemies. Carthaginian and other Phoenician influences had not civilized the natives of the Spanish interior; the subjection of the Iberian peninsula occupied the Romans right up to the time of Augustus. Gaul north of its Mediterranean coasts held Caesar for ten years and then erupted in revolt whenever opportune under the early emperors. The Romans invaded Germany under Augustus, but were repulsed and forced to content themselves with a military occupation of the left bank of the Rhine. The Flavian advance in the south west, which was consolidated under Trajan and Hadrian, was regarded with scorn by Roman historians who remembered earlier expeditions to the Elbe. Caesar visited Britain but a permanent occupation did not take place until a century later, and then only of the south east. The advance to the north, which culminated under Agricola, was hotly contested and never really secured in Scotland. North England always remained uneasy. Augustus had to fight heavily to consolidate the conquest of the Alps and the Danube area. There was widespread unrest on the Danube in the Flavio-Trajanic period, and Dacia was not an easy acquisition.

Representative Roman views of the northern barbarians will be found in Cicero and the historians from Caesar to Tacitus. For Cicero the Gauls were savages. He congratulated his brother on having been assigned Asia rather than a province of the West: 'quod si te sors Afris aut Hispanis aut Gallis praefecisset, immanibus ac barbaris nationibus ...'. There are occasional complimentary references to Gaul, but it is clear that these are only apparent exceptions. In the Pro Flacco, for example, Gaul provides favourable testimony for Flaccus, but it is the Massilienses who are meant. Massilia was an ancient Greek colony which had long been an ally of Rome. The Roman colony of Narbo is distinguished from the surrounding tribes. Decimus Brutus assisted the republican cause 'summo studio municipiorum coloniorumque provinciae Galliae', but if Antony had had access to Gaul he would have
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37 Cic. Q. Fr. I, 1, 27. For a similar contrast cf. Balb. 18, 41.
38 Cic. Q. Fr. I, 1, 27. For a similar contrast cf. Balb. 18, 41.
39 Cic. Q. Fr. I, 1, 27. For a similar contrast cf. Balb. 18, 41.
40 Cic. Q. Fr. I, 1, 27. For a similar contrast cf. Balb. 18, 41.
descended upon Italy 'cum omni immanitate barbariae' 41.

It is this aspect of Gaul that is to the fore in the Pro Fonteio delivered in 69 B.C. on behalf of a governor of Transalpine Gaul being tried for extortion. There is a constant juxtaposition of Roman and barbarian, and the accusation is discredited for relying on Gallic testimony, 'libidine barbarorum quam nostro­num hominum litteris' 42. Roman prejudice against what is foreign is exploited to the full 43. The warlikeness and rebelliousness of the Gauls are stressed 44. Much is made of the charge of irreligion, and the Gauls are castigated for practising human sacrifice up to the present day 45. Cicero 46 sneers at the dress of the Gauls appearing 'sagatos bracatosque' in court. Again and again he stresses the 'insitas inimicitias' and the 'immani et intolerandae barbariae' 47 of the Gauls. The speech is remarkable for the depth of hostility which it shows to them some ten years before commencement of Caesar's campaigns and for the violence which a Roman advocate could use in attacking their credibility as witnesses.

Gaul appears again in the speech De Provinciis Consularibus 48 of 56 B.C., where the context is military. Caesar's achievements are magnified when the barbaric warlike nature of the Gauls is stressed: 'ceterae partes a gentibus aut inimicis huic imperio aut infidis aut incognitis aut certe immanibus et barbaris et bellicosos tenebantur'. A new element in Cicero's description of the Gauls is the reference to their 'multitudo', obviously an important factor from the point of view of conquest.

Cicero did not have to deal with German or British witnesses, although he has his joke about Trebatius being a 'Britannicus iuris consultus' 49. Both peoples fell into the category of the uncivilized enemies of Rome 50. Britain is linked with Scythia as an example of 'barbaria' in a philosophical work 51. Besides Trebatius, Cicero's brother provided a personal link with Britain. Cicero's chief interest in Britain was in the plunder. There proved to be nothing except slaves, and these, as he reminded Atticus 52, would be completely uneducated. Cicero's casual attitude is revealing. He was concerned with the fruits of conquest, not with scruples about a 'bellum iustum'.

Caesar's references to the 'nationes' 54 of the north are of particular interest since he spent ten years in close contact with them. Caesar recognized that there were cultural differences between the peoples of Gaul. Proximity to the Roman province of Transalpina provided the criterion, just as the tribes of
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41 Cic. Phil. V, 13, 36f.
42 Cic. Font. 3, 4; cf. 5, 12; 14, 32; 21, 49.
43 Cic. Font. 7, 15; 11, 23.
44 Cic. Font. 5, 12.
45 Cic. Font. 13, 30f. It is fair to note that even the Romans themselves practised human sacrifice upon occasion. Pliny the Elder (N.H. XXVIII, 2, 12) says: 'etiam nostra setas vidit', and 'solet' in the next phrase may be compared.
46 Cic. Font. 15, 33.
47 Cic. Font. 20, 44.
49 Cic. Fam. VII, 11, 2.
52 Cic. Att. IV, 17, 6; 18, 5.
53 Cic. Att. IV, 17, 6; 18, 5. The expression 'externae gentes' is not used.
Britain were assessed on their closeness to Gaul. Caesar was prepared to acknowledge any signs of 'sollertia' on the part of the Gauls and did not withhold praise from their military achievements and skill. This is illuminating, and a tribute to his objectivity, for he could easily have magnified his achievements by exaggerating the barbarism of his opponents. Of course he uses the term 'barbari', but, as Rice Holmes remarks, with the sense of the colonial English term 'natives'. Caesar often associates the term 'imperiti' with 'barbari', and even makes the Gauls themselves refer to their lack of technical skill. When unmasking a piece of Roman deception, Arioristus is made to remark that 'non se tam barbarum neque tam imperitum esse rerum', and the Morini use the same phrase to excuse their attack upon the Romans: 'quod homines barbari et nostrae consuetudinis imperiti bellum populo Romano fessissin' 59. This lack of sophistication as compared with Roman finesse struck the author of the De Bello Africo when he called the Gauls 'hominis apertos minimeque insidiosos, qui per virtutem, non per dolum dimicare consuerunt' 60.

Caesar does mention the savagery of the northern barbarians. This can be seen from the combination 'feri ac barbari', which, however, is placed in a Gallic description of the Germans. Although Caesar uses 'barbari' of any of his enemies, he applies it especially to the Eburones and the 'nationes quae trans Rhenum incolerent'. The military superiority of the Helvetians and Belgians is explained by their frequent battles with the Germans. The Britons seem to be called 'barbari' rather frequently when one considers the shortness of the passage in which they are described. The derogatory senses of 'barbarus' are confined to native incompetence or to the wildness of the Germans or the Britons. But Caesar never exhibits the vehemence of Cicero in his references to the northerners.

Sallust mentions the Gauls and the Allobroges several times in the Bellum Catilinae. To judge from a few stray phrases he held the hostile view of Cicero rather than the more discerning attitude of Caesar. Caro is made to describe the hostility of the Gauls to Rome: 'Gallorum gentem infestissumam nomin Romano' 66. Aid is to be sought from the Allobroges because 'natura gens Gallica bellica est'. Sallust gives the Gauls a high military rating: 'gloria
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55 Caes. B.G. I, 1, 3; V, 14, 1; cf. IV, 3, 3 on the Ubians.
56 Caes. B.G. VII, 22, 1; cf. III, 21, 3 for the mines of Aquitania.
57 Rice Holmes on I, 40, 9. Contrast the few examples of 'barbarus' meaning 'agrestis, ferus' in Meusel, s.v., with the substantival examples given under 2.
58 Caes. B.G. I, 44, 9, where Rice Holmes suggests 'such a dolt' for 'barbarum'.
59 Caes. B.G. IV, 22, 1, where he translates 'barbari' by 'uncivilized'.
60 Bell. Afr. 73, 2.
62 Caes. B.G. III, 16, 4, where however there is some moral disdain on account of an infringement of the rights of ambassador by the natives.
63 Caes. B.G. V, 34, 1; VI, 34, 6 of the Eburones; II, 35, 1; IV, 17, 10; VI, 10, 2; 29, 2; 35, 6; 37, 7; 37, 9 of the Germans.
64 Caes. B.G. I, 1, 4; cf. the 'German' origin of the Belgians in II, 4, 1.
65 Caes. B.G. IV, 21, 9; 24, 1; 32, 2.
66 Sall. Cat. 52, 24.
67 Sall. Cat. 40, 1. Cicero's references to the Allobroges are more circumspect, since he had received assistance from their ambassadors in the Catilinarian conspiracy, but cf. Cat. III, 9, 22; Sull. 13, 36. For the military reputation of the Gauls in Sallust, cf. Cat. 53, 3; Jug. 114, 2.
belli Gallos ante Romanos fuisse'. They are viewed entirely in the context of the danger which they presented to Rome.

Two episodes in the extant portion of Livy deal with Celtic peoples. In book V he describes the sack of Rome by the Gauls in 390 B.C., and in book XXXVIII the Roman attack on the Galatians in 189 B.C. The Gauls are a strange people coming from a wild region. They are classified as 'barbari' even when their demands were just. The Galatians were a 'ferox natio' only in comparison with the surrounding peoples of Asia Minor, and were no longer as formidable as their ancestors had been two centuries before. Livy stresses the impulsiveness of the Gauls and the fierceness of their first onslaught. Like Sallust, he refers to their great military reputation. This went back to their defeat of Rome at Allia, and formed an element in the Roman attitude to all the wild peoples north of the Alps.

Velleius Paterculus had himself fought against the barbarians of the north under his hero Tiberius. But his account of the Germans, and of the Danubian tribes, shows none of the restraint of Caesar. Velleius did not rise above the rank of 'legateus legionis' in the war. It is accordingly likely that his account of the Germans, even when allowance has been made for its rhetoric, approximates more to that of the ordinary Roman officer. The great multitude of the Germans, their size and savagery are all emphasized. The Langobardi are described as a 'gens etiam Germana feritate ferocior'. The Germans are scarcely human: 'esse homines qui nihil praeter vocem membraque habarent hominum'. They possessed a native craftiness: 'in summa feritate versutissimi natumque mendacio genus'. Other northern peoples are described in terms almost as violent. In Velleius one is close to the actual feelings of combatants before battle.

For Tacitus the 'gentes' and 'nationes' were greatly inferior to the Romans. A commander of the fleet at Ravenna is strongly censured for treating Italy 'velut infimam nationum'. The term barbarian is often applied to less civilized peoples, usually disparagingly. It is used especially of the warlike tribes on the
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68 Livy V, 37, 2. Cf. V, 33, 11 for the effect of their environment on the peoples living in the Alps. For the Gauls as an 'ignota gens' cf. V, 32, 7; 35, 4; 38, 6; Rudberg, o.c. n. 8, 12 ff.
69 Livy V, 36, 9; 39, 5. The envoys whom the Romans sent to the Gauls are censured for being so 'praefroces' as to be 'Galliis magis quam Romanis similes' (V, 36, 1).
70 Livy XXXVIII, 16—17. Of course the description of the Galatians in the speech of Manlius Vulso was intended to belittle their reputation before battle.
71 Livy V, 37, 4: 'flagrantes ira, cuius inaptos est gens'; cf. 49, 5; XXXVIII, 17, 8; 21, 8.
73 Vell. II, 106, 2.
74 Vell. II, 117, 3.
75 Vell. II, 118, 1. Maroboduus is compared to a serpent in a hole — 120, 3.
76 Vell. II, 90, 1; 95, 2.
Roman frontiers. Cunning and treachery are to be expected from 'barbari'. Unusual, and therefore often undesirable, customs are labelled barbarian. In general barbarians suffer from moral and cultural inferiority.

'Externus' is a word that occurs frequently in Tacitus. It can mean that which is entirely foreign, as when client kings are said to be protected 'adversum externa imperia' or be confined to that which is not specifically Roman. The phrase 'externae res' covers both frontier and provincial affairs. The non-literal senses of 'externus' are interesting for showing Roman associations with the idea of the foreign. The word can mean 'hostile', as in the warning to Civilis 'ne externa armis falsis velaret'. It is also applied to what is un-Roman in an unfavourable sense. The people of Lugdunum can say of the neighbouring town of Vienna: 'cuncta illic externa et hostilia'. Yet Vienna was as much a Roman colony as Lugdunum, even if it had not been settled by a nucleus of Roman veterans. Tacitus complains of the decline of an ancient Roman priesthood, 'quia externae superstitiones valescant'. One notes the sting in his description of Nero's reliance upon his German bodyguard: 'permixti Germanis, quibus fidebat princeps quasi externis'.

The Britons are featured frequently in Tacitus. Even in Agricola's time they could arouse fear of the unknown among the Romans. Before the battle of Mons Graupius the troops had to be assured that their present enemies were 'ceterorum Britannorum fugacissimi ideoque tam diu superstites'. They were not 'novae gentes atque ignota acies'. That Agricola had to make these assurances makes it clear what the actual feelings of the soldiers were. Tacitus regularly refers to the Britons as 'barbari'. They were unaware of their own origins and lived 'dispersi ac rudes' when Agricola attempted to introduce town-life among them. They were distinguished from the Gauls, whom Tacitus regarded as their ancestors, by greater 'ferocia': 'plus tamen ferociae Britanni praeferunt, ut quos nondum longa pax emollierit'. The governorship of Vettius
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79 Cf. e.g. Tac. H. III, 5 and Gerber and Greef, s.v. 'barbarus'.
81 Tac. Ann. III, 33, compares the accompaniment of a governor of a province by his wife to a 'barbari incessus'.
82 The people of Seleucia on the Tigris are complimented for not being 'in barbarum corrupta' (Tac. Ann. VI, 42; cf. H. V, 2).
83 It occupies almost a page in Gerber and Greef, while 'barbarus' does not fill more than half that space.
85 Tac. H. V, 10; Ann. III, 32; XV, 18.
86 Tac. H. IV, 32; cf. III, 5.
87 Tac. H. I, 65. Yet cf. Ann. XI, 1, where a consul from Vienna could be suspected under Claudius of rousing native Gallic sentiment against the emperor: 'quando genitus Viennae multisque et validis propinquitatibus subnixus turbare gentilis nationes promptum habet'.
89 Tac. Ann. XV, 58.
90 Tac. Agr. 34, 1; cf. 22, 1 for 'novae' and 24, 1 for 'ignota'.
92 Tac. Agr. 21, 1.
93 Tac. Agr. 11, 5.
Bolanus was 'placidius quam feroci provincia dignum est'⁹⁴. Mention is made of the 'insitam ferociam et Romani nominis odium' of Venutius⁹⁵. The picture of the Britons that emerges from Tacitus is largely that of a conventional 'externa gens' at war with Rome. This was largely due to the type of work in which they appear. The Agricola was a biography, not an ethnography nor a military history of Britain, and the Annals formal history.

Descriptions of the Germans occur in quite different settings. Since the Germania is an ethnographical treatise, military prowess could be subordinated to the pursuits of peace. There is frequent reference to Rome. Tacitus often suggests, though not always explicitly, that the Germans had a purer way of life than the degenerate Romans of his day. Then, too, there is an interesting tension between his undoubted approval of German simplicity and his disgust at their more barbaric characteristics. The tone of the Germania is a useful corrective to the conventional accounts of the German wars in the Annals. Though in the same historical tradition, the account of the Batavian Uprising in the Histories has some valuable features due to its detail and the care with which the complex relations between the rebels and the Romans are described. It is by no means a straightforward account of conquest over barbarians.

The Germans are regarded as 'barbari'⁹⁶, but the term is not used much in the Germania. It is in the military episodes of the other works that it is found fairly often⁹⁷. In the Annals Germanicus is made to describe the German 'barbari' in some detail in his speech before the battle of Idisiaviso in 16 A.D. He belittles their armour and military effectiveness after the first charge and then accuses them of unreliability and disregard of human and divine law⁹⁸. The exaggeration of this passage stands in marked contrast to the usual restraint of Tacitus, and is reminiscent of Velleius Paterculus. It confirms the impression that the average⁹⁹ view of the Germans was more violent than that of Caesar or Tacitus.

Germans suffered from barbarian ignorance¹⁰⁰. It was in this respect that Civilis was an exception, since he was 'ultra quam barbaris solitum ingenio solvens'¹⁰¹. 'Barbarus' is also used as an adjective of certain German practices. The character of the 'barbaro ritu'¹⁰² which accompanied the swearing of oaths at the outset of the Batavian revolt is not explained, but the phrase 'barbari ritus' (of the Semnones) refers to human sacrifice¹⁰³.

As Tacitus uses 'externus' more often than 'barbarus', the word is also found

⁹⁴ Tac. Agr. 8, 1.
⁹⁵ Tac. H. III, 45; cf. Ann. XII, 33, of the Silures; XIV, 34; 38, of the forces of Boudica.
⁹⁶ Tac. G. 18, 1; Ann. XIII, 54.
⁹⁷ Tac. Ann. 1, 57; 64; 65; 68, where a bolder plan pleases them as barbarians; II, 63; XII, 79; H. IV, 29; V, 14; 15.
⁹⁹ Cf. above p. 97, n. 73 for Velleius and Caesar's army. The second century epitomator Florus stands in this tradition. Cf. the tone of such passages as I, 38; 5; 38, 12 ('quadrum stolidate barbarica' of the Cimbrians); 45, 1 and 6 on the Gauls; II, 22, 5 on the Alpine tribes; 29, 20 on the Sarmatians ('tanta barbaria est, ut non intellagent pacem').
¹⁰⁰ Tac. G., 45, 4—5, concerning amber.
¹⁰¹ Tac. H. IV, 13.
¹⁰² Tac. H. IV, 15.
¹⁰³ Tac. G. 39, 2.
in connection with Germans. Even the Treverans were regarded as 'externi' by the legions stationed on the Rhine during the mutiny at the beginning of Tiberius' reign. The Batavian uprising is often so labelled. Interestingly, the armies of Vitellius fall foul of the same prejudice. They consisted of 'cives socii externi'. The prejudice was based on the fact that there had been a rapid conscription of German auxiliaries, who formed the most formidable element: 'Germanos, quod genus militum apud hostis atrocissimum sit'. But even the legions themselves in the heat of battle could be stigmatized as 'peregrinum et externum' by Otho's forces. It is in such military situations that social and cultural differences are exploited with the greatest vehemence. At other times they often lie dormant.

By Tacitus' day most of the 'gentes' of Gaul, the Rhineland and Britain had been brought under Roman control. His references to those which had been conquered show a significant change. The Romans were the last people not to admire military prowess: often admiration for the fighting qualities of the Gauls, the Germans and the Britons shines through Roman dread of their 'ferocia'. But when they had been incorporated into provinces, the picture changed. Much of the admiration went: the warriors had become soft and enervated. Tacitus has a very blunt word to describe their condition: 'servitus'. A few examples may be quoted. Reference has already been made to the distinction which he makes between the Britons and the Gauls. The rest of the passage is informative: 'nam Gallos quoque in bellis floruisse accepimus; mox segnitia cum otio intravit, amissa virtute pariter ac liberate, quod Britannorum olim victis event: ceteri manent quales Galli fuerunt.' In his bitter speech before the battle of Mons Graupius Calgacus compared the Britons to the most recently acquired slaves in a household: hence the worst treated. The client kingdom of Vangio and Sido across the Danube was admirably loyal, 'suone an servitii ingenio'. The free Germans regarded the walls of the Roman colony of Colonia Agrippinensis as 'munimenta servitii'. Civilis reminded the Gauls 'malorum quae tot annis perpessi miseram servitutem falso pacem vocarent'.

The literary evidence for the tribes of Europe presents a picture of uncivilized warlikeness. The Romans never quite lost their fear for the invaders from the north who had defeated them at the battle of Allia at the end of the fourth...
century B.C. It was transferred from Gaul to German and to Briton, but lessened by actual contact with these peoples from the first century B.C. onwards. This picture must also be interpreted in the light of the fact that the 'externi' figure in Roman literature largely as enemies to be conquered or as rivals for privilege at Rome. In many passages where Cicero's Gauls appear as the worst of men they were providing evidence for the opposite side in the case. An easy way of discrediting provincial evidence was to vilify the witnesses, a point to which even Quintilian has drawn attention. But although the violence of Cicero's language need not be taken at its face value, it cannot be denied that he had little respect or sympathy for the uncivilized peoples living beyond the Alps. However individuals could always be drawn into the world of Rome. In Cicero's view service to the state should be rewarded with citizenship. Whatever his private opinion of Balbus, the powerful agent of Caesar, may have been, Cicero defended his right to Roman citizenship with great energy. The 'barbaria' of Punic Gades can be shed, especially if the right measures are taken by wise administrators like Caesar.

The evidence of the historians must also be placed in its context. The Romans had inherited the tradition of Greek ethnography. The formalism and traditionalism of much late republican and early imperial description of the enemies of Rome must be acknowledged. On the other hand the Celtic world, for all its magnificence, was culturally inferior to Graeco-Roman civilization. But the fact that the Romans referred to the Gauls, Germans and Britons as 'barbari' need not imply the scorn which the Greeks felt for non-Greeks. Aspects of barbarian life were admired, and differences between them admitted. Caesar showed a remarkable restraint in describing his enemies. He made great use of the Roman custom of reconciling prominent foreigners to himself. Many Gauls with Roman citizenship owed it to a grant which he made to an ancestor. Much is learnt of his attitude when one considers that soon after completing the subjugation of the vast territories of Gaul he set out for the civil war leaving the local tribes largely self-governing in internal matters. Further, though these were partly hostages, Gauls and Germans accompanied his armies to Italy and the East as useful auxiliaries. He seems to have felt that there could be little difficulty in incorporating the new conquest into the Roman empire.

It is greatly to be regretted that Pliny's account of the German Wars has not survived. It would have been interesting to know to what extent his vision of the civilizing mission of Rome affected his actions as a cavalry officer and later as

---

115 Quint. XI, 1, 89: 'Quod ad nationes pertinet, Cicero varie: detracturus Graecis testibus fidem, doctrinae atque litteras, sequi eius gentis amator em esse profinetur, Sardos condemnit, Allobrogas ut hostes insectatur'.

116 Cic. Balb. 9, 24; 13, 30. Sanford, o.c. n. 31, 197, has stressed the importance of virtutis grants of citizenship in the late republican period for showing that the gulf between Roman and non-Roman was not impassable. Foreigners were prepared to endure slavery in the hopes of acquiring citizenship after being freed. Cf. the speaker in Petronius (51, 4) who said: 'Quare ergo servivisti?' Quia ipse me dedi in servitutem et multum civis Romanus esse quam tributarius'.

117 Cic. Balb. 19, 43. The tone of the Pro Archia, on behalf of an Italian Greek, and of the Pro Rege Deiotaro, a defence of a Galatian tetrarch, is most complimentary to the defendantes concerned.

procurator of Belgica. But it seems that he subscribed to the traditional Roman attitude of superiority to the peoples of the north. A most revealing phrase occurs in his description of the Chaucans who lived on the coast. Their land was flooded twice every twenty-four hours by the tide. There were no trees, no cattle. Yet such people called it slavery to be under Roman rule: 'et hae gentes, si vincantur hodie a populo Romano servire se dicunt! ita est profecto: multis fortuna parcit in poenam' 119. It was left to Tacitus to sympathize fully with the desire of the 'barbari' for 'libertas'.

It is true that Tacitus was scornful of much. Both the cultural backwardness of the Germans and the Britons and their servile condition when under direct Roman rule excited his contempt. Yet his criticism of 'luxuria nostra' throughout the Germania led him to give a balanced view of German tribal life, or of that part of it which he chose to discuss. In spite of his gibes at slavery, his admiration for Agricola's methods of administration in Britain and even more his sympathy with his attempts to encourage Romanization show an interest in the good of the natives. But it can hardly be claimed that it went beyond merely that.

The main test applied by the Romans to foreigners was based on cultural considerations. This in itself was an important factor that allowed for future co-operation between victor and vanquished. Even the most violent of the passages considered above erected no impassable barrier between Romans and non-Romans as peoples. The Romans were convinced of their own superiority and were prejudiced against 'externi' as enemies on the field of battle, as unreliable witnesses, even, as in the case of the 'primores Galliae' under Claudius, as rivals for political position at Rome. But in spite of these prejudices they were ready to accept members of the 'externae gentes' as human beings capable of reaching the cultural standards set by Rome. For all their basic indifference to the peoples of the empire, for all their harsh statements about 'barbari', the Roman attitude to the 'externae gentes' did not preclude a sound basis for good 'race relations'.

119 Pliny, N.H. XIV, i, 4.
120 Tac. G. 45, 5.
121 Tac Agr. 19; 21.
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