

A HISTORICAL AND
HISTORIOGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY ON
CASSIUS DIO'S *ROMAN HISTORY*
BOOK 57.1-17.8

CHRISTOPHER THOMAS MALLAN

DPhil Thesis
Wadham College
Trinity Term 2015

Word Count: 98,330

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a historical and historiographical commentary on Book 57 (Chs. 1-17.8) of Cassius Dio's *Roman History*. It comprises two sections, an Introduction followed by the Commentary itself. The introduction is sub-divided into three chapters. The first of these introductory chapters (*The Roman Historian at Work*) presents a discussion of the historical material available for Dio's Tiberian narrative, and a discussion of the factors which were instrumental in Dio's writing and shaping his narrative of the reign of Tiberius. The second chapter (*Dio on Tiberius*) is an analysis of Dio's portrayal of Tiberius and of the historian's understanding of Tiberius in the historical context of the early Principate. These chapters are followed by some brief *Notes on the Text of Book 57*, which considers the manuscript tradition of Book 57, and comments on portrayal of the reign of Tiberius in the Dionian tradition, and in particular the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, Xiphilinus, and Zonaras. The second part of the thesis, the commentary, presents an analysis of Dio's narrative from both historical and historiographical perspectives.

Christopher Thomas Mallan
Trinity Term, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABBREVIATIONS	v
PREFACE.....	vii
INTRODUCTION	
CHAPTER 1: THE ROMAN HISTORIAN AT WORK: SOURCES AND METHOD OF COMPOSITION	1
CHAPTER 2: DIO ON TIBERIUS	40
NOTES ON THE TEXT OF BOOK 57	74
COMMENTARY	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	322

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am most grateful for the guidance of my supervisor Professor Chris Pelling, who, like a skilled helmsman, has steered this thesis towards submission. Professor Pelling's insatiable curiosity and his generosity of spirit have been nothing short of inspirational. It has been a privilege working with him over these past few years and I wish him all the very best for his impending retirement.

I owe another academic debt to my friend and mentor Caillan Davenport, in particular for his unceasing encouragement over many years, as well as for reading and offering advice on sections of this commentary. I would also like to thank Nigel Wilson, who has given me assistance on several points of a textual nature, and the Wadham contingent: Steve Heyworth, Peter Thonemann, and in particular James Morwood, for their unceasing moral support. I am also grateful to the trustees of the Constantine Aspromourgos Prize for Greek Studies for providing me with some welcome financial assistance, especially at a time when graduate funding in the humanities is scarce.

Further thanks (and perhaps apologies) are due to my friends in Oxford: Kimberley Czajkowski, Simon Day, Daniel Press, and Hollie Thomas, who have all endured countless Dio-induced ramblings with good humour.

But my greatest debt of all is to my beloved family: Beverley, Donald, Catherine, and especially my parents Mick and Kerry, my sister Kimberley, and my darling wife Helen.

12 May 2015
C.T.M.

ABBREVIATIONS

In most cases abbreviations of ancient texts conformed to those found in either *OCD*³ or *LSJ*⁹.

<i>BNP</i>	= H. Cancik, et al. (eds.), <i>Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World</i> (Brill Online).
Bekker	= I. Bekker, <i>Cassii Dionis Cocceiani rerum romanarum libri octoginta</i> , (Leipzig, 1849).
Boissevain	= U.P. Boissevain (ed.), <i>Cassii Dionis Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt</i> , vols. 1-3 (text), 4 (<i>index historicus</i> , ed. H. Smilda), 5 (<i>index Graecitatis</i> , ed. W. Nawijn) (Berlin, 1898-1931).
Cary	= E. Cary (ed. and trans.), <i>Dio's Roman History</i> (London, 1914-27).
CCAG 8.3	= P. Boudreaux, (ed.), <i>Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum, Codicum Parisinorum partem tertiam</i> , (Brussels 1912)
CCAG 8.4	= P. Boudreaux, F. Cumont (edd.), <i>Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum, Codicum Parisinorum partem quartam</i> , (Brussels 1922).
Denniston <i>GP</i> ²	= J.D. Denniston (rev. K.J. Dover), <i>The Greek Particles</i> , (2 nd Edn., Oxford 1954).
Goodwin <i>MT</i>	= W.W. Goodwin, <i>Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb</i> (London 1889).
<i>EJ</i> ²	= V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones (eds.), <i>Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius</i> , 2 nd Edition (Oxford 1955).
<i>ES</i>	= <i>Excerpta de Sententiis</i> .
<i>EVV</i>	= <i>Excerpta de Virtutibus et Vitiis</i> .
Fishwick <i>ICLW</i>	= D. Fishwick, <i>The Roman Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire</i> (Leiden 1987-)
<i>FRHist</i>	= T.J. Cornell, et al. (edd.), <i>The Fragments of the Roman Historians</i> (Oxford 2013).
<i>GRSRE</i>	= P. Janiszewski, et al. (edd.), <i>Prosopography of the Greek Rhetors and Sophists of the Roman Empire</i> (Oxford 2015).
<i>IK</i>	= <i>Inscripfen Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien</i>
<i>Inscr.Ital.</i> XIII.1	= A. Degrassi, <i>Inscriptiones Italiae, Volumen XIII Fasti et Elogia, Fasciculus I, Fasti Consulares et Triumphales</i> (Rome 1947)
<i>Inscr.Ital.</i> XIII.2	= A. Degrassi, <i>Inscriptiones Italiae, Volumen XIII Fasti et Elogia, Fasciculus II – Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani</i> (Rome 1963)
Lb	= <i>Codex Laurentianus</i> plut. 70.10.
<i>LGR</i>	= <i>Excerpta de legationibus Gentium ad Romanos</i>

<i>LSJ</i> ⁹	= H.G. Liddell and R. Scott (rev. H.S. Jones, R. McKenzie), <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , (9 th Edn, Oxford 1996).
<i>LTUR</i>	= E.M. Steinby (ed), <i>Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae</i> (Rome 1993-1999).
M	= <i>Codex Marcianus graecus</i> 395.
Mason <i>GT</i>	= H.J. Mason, <i>Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: a lexicon and analysis</i> (Toronto 1974).
Melber	= J. Melber, <i>Dionis Cassii Cocceiani historia romana</i> (Leipzig 1890-1928).
Mommsen <i>Staatsr.</i> ³	= T. Mommsen, <i>Römisches Staatsrecht</i> (3 rd Edn., Leipzig 1887).
Mommsen <i>Strafr.</i>	= T. Mommsen, <i>Römisches Strafrecht</i> (Leipzig 1899).
Oliver <i>GC</i>	= J.H. Oliver, <i>Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri</i> (Philadelphia 1989).
<i>PIR</i>	= E. Klebs and H. Dessau (eds.), <i>Prosopographia imperii romani, saec. i, ii, iii</i> (Berlin 1897-8).
<i>PIR</i> ²	= <i>Prosopographia imperii romani, saec. i, ii, iii</i> , (2 nd Edn., Berlin and Leipzig 1933-).
<i>RE</i>	= A.F. von Pauly, G.E. Wissowa, et al. (eds.), <i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (Berlin and Stuttgart 1894 -).
Reimarus	= H.S. Reimarus (ed. and comm.), <i>Τῶν Δίωνος τοῦ Κασσίου Ῥωμαίων ιστορίων τὰ σωζόμενα. Cassii Dionis Historiae Romanae quae supersunt</i> (Hamburg, 1750).
<i>RIC</i> 1	= C.E.V. Sutherland, <i>The Roman Imperial Coinage: from 31 B.C. to A.D. 69 Volume 1</i> (London 1984).
<i>RPC</i>	= A.M. Burnett, et al. <i>Roman Provincial Coinage</i> (London 1992-).
<i>RP</i>	= R. Syme, <i>Roman Papers</i> (Oxford 1979-1991) (Vols. 1-2 ed. E. Badian), Vols 3-7 ed. A.R. Birley).
<i>RRC</i>	= M.H. Crawford, <i>The Roman Republican Coinage</i> (Cambridge 1974).
<i>SCPP</i>	= <i>Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre</i> .
Schmid <i>Attic.</i>	= W. Schmid, <i>Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern: von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus</i> (Stuttgart 1887-97).
<i>Tab. Lar.</i>	= <i>Tabula Larinas</i> .

PREFACE

A brief word should be said about the nature and content of this thesis. Long out of fashion in many quarters, the commentary genre nevertheless has its uses for historians. Dio's narrative presents the would-be commentator with several possible methodological approaches. As the scholarly conception of Dio continues to evolve and become more complex, it is perhaps no longer possible or desirable to produce a straight 'historical' commentary of Dio. To come to terms with Dio and his history it is necessary to consider the text from multiple angles. To take this into account, I have titled this thesis a 'historical and historiographical commentary'. The aim of this commentary is to analyse Dio's narrative of the first years of the reign of Tiberius as a work of historical writing – that is as a work of literature that dealt with real persons and events. Throughout I've tried to keep two questions at the forefront of my mind: first 'What does this particular passage tell us about Dio and his *Roman History*?'; and second 'What does this contribute to our understanding of the reign of Tiberius?'. It is hoped that this commentary goes some way to addressing these questions.

CHAPTER 1

THE ROMAN HISTORIAN AT WORK: SOURCES AND METHOD OF
COMPOSITION

Writing in the first quarter of the third century, the consular historian L. Cassius Dio was the last writer of antiquity to deal with the reign of Tiberius in any detail.¹ One fortieth of Dio's immense history described the character of Tiberius and that of his reign. The Tiberian books (Books 57 and 58) represent an important stage in the transmission of the historical tradition concerning Tiberius. On the one hand, Dio's narrative, in many respects, laid the foundations of the later (what we may call) Byzantine tradition concerning the reign of Tiberius.² On the other hand, Dio's history may help us think about the process of transmission by looking in the other direction. Dio was the inheritor of a body of historical literature that treated the successor of Augustus, and the years in which Tiberius was the foremost man in the Roman world. As the inheritor of this tradition, Dio was in the position to reinterpret it according to what he thought important to record.

This chapter presents a discussion of the tradition Dio inherited and the ways in which it was refashioned by the historian. As such, and taking into account the fragmentary state of our knowledge concerning this tradition, there is much which is speculative in the following pages. Nevertheless, the consideration of these issues allows us to appreciate not only the creative process behind the *Roman History* as a

¹ For Dio's name, see *AE* 1985, 821; Rich 1990: 1 fn. 1; cf. Leunissen 1989: 163 with n. 147, and *passim* gives Dio's name as L. Claudius Cassius Dio Cocceianus, and Lavan (2013: 131), who styles the historian Claudius Cassius Dio on the basis of *AE* 1971, 430. Both Lavan and Leunissen seem to be in error. The *agnomen* Cocceianus is almost certainly incorrect: Gowing 1990. It is also unlikely that Dio bore the name Claudius: Salomies 2005: 108-9.

² At least for the works of Peter the Patrician (presumably), John of Antioch, the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, Xiphilinus, and Zonaras.

work of literary historiography, but also the characteristics of the tradition that Dio transformed. Furthermore, this chapter provides the opportunity to revisit and challenge some of the assumptions that have been made about Dio's Tiberian narrative and the tradition upon which it was based.

Sources

It has been fifty years (and one) since Millar launched his attack on the value of *Quellenforschung* as a tool for investigating Dio's history.³ The direction and target of his attack was and still is largely justified. Despite the great energy expended on divining specific sources behind the extant accounts for the reign of Tiberius, the results have been generally barren. Any attempt to attribute specific passages of Dio's narrative to specific no longer extant authors never rises above supposition. Nevertheless, such a line of inquiry is not devoid of value. Although Millar depreciated the importance of detecting concordances between surviving texts, these parallels (and divergences) between texts can often offer important clues about a historian's authorial agenda. The divergences between our sources in particular often allow us to consider what made a historian like Dio distinct in his outlook, especially if they conform to a pattern discernible across his work. Furthermore, if we are to appreciate something of Dio's historiographical programme and method of composition, we need to consider the range and types of sources of information that were available to him – literary, documentary, and oral, and the possible ways in which he engaged with the existing historiographical tradition.

The question of the source tradition that lies behind the accounts of Dio, Suetonius, and Tacitus represents the Augean stables of first century historiography.

³ Millar 1964: 34-8.

As a preliminary, some general observations may be offered. It is likely that the bulk, but maybe not all, of Dio's material was derived from literary sources.⁴ The narrative of Book 57 (and Book 58) reveals Dio's familiarity with the pre-existing annalistic tradition. But the nature and quality of Dio's other (putative) sources of information require further probing. At the beginning of the 20th century, Jan Bergmans argued that Dio consulted three major sources for his account of Book 57.⁵ In Bergmans' schema, Tacitus was Dio's *Hauptquelle* for Chapters 1-6. For Chapters 7-13 Dio turned to a biographical source (which was not Suetonius, but which was used by Suetonius), before then using a second annalistic source for Chapters 14-24. A fourth minor biographical source was consulted for Chapters 19 and 23. Dio's second annalistic source was also employed to augment the Tacitean material used in Chapters 1-6. *Prima facie* Bergmans' model has a certain attractiveness. At very least, it reflects the textures of Dio's narrative. Yet it is also too neat, and is vulnerable on several points. Especially susceptible to criticism is the idea that Dio was reliant on two distinct biographical sources.

The biographical flavour of Dio's imperial history has been well noted in the scholarship.⁶ Two snippets of information from the *Suda* might suggest that Dio was interested in the genre of biography as distinct from history.⁷ The *Suda* claims that

⁴ E.g. Stuart 1904; Swan 1987; Rich 1989: 90; etc. Dio's reliance on existing literary sources may well apply to his contemporary narrative as well: Barnes 1984: 253-4; Meckler 2005.

⁵ Bergmans 1903: 129-30.

⁶ Questa 1957; Edmondson 1992: 36; Ameling 1997: 2479-82; Pelling 1997a; Murison 1999: 20-1. Note however the perceptive comments of Kemezis 2014: 139-40, especially (140), 'what we get [in the imperial books] is not so much history-as-biography, but rather the story of how a succession of very different men enacted a standard set of scripts that were defined not by their nature, but by the political climate in which they inhabited.' This is not to say that the character of the emperor did not matter – for clearly it did, as attested by the keen attention Dio (and his epitomators) have in the characters of the emperors.

⁷ Although the two genres were considered distinct in the ancient world as they are today, the boundaries between history and biography are often fluid: cf. Gentili and Cerri 1988: 61-85; Pelling 2011: 13-25.

Dio wrote a life of his compatriot Arrian, as well as work on Trajan.⁸ The life of Arrian was possibly genuine, but we may regard the second work with particular suspicion. The alleged *Events Concerning Trajan* may simply have been a copy of Book 68 that circulated independently from the rest of the *Roman History*. Given the enduring legacy of Trajan, especially in the later third and fourth centuries, this seems possible.⁹

Freyburger-Galland has posited that Dio's presentation of imperial history may have been influenced by the structural approach of Suetonius' *Caesares*.¹⁰ The idea is a stimulating one. Dio's non-annalistic material is indeed arranged in a Suetonian manner. Yet we cannot be sure how distinctive this so-called Suetonian approach was to Suetonius.¹¹ Moreover, we know too little about the style of Dio's historiographical precursors to know whether this observation has merit. Furthermore, we should not preclude the possibility that Dio arrived at this pattern independently of Suetonius, or at least without conscious imitation of the Latin biographer.

Nevertheless, it seems highly plausible that Dio had at least a passing familiarity with works of Suetonius, in particular the *Caesares*. At any rate, we know that Suetonius was read during the Severan age, and indeed seems to have even acquired the status of a minor classic. Dio's coeval Marius Maximus seems to have envisioned his own set of twelve imperial biographies as a continuation of

⁸ Suda Δ 1239 [Adler 2.116-7]. For comments on the *Life of Arrian*, see Bosworth 1972a: 166; Baldwin 1986: 484; cf. Millar 1964: 70. The *Suda* gives the title of the work on Trajan as *Events Concerning Trajan* (τὰ κατὰ Τραϊανόν).

⁹ For the fame of Trajan, see Syme 1971: 89-112; cf. Stertz 1980: 500-1 (on references to Trajan in Ammianus).

¹⁰ Freyburger-Galland 2009: 160-1 (especially). Cf. Baldwin 1983: 146-7, who says that Dio was 'influenced by the biographer as well as by the historian'; presumably referring to Suetonius and Tacitus respectively.

¹¹ Indeed, there is some cross over between the arrangement of Nepos' biographical works and Suetonius: Wardle 2014: 7. For the biographical precursors of Suetonius, see Wardle 2014: 6-9.

Suetonius.¹² The healthy afterlife of Suetonius during the fourth century and later is well attested by anecdotal evidence, and it is unlikely that his popularity in late Antiquity was due to a sudden resurgence of interest.¹³ But whether Dio actually *used* Suetonius as a source of information is another matter. That he did has been advanced periodically, yet seldom convincingly.¹⁴ With respect to Books 57 and 58 of the *Roman History*, although sharing several anecdotes, there are no traces of the *Life of Tiberius* strong enough to indicate that Dio used Suetonius as an authority of importance.¹⁵ Any concordances between the two can be explained by a shared source.¹⁶

Yet perhaps the most compelling argument against Dio's use of Suetonius as a major source of information is one of practicality. The absence of clearly datable material in Suetonius would have made the biographer useless for Dio's annalistic passages. Suetonius would have been of greater use in the non-annalistic section of Book 57 (Chapters 7-13), where Dio, like Suetonius, appraises Tiberius and his reign according to a set of rubrics.¹⁷ Yet here, although we find Dio and Suetonius sharing several items, there is nothing to suggest that Dio was in any way dependent on

¹² For Marius Maximus' work in general, see the cautious appraisal of Levick and Cornell (*FRHist.* 1.605-11); cf. Kemezis 2012: 410-11 n. 97. Syme (1968: 89-90; 1971: 57, 256) was adamant that Marius Maximus conceived of his work as a continuation (and emulation) of Suetonius' *Vitae XII Caesarum*.

¹³ E.g. *HA Prob.* 2.7; Auson. *Caes.* 1-5. Paulinus of Nola composed a verse epitome of Suetonius' (now lost) three book *De regibus* (cf. Auson. *Epist.* 17 [Green]).

¹⁴ Millar 1964: 85-6; Harrington 1971: 47-54, who point out several (nearly identical) anecdotes that appear in both Suetonius and Dio; Freyburger-Galland 2009, who discusses the parallels between Book 59 and the *Life of Caligula*.

¹⁵ Note also 57.17.2 and the exchange between Tiberius, Ateius Capito and the grammarian Porcellus, which is very close to the report given in Suet. *Gram.* 22.3. See commentary *ad loc.*

¹⁶ Cf. Manuwald 1979: 258-68; Swan 1987: 286-8; Swan 1997: 2532, who reach this conclusion concerning the relationship between Dio and the *Life of Augustus*.

¹⁷ For this technique in Suetonius, see Power 2014: 8-9; Hurley 2014: 21-37.

Suetonius.¹⁸ Indeed, in arrangement, focus, and detail, the two authors show a considerable degree of independence.¹⁹

Ultimately an interest in biography and the biographical does not necessarily mean that Dio used biographical sources. Indeed, our evidence for such sources for the Tiberian Principate is scant. Tiberius' brief autobiography may have been consulted, but there is nothing in the extant narrative of Book 57 or 58 that suggests a familiarity with this enigmatic work.²⁰ Aside from Suetonius, the only other known biography of Tiberius was that written by Plutarch. Aside from its attestation in Lamprias' catalogue, only two fragments are known which may have originated with this work.²¹ Coincidentally, both these fragments concern Tiberius' time on Rhodes. The first, concerning the occurrence of an *omen imperii* is not found in Dio's narrative.²² The second, preserved by the eleventh/twelfth century historian George Cedrenus, relates a familiar anecdote about Tiberius and the astrologer Thrasyllus found in Dio, Suetonius, and Tacitus.²³ Yet I do not think that too much should be made of this latter concordance.²⁴ If we look beyond these two isolated examples to the sporadic scraps of information Plutarch provides regarding Tiberius in the *Moralia*, it is interesting to note that not one of them finds any parallel in Dio's narrative for Book 57.²⁵ Judging from the evidence of Dio and Plutarch's narrations

¹⁸ Thus Jaeger 1910: 83.

¹⁹ See Commentary § IV *Tiberius' Conduct as Ruler*.

²⁰ Interestingly where Dio cites texts written by emperors he does so to refute their claims: Hadrian 69.11.2 [Xiph.]; Severus 76(75).7.3 [Xiph.]; Caracalla 79(78).2.1. There are no such comments in Books 57 or 58 where we might expect such disagreement, although the lacunose state of our text precludes certainty in this matter.

²¹ Plutarch's *Tiberius* is number 27 in the *Lamprias Catalogue*. For plausible suggestions on the form and focus of this lost life, see Jones 1971: 80; cf. Stadter 2014a: 62-3.

²² Plut. F 182 [Sandbach].

²³ Cedr. 1.344 [Bekker]; cf. 55.11.1-2; Suet. *Tib.* 14.4; Tac. *Ann.* 6.20-1.

²⁴ *pace* Stadter 2014a: 192 n. 13, who seems to endorse the view that Dio's version is derived from Plutarch's *Tiberius*.

²⁵ Plut. *Mor.* 60C-D [= *How to tell a flatterer*], 96C [= *On Having Many Friends*], 136E [= *Advice on Keeping Well*], 207E [= *Sayings of Kings and Commanders*], 419D [= *Failure of*

of the events of A.D. 68-9, it seems likely that Dio generally eschewed Plutarch's imperial lives as sources of information.²⁶ Other biographies of Tiberius, or imperial princes such as Germanicus, may have been written and have stayed in circulation until the early third century, but of these works no verifiable traces survive.²⁷

If we return to Bergmans' thesis concerning Dio's use of at least two biographical sources we run into further trouble. The sort of personal biographical detail we find in Book 57, for example Tiberius' poor eyesight (57.2.4) or his behaviour towards his friends (57.11.7), although possibly excerpted from a putative *vita Tiberii*, need not have been. Such details are not unknown to annalistic historiography. Indeed, Tacitus notes Tiberius' appearance (*Ann.* 4.57.2). Dio himself, when narrating the reigns of his contemporaries, frequently has recourse to personal details, such as the sort of company Caracalla kept, or physical details such as the scar on Macrinus' ear (which betrayed the fact that the emperor had once worn a Moorish earring).²⁸ Such personal descriptions were as common in ancient historiography as in biography, and thus need not have originated from an earlier biography.

We may push this scepticism even further. It seems to me most unlikely that the material gathered in Chapters 7-13, the most 'biographical' of Dio's account, was excerpted from a now lost biography of the emperor. This is not to say definitively that a biography of the emperor was not consulted by Dio. Rather the point is that we do not need to presuppose the existence of an earlier biography to explain the form

Oracles], 624C [= *Table Talk*], 794B [= *Old Men in Government*]. For a referential list of the appearances of emperors in Plutarch's surviving works, see Ash 2008: 572-4.

²⁶ Murison 1999: 12-17.

²⁷ Kessler's contention (1905: 89) that Dio followed a biography of Germanicus for 57.5-6, 57.18.1, 6-10, which was also used by Suetonius (*Cal.* 3-5), and by Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.31-39, and *passim*), has been adequately dismissed by Marsh (1931: 267-71; but cf. Walker 1952: 130). It may be added that this theory does not adequately account for the clear parallelism in the accounts of Tacitus and Dio for *both* the Pannonian and German mutinies, which does not seem appropriate to biographical source devoted to the elder of the two princes.

²⁸ E.g. 78(77).17.2-4 [Xiph.] (Caracalla's companions and habits); 79(78).11.1 (Macrinus' ear).

and material contained within these particular chapters. As we shall see in the following section, it is possible that the information was drawn from annalistic sources and then arranged by Dio thematically – a process perhaps not dissimilar to that used by Suetonius in the *Life of Tiberius* and elsewhere.²⁹

Annalistic sources, not biographies, comprised the bulk of Dio's material for Book 57.³⁰ We may be confident that most if not all of these were written in Latin. Swain's doubt that Dio used Latin sources directly seems unwarranted.³¹ True, there were undoubtedly Greek sources for this period and it has been suggested that one of these lost early imperial Greek historians was the source behind Plutarch's imperial lives.³² But Swain's point seems to be that Dio might have used Latin sources in translation, rather than in their original language. Such a hypothesis rests on a double assumption: first, that many of the Latin historians were translated; and second, that it was unusual for 'a Greek' to have fluency in Latin. Such assumptions rest on shaky ground. It is true, on the one hand, that the likes of Sallust and Eutropius found translators in Zenobius and Paeanius respectively.³³ Yet the attention given to these works is perhaps not indicative of broader trends of a translation movement from Latin into Greek. The works of Sallust and Eutropius were relatively short – a boon for any translator. Moreover, by the second century when Zenobius made his translation, Sallust's works had become classics in their own right, while Eutropius' *Breviarium* was a text of utility in its fourth century context (and after), and was thus

²⁹ Swan 1997: 2532, 2534.

³⁰ Rich 1990: 7; Swan 1997.

³¹ Swain 1996: 404 n. 17: 'it cannot be proved that Dio used Roman historians as his sources'. Presumably Swain's 'Roman historians' is a gloss for historians who wrote in Latin.

³² Jones 1971: 76-7; but note Syme's cogent rebuttal of Jones' argument (1980: 109-10 = *RP* 3.1256-7).

³³ For Zenobius, see Suda Z 73 [=Adler 2 p. 506]; *GRSRE* no. 1088; cf. Baldwin 1986: 481. Paeanius is probably identical to the one time pupil and correspondent of Libanius: *PLRE* 1.657 (Paeanius); *GRSRE* no. 766.

appealing for Greek and Latin speakers alike. On the other hand, there is no external evidence that might indicate that the major annalistic sources for the reign of Tiberius were found in Greek translation. As for the second point, there is no reason to suggest that Dio needed to read sources in translation. He was a Roman Senator, first and foremost, and conducted his political career in a Senate house that was still predominantly Latin speaking when it came to formal business and pronouncements.³⁴

Furthermore, we may adduce positive evidence for Dio's use of Latin sources. Dio's decision to include Greek transliterations of Latin terms shows on one level at least his engagement with the Latin language and perhaps even a source-text that was written in Latin.³⁵ The story of Tiberius' response to the overzealous prefect of Egypt, might present one such example of direct use of a Latin text. The version of Tiberius' witticism preserved in Suetonius (*Tib.* 32.2) and Orosius (7.4.4),³⁶ surely represents the original *dictum*, as indicated by the likely pun on the word *deglubere* ('to fleece'), which may refer to the act of shearing a sheep or in the colloquial sense of taking money by unscrupulous means.³⁷ The pun is lost in Dio's retelling in the Greek, although not at the expense of the overall meaning of the anecdote.³⁸ Similarly the story of the exchange between Capito and the grammarian Porcellus,³⁹ which appears in almost identical form in Suetonius' *Concerning the Grammarians and Rhetoricians*, seems again to derive from a shared Latin source.

³⁴ Kaimio 1979: 103-10, esp. 108. For Dio's Latinity, see Millar 1964: 143 n. 8, 189.

³⁵ E.g. 57.10.1 where Dio uses a straight transliteration of the Latin *pontifex*. For this characteristic in general, see Freyburger-Galland 1997: 163, *passim*.

³⁶ *boni pastoris esse tondere pecus, non deglubere*.

³⁷ For this sense note, Muse 2009: 310-11, and commentary *ad loc*.

³⁸ Cf. Meckler 2005 on another instance (sc. 78(77).4.1-2 [Xiph., Petrus, EVV]) where Dio may have missed a pun in his Latin source material, although I am not convinced by the argument.

³⁹ For this man's name see commentary 57.17.2.

What then may we say about Dio's sources and the tenor of the historiographical tradition available to him? The legacy of Tiberius was not straightforward – especially in senatorial circles. Even before he came to write his history, Dio would have known something of this reputation. There was, after all, no oath to uphold Tiberius' *acta* made at the beginning of each year. Yet his example could be still cited as a legal precedent, as amply attested in the *lex de imperio Vespasiani*. In general it seems likely that the tradition that Dio followed was one that was generally hostile to Tiberius, and which made much of the emperor's native dissimulation.⁴⁰ At least we may infer this by the tenor of the surviving narratives of Suetonius and Tacitus. Whether this picture is derived exclusively from a literary tradition or was part of a more widespread 'vulgar' tradition, cannot be determined.

A passing remark by Seneca in the *de Clementia* suggests that by the mid-first century it was commonplace to divide Tiberius' reign into an exemplary phase, followed by a less positive period.⁴¹ We may extrapolate from this, and the fact that Suetonius and Tacitus also choose turning points in Tiberius' reign to state that an influential part of the main historiographical tradition that was produced after Tiberius' death divided Tiberius' reign into two (or more) distinct phases, which coincided with the emperor's alleged moral decline. It is possible that many of the negative aspects of the portrayal of Tiberius derived from a single author: a man who, in Champlin's opinion, knew and disliked Tiberius intensely.⁴² But we must be wary about thinking of these lost Julio-Claudian sources as one-note productions,

⁴⁰ E.g. Sage 1990: 1002; Baldwin 1983: 266.

⁴¹ *Sen. Clem.* 1.1.6 with Braund 2009: 174.

⁴² Champlin 2008: 418-9; cf. Martin 1981: 204-5; Sage 1990: 1002-3. This view is an expansion of that proposed by Schwartz (*RE* 3, cols. 1716-7 = Cassius 40); *contra* Syme 1958a: 272-3.

irrespective of Tacitus' much quoted observation that they were.⁴³ The tradition, and the ways later authors dealt with it, was perhaps more nuanced than we tend to credit. Similarly, the patterns which we find in Dio, Suetonius, and Tacitus may not be simple reflections of their sources. The lavish praise that Dio heaps upon Tiberius in Chapters 7-13 need not have originated with a source entirely favourable to the emperor.⁴⁴ Indeed, if Dio composed this passage by carefully selecting and reworking his source materials, then the resulting narrative may in fact be more laudatory in tone than that which he found in any one of his sources.

The preponderance of senatorial material in Book 57 is suggestive of Dio's use of a source (or sources) intimately familiar with senatorial affairs. Of course, it would be wrong to assume that senatorial material was the exclusive preserve of senatorial historians: well-placed members of the *ordo equester* could equally have had access to such material as the example of Suetonius makes clear. Nevertheless, judging from what appears in Dio's narrative, this source of information was full and detailed on points of administration and senatorial procedure under Tiberius. It seems unlikely that such details were derived from an author who was not of the senatorial order or in some way connected to this tradition.

Anecdotes and trivialities relating to certain members of the *ordo senatorius* may add further weight to this assumption. From Book 57, the story of the behaviour of the *consul suffectus* for 15, C. Vibius Rufus, may serve as an illustration. In the long view, Vibius Rufus was something of a historical non-entity: no trace of the man survives in the narratives of Tacitus or Suetonius. His two claims to fame, at least as Dio would have it, were his choice of wife and his choice of seat in the *curia*. Yet this

⁴³ Tac. Ann. 1.1: *Tiberii Gaique et Claudii ac Neronis res florentibus ipsis ob metum falsae, postquam occiderant recentibus odiis compositae sunt.*

⁴⁴ Cf. Jaeger 1910: 100-1.

is precisely the sort of gossipy observation that would have entered senatorial lore and caught the attention of a contemporary (or near contemporary) historian.⁴⁵ Similarly the story of the eccentric trumpet playing habits of the consul of 19 may also owe something to this tradition. Again we cannot be sure that Dio found these stories in a senatorial author, or even that they originated with such an author. Non-senatorial authors like Olympiodorus and Ammianus Marcellinus preserve similar trivialities about the great men of the late fourth century.⁴⁶ What we can say is that these stories are very Dionian. In fact, the decidedly chatty quality of these anecdotes recalls strongly the sorts of comments Dio makes about his own contemporaries in the *Roman History* and is indicative of the degree to which Dio harmonised his vision of the past with that of the present.

The identities of Dio's annalistic sources are similarly elusive. On the whole, it is easier to rule out candidates. Tacitus may have been known to Dio.⁴⁷ Yet if so, how Dio engaged with this historiographical predecessor is not clear. Certainly Tacitus was not used as a major source for Dio in Book 57. At times Dio and Tacitus present material in a similar manner, which is indicative at least of a shared source. Most notably this occurs in their treatment of the revolts of A.D. 14, and in the their method of introducing Sejanus.⁴⁸ Occasionally there are divergences in the dating of specific events.⁴⁹ Some of these are of a minor nature, but are suggestive of divergent annalistic traditions. Late in Tiberius' reign, Tacitus records the appearance of the

⁴⁵ 57.15.6: for this individual see commentary *ad loc.*

⁴⁶ E.g. Olymp. F 41.2 [ed. Blockley] on Probus (son of Olybrius) and Symmachus, and Maximus; Amm. Marc. 27.3.3-11 on the urban prefects Symmachus and Lampadius.

⁴⁷ Syme 1958a: 690-2; Sage 1990: 999-1002; cf. Harrington 1971: 54-7; Syme 1983: 19-22 = *RP* 4.240-3. Even so, we cannot assume that Dio read all of Tacitus' *Annales* and *Historiae*. Indeed, Dio might only have had access to individual books.

⁴⁸ For Dio's account of the revolts, see commentary § III. *Dio on the Pannonian and German Mutinies*. For the source connection between Dio and Tacitus' introduction of Sejanus, see Champlin 2012: 379; Matthews 2010: 59-60. See also, Syme 1958a: 272-4.

⁴⁹ Syme 1958a: 692.

phoenix in Egypt in the year 34, whereas in Dio's account it appears in the year 36.⁵⁰ Similarly the demise of Tiberius' estranged wife Julia is recorded in Tacitus' account in 14, but in Dio it appeared at some later (undated) juncture, judging by where it appears in Zonaras' narrative.⁵¹ Yet the points of difference run more deeply. As Syme noted across several studies, the annalistic sections of Dio's and Tacitus' narratives for the years A.D. 15, 16, and 17 bear little similarity to one another.⁵² This might suggest different sources, or different selections from the same source.⁵³ Of course none of this precludes the possibility that Dio knew Tacitus' narrative. Rather, simply that Dio did not use Tacitus as his main annalistic source.

Of our lost authorities, the name Aufidius Bassus has often been identified as Dio's main source for his annalistic narrative.⁵⁴ There is little to affirm or confute this assertion. What we know of Bassus' oeuvre is scant.⁵⁵ The chronological scope suggested by the extant fragments cover the period from the death of Cicero to the fall of Sejanus. But that the narrative of Cicero's demise was a part of Bassus' annalistic history has been doubted.⁵⁶ For a better sense of the scope of his work, we need to turn to what is perhaps the most important of the fragments: a selection of consular

⁵⁰ If Tacitus is not in error and faithfully represents his source, it is possible that Dio (or his source) transposed this event from 34 to 36 so that the appearance of the phoenix appeared as one of the omens portending Tiberius' death. Although it is worth noting that Pliny (perhaps sharing the same source as Dio) dates the appearance of the phoenix to A.D. 36 (*HN* 10.2.5), citing the authority of the antiquarian (and miscellanist?) Cornelius Valerianus (*PIR*² C 1471; *FRHist.* 1.637-8 (Rich)).

⁵¹ 57.18.1^a = Zonar. 11.2 [Dindorf 3 p.5]. The displacement might again be Dio's for narrative purposes, as a means of illustrating Tiberius' increased harshness following the demise of Germanicus.

⁵² Syme 1958a: 691; Syme 1977: 237 = *RP* 3.1019-20; Syme 1981a: 365-6 = *RP* 3.1423-5. Cf. Swan 1997: 2531-2.

⁵³ It may be suggested tentatively that the lack of contact between the two, particularly for the annalistic sections, is indicative of Dio's awareness of Tacitus' narrative and his consciousness not to follow the Latin annalist too closely.

⁵⁴ E.g. Marx 1936; Syme 1958a: 275, 698; Sage 1990: 1006-7. Cf. Manuwald 1979: 257-8.

⁵⁵ See *FRHist.* 1.518-21 (Levick).

⁵⁶ Syme 1958a: 697; Syme 1977: 235 = *RP* 3.1017; cf. Wilkes 1972: 197; Sage 1990: 1005. In Syme's view, the fragment on Cicero (*FRHist* 78 'Aufidius Bassus' F 1) was taken from an otherwise unattested monograph on Cicero or perhaps the Triumviral period.

names from Bassus preserved in Cassiodorus' *Chronicle*. This list in the *Chronicle* corresponds to the years 8 B.C. to A.D. 31.⁵⁷ Certainly 8 B.C. provides an attractive starting year for Bassus' annalistic work – picking up where Livy's monumental history left off. But whether this list reflects the scope of Bassus' history is a point of scholarly discord. Some interpreted Cassiodorus' consular list as encompassing the full extent of Bassus' work, which effectively continued Livy's narrative from 8 B.C. to A.D. 31.⁵⁸ Others have put the termination of the work somewhat later, perhaps as late as 47.⁵⁹ Amongst the sundry fragments of Bassus' work, there is one slender parallel that might tie it to Dio's narrative. For the year 17 both Dio and Bassus (via Cassiodorus' consular list) identify the consul as C. Caecilius; Tacitus, with support of two lapidary *fasti* names him C. Caelius.⁶⁰

Yet a closer examination of the consular data that appears in Cassiodorus and Dio soon reveals problems should we wish to identify Bassus as Dio's sole annalistic source for Book 57. Cassiodorus identifies the consul of A.D. 19 as C. Norbanus. In the main body of Xiphilinus' *Epitome*, however, the consul appears as 'L. Norbanus' (57.18.3 [Xiph.]). This is likely to have been the consul's praenomen – at any rate this is how he is named in Tacitus' *Annals* and in surviving epigraphic sources. Yet Cassiodorus cannot simply be dismissed as being in error, for there is external support for the consul of 19 possessing the *cognomen* Gaius.⁶¹ The apparent conflict between Dio in the main text and Cassiodorus suggests one of two options. The first is that Dio

⁵⁷ *FRHist* 78 'Aufidius Bassus' F 4. It seems more likely that Cassiodorus copied a pre-existing consular list derived from Aufidius Bassus' work: *FRHist*. 3.604-5 (Levick).

⁵⁸ Sage 1990: 1004-5.

⁵⁹ Townend 1961: 230, 233. Cf. Townend 1962: 490, where he suggests A.D. 43. Martin (1981: 202) suggests 'close to A.D. 50', similarly Marx (1936: 94).

⁶⁰ For references, see commentary 57.17.1.

⁶¹ Note also that the *fasti* which form part of the Book indices found in the manuscripts of Dio (which I believe to have been compiled by Dio himself), identify the consul of A.D. 19 as Γ. Νωρβανὸς Γ. υἱ. Φλάκκος ἢ Βάλβος. The individual may be polyonymous.

did not use Bassus after all. Such a conclusion based on this single piece of evidence is too drastic. The more likely alternative is that Dio was not confined to a single annalistic authority for Book 57. In the annalistic narrative of A.D. 15 Dio himself draws the reader's attention to a divergence in his sources over the dating of a particular event.⁶²

If our evidence for Aufidius Bassus is slender, it is even more meagre for the consular historian Servilius Nonianus. Syme's arguments in favour of Servilius Nonianus being Tacitus' major source for the first books of the *Annales* are on the whole unconvincing.⁶³ In Syme's view Tacitus was attracted to the earlier consular historian on account of Nonianus' exalted social position relative to that of the (supposedly) non-Senatorial Aufidius Bassus.⁶⁴ 'In the estimation of Cornelius Tacitus, Nonianus, consul and proconsul of Africa, can hardly have yielded precedence to Bassus as an authority for the Tiberian books.'⁶⁵ If we use the same arguments, Cassius Dio, twice consul, proconsul of Africa, and just as status-conscious as Tacitus, could not have possibly overlooked the work of Nonianus either. Such arguments do not bear close scrutiny.⁶⁶

Any attempt to assign particular pieces of information to Nonianus is ultimately quixotic. In a recent article, Bablitz has suggested tentatively that the one-

⁶² 57.14.3. Similarly we may note Dio's comments at 57.3.3-4 about the various stories surrounding the causes of Tiberius' conduct following the death of Augustus.

⁶³ And by extension that he was not used by Dio in Books 57-8. Townend 1962: 490, sees Servilius Nonianus as the author behind the negative tradition concerning Tiberius, found in all three of Suetonius, Dio, and Tacitus.

⁶⁴ The evidence for Bassus' non-Senatorial standing is based largely on the fact that he was an adherent of Epicureanism (cf. Sen. *Ep.* 30 = *FRHist.* 78 'Aufidius Bassus' T 1). Of course in practice, Epicureanism was no bar to membership of the senatorial order. The example of the 'liberator' Cassius Longinus should be a sufficient illustration, but note also the example of the Julio-Claudian senator 'Pompedius' in Josephus (*AJ* 19.32-3) who is perhaps better identified as the consul *suffectus* for A.D. 44, [P?]. Pomponius Secundus (*PIR*² P 754; Swan 1976). For Epicureans in Roman politics, see Momigliano 1941: 151-7; cf. Griffin 1989: 28-32.

⁶⁵ Syme 1977: 235 = *RP* 3.1017; cf. Syme 1958a: 276.

⁶⁶ Cf. Cornell 1986: 78-9.

time advocate Nonianus provided Dio, Suetonius, and Tacitus with information about Tiberius' behaviour in the courts.⁶⁷ The suggestion is tempting, but does not take us far. After all, one did not need to be a former advocate to appreciate a good courtroom anecdote, as attested by the preservation of these details in Suetonius.⁶⁸ Again, Nonianus has been offered as the source behind the 'sampling of grim Tiberian jests' that appear in Suetonius' *Life of Tiberius*.⁶⁹ The assumption rests on the identification of the unnamed consular historian at *Tiberius* 61.6 with Servilius Nonianus.⁷⁰ Whether or not Suetonius' unnamed historian is in fact Nonianus, it is tempting to assign many of the various samples of Tiberian gallows humour in Dio and Suetonius to the same source.

The value of jokes and casual remarks attributed to famous individuals is a constant of both ancient and modern historiography.⁷¹ Book 57 contains fifteen stand-alone sayings attributed to Tiberius, thirteen of these in *oratio recta*.⁷² Somewhat surprisingly, the remainder of the Tiberian narrative in Book 58 contains only five such Tiberian *dicta*.⁷³ The number of Tiberian sayings is relatively high. For the sake of comparison, Book 59 contains eleven sayings of Caligula. Surprisingly there are few such sayings attributed to Augustus over the course of books 53-56,⁷⁴ given that so many were in circulation.⁷⁵ The provenance of Dio's imperial *apophthegmata* is obscure. It is possible that Dio had access to a pre-existing collection of Tiberian

⁶⁷ Bablitz 2009: 122 n. 4.

⁶⁸ I owe this observation to Chris Pelling.

⁶⁹ Baldwin 1983: 154.

⁷⁰ Syme 1958a: 277; Baldwin 1983: 154; Sage 1990: 1006.

⁷¹ As indeed they were to Plutarch's conception of biography: cf. Plut. *Alex.* 1.

⁷² For the sayings presented in *oratio recta*, see 57.2.3, 57.2.6, 57.7.4, 57.8.2, 57.9.2, 57.10.5, 57.13.3, 57.18.2 [Xiph., Zonar.], 57.19.1^b [Petrus Patricius], 57.19.4 [Xiph., Zonar.], 57.21.1 [Xiph.], 57.24.8 [Xiph.]. This does not include the reputed exchange between Tiberius and Clemens the pseudo-Agrippa.

⁷³ 58.3.7 [Xiph.], 58.23.3, 58.23.4, 58.24.4, 58.28.4.

⁷⁴ E.g. 55.10.16, 56.30.34.

⁷⁵ Laurence and Paterson 1999: 189.

dicta, similar to that compiled by Tiro of choice Ciceronian one-liners.⁷⁶ Such a document might have been in circulation during the early third century, perhaps containing the sayings of several emperors in addition to Tiberius. Our knowledge of such booklets is slight: but aside from Christian texts,⁷⁷ the only surviving examples from antiquity of texts dedicated solely to *dicta* are the three found amongst Plutarch's *Moralia* (*Saying of the Spartans*, *Sayings of the Kings and Commanders*, and the *Sayings of the Romans*), and although slightly different in nature, the so-called *Disticha Catonis*.⁷⁸ Alternatively, Dio might have collected the Tiberian *dicta* himself.

In general terms, such sayings could have diverse origins. Laurence and Paterson have made a useful distinction between *dicta* that owed their origins to official documents, such as the *acta senatus*, and so-called 'floating' *dicta*, which were ahistorical sayings in common circulation that were subsequently attached to a particular individual or individuals.⁷⁹ An illustrative example of the latter is the contrived encounter and exchange between Tiberius and the imposter Clemens, which certainly started its life as an adaptation of a well-known folk-tale, before entering the literary tradition.⁸⁰ Yet this is not the case for the bulk of Tiberius' reported comments in Book 57. Some of the Tiberian *dicta* appear to have been delivered in the Senate. Indeed, six of the sayings might reasonably be ascribed to a senatorial context and

⁷⁶ For the Ciceronian *dicta* compiled by Tiro, see Quint. *Inst. Orat.* 6.3.3, 6.3.5; Macrob. 2.1.12; cf. Laurence and Paterson 1999: 188; *FRHist.* 1.403 (Drummond).

⁷⁷ For Christian examples, note the second/third century texts *P.Oxy.* 1 and *P.Oxy.* 654, which contain sayings of Jesus. The late antique *Sayings of the Desert Fathers* is perhaps a more elaborate, none the less indicative, manifestation of this genre.

⁷⁸ For the Plutarchan books of *apophthegmata*, see Stadter 1989: xlv n. 39; Pelling 2002: 68-85; Stadter 2014b. For the possible first century (A.D.) origins of the *Dicta/Disticha Catonis*, see Connolly 2012; *contra* Morgan 2007: 87.

⁷⁹ Laurence and Paterson 1999: 183 n. 2. As the same authors note (1999: 191-2) identical *dicta* are occasionally attributed to different individuals. For this characteristic of anecdotes in general, see Saller 1980: 76-7.

⁸⁰ 57.16.4 with commentary *ad loc.*

have a ring of authenticity about them.⁸¹ Aside from Tiberius' comments at the senatorial sessions in September A.D. 14, two more of these sayings are attributed to Tiberius' reaction to specific events. The first concerns the behaviour of the *consules ordinarii* in a legal matter (57.21.1 [Xiph.]; cf. 57.7.4), and the second appears in connection with the aborted trial of the aged Cn. Cornelius Lentulus (57.24.8 [Xiph.]).⁸² From what little evidence we have of the form of the *acta senatus*, it appears that statements were recorded in *oratio recta*.⁸³ Hence, we cannot rule out the possibility that these items were found in the *acta senatus*, and were later extracted either by Dio or an earlier historian.⁸⁴

Mention of the *acta senatus* should give us pause. Tacitus' use (or not) of these documents has been a topic of much discussion and debate.⁸⁵ For Dio, there is slight evidence of his direct consultation of documentary sources in the Tiberian narrative.⁸⁶ Nevertheless, there are several instances where Dio cites non-literary sources. At one point Dio professes to quote what appears to be the precise wording of an imperial edict (57.9.2). At another juncture Dio shows a keen awareness of the voting procedure of a particular debate, where a motion of Cn. Calpurnius Piso was vetoed by a tribune, a detail which might have appeared in the *acta senatus*.⁸⁷

⁸¹ 57.2.3, 57.2.6, 57.18.2, 57.21.1 [Xiph.], 57.24.8 [Xiph.].

⁸² The ironic ring of Tiberius' reputed exclamation during the trial of Lentulus no doubt caught the historian's attention (οὐδὲ ζῆν ἔτ' ἔφη ἄξιός εἰμι, εἶγε καὶ Λέντουλός με μισεῖ). For Lentulus, see Syme 1986: 287-96.

⁸³ Talbert 1988: 145.

⁸⁴ From what little evidence we have of the form of the *acta senatus*, it appears that statements were recorded in *oratio recta*: Talbert 1988: 145. That the information we find in Dio was distilled from the *acta senatus* by way of an earlier annalist is perhaps to be preferred to Dio's direct consultation of the *acta*: Talbert 1984: 325; Swan 1997: 2532-3.

⁸⁵ Syme 1958a: 278-86, 705; Syme 1970: 4-5; Syme 1982: 73 and *passim* = *RP* 4. 207 and *passim*. Cf. Martin 1981: 206-7; Talbert 1984: 326-34; Sage 1990: 1008-10; Matthews 2010: 60-1, *passim*; Pettinger 2012: 217. For a sensible discussion of the *acta senatus* in general, see Talbert 1984: 308-23.

⁸⁶ For an overview of Dio's relationship with epigraphic sources, see the venerable, but still worthy study of Stuart (1904).

⁸⁷ 57.15.9.

Elsewhere Dio claims an awareness of the formulae applied on imperial letters issued under Tiberius (57.12.2; 58.4.3). Of course it is possible that this material may have been obtained through a well-informed intermediary source. At any rate Dio's statement that Tiberius eschewed the *cognomen* 'Augustus' does not suggest a historian with an intimate knowledge of documents from the Tiberian Principate.⁸⁸ However, we are not in a position to rule out the possibility that Dio's knowledge of imperial letters was the result of autopsy. Certainly later in his history Dio makes a point of noting the imperial styles used in letters of the emperors of his own time, which we may be sure was borne out of personal enquiry or confirmed by experience.⁸⁹

Similarly we may note Dio's sporadic references to public records, which he variously calls τὰ δημόσια γράμματα or τὰ κοινὰ ὑπομνήματα. These sources are cited sporadically throughout the *Roman History*. In a general statement about the writing of history at 53.19.2, Dio identifies 'the public records' (sc. τὰ δημόσια ὑπομνήματα) as one of the main sources of history available under the Republic, and it is implied, under the imperial period as well. Yet, whether he used these sources directly and systematically over the course of composing the *Roman History* is doubtful.⁹⁰ Be this as it may, it is interesting to note a cluster of references to the public records in the Tiberian narrative. Of the eight references to these documents in the *Roman History*, four appear in Book 57 whereas only one appears in the subsequent Julio-Claudian narrative, and none appears in his account of the reign of

⁸⁸ See commentary 57.8.1-2.

⁸⁹ E.g. 73(72).15.5 [Xiph.], 79(78).16.2, 80(79).2.2 [Xiph.].

⁹⁰ Rich 1990: 8, 153; *pace* Edmondson 1992: 31, although he also concedes that Dio may have used these via an intermediary source (1992: 32).

Augustus.⁹¹ This spike in references leads to one of two conclusions. The first, admittedly unsatisfying, is that Dio himself turned to these records for details for the early years of Tiberius' reign. Against this, it should be noted that the references to the public records in the Tiberian narrative do not indicate any level of familiarity with the documents themselves. Unlike, for example Suetonius, who cites the *acta* for specific points of detail,⁹² Dio's references to these documents are somewhat oblique. When he cites the public records it is usually to note when something was (or was not) included in them.⁹³ The second possible explanation is more satisfactory. Given the distribution and nature of the references to these documents, it seems likely that the references to the public records in Book 57 derive from a single source, whose history furnished material for the first half of the reign of Tiberius.⁹⁴

We may detect traces of literary sources of a different nature in Dio's account, which furnished specific anecdotal details. Two anecdotes concerning Galba's imperial destiny appear in the *Roman History* prior to the narrative of A.D. 68. The first appears late in the reign of Augustus (56.29.5), and the second at some point after A.D. 17 (57.19.4 [Xiph.]). The second of these references, which is preserved only in Xiphilinus, is oddly placed. The most likely context would be for it to have been placed under the year of Galba's consulship if it had originated in an annalistic source, but this does not seem to have been the case.⁹⁵ Unfortunately its original context is irrecoverable, but its function seems to be purely anecdotal and it was not

⁹¹ 44.11.3, 47.6.4, 53.19.2, 57.12.2, 57.16.2, 57.21.5 [Xiph.], 57.23.2 [Xiph.], 61(60).33.1 [EVV].

⁹² E.g. Suet. *Cal.* 8.2.

⁹³ Note the anecdote of Tiberius and the architect, whose achievements, Dio says, were not included in the records (57.21.5 [Xiph.]). If we are to believe that Dio consulted the records directly, we would need to imagine Dio reading about the deeds of the architect then checking the public records to see if there was any mention of him. This seems unlikely.

⁹⁴ Here Aufidius Bassus might be a candidate for these references, if his history did conclude in A.D. 31.

⁹⁵ Tacitus (*Ann.* 6.20.2) tells the identical story but places it in A.D. 33, the year of Galba's consulship.

tied to any particular year. Interestingly, both stories of Galba's *omina imperii* involve divination. In the case of the former, Dio gives the story of the lightning strike which obliterated the letter 'C' on an inscription to Augustus, which was portentous not only of Augustus' death but also of Galba's imperial future, as Galba assumed the *toga virilis* in that year. The second concerned Tiberius' investigation of the horoscopes of prominent men including Galba, whom Tiberius predicted would rule briefly. As noted correctly by Syme, the author of these anecdotes must have been writing after the events of A.D. 68.⁹⁶ We may tentatively put forward a candidate for these stories: Ti. Claudius Balbillus. We know that Balbillus was alive in at least A.D. 70 when he was honoured by Vespasian with games at Ephesus.⁹⁷ This (likely) son of Tiberius' astrologer Thrasyllus is known to have been a man of some eloquence and learning.⁹⁸ According to Seneca (*QN* 4.2.13), Balbillus' literary accomplishments were broad and he wrote on many topics. Thanks to a Byzantine catalogue of astronomical texts we know he composed a work titled Ἀστρολογούμενα,⁹⁹ and although we may be fairly certain that the anecdotes found in Dio did not derive from the Ἀστρολογούμενα (a summary of which survives),¹⁰⁰ Balbillus' interests in astrology and divination are at least consonant with the tenor of these stories.

A final type of source may be adduced. At least some of Dio's material may have come from non-written or oral sources. Determining the origins of particular anecdotes is rife with supposition, and is perhaps ultimately futile. There are few

⁹⁶ Syme 1958a: 692; cf. Swan 2004: 301-2.

⁹⁷ 65(66).9.2. For the Balbilleia at Ephesus, see Brunet 1997; *SEG* 47 (1997), 1620.

⁹⁸ Cf. Wilkes 1972: 191.

⁹⁹ In the MS (*codex Parisinus graecus* 2425) the author of the Ἀστρολογούμενα is identified as Βάρβιλλος – a likely mistake for Βάλβιλλος. Interestingly (but no doubt coincidentally) Xiphilinus and the compiler of the *EVV* identify the astrologer Βάρβιλλος (65(66).9.2 [Xiph., *EVV*]) as well.

¹⁰⁰ *CCAG* 8.3 p. 103-4; cf. *CCAG* 8.4 p. 232 (the summary of an anonymous author, but likely to be Balbillus).

clues in the text. Occasionally Dio claims to have heard (sc. ἤκουσα) certain stories or versions of a story.¹⁰¹ This might refer to Dio's careful notation of oral sources, or simply be an informal way of reporting a rival tradition that he found in his literary authorities.¹⁰² Nevertheless, we may draw tentative arguments from analogy. Like any closed institution,¹⁰³ the Senate was certainly a place where stories and anecdotes about former members were freely and frequently exchanged. In the Senate, institutional memory was long.¹⁰⁴ This memory embraced not only those exemplary figures from the past, whose deeds and *dicta* were the staples of the rhetorical tradition, but to individuals less worthy. In one well-known passage, Dio cites the authority of his own father as a source of the truth behind the rumour concerning the dubious circumstances surrounding the accession of Hadrian.¹⁰⁵ Even beyond the Senate, the civic centres that Dio inhabited were no doubt rife with stories and anecdotes about emperors. We may recall Plutarch's statement at the beginning of the *Demosthenes* where he notes one of the advantages of living in a city was the circulation of anecdotes usually omitted by the literary texts.¹⁰⁶ It is possible that such informal sources of information were used (even tacitly) by Dio to corroborate or correct specific details.

The sources available to Dio were diverse. As I have maintained in the foregoing discussion, it is likely that the bulk of Dio's narrative for Book 57 was constructed from the annalistic tradition, which was established in the mid-decades of

¹⁰¹ See commentary below at 57.3.3. Cf. 58.11.7.

¹⁰² Millar 1964: 36-7, suggests that items introduced with the verb ἤκουσα 'might derive from the historical or antiquarian readings of his friends'. Cf. Syme 1958a: 690.

¹⁰³ The modern university is a case in point, where stories of past professors or eccentrics (two groups by no means mutually exclusive), are told, re-told, embellished, and float between different individuals.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.16.1

¹⁰⁵ 69.1 [Xiph.]; cf. Millar 1964: 36.

¹⁰⁶ Plut. *Dem.* 2.1; with Pelling 1979: 90. Note also Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.3 for these sorts of informal but well-informed oral sources available to him at Rome.

the first century A.D. There is nothing in Dio's narrative that precludes the possibility that Dio drew from multiple annalistic sources. These accounts, which laid the basis for Dio's narrative, may have been augmented by other sources of information – perhaps oral tradition or even personal autopsy of the documents of Tiberius' reign. Although the identities of Dio's sources are elusive, at least one of Dio's literary authorities must have satisfied his desire for senatorial information. How Dio used these sources to construct his narrative is a topic to which we now turn.

Dio's Method of Composition

Thanks to an autobiographical statement preserved in Xiphilinus' *Epitome*, we know something of Dio's general method of work for the *Roman History*. Dio says that he spent ten years collecting (sc. συνέλεξα) the material for the history from the beginning to the death of Severus, and twelve years writing this material up.¹⁰⁷ This picture is imperfect. As Avenarius noted, Dio makes no mention of when he made a draft of his history.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, Dio neglects to say that he was making preparations gathering material for the history after Severus as well during this period. In his narrative following the murder of Caracalla, Dio says that he knew that he would write of those events also, following a dream he received between the death of Severus (4 February 211) and the fall of Geta (December 211).¹⁰⁹ These passages have posed numerous problems to those wanting settle the question of when the

¹⁰⁷ 73(72).23.5 [Xiph.]. For a similar description of a two-phase composition, see Lucian. *Hist. conscr.* 48. Coincidentally, Dionysius of Halicarnassus spent a period of 22 years composing his history: Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2.

¹⁰⁸ Avenarius 1956: 88, who proposes reasonably that Dio produced a draft (ὑπόμνημα) after the gathering of the materials.

¹⁰⁹ 79(78).10.1-2. Or so it is generally assumed: Millar 1964: 39; Barnes 1984: 245. Cf. Swan 1997: 2552-5, suggests that the passage in question could in fact refer to a time before the death of Severus.

history was written. The dating of composition may be sidestepped when considering Book 57. It is sufficient to assign its inception to a period following the death of Severus.¹¹⁰ What, however, I shall discuss in this section is what we can reconstruct of what Dio actually did during these two phases of composition.

As with the question of Dio's sources, we are confronted with a series of unknown factors when it comes to Dio's method of composition. What should be noted is that Dio did not come to his task of writing history from a position of total ignorance of Roman history. As a senator of mature years, Dio must have had, at the very least, an outline understanding of Roman history before he started on his task of composing his history of Rome from its beginnings. Opinions and prejudices concerning specific individuals had no-doubt developed in his mind before he started his reading. Dio says that his reading was extensive, but he gives no clue as to how he managed his reading.¹¹¹ Instead, we are left with a series of unanswerable questions. Did Dio, for example, organise his reading according to time periods? That is to say did Dio begin with reading accounts of the Regal period then progress to those of more recent times? Alternatively, did he read and take notes from whatever books he had to hand? Whatever the case, by the end of the reading and note-taking phase, Dio was in a position to undertake his history as a continuous narrative, and to organise it mentally as a thematically unified whole.

Something of Dio's method of work may be divined from what he says and the finished product. Dio's period of gathering materials must have involved

¹¹⁰ The only datable reference to his own time is his comment at 58.14.1, concerning the fall of Plautianus in 205. Even if we could establish a firm date for the beginning of Dio's period of writing, we cannot assume that Dio wrote his history in chronological sequence and therefore cannot estimate when particular books were written, as noted correctly by Edmondson (1992: 32-3).

¹¹¹ F 1.2 [ES]: <ἀνέγνω μὲν> πάντα ὡς εἰπεῖν τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν τισι γεγραμμένα, συνέγραψα δὲ οὐ πάντα ἀλλ' ὅσα ἐξέκρινα. Millar's suggestion (1964: 33) that the missing verb in the first part of the sentence could be συνέλεξα is attractive, suggesting an active gathering of material (and by extension note-taking?).

extensive note taking, perhaps with the aid of a secretary.¹¹² Many if not most of Dio's sources would have been in the form of cumbersome rolls rather than codices, and the presence of a helper would have been welcome, should Dio wish to cross-check his sources. If Dio prepared the bulk of his history at his home in Capua, which is what he implies he did,¹¹³ then we may assume that most of his literary sources were his own or belonged to his friends, which he borrowed or had copied.¹¹⁴

When taking notes we may assume that Dio had certain passages copied accurately so that they followed the source closely, perhaps even verbatim.¹¹⁵ This may be seen in several instances where Dio's Greek follows a parallel Latin text. These notes were probably taken in Greek, but we cannot be certain. If they were translated at this point, this note-taking phase takes on additional importance when thinking about the composition of the work. If not, and the notes were taken in whatever the language of the source text, then the process of translating the source material from Latin into Greek occurred later during the writing phase. This phase of the composition process is one where errors could enter Dio's material. Certainly at least one of Dio's errors (if that is indeed what it is) could have originated at this time. The *eques* Clutorius Priscus appears in the (epitomised) text as Γάιος Λουτώριος Πρίσκος (57.20.3 [Xiph.]). The praenomen of this individual is otherwise unattested, but it seems possible that Dio in his source text found this individual's name written as C LUTORIUS PRISCUS (perhaps with little or no spatial division between the

¹¹² For these sorts of assistants, see Pelling 1979: 95.

¹¹³ For Dio's residence at Capua, see 77(76).2.1 [Xiph.]; cf. Millar 1964: 10-11.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Johnson 2010: 92-3, who notes the relatively scarcity of specialist books in ancient Rome, and the importance of a community of readers to keep such books in circulation.

¹¹⁵ This would account for what Pelling (1979: 91) saw as Dio's apparent tendency to follow one source at a time for specific episodes within the Republican narrative.

words), resulting in Dio making the reasonable assumption that the first letter was an abbreviation denoting Priscus' praenomen.¹¹⁶

The process of writing posed its own challenges. Perhaps at an early stage, Dio settled on a number of books for his history.¹¹⁷ The fact that Dio's history covered more territory than Dio seems to have anticipated perhaps resulted in a significant degree of compression for his Antonine narrative.¹¹⁸ At any rate Dio decided to devote two books, one fortieth of *Roman History*, to the twenty-three years of the Principate of Tiberius Caesar. Once Dio had made this decision, he was presented with problems of how to structure his material. The first of these problems was to decide where the book division should fall. The death of Germanicus could have provided such a point – in Dio's opinion the death of the prince precipitated a great change in Tiberius' conduct (57.13.6). However, to use the death of Germanicus as the point of division would have greatly unbalanced the two books and limited his analysis of Tiberius and his reign.¹¹⁹ The rise of Sejanus might have provided another point. Such was the approach of Tacitus, who introduced Sejanus as a major character in the history in the early 20s, so as to coincide with the demise of Drusus, and the half-way point of the Tiberian hexad.¹²⁰ Compositionally this might have worked well for Dio. Had Book 58 begun with these events, it would have been the narrative of the

¹¹⁶ An alternative is that a kappa has fallen out of the text early in transmission, thus requiring the simple emendation Γάιος <K>λουτῳριος Πρίσκος, however there is no independent evidence that confirms that Priscus' praenomen was in fact Gaius. Or, as Chris Pelling reminds me, it could be due to Dio's misreading of his own (or his secretary's) notes.

¹¹⁷ As noted by Millar (1998: 194), Book 40 seems to mark the great turning point in Dio's history with the crossing of the Rubicon.

¹¹⁸ Swan 1997: 2557 suggests that Dio's accelerated pace of coverage for his narrative from 27 onwards was due to his schedule of work. This cannot be the full picture. The attention Dio devoted to the annalistic narrative contained in books 36-51 is deliberate, and anomalous. Books 3-35 seem to have covered ground swiftly, comprising the period from the establishment of the Republican government down to the mid-first century A.D.: cf. Moscovich 1983.

¹¹⁹ For which, see *Chapter 2, Dio on Tiberius*.

¹²⁰ For discussion of Tacitus' decision to use the death of Drusus as a turning point in Book 4, see especially Sage 1990: 976-8.

rise and fall of the great prefect. But again this would have posed problems of balance. Dio's focus is on Tiberius, not on Sejanus. Instead, Dio chose to mark the division with Tiberius' move to Capri in A.D. 26.¹²¹ The choice was sensible and is unexceptionable. Dio was not the last to see the move to Capri as marking a turning point in Tiberius' reign.¹²² In chronological terms it was also a convenient date, at virtually the halfway point in Tiberius' reign.

There is an internal structure in evidence in Book 57. Chapters 1-6, while ostensibly a continuation of the annalistic narrative for the year 14 begun in Book 56 are in effect removed from the annalistic narrative, with chapters 1-3 concerning Tiberius' nature and the reasons for his *cunctatio* in August-September 14, and chapters 4-6 providing linked digression on the mutinies in Pannonia and on the Rhine. Similarly chapters 7-13 are non-annalistic. The resumed annalistic narrative spans chapters 14-24. As the following table makes clear, the annalistic sections of Book 57 vary considerably in length.

Year (A.D.)	Number of Lines (Boissevain)
15	44
16	58
17*	53
18*	0
19*	31
20*	53
21*	18
22*	7

¹²¹ We know Book 57 terminated in A.D. 25 thanks to the *fasti* supplied in the ancient index affixed to the beginning of the book.

¹²² E.g. Auson. *Caes.* 54-57: *Praenomen Tiberi nactus Nero prima iuventael tempora laudato gessit in imperio. I frustra dehinc solo Caprearum clausus in antrol quae prodit vitiis, credit operta locis.*

23*	83
24*	2
25*	27

* Denotes years that only exist in Dio's epitomes.

The lacunose and fragmentary state of Book 57 makes firm conclusions about the original form of Dio's annalistic narrative impossible. The patterns of material for at least a third of Book 57 reveal more about the tastes of his epitomators than about Dio himself. What looks like the total disappearance of his annalistic account for A.D. 18 is a case in point: Dio's account of that year might well have been brief, but we cannot be sure.¹²³ Yet we may perhaps note for the sake of comparison, this next table presents an overview of those years that survive in their entirety in Book 58.¹²⁴

Year (A.D.)	Number of Lines (Boissevain)
32	89
33	77
34	32
35	34
36	6

These patterns (or rather the absence of a clear pattern), indicates strongly that Dio chose his material deliberately. He was not concerned with ensuring an even distribution of material for each year. Occasionally Dio attempts to impose a degree of thematic unity on his selection of annalistic material for an individual year, but we

¹²³ Dio's epitomators were not bound by any adherence to annalistic conventions and could omit entire years: Xiphilinus, for example has nothing for A.D. 18 and A.D. 35 in the section of his *Epitome* corresponding to Books 57 and 58, yet he preserves Dio's meager account for A.D. 36. Zonaras is generally even more selective. See further, *Notes on the Text of Book 57*.

¹²⁴ For comparison with the distribution in the Augustan books, see the tabulation of Swan 1997: 2527-9.

cannot be sure that he does this consistently for every year in Book 57. Urban affairs dominate the selection of annalistic material. This trend is perceptible in the later Augustan books, but is far more acute in the Tiberian narrative.¹²⁵ Dio's decision to focus so much of his attention on Tiberius (a sedentary emperor) is certainly a contributing factor to this decision. Only occasionally do we catch a glimpse of external events. Xiphilinus preserves a brief summary of Germanicus' campaigns; we may assume that Dio's original account was more fulsome.¹²⁶ The North African campaign against Tacfarinas might too have been afforded summary treatment by Dio, but now not a trace survives, again possibly due to the tastes of Dio's epitomators. In both of these instances Dio probably telescoped the accounts of these campaigns, which occurred over several years, into single narrative blocks – a technique which is observable elsewhere in the *Roman History*.

The singling out of key individuals around whom a narrative could be structured was a key compositional device for both the Republican and Imperial books of the *Roman History*.¹²⁷ In the case of Book 57, the figure of Tiberius dominates and indeed controls Dio's narrative. At times Dio will develop secondary characters to act as foils to the central characterisation of the emperor, but this technique is perhaps underused in the Tiberian narrative, when we compare it with the way he will use this technique elsewhere in the *Roman History*.

Aside from questions of structure, the very act of writing an annalistic history presented challenges, not least the difficulty of co-ordinating several sources. Two models of composition present themselves. The first is that suggested by Pelling in his

¹²⁵ Cf. Swan 1997: 2543-8 for this trend in the Augustan narrative.

¹²⁶ Xiphilinus had little interest in campaign narratives, unless they contained some morally edifying anecdotes: Brunt 1980: 491.

¹²⁷ Pelling 1997a; Pelling 2006: 257-62; Simons 2009.

seminal article on Plutarch's method of composition.¹²⁸ According to this view Dio relied on a control text before him, essentially excerpting from it as he compiled his *Roman History*. Dio then augmented this narrative with the various fruits of his researches as he went along and as he saw fit. In this model, it is the period of writing that was all-important, at the expense of the period of reading and note taking. Yet the main problem with this method is that it seems at odds with Dio's stated method of composition. Instead it suggests a sequential method of reading, note taking, then writing. Dio, however, suggests that the reading (and presumably note taking) occurred during the first ten-year period, then the process of working up his material fell to the next period of twelve years.

An alternative model has been advanced by Rich.¹²⁹ This model places more attention on the note-taking phase of composition. According to this model, Dio took notes as he read, and it was from these notes based on his diverse sources that Dio composed his narrative. Such a model is attractive. As we have seen above, it is almost certain that Book 57 was not an epitome of a single earlier historian, but was rather a piece of writing which drew upon several literary sources. Thus Dio was faced with the challenge of coordinating several of his annalistic sources. Indeed, the problem of reconciling two or more different accounts is noted explicitly by Dio at 57.14.3 concerning the distribution of the Augustus' largess to the people of Rome.¹³⁰ Moreover, if at any point in his narrative he had recourse to a non-annalistic authority, he had to take care to insert whichever particular story he found of interest into its correct chronological position, or where it was thematically suitable. For the

¹²⁸ Pelling 1979: 91-5. Adopted in an extreme form by Swan 1997: 2533-43. Note however, Pelling 2002: 66, where he refines this view to the composition of the *ὑπόμνημα*, which formed the basis of the finished product.

¹²⁹ Rich 1989: 89-92, 106-7. Rich 1990: 6-7.

¹³⁰ Although it may be conceded that Dio found such a statement in a source.

annalistic material, Dio would need to have recorded in his notes the consuls under whom each event or series of events took place. The cardinal virtue of this system is in its flexibility. If Dio chose to follow a single source for a long stretch of narrative, he could do so by simply copying out the text into his notes.¹³¹ If Dio desired to assemble a collection of details that were of interest, he could do this also.

If we accept a model of composition like that proposed by Rich, we can then explain the contours of Dio's narrative, which Bergmans regarded as being indicative of the particular genres of sources used by Dio. In response to the schema offered by Bergmans (as outlined above, page 3), I would suggest that in chapters 2 to 6, Dio followed in the main a source in common with Tacitus (if not Tacitus himself); this applies especially to chapters 4 and 5 where Dio followed this source closely, but condensed it as he saw fit. Chapters 7 to 13 were a compilation of several different sources, and were almost certainly not derived from a lost biographical source as Bergmans suggested. This is most clearly seen in the clustering of the various stories told about Livia (57.12).¹³² Moreover, the fact that Dio adopts this approach throughout the imperial books (at least to the best of our knowledge) also suggests strongly that he did not lift this section from one of his historiographical predecessors. The annalistic narrative (Chapters 14-24) seems likely to have been compiled in this manner too. The composition required care and attention, but given the relative sparseness of Dio's annalistic chapters the task of reconstituting an annalistic narrative would not have been beyond the skill of the historian, nor would it have been overly time-consuming.

¹³¹ Cf. Pelling 2002: 65-6.

¹³² Note also the similar clustering of anecdotal material again concerning Livia at 58.3.5 [Xiph.].

The writing phase would see Dio link his material together, sometimes roughly, but at other times very well indeed, with ‘gliding transitions’ between his material, or thematically related anecdotes. The importance of this phase cannot be underestimated – after all, according to Dio it took longer to write up his history properly than to collect the materials for it. It was certainly in this phase that Dio managed to harmonise his diverse material in a way that created the impression of a unified whole.¹³³ To understand how and why Dio shaped the narrative in the ways he did, we need to turn to the historian himself.

The Shaping of Material and the Personality of the Historian

It was once posited that Dio’s originality of thought was found only in the speeches or authorial digressions of the history. The rest of his work instead displayed ‘a failure to rethink the data’ which his sources provided.¹³⁴ As we shall see, such a view is difficult to sustain. In Book 57, which has no (surviving) set-piece speech, Dio’s presentation of Tiberius’ reign reveals not only the interests and preoccupations of the historian, but also an ultimately successful attempt to weave his material into the thematic fabric of his work.

There are few nowadays who would argue that Dio was a slave to the opinions of his sources. As is generally recognized, Dio was a historian who reshaped his material in ways that could be both subtle and profound.¹³⁵ Often we find that the attitudes of the historian are close to the surface, even in apparently unadorned

¹³³ Cf. Lucian (*Hist. conscr.* 50-1), who notes the importance of fashioning the material in the composition process.

¹³⁴ Gabba 1984: 70-71 (quote on 71), commenting on Dio’s portrayal of the reign of Augustus.

¹³⁵ E.g. Pelling 1982; Rich 1989: 88-9, *passim*; Mallan 2014.

narrative passages. For example, we may consider Dio's description of the aid Tiberius gave to impecunious senators (57.10.3-4). The passage appears in the context of Dio's account of Tiberius' exemplary conduct up to the death of Germanicus. Although Dio may be seen to be reacting to the same source material (either directly or indirectly) as Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.37-8) and Suetonius (*Tib.* 47), his judgment is independent of the other two who follow the same interpretation. Comparison between the accounts in Dio and Tacitus is especially illustrative of this. Tacitus' story of Tiberius' treatment of M. Hortensius Hortalus,¹³⁶ the impoverished senator hoping to gain a subsidy presumably so that his children might reach the property qualifications for admission to the Senate, is intended to evoke the reader's sympathy and reflect badly on the emperor's conduct. Dio, by avoiding the personalized angle, portrays Tiberius' actions as being a simple case of deciding between the worthy and unworthy. As a result he emerges in a positive light. Tacitus, by contrast, turns this around to illustrate Tiberius' niggardliness and latent hostility towards the *ordo senatorius*.

Similarly we may note Dio's attitude towards Tiberius' public munificence (57.10.1-2). While reacting seemingly to the same material as Suetonius (*Tib.* 47), Dio presents this material in an entirely different (and positive) light. Even if the opinions of Dio were in fact those of the shared source text (and it was Suetonius who adjusted them to suit his own picture of the parsimonious *princeps*), Dio's presentation of these views is consonant with his own views on such imperial expenditure as seen elsewhere in the *Roman History*.¹³⁷ We may learn something as well from the silences in Dio's text. For our Latin tradition, the lack of imperial

¹³⁶ *PIR*² M 211. It is possible that this individual is in fact a certain [?] Marcius Hortalus, based on *AE* 1987, no. 163, a fragment of the *fasti* of the Arval Brethren: Briscoe 1993; cf. Eck 1993. For comments on the fragments of this text, see Bodel 1995.

¹³⁷ See commentary at 57.10.1-2.

expansion was a major point of censure for the successor of Augustus.¹³⁸ For Dio, an opponent of vainglorious military expansion, nothing is said against Tiberius' apparent lack of energy in this field.¹³⁹ Furthermore, from what we know of Dio's attitude to emperorship, martial accomplishments were not of fundamental importance.¹⁴⁰

The recurrence of certain motifs or themes over the course of the Imperial books of the *Roman History* is one of the characteristics of Dio's reshaping of his source materials. Here Pelling's idea of 'trans-regnal themes' is a helpful concept to appreciate Dio's approach to composing his imperial narrative.¹⁴¹ This applies not only to broad thematic concerns, such as the hypocrisy of the imperial system, but also to specific details that Dio is frequently attracted to, such as an emperor's attitude towards things like taxation, public games, or even private dinner parties, all of which are used as convenient barometers of an emperor's reign.¹⁴²

Yet the term 'trans-regnal' should not be taken to imply that all of these recurring themes apply to the imperial narrative alone. We find that some of these recurring themes are deeper and extend across the *Roman History* as a whole. Dio's belief in the potentially corrupting influence of (excessive) honours is a prime example. Hence Dio makes a point of recording instances where individuals rejected or accepted honours and the effects of their decisions on their conduct.¹⁴³ This idea seems to be closely associated with Dio's conception of human nature (ἄνθρωπος, or φύσις). The place of human nature in Dio's work has been a topic of much

¹³⁸ Suet. *Tib.* 37.4; Tac. *Ann.* 4.32; etc.

¹³⁹ For Dio's generally negative attitude towards territorial expansion, at least under the emperors, see Swan 2004: 12.

¹⁴⁰ Davenport and Mallan 2014: 646-7.

¹⁴¹ For this idea, see Pelling 1997a.

¹⁴² E.g. see commentary at 57.10.5 (taxation), 57.11.4-5 (games), 57.11.3 (dinner parties).

¹⁴³ Note commentary at 57.12.1.

scholarly industry and this is not the place to digress on this complex issue.¹⁴⁴ Instead, it is sufficient to note that for Dio human nature (broadly speaking) was a key factor in historical causation and in explaining behaviour. For the purposes of this commentary we may gloss human nature as a medley of commonplaces concerning human motivation. This can be seen sporadically throughout the course of Book 57, but often tacitly expressed.¹⁴⁵

It is frequently stated that one of Dio's greatest debts was to Thucydides. Stylistically, we see flashes of the Athenian exemplar throughout the *Roman History*. Dio's frequent juxtaposition of professed motives with real motives, appearances with realities may owe something to Thucydides, although these had long been standard rhetorical devices.¹⁴⁶ More deeply, we may even trace the influence of Thucydides on an intellectual level.¹⁴⁷ Yet to think of Dio as a third century Thucydides (a pallid imitator or otherwise) is misleading. In the imperial books at least, there is much that is decidedly un-Thucydidean about Dio's historiographical style and programme. The presentation of narrative focused around a particular character, the interest in women as historical players, to cite but two obvious illustrations, owes little (if in fact anything) to Thucydides.

Ostensibly, Dio set out to write an annalistic history of the Roman people that began from the advent of Aeneas. From this point, the political and moral fortunes of

¹⁴⁴ A detailed analysis of Dio's conception of human nature has yet to be written. Note however, the contribution of Rees (2011) in his unpublished DPhil thesis; cf. Millar 1964: 76; Reinhold 1988: 215-17; and in the Commentary below at 57.13.4 νῦν μὲν γὰρ ... προτιμήσειν.

¹⁴⁵ E.g. Germanicus' surprising rejection of imperial power (57.6.2-3); Livia's desire to surpass Tiberius in terms of influence (57.12.3).

¹⁴⁶ For this feature of Dio's style, note Rich 1989: 89; Rich 1990: 14; cf. Pelling 1983: 221-2; Rich 2010: 171; Kemezis 2014: 136 with n. 114. For Thucydidean examples, note (among many) Thuc. 2.65.9: ἐγίγνετό τε λόγῳ μὲν δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή; 3.70.1; etc. It is of course implicit in Thucydides statement at 1.23.6 on the causes of the Peloponnesian war.

¹⁴⁷ E.g. Millar 1964: 42. Note the interesting comparison between Thucydides and Dio's use of the language of enslavement by Lavan 2013: 137-8.

the Romans were his main focus and from which he seldom strayed.¹⁴⁸ In particular it was the ways in which the sovereign body exercised power that was central to Dio's project. Following the victories of Augustus over his rivals, Dio saw history as being the history of a succession of monarchic rulers. Roman history had become *Kaisergeschichte*. As such, Dio's focus is on the emperors themselves and their performance of the role of emperor. The emperors' interactions with specific groups (for example, the senate, the Roman people, the army, or provincial populations) or individuals in Roman society are used to illustrate the behaviour and attitudes of individual emperors.¹⁴⁹ The reign of Tiberius represented a single stage in this historical cavalcade of emperors and imperial pretenders. As a result of these factors, when we consider Book 57 we may note that the treatment is fundamentally different from that of Tacitus. On the one hand, from what we can tell from the surviving narrative, Dio has virtually nothing to say about events in, for example, Germania or in Parthia. On the other hand, the sort of intense critique of individuals (usually senators) or senatorial meetings that we find in Tacitus is also absent from Dio.

Although Dio came from a provincial stock (albeit senatorial), there is little in his work that may be read as a provincial perspective. As has been argued persuasively by Lavan, Dio's authorial voice is that of someone aligned 'with the centre and the ruling power.'¹⁵⁰ This perspective may be seen throughout Book 57 through Dio's choice of material. As noted above, Dio was attracted to the details of government and administration. At times these notes have an aetiological function, in so far as they trace the origins of particular customs, procedures or institutions. The

¹⁴⁸ An early fragment from the first book of Dio's work seems to outline this principle (F 2.4 [ES]): τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν Ῥωμαίων πάντα κατὰ δύναμιν ἐπέξειμι, τῶν δὲ δὴ λοιπῶν τὰ πρόσφορα αὐτοῖς μόνον γεγράφεται.

¹⁴⁹ For further discussion, see Commentary § IV *Tiberius' Conduct as Ruler*.

¹⁵⁰ Lavan 2013: 139-40 (quote from 139).

establishment or violation of precedent in Senatorial matters is also an issue of concern. Dio's account therefore furnishes an abundance of information on senatorial administration under Tiberius. Hence, amongst other things, Dio notes the shortage of quaestors in A.D. 16, the attempted regulation of when governors should take up their postings in the provinces, and the arrangements made in the wake of the death of the governor of Crete and Cyrenaica in A.D. 15.¹⁵¹

It comes often as a surprise, in a narrative so truncated, that Dio scattered throughout his narrative so many apparent trivialities. A single example should suffice as an illustration. Dio makes two references to *scimpodia* in the space of three chapters.¹⁵² Dio could simply have chosen to use a less recherché vocabulary – a simple 'litter' (φορτεῖον) would have sufficed in both contexts. What is more, it is not only Dio's choice of word that is surprising. In both instances Dio proceeds to provide authorial comment on their use and symbolism. For Dio a *scimpodion* was an object that denoted a specific status: the sort of thing that 'the wives of senators use' (αἱ τῶν βουλευτῶν γυναῖκες χρῶνται).¹⁵³ The use of such objects was a symbol of senatorial rank. By extension, knowledge of such devices and the protocol surrounding their use was similarly an affirmation of this privileged status. Dio's commentary on *scimpodia* not only serves as a reaffirmation of his own rank, but also of the centrality of the Senate in his historical programme.

It was one of Syme's favoured rhetorical flourishes to juxtapose the 'consular historian' (Tacitus) with the 'Greek from Nicaea' (Dio) when trying to assert the superiority of the former. Unfortunately, the mentality such a division betrays is less than helpful when it comes to understanding Dio and his work. When we read Dio the

¹⁵¹ 57.16.1 (shortages of quaestors); 57.14.4 (death of the governor of Crete and Cyrenaica); 57.14.5 (reform of gubernatorial tenures).

¹⁵² 57.15.4 (with commentary *ad loc.*), 57.17.6.

¹⁵³ 57.15.4; cf. 60.2.2 [Xiph.].

voice we hear is that of a senator. He may often speak to us with an accent different from that of Tacitus, but it is a voice that conveys a deep knowledge of the Senate and its institutions, and of someone attempting to make sense of nearly one thousand years of history.¹⁵⁴ But Dio's senatorial status is also a key component of Dio's presentation of material throughout the *Roman History*. When Dio came to write the autobiographical *sphragis* that closes the work, a key aspect of Dio's self-portrayal is that of a disciplined Senatorial administrator, a man of energy.¹⁵⁵ Throughout the work, he is concerned with titles, offices, and senatorial ceremony. He appraises emperors through senatorial eyes. These eyes may have interpreted events differently from a Tacitus or a Sallust, yet the gaze is senatorial all the same.

Conclusion

As the foregoing discussion has shown, the fifty-seventh book of Dio's *Roman History* cannot be understood simply by the sources which formed the basis of Dio's narrative or by the personality of the historian. Rather it is only an appreciation of a combination of these two factors and the way in which it is likely that Dio constructed his narrative that we can come to any degree of understanding of this part of Dio's work. The question of Dio's sources for the early Julio-Claudians has proved a vexed issue. The tantalizing concordances with the tradition represented by Tacitus and Suetonius means that many hypotheses and hunches have been made by historians about the traditions used by our surviving ancient authorities. Yet as I have attempted to show, although there is little to gain by attempting to divine the identities of specific now lost authors from Dio's narrative, we can get a sense of the breadth of

¹⁵⁴ See Kemezis 2014: 137-8, 148-9.

¹⁵⁵ 80(80).1-5 [Xiph., EVV].

sources and texts that informed either Dio or the works in which his work was based. When thinking about the nature of this tradition, it is perhaps worth remembering the dictum of J.B.S. Haldane in so far as it may be ‘not only queerer than we suppose, but queerer than we can suppose’.

The consideration of how Dio worked and the ways in which he may be seen to reshape his material is generally a more fruitful line of enquiry. Again reasoned speculation is involved, but the resultant image of the historian at work at least makes us confront the problems involved with writing a history that was not a mere epitome of a single earlier historian. Moreover, even if the resultant picture is imperfect, we stop seeing Dio as being a slave to his sources and instead as a historian of some sophistication and individuality. How Dio’s presentation of the reign of Tiberius is integrated fully with his history more generally is one of the major themes of this commentary. How Dio went about fashioning his portrayal of the central figure in the narrative, the emperor Tiberius, is a topic to which we now consider in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2

DIO ON TIBERIUS

‘It lacks bite, intensity, and colour; it is antithetic but not epigrammatical, tortuous without profundity, and portentiously abstract.’

(Syme 1958: 273)

One of the effects of the dynastically influenced imperial portraiture of the second and early third centuries A.D. is that emperors start to look alike. Hadrian’s visage dissolves into that of Antoninus Pius, Antoninus’ into that of Marcus Aurelius, Marcus’ into that of Commodus. Even the boy Caracalla, properly M. Aurelius Antoninus, scion of a Romanised North African and an Emesine Syrian, is represented in portraiture so as to be the spitting image of a generic Antonine youth. Features that were once distinct are softened by the sculptor, fashioned, as it were, into the serene blandness that was representative of Antonine piety. The same observation may be applied to those portraits of emperors that appear in rhetoric of the age. Much has been written as to whether the anodyne *Eis Basilea* oration was a composition addressed to Antoninus Pius, Philip the Arab, Septimius Severus, or alternatively a rhetorical exercise variously dated between the second and the ninth centuries.¹⁵⁶ Yet genuine or not, the point is that the contents of the oration are so general, so stereotypical, that it could be legitimately seen to apply to any number of emperors, or no emperor in particular.

¹⁵⁶ [Aristid.] *Or.* 35. For the debate, see Jones 1972; Stertz 1979; De Blois 1986; cf. Barker 1957: 220-5. Whenever the oration was composed, Barker’s suggestion that it was written in the ninth century has been roundly (but not always cogently) rejected. Here it is taken to be of either second or third century date.

Superficially, there may seem something of imperial Antonine or Severan statuary about the emperors that appear in Dio's history. They are, in most cases, variations on a common theme. Bad emperors tend to persecute (virtuous) members of the elite, while leading lewd or luxurious lifestyles themselves. Good emperors, conversely, typically behave in just the opposite manner. Such an approach was conventional. It had long been a staple of Greek historiography to judge the quality of a regime (or period of history) by the ethical quality of its ruler. This was, certainly, in part a result of the influence of rhetoric that drew upon the dominant ethical commonplaces of the age. The rhetorical handbooks provided models from which encomiastic speeches could be structured. It was the job of the rhetor to select from the categories those which most pertained to the virtues (real or imagined) possessed by the emperor. These models were essentially late-Classical in origin, and a path may be detected linking the encomiastic productions of Isocrates and Xenophon with the panegyrics delivered to the various late Roman warlords and dynasts represented in eleven of the twelve so-called *Panegyrici Latini*.¹⁵⁷ Not only was the form stereotyped, but so too was the language. When the late second century grammarian Julius Pollux came to write about the language used to describe kings in the first book of his *Onomasticon*, he produced an extensive list of adjectives of desirable virtues and qualities.¹⁵⁸ Immediately following this list was a list of antonyms, used to describe tyrants: a reminder, if ever one was needed, of how easy it was to switch from encomium to vituperation.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ For the development of this sort of praise literature (*encomia*, *laudationes*, panegyrics), see in general Nixon and Rogers 1994: 1-3, 10-14, 23-4. For the stereotypical aspects of encomiastic speeches, with an emphasis on characterisation (specifically Isocrates' *Evagoras*), see Halliwell 1990: 42-3, 56-7.

¹⁵⁸ Poll. 1.40-42 [Bethe p. 1.12-3].

¹⁵⁹ E.g. Arist. *Rhet.* 1368a.33-37; [Arist.] *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1425b.36-40.

Yet mention of these rhetorical works should give us reason to pause. Dio was a historian who took his task seriously, and was writing an extensive annalistic history of considerable sophistication. He was not writing a historical handbook *de Caesaribus*. Although Dio was influenced undoubtedly by rhetoric and contemporary discourses on kingship, Dio's emperors are, on closer inspection, not a series of cardboard cut outs of good and bad emperors. As a historian he was interested in the personal and external factors that motivated his protagonists to act in the way they did. Moreover, he tried to make clear distinctions between appearances and realities, between what was professed and what was actually done. Furthermore, it is notable that Dio is often more interested in how the men who became emperors performed their duties, rather than just documenting and judging them on the basis of their abstract qualities – their virtues and their vices.¹⁶⁰ Dio's portrayal of Tiberius provides an illustration of these features.

The previous chapter noted the indisputable fact that Dio's imperial history becomes more biographical, at least to the extent that his material is arranged tightly around the person of the reigning emperor. Dio's treatment of Tiberius is an interesting case-study for investigating how this method works. Perhaps uniquely of the emperors covered in the work, Tiberius enjoyed an illustrious career before his accession to the purple in middle age.¹⁶¹ Indeed, Dio pays significant attention to tracking Tiberius' political career prior to his accession. But the question of how exactly Dio conceived of Tiberius' position in August A.D. 14 is one that has not received appropriate consideration, although it is of importance when considering the opening of Book 57. There are also questions of a more literary-historiographical

¹⁶⁰ See the stimulating treatment of Kemezis 2014, especially 139-40.

¹⁶¹ It is impossible to draw concrete conclusions on this issue, owing to the fragmentary nature of Dio's imperial narrative, and Xiphilinus' more tightly controlled biographical focus. For which see Mallan 2013: especially 630-44

nature. Whether Dio's comments on Tiberius' early career have a bearing on the characterisation of Tiberius presented in Books 57 and 58 has been doubted. According to Pelling (1997: 127), '[u]nder Augustus, Tiberius has not yet passed the "threshold of biography" – that is, he has not yet become important enough to excite any real personal interest.' The sentence raises two important questions. First, if 57.1 does indeed mark the "threshold of biography" we may legitimately wonder how Dio approached the figure of Tiberius before he crossed this threshold – that is in the pre-accession narrative. Second, we need to determine what the possible functions of the biographical elements actually are in the overarching narrative concerning Tiberius and his reign. By approaching Dio's portrayal of Tiberius from both literary-historiographical and historical perspectives, this chapter will address these questions.

Dio and the pre-imperial career of Tiberius

Although supplying one of the fullest accounts of Tiberius' pre-accession career, Dio's account appears insubstantial and unsatisfying as history. Whether through ignorance or design, Dio pays little attention to describing the constitutional position of Tiberius or the extent of his *imperium* in either A.D. 4 or 13.¹⁶² This apparent defect is not peculiar to Dio. The general absence of reliable or conclusive evidence for Tiberius' constitutional position following his adoption by Augustus has resulted in many ingenious explanations by scholars to define his position at the time of and immediately following Augustus' death. It has been reasoned that Tiberius possessed *imperium maius* equal to that of Augustus, which did not require renewal upon

¹⁶² Cf. Swan 2004: 85

Augustus' death, along with the crucial *tribunicia potestas*.¹⁶³ Much of this interpretation hinges on the interpretation of Velleius' statement (2.121.1): *senatus populusque Romanus postulante patre eius, ut aequum ei ius in omnibus provinciis exercitibusque esset, quam erat ipsi, decreto complexus est*. Suetonius too knew of a law, presumably the same as that mentioned by Velleius, which gave Tiberius joint authority over the provinces (*Tib.* 21.1). Tacitus' comment that Tiberius was *collega imperii* with Augustus (*Ann.* 1.3) sheds little light on the matter: Tacitus' description seems like an informal formulation, which does not seem to indicate Tiberius' official title or position. The date of this law is not given by either Suetonius or Velleius, but from the context of the narrative it seems likely that it was granted to Tiberius either in late (September?) 12 or early 13.¹⁶⁴

Less clear is the extent of the powers enjoyed by Tiberius. We should not expect precise constitutional formulations from either Velleius or Suetonius, but even if we take that into account, their versions leave the exact extent of the powers Tiberius received in A.D. 12/13 poorly defined. Particularly important for the events following Augustus' death is the question of whether Tiberius' *imperium* in A.D. 13/14 extended to Italy and Rome. It has been argued that Augustus' statement concerning the census of 13/14 (*RGDA* 8: *[et te]rtium consulari cum imperio lustrum conlega Tib. Cae[sare filio] m[eo feci] Sex. Pompeio et Sex. Appuleio cos*), indicates Tiberius' possession of *imperium* in Italy in 14.¹⁶⁵ Yet the wording of the document only describes Augustus' own powers at the time of the census, and is not explicit as

¹⁶³ Brunt 1974a: 171-4, 179-80; Levick 1976: 75, 79-81.

¹⁶⁴ Brunt 1974a: 171-3; Woodman 1977: 210-11; Swan 2004: 294; Ferrary 2009: 125-6 with n. 129; cf. Goodyear 1972: 112.

¹⁶⁵ Brunt 1962: 72; Brunt and Moore 1973: 51-2; Levick 1976: 63; *contra* Jones 1951: 118 = Jones 1960: 16. Cooley (2009: 143) does not address this issue, noting simply the connection between the passage in the *RGDA* and the law enacted in 14 to allow Tiberius to be Augustus' colleague in the census (Suet. *Tib.* 21)

to whether Tiberius' (implied) *censoria potestas* derived from his possession of the same consular *imperium* held by Augustus, as argued by Hardy (1919: 48-9) and assumed by Brunt and Moore. Moreover, while Suetonius (*Tib.* 21.1) groups the extension of Tiberius' powers over the provinces and the authorisation of the census under the one law (*lege per consules lata, ut provincias cum Augusto communiter administraret simulque censum ageret*), he does not connect Tiberius' censorial authority with his new extended command.

Given the importance attributed to these powers by historians, these omissions by Dio are surprising. On the whole, Dio was interested in the constitutional developments and the granting of novel political powers during the Augustan period.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, it is not as if Dio failed to appreciate the importance of the *imperium* granted to Augustus over the imperial provinces in 27 B.C.: Dio quite rightly saw this as one of the foundations of Augustus' power.¹⁶⁷ Yet, there is no trace in Dio's narrative of the laws that supposedly elevated Tiberius to the same position as Augustus (with respect to his *imperium maius*) prior to Augustus' death, as indicated by Suetonius. It is, of course, possible that such material once existed in Dio's account: Books 55 and 56, where we should expect to find such details, are especially lacunose. Particularly unfortunate is the loss of the end of Dio's account of A.D. 13, where it is possible that Dio made reference to this extension of Tiberius' *imperium*, should it have occurred in that year.¹⁶⁸ However, this seems unlikely. Had Dio included such details, we should expect them to have been grouped together with his brief account of the renewal of Tiberius' *tribunicia potestas* and the advancement

¹⁶⁶ Syme (1978a: 56): 'That being so, the historian [sc. Dio], whose interest in constitutional matters is patent, and sometimes excessive, ought not to have missed the grant of an *imperium* over provinces and armies equal and equipollent to that of Caesar Augustus.'

¹⁶⁷ 53.16.1; cf. Brunt 1977: 96; Cotton and Yakobson 2002: 193-4. For the settlements of 28 and 27 B.C., see Rich and Williams 1999: especially 188-213; Ferrary 2009: 92-9.

¹⁶⁸ For the lacuna at 56.28.6, see Boissevain 2.540-41.

of Drusus (56.28.1). More tellingly, Dio's silence on such matters is found elsewhere: since the publication of *P. Colon.* 4701, it is almost certain that Agrippa possessed *imperium maius* over the provinces at the time of his death, and thus must have been granted to him with the grant of *tribunicia potestas* in either 18 or 13 B.C.¹⁶⁹

These are not the only instances where Dio is extremely selective in reporting specific grants of power. When describing the punitive expedition by Tiberius and Germanicus mounted in A.D. 11 in the wake of the Varian disaster, Dio comments on Germanicus' proconsular authority,¹⁷⁰ but not on that possessed by Tiberius. Similar silences occur with respect to the precise nature of Tiberius' authority in his campaigns in Illyricum and Dalmatia between A.D. 6 and 9 (55.30.1; cf. 56.12.1), or those in Germany between A.D. 4 and 6 (55.28.5). Of course, Dio would have recognised that these campaigns entailed Tiberius' possession of some form of proconsular *imperium*: by the time of his adoption in A.D. 4, Tiberius had already been consul twice (in 13 B.C. and 7 B.C.) and so was eligible for the command of armies in the provinces. Hence, Dio's silence concerning the details of Tiberius' *imperium* following his adoption could have been due to Dio's belief that Tiberius' authority in these campaigns was not in any way extraordinary or surprising, at least in so far as it was not beyond the usual *imperium* possessed by proconsular or propraetorian military commanders. Indeed, in his description of the German campaigns of A.D. 4, Tiberius is identified as only one of several commanders (55.28.5), and the nature or extent of his *imperium* is left undisclosed.

It remains to be discussed in what terms Dio interpreted Tiberius' position in 14. Two features characterise Dio's understanding of Tiberius' position prior to

¹⁶⁹ The editio princeps of the so-called *laudatio funebris* (*P. Colon.* 4701) is that of Koenen 1970. For discussion of Agrippa's ἐξουσία (as termed in the *laudatio*) see Koenen 1970: 269-83; Gray 1970; Gruen 2005: 44. For Agrippa's *provincia*, see Lacey 1996: 117-31.

¹⁷⁰ 56.25.2; Brunt 1974a: 185; Syme 1978a: 57; Swan 2004: 278.

Augustus' death: his possession of the *tribunicia potestas* and his designation as Augustus' "successor" (διάδοχος). These two things are obviously connected. Dio is careful to record the conferral of the *tribunicia potestas* upon Tiberius in 6 B.C. (55.9.4), A.D. 4 (55.13.2 [Xiph.]) and its renewal in 13 (56.28.1). Why he should have placed such emphasis on this is not difficult to understand: Dio recognised the importance of these powers for Augustus and subsequent emperors.¹⁷¹ Moreover, Dio connected Augustus' conferral of the *tribunicia potestas* to select individuals as being indicative of his nomination of a successor,¹⁷² in a way that grants of *imperium* were not. Hence, Dio records Augustus' grant of the tribunician powers to Agrippa in 18 B.C. (54.12.4) in such a way as to indicate he was the chosen successor, should Augustus predecease him (53.31.2-5). Similarly, Velleius regarded the initial grant of tribunician powers to Tiberius in 6 B.C. and A.D. 4 as elevating him to a position of (near) equality with Augustus, and in the case of the latter, designating him as Augustus' successor.¹⁷³

The imperial succession plans of Augustus were of as much interest to Dio as they have been to latter day historians.¹⁷⁴ Dio introduced the theme of succession, appropriately, in his account of Augustus' illness in 23 B.C. At this point, Dio says that Augustus did not (overtly) appoint a successor (διάδοχον μὲν οὐδένα ἀπέδειξε), but gave his ring to Agrippa,¹⁷⁵ and a book containing the public revenues

¹⁷¹ 53.17.10, 53.32.6; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.56; HA *Tac.* 1.5

¹⁷² Brunt and Moore 1973: 47; Lacey 1979; Rich 1990: 169.

¹⁷³ Vell. Pat. 2.99.1; 2.103.1-3.

¹⁷⁴ For the modern bibliography and summary, see Rowe 2002: 1-22; Gruen 2005; Lott 2012: 4-24; Stevenson 2013. For Dio's treatment of the imperial succession throughout the *Roman History*, see Davenport and Mallan 2014.

¹⁷⁵ Dio's account recalls the 'vulgate' tradition of Alexander's death, whereby Alexander gave his ring to Perdiccas, but did not nominate a successor (Diod. Sic. 17.117.3; Curt. 10.5.4; Justin. 12.15.12). Cf. Rich 1990: 165-6.

and military forces to the consul (*suffectus*) Cn. Calpurnius Piso (53.30.1-2).¹⁷⁶ Under the events of 17 B.C., Dio (54.18.1) describes how Augustus adopted Gaius and Lucius as ‘successors to the empire’ (διαδόχους τῆς ἀρχῆς). Tiberius’ role in the Augustan narrative is defined largely by his part in Augustus’ succession plans. Hence, under 6 B.C., Dio (55.9.7) notes that one of the explanations given for Tiberius’ retirement to Rhodes was his anger at not being designated ‘Caesar’ (ὅτι μὴ καὶ Καῖσαρ ἀπεδείχθη) by Augustus.¹⁷⁷

The adoptions of A.D. 4 (55.13.2-3) are presented as Augustus securing Tiberius, Agrippa Postumus, and Germanicus as his successors (sc. διάδοχοι).¹⁷⁸ The same language appears at the beginning of Tiberius’ funeral oration for Augustus, where Tiberius describes himself as ‘the child and successor of Augustus’ (τοῦ καὶ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ διαδόχου) (56.35.2). The appropriateness of such a statement to the historical context of Augustus’ funeral has been rightly questioned.¹⁷⁹ But the language itself is not anachronistic, at least for Greek writers of the Augustan age: Strabo describes Tiberius in almost identical terms,¹⁸⁰ just as Nicolaus of Damascus styled the young Octavian, Julius Caesar’s ‘child and appointed successor’ (τὸν

¹⁷⁶ For Piso: *PIR*² C 286; Syme 1986: 368.

¹⁷⁷ It has been thought that Dio’s vocabulary here (sc. Καῖσαρ) is anachronistic (cf. 53.18.2), reflecting the later usage of the name Caesar to denote a successor (Rich 1990: 229; followed by Pelling 1997a: 142 n. 81), based on the assumption that the title ‘Caesar’ (to denote an heir) did not become standard practice until the reign of Hadrian and the adoption of L. Ceionius Commodus in A.D. 136 (cf. Mommsen *Staatsr.*³ 2.2: 1139-40; Hammond 1957: 28-31). However, the extent to which Dio’s comment is an anachronism may not be as great as it first appears. It was not unknown in the first century to think of a successor as a Caesar, at least in an informal sense: for Plutarch (writing probably in the reign of Domitian) describes Piso as being ‘designated Caesar’ by Galba as a result of his adoption (*Galba* 23.2; cf. 64(63).5.1 [Xiph.]). For the Flavian date of Plutarch’s *Galba*, see Hardy 1906: 309-11; Jones 1966: 71. Note now, Stadter (2014a: 65-9), who argues for a Vespasianic date.

¹⁷⁸ The surviving text of 55.13.2 does not mention the adoption of Agrippa. However, it is likely that his omission is due to Xiphilinus rather than Dio: see Swan 2004: 141-2; *pace* Levick 1966: 229-30.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Millar 1964: 101.

¹⁸⁰ Strabo 6.4.2: Καῖσάρ τε ὁ Σεβαστὸς παρέσχεν ἀφ’ οὗ παρέλαβε τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτοτελῆ καὶ νῦν ὁ διαδεξάμενος υἱὸς ἐκείνον παρέχει Τιβέριος. Cf. 3.3.8.

παῖδα καὶ διάδοχον ἀποδειχθέντα).¹⁸¹ Moreover, Tiberius' comments are consistent with his portrayal up to that point in the narrative.¹⁸² Furthermore, Tiberius' comments add to the thematic unity of Book 56, which opens with Augustus' speech to the *equites*, where he expresses the importance of children (as successors) for the future of individual families and the Roman state.

Dio had certainly stressed some of the steps Augustus made to groom Tiberius as his successor. With the exception of the grant of the *tribunicia potestas*, these appear predominantly as gestures designed to augment Tiberius' position by association, an imperial colleague in deeds, if not in a formal constitutional sense.¹⁸³ Hence, Dio tells us that when Augustus had augmented the *aerarium militare* with his own funds, he had advertised that the donation had been made jointly with Tiberius (55.25.2).¹⁸⁴ Similarly, Dio notes the instances where Augustus and Tiberius shared joint salutations as *imperator*.¹⁸⁵ In his description of A.D. 13, Dio notes the importance of Augustus' and Tiberius' joint role in the reformed *consilium*, which had been created in response to Augustus' declining health.¹⁸⁶ We may assume that

¹⁸¹ Nic. Dam. *Caes.* 115 [= *FGrH* 90 F 130.xxix]; cf. 118 [= *FGrH* 90 F 130.xxix], 120 [*FGrH* 90 F 130.xxx]. For the notion of the 'succession' to Caesar, note also, 45.41.3 (speech of Cicero); Plut. *Ant.* 16.3 (sc. τὴν Καίσαρος διαδοχὴν) with Pelling 1988: 157.

¹⁸² Swan 2004: 327. How Tiberius' frankness at this point accords with his subsequent characterisation (especially 57.1) is less easily reconciled.

¹⁸³ The augmentation and consolidation of Tiberius' position through his association with Augustus is a feature of the coinage produced late in Augustus' reign at Lugdunum featuring Augustus on the obverse and Tiberius on the reverse. e.g. *RIC* I² (Augustus) nos. 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226. For discussion on the degree to which coinage was used to promote Tiberius following his adoption, see Sutherland 1951:73-78.

¹⁸⁴ Dio is apparently referring to the same donation mentioned by Augustus in the *Res Gestae* (*RGDA* 17), yet without, unsurprisingly, mention of Tiberius. See further, Swan 2004: 175.

¹⁸⁵ 55.6.4, 55.28.6, 56.17.1. For the dating of these salutations, see Barnes (1974: 23-36); Syme (1979: 315-17); Swan (2004: 264-65); Cooley (2009: 122).

¹⁸⁶ 56.28.2-3; cf. Crook 1955: 14-18; Swan 2004: 294-96.

Dio duly recorded, in a now lost passage, the performance of the *lustrum* by Tiberius and Augustus in A.D. 14.¹⁸⁷

In summary, the following points may be noted with respect to Dio's representation of Tiberius' position at the point of Augustus' death. The first is the inevitability of Tiberius' succession. It is this that gives Tiberius' behaviour at 57.2-7 so much of its force. Dio invites the reader to ask why the man who has been designated successor should take so long to accept the Principate when it was finally his. The second is the absence of any attempt to explore the full legal basis for Tiberius' power. Such information must have been available to him, for as we have seen, Dio notes the granting of special commands to Gaius Caesar and Germanicus, but only when such a grant was unusual. Not so for Tiberius. The thing that matters most for Dio with respect to Tiberius' career was his designation as Augustus' successor. By avoiding discussion of these constitutional points Dio emphasises the monarchic nature of the Augustan regime and what was the essentially extra-constitutional position of the emperor and the organisation of the succession.

Characterising Tiberius

The framework within which Dio describes Tiberius' pre-accession career provides little opportunity to develop his characterisation of the man who would be Augustus' successor. As we have just seen, Tiberius' function in the narrative leading up to Book 57 is largely, but not exclusively, as a passive participant in events – Augustus' general, or Augustus' successor. Dio's discussion of Tiberius' nature, which comes at 57.1 appears to have been deliberately delayed, so that it could function as a way of

¹⁸⁷ Cf. *RGDA* 8; Suet. *Tib.* 21.1. This is preferable to the suggestion of Jones (1960: 23) that Dio simply omitted it altogether. Cf. Astin 1963: 230.

introducing the new reign and the succession debate of A.D. 14. Indeed, we get the impression that for Dio it only became necessary to understand Tiberius' nature when he became an active political player, that is to say emperor.¹⁸⁸ But if Tiberius' native dissimulation, ostensibly the topic of 57.1, was (seemingly) not important to Dio's characterisation of Tiberius before he became emperor, we may wonder if there are other aspects of his characterisation that are developed in these early books, and if so, whether these are carried over into Dio's portrayal of Tiberius the emperor.

In several important respects Dio largely eschews the temptation to foreshadow his characterisation of Tiberius in his pre-accession narrative. In this respect Dio's characterisation of Augustus' successor is distinct from the likes of Suetonius or, indeed, Velleius. This may be seen in a number of presentational choices Dio makes. Although on many occasions a keen prosopographer,¹⁸⁹ Dio makes little of Tiberius' familial connections. To be sure Tiberius' parentage is duly recorded at his introduction into the narrative.¹⁹⁰ But unlike Tacitus or Suetonius, Dio makes virtually nothing of the anti-Claudian tradition of Roman historiography in his portrayal of the emperor.¹⁹¹ The salient feature was that Tiberius was of noble birth, and that he was the stepson of Augustus.

¹⁸⁸ From what we can make of Dio's truncated imperial narrative, this seems to be his general approach. For example, of those emperors who had distinguished pre-imperial careers, Dio (in most cases represented by Xiphilinus) does not appear to reveal to the reader much about their character prior to their accession. Occasionally, we are afforded clues to the quality of the successor, such as to Marcus' excellence (69.21.1-2 [Xiph.]); Commodus' inadequacy (72(71).22.3 [Xiph.]), or to Caracalla's general viciousness (77(76).7.1-2 [Xiph., *EVV*]; 77(76).14.1 [Xiph.]), etc.

¹⁸⁹ See the succinct judgment of Millar (1964: 164): '[Dio] is a born prosopographer'. Also, Graham 1974: especially 142-3. For an example of Dio's awareness of such details even in his Republican narrative, note his comments concerning the grandfather of the conspirator P. Cornelius Lentulus, at 46.20.5.

¹⁹⁰ 48.15.3-4. Dio was clearly attracted to the twist of fate that saw the scion of a one-time follower of Antony become Caesar's (sc. Augustus') ultimate successor.

¹⁹¹ For which, see commentary 57.1.1 s.v. Τιβέριος δὲ εὐπατρίδης μὲν ἦν.

Similar observations may be made about Dio's attitude towards Tiberius' education. We know that by the time Dio came to write his history there were numerous stories concerning Tiberius' intellectual pursuits, and his rhetorical accomplishments.¹⁹² However, Dio provides little information regarding Tiberius' education beyond the ostensibly off-hand comment at 57.1.1. There are minor exceptions to this general rule. At 55.9.5, Dio says that Tiberius' sojourn on Rhodes in 6 B.C. was made on the *pretext* of acquiring further education, and two later anecdotes from his reign reveal Tiberius' somewhat pedantic streak in his desire to use pure Latin in legal contexts.¹⁹³ Dio attributes to Tiberius an apophthegm, with the emperor quoting lines from Attic tragedy.¹⁹⁴ However, such quotations are hardly authentic evidence for Tiberius' Greek literary leanings.¹⁹⁵ Nor should we regard them as evidence of a subtle authorial agenda which attempted to portray Tiberius as an educated emperor. Indeed, there is a tendency for emperors in Dio to quote the classical canon. Even those whom Dio portrays as having had few (if any) meaningful educative experiences are adept at producing an apt (and often ironic) tag.¹⁹⁶

Perhaps more significantly, the pre-accession narrative contains virtually nothing that might indicate Tiberius' virtues or vices that would become evident during his reign. Only towards the end of Book 56 do we get a hint of his quality, yet this is only the report of rumour that Augustus appreciated his stepson's character and that he had chosen him as his successor so as to enhance his own posthumous

¹⁹² E.g. Suet. *Tib.* 70-71; Tac. *Ann.* 13.3; Fronto *ad Verum Imp.* 2.1.10 [= Van den Hout² p. 123.7-8]. See also commentary 57.1.1 s.v. καὶ ἐπεπαίδευτο.

¹⁹³ 57.15.2, 57.17.1-3; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 71.

¹⁹⁴ 58.23.4, cf. Kannicht and Snell *TrGF* 2.145 (Adesp.) no. 513.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Horsfall 1979: 87; *pace* Rutledge 2008: 462-4.

¹⁹⁶ E.g. Caligula: 59.19.2; Caracalla: 79(78).8.4; cf. Horsfall 1979: 87. Note also Power 2011, who notes the ironic use of quotations in Suetonius' *Divus Claudius*. For Tiberius' education and literary tastes, see Levick 1976: 15-18; Kaimio 1979: 132-3; Syme 1986: 349-52, 360-2; Rutledge 2008: 453-67.

reputation.¹⁹⁷ The vocabulary Dio employs for Tiberius in his pre-accession phase is conspicuous for the absence of any of the typical ethical vocabulary so tied to discourses of kingship. This is particularly evident throughout Dio's narratives of Tiberius' military campaigns in the last two decades of Augustus' rule. Dio could have created a different picture. The material was available to Dio to present a very positive impression of Tiberius and his qualities. Tacitus, although never speaking of Tiberius' military exploits directly or in any detail, clearly knew them and was prepared to regard them positively. For the Latin annalist, the admirable qualities displayed by Tiberius *sub Augusto*, gradually disappeared after his accession.¹⁹⁸ More explicitly, the enthusiastic Velleius was keen to demonstrate how the successes of the campaigns were clear proof of Tiberius' virtues.¹⁹⁹ Yet in Dio's version the future emperor's actions are narrated without the adornment of panegyric.²⁰⁰ Even Tiberius' desperate flight to his brother's side during the latter's critical illness is described dispassionately, and there is little hint at Tiberius' well-reputed fraternal *pietas*.²⁰¹ Indeed, if we are expecting a straightforward ethical profile of Tiberius as an emperor-in-waiting we are disappointed. We are given few clear indications whether or not Tiberius would prove *capax imperii*.²⁰²

¹⁹⁷ 56.45.3. This is a theme that Dio plays with in his accounts of the succession from Tiberius to Caligula, where each emperor chooses a successor that is worse than himself (58.24.3-4). Cf. Edmondson 1992: 49-50; Swan 2004: 350; Davenport and Mallan 2014: 648-9.

¹⁹⁸ Tac. Ann. 6.51: *egregium uita famaue quoad priuatus uel in imperiis sub Augusto fuit*.

¹⁹⁹ Note especially Vell. Pat. 2.104.3-4, where Velleius claims to be a witness to Tiberius' qualities, and great deeds during the campaigns of A.D. 4.

²⁰⁰ Syme (1978a: 52) notes that more space is given to Drusus' actions, at the expense of Tiberius' achievements.

²⁰¹ 55.2.1. Note the exemplary version of Tiberius' actions preserved in Val. Max. 5.5.3; [Ov.] *Consol. ad Liv.* 83-94; Plin. *HN* 7.84. See further, Wardle 2002; Woodman 2006: 308-9. Champlin 2011: 76-7.

²⁰² By no means an idle question: whether an imperial candidate was worthy of the position was a topic of interest to Dio, just as it was to his historiographical predecessors and successors. For this idea in Dio's work, note, especially the speech Dio gives to the emperor

Of all the possible vices that Dio could choose to discuss during the narrative of Tiberius' reign, it was his bloodthirstiness (μυαιφονία) and cruelty (ὀμότης) that receive the greatest attention. These were, after all, the characteristics that Dio thought were at the heart of Tiberius' encouragement of treason trials.²⁰³ In Dio's mind, the emperor's zealousness in pursuing these investigations was one of the great disasters of his reign.²⁰⁴ In this respect Dio was working firmly within the established historiographical/biographical tradition concerning Augustus' successor. Suetonius devotes several chapters to the various manifestations of Tiberius' cruelty.²⁰⁵ Yet, whereas the biographer was keen to illustrate how cruelty was evident in Tiberius' character from an early age;²⁰⁶ this is not the case for Dio's portrayal. Such foreshadowing is simply not necessary for Dio's method of portraying Tiberius. For Dio, this sort of cruelty or 'bloodthirstiness' exhibited by Tiberius is a vice that becomes only relevant once an individual becomes emperor or the most powerful individual in the state. This may be taken further. 'Bloodthirstiness' or μυαιφονία is a strong word in Dio's vocabulary. If we are to think in terms of Pelling's 'trans-regnal themes', we may note that is a common characteristic in Dio's mind of those individuals who pursued proscriptions and judicial murders.²⁰⁷ Dio's comment about

Hadrian concerning the adoption of Antoninus Pius (69.20 [Xiph.]). For discussion of which see Davenport and Mallan 2014.

²⁰³ 58.22.4-5; 58.24.4; cf. 57.19.1 [Xiph., Zonar.]: τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα ἀγρώως ἤρξε, καὶ ταῖς τῆς ἀσεβείας δίκαις, ... δεινῶς ἐπεξῆει.

²⁰⁴ That an emperor should not pursue such charges is part of the advice given by Maecenas (52.31.7-8); and is echoed in the speech of Livia (55.19.6). Cf. Edmondson 1992: 51.

²⁰⁵ Suet. *Tib.* 57-62. For Tiberius' 'bloodthirsty' nature, note also Tacitus' vivid statement (*Ann.* 6.39) concerning Tiberius' decision to move closer to the city of Rome, 'quasi aspiciens undantem per domos sanguinem aut manus carnificum.'

²⁰⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 57.

²⁰⁷ The list of individuals Dio identified as 'bloodthirsty' is ominous: F 109.12 [EVV] (Sulla), cf. 43.50.2; 59.4.1, 59.10.2 (Caligula); 67.18.1 [Xiph.] (Domitian); 73(72).1.1 [Xiph., EVV] (Commodus); 79(78).9.3 [Xiph.] (Caracalla); 80(79).3.3 (Elagabalus). For μυαιφονία as a trait of tyrants generally, note Plut. *Mor.* 457A [*de cohibenda ira*]. Indeed, some modern historian's too have used this trait to characterize the behaviour and motivations of twentieth century tyrants. Note Trevor-Roper (1962: 117-8) on Adolf Hitler: 'Hitler's lust for blood was

Tiberius' behaviour, therefore, situates the emperor in a line of murderous autocrats, recalling the likes of Sulla and anticipating the behaviour of emperors to come.

The absence of these stock Suetonian or, indeed, Plutarchan elements and biographical techniques in Dio's sketch of Tiberius may not be especially surprising, and it conforms to our impression of the circumscribed nature of Dio's portrayal of Tiberius in the Augustan books. Nevertheless, as we shall see, Dio's skeletal portrayal of the pre-accession Tiberius does contain one important element that feeds directly into his characterisation in Books 57 and 58. For this point of continuity, we need to look beyond Tiberius' virtues and vices, but to his ascribed motivations.

Dio's narrative of Tiberius' retirement to Rhodes provides a clue to what these motivations might be. It occurs in one of the few instances where Dio attempts to interpret Tiberius' motivation prior to the death of Augustus. Dio begins by describing Augustus' decision to chastise Gaius and Lucius by granting the *tribunicia potestas* to Tiberius (55.9.4-7):²⁰⁸

βουληθεῖς δὲ δὴ τρόπον <τινὰ> μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς σωφρονίσαι, τῷ Τιβερίῳ τὴν τε ἐξουσίαν τὴν δημαρχικὴν ἐς πέντε ἔτη ἔνειμε καὶ τὴν Ἀρμενίαν ἀλλοτριουμένην μετὰ τὸν τοῦ Τιγράνου θάνατον προσέταξε. [5] συνέβη δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκείνοις καὶ τῷ Τιβερίῳ μάτην προσκροῦσαι, τοῖς μὲν ὅτι παρεωρᾶσθαι ἔδοξαν, τῷ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ὀργὴν αὐτῶν ἐφοβήθη. ἀμέλει καὶ ἐς Ῥόδον ὡς καὶ παιδεύσεώς τινος δεόμενος ἐστάλη, μήτ' ἄλλους τινὰς μήτε τὴν θεραπείαν πᾶσαν ἐπαγόμενος, ἢ ἐκποδὼν σφισι καὶ τῇ ὄψει καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις γένηται. [6] καὶ τὴν τε ὁδὸν ιδιωτικῶς ἐποίησατο, [...]

unabated, perhaps even increased, by time and defeat', and 'Throughout the war Hitler continually gave evidence of this lust for blood, this physical delight in the intellectual contemplation of slaughter for its own sake.'

²⁰⁸ The passage is an amalgam of Xiphilinus' and the *EVV*, for which, see Boissevain 2.487-88. The closeness of Xiphilinus and the *EVV* indicates that the reconstructed text is close, if not identical to Dio's original.

καὶ ἐς τὴν νῆσον ἐλθὼν οὐδὲν ὀγκηρὸν οὔτε ἔπραπτεν οὔτε ἔλεγεν. [7] ἡ μὲν οὖν ἀληθεστάτη αἰτία τῆς ἐκδημίας αὐτοῦ τοιαύτη ἐστί, λόγον δέ τινα ἔχει καὶ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν Ἰουλίαν, ὅτι μηκέτ' αὐτὴν φέρειν ἐδύνατο, τοῦτο ποιῆσαι· κατέλιπε γοῦν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ [...].

Wishing to chasten them [sc. Gaius and Lucius] more strictly in some way, he bestowed upon Tiberius the tribunician power for five years and the command of Armenia (which was becoming hostile following the death of Tigranes). [5] But it came to pass that he gave offence to them as well as to Tiberius: on the one hand, the former because they thought they had been overlooked, to Tiberius, on the other hand, because he feared their anger. Anyway, Tiberius set off for Rhodes on the pretext of needing some further study, without taking with him other companions, nor indeed entire retinue, so that his presence and actions would be of no concern to them. [6] And he made the journey in the manner of a private individual, [...] and having arrived on the island neither did nor said anything arrogant. [7] So although this is the truest reason for his exile, there is also a story that he did this because of his wife Julia, as he was no longer able to put up with her – at any rate he left her in Rome [...]

Dio's explanations seem weak; or so it has been suggested.²⁰⁹ More worryingly, the tone is odd. The historian's sudden adoption of a quasi-Thucydidean register (sc. ἡ ... ἀληθεστάτη αἰτία) almost lapses into literary burlesque.²¹⁰ Rarely, if ever, is Dio so

²⁰⁹ Pelling 1997a: 142. Seager (1972: 31) follows a line of explanation which is close to Dio's. Note also Levick (1972) who sees Tiberius' pride as a major motivating facet in his Rhodian exile, and his fear of Gaius for the period after 1 B.C.

²¹⁰ Cf. Thucydides 1.23. Thucydides' ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις was often glossed as ἀληθεστάτη αἰτία, see e.g. Dion. Hal. *Epist. ad Amm.* 6.; Schol. *In Thuc.* [ed. Hude p. 26].

clumsy. Why he should choose to evoke Thucydides at this point is obscure – was Tiberius’ retirement to Rhodes really sufficient to warrant such an allusion?²¹¹ Yet the very inappropriateness of Dio’s attention-seeking phraseology may just be the point.²¹² It is jarring because it is seemingly so inappropriate to the content of the passage. As such, it draws the reader’s attention to Tiberius’ motivating fear of Gaius and Lucius as rivals in the imperial succession.

To appreciate the force of the passage, it is perhaps necessary to go back further, to the earliest comments Dio makes concerning the adult Tiberius. In 20 B.C. the young Tiberius was sent to Armenia at the head of an embassy to re-install the puppet-king Tigranes.²¹³ The mission was a success, due predominantly to the actions of the Armenians themselves who deposed Artaxias.²¹⁴ Nevertheless, Dio reports that Tiberius began to adopt a majestic bearing (sc. ἐσεμνύνετο),²¹⁵ chiefly because sacrifices were voted to commemorate his accomplishments (54.9.5).²¹⁶ Dio then goes on to add that after the occurrence of a series of omens just as Tiberius and his retinue approached the field of Philippi, Tiberius ‘began thinking about the monarchy’ (καὶ περὶ τῆς μοναρχίας ἐνενόει) (54.9.6).²¹⁷ Tiberius’ imperial aspirations are thus

²¹¹ Dio is perhaps not alone in affecting a Thucydidean register at this historical juncture. Cf. Syme (1986: 84): ‘The truest explanation is declared in the pretext put out later on’. The superiority of Dio’s effort is patent.

²¹² For another less extreme example of this, see 57.6.2 with commentary ad loc.

²¹³ For the mission, see *CAH* 10.260, 263-4 (Anderson); Magie 1950: 476; Levick 1976: 26-7; Sherwin-White 1984: 325.

²¹⁴ Artaxias II, who ruled between c. 33 and 20 B.C. was the son of Artavazd II, and the brother of his successor Tigranes III. Dio notes that he had overseen the execution of Romans in Armenia, some time before 30 B.C (51.16.2). For the stemma of the family of Artaxias II, see Lang 1983: 513.

²¹⁵ Or the sort of bearing appropriate for a king? Cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 8.3.1.

²¹⁶ Levick indicates that this remark concerning this behaviour is derived from a hostile source (1976: 26). However, Dio’s comment is perfectly consonant with his own conception of the effect excessive honours have on individuals, and his comment on Tiberius’ behaviour need not have been derived from his source.

²¹⁷ Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 14.3 (omen at Philippi).

signalled early.²¹⁸ Dio does this, in part, as a way of foreshadowing Tiberius' later assumption of power, just as he does for other future emperors. Yet, on closer inspection, what Dio does here is actually more interesting than it first appears. Elsewhere, Dio would have noted the *omina imperii* and stopped at that. However, by focalizing these comments through the character of Tiberius, Dio is able to graft onto the future emperor what we may term an imperial mindset,²¹⁹ of which fear of other imperial aspirants was a part.²²⁰

Fear of rivals, borne out by his desire for power, therefore, becomes Tiberius' motivating factor at these nascent stages of his characterisation in the *Roman History*.²²¹ More than this, it is also a constant (perhaps *the* constant) feature of Dio's characterisation of Tiberius in both his pre- and post- accession narratives. At 57.3.1-2, Dio explains Tiberius' delay in accepting the Principate as being partly due to his nature, but partly due to his fear of the soldiery in Pannonia and Germany, Germanicus, and the possibility of a coup within Italy.²²² Moreover in A.D. 14, as in 6 B.C., Tiberius hoped to save himself by appearing as a private individual.²²³ Following the suppression of the mutinies, Tiberius remains fearful of Germanicus, and additionally of the elder Agrippina (57.6.2), and it was perhaps this fear of a rival that

²¹⁸ We may note that Velleius (2.94) uses Tiberius' embassy to Armenia in a similar way as Dio, in so far as it marks the point at which Tiberius appears as an appropriately kingly successor to Augustus.

²¹⁹ Cf. Caesar's desire for 'great power', after receiving a dream while a quaestor in Spain (37.52.2).

²²⁰ E.g. 55.13.1. More generally, fear (especially of the bold or conspicuously virtuous) is a basic characteristic feature of tyrants: Xen. *Hiero* 5.1-2; 6.4, 6.15, 7.10; Plut. *Dion* 9.7; Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 5.20-21[57-62]; App. *BC* 5.79.334. Note too Augustus' comments in the Livia-Augustus dialogue: 55.15.1-2.

²²¹ Pelling 1997a: 141. For fear as a motivating force in the Roman historians, see the comments and discussion of Levene 1997. For the importance of fear as a driving factor in human actions in Dio, see Kuhn-Chen 2002: 174-6 (with abundant examples); cf. Hose 2007: 464. Fear is recognised as an important catalyst for individual motivation and historical causation in the Greek historians as well – and especially in Thucydides, for which see Desmond 2006.

²²² Tiberius' fear of Germanicus is reiterated at 57.4.1.

²²³ 57.3.2 with note in the commentary s.v. ἰδιωτεύων σωθῆναι.

brought about the best years of Tiberius as ruler in Dio's mind.²²⁴ Dio maintains this characteristic through into Book 58, where Tiberius becomes fearful of the inordinate power of Sejanus (58.4.1). Although Tacitus too notes Tiberius' fear of Sejanus, for Tacitus this was just another feature that kept Tiberius' vices in check,²²⁵ whereas for Dio this fear is an emotion that prompts Tiberius to action, allowing him to plan and execute the downfall of his once trusted lieutenant.²²⁶

As noted by Levene (1997: 129), '[f]ear is frequently attributed to characters in what seem like quite neutral contexts, without any obvious indication that it is a defect'. Indeed, such an idea clearly applies to Dio's presentation of Tiberius' fear. It is simply another complementary facet of Dio's overarching characterisation of the emperor. The result of this is not a picture of Tiberius as a particularly timorous emperor, at least not in the way that Dio would portray the emperor Claudius.²²⁷ Nor is it the same as Suetonius' image of a fretful Tiberius that emerges towards the end of the *Vita*.²²⁸ Rather, Dio's characterisation of Tiberius' fear feeds into what we may regard as an overarching portrayal of Tiberius as a quintessentially cautious or safe emperor. Indeed the contrast with Claudius is important. Whereas Claudius' fearfulness allows his wives and freedmen to gain control over him (and the organs of state),²²⁹ in the case of Tiberius, his fear either augments his control of events, or drives him to make well-considered decisions.²³⁰

²²⁴ 57.7.1, 57.13.6, with commentary.

²²⁵ Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6.51: *instabilis saevitia sed obtectis libidinibus dum Seianum dilexit timuitue*.

²²⁶ Dio also says that Tiberius had even made preparations to flee Capri, lest Sejanus sail against him (58.13.1).

²²⁷ Or indeed in the way Marañón (1956: 50-1) would do in his (now pseudo-) psychoanalytical study of the emperor.

²²⁸ Suet. *Tib.* 63-66.

²²⁹ E.g. 60.2.4-7, 61(60).31.5 [Xiph.].

²³⁰ Even in the case of Germanicus, whose intentions Tiberius misinterpreted, we can still appreciate that Tiberius acted in an appropriate manner. See commentary below 57.6.3.

There is another observation to make here. Contrary to what has generally been supposed, Dio has succeeded in making what may be loosely termed a psychologically consistent portrait of Tiberius that continues from his earliest years as a politically active player through to his death. It is true that this portrait only works on the most superficial of readings. This is not, however, to deprecate what Dio has achieved. On the one hand, his Tiberius may be responding to the sorts of typical fears that any imperial aspirant or emperor might feel. But we should note that Dio does not ascribe such motivations to every emperor or imperial claimant. Moreover, while fear may be ubiquitous as a driving emotion in Dio, not every historical character reacts to it in the same way. The case of Macrinus may serve as an appropriate illustration. Macrinus, like Tiberius desired to become emperor after a soothsayer had foretold his accession.²³¹ Fear then compelled him to engineer the murder of Caracalla, lest the emperor hear of the prophecy (79(78).4.4).²³²

Thinking with Tiberius: a) the emperor's nature

As we would expect, the narrative of Tiberius' reign does see a change in terms of Dio's willingness to engage in more direct characterisation. Yet how this characterisation should be read is less clear-cut. Nowhere is this more explicit than in Dio's elaborate opening sketch of the emperor's nature. The passage, positioned at the narrative 'threshold' of Tiberius' reign, requires comment, not least because it is the longest passage of direct characterisation Dio devotes to the emperor. Let us confine ourselves to the opening two sections of Dio's outline (57.1.1-2):

²³¹ 79(78).4.1, with 79(78).11.4.

²³² That fear of a king/tyrant was regarded as a common cause of usurpation, note Arist. *Pol.* 1311b.36-40; cf. 55.19.5.

[1.] ταῦτα μὲν κατὰ Αὐγουστον ἐγένετο, Τιβέριος δὲ εὐπατρίδης μὲν ἦν καὶ ἐπεπαίδευτο, φύσει δὲ ιδιωτάτῃ ἐκέχρητο. οὔτε γὰρ ὧν ἐπεθύμει προσεποιεῖτό τι, καὶ ὧν ἔλεγεν οὐδὲν ὥς εἰπεῖν ἐβούλετο, ἀλλ' ἐναντιωτάτους τῇ προαιρέσει τοὺς λόγους ποιούμενος πᾶν τε ὃ ἐπόθει ἡρνεῖτο καὶ πᾶν ὃ ἐμίσει προετείνετο· ὠργίζετό τε ἐν οἷς ἥκιστα ἐθυμοῦτο, καὶ ἐπεικῆς ἐν οἷς μάλιστα ἡγανάκτει ἐδόκει εἶναι. [2.] ἡλέει τε δῆθεν οὓς σφόδρα ἐκόλαζε, καὶ ἐχαλέπαινε οἷς συνεγίγνωσκε· τόν τε ἔχθιστον ὥς οἰκειότατον ἔστιν ὅτε ἐώρα, καὶ τῷ φιλάτῳ ὥς ἄλλοτριωτάτῳ προσεφέρετο. τό τε σύμπαν οὐκ ἡξίου τὸν αὐταρχοῦντα κατάδηλον ὧν φρονεῖ εἶναι· ἔκ τε γὰρ τούτου πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ππαῖεσθαι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου πολλῶ πλείῳ καὶ μείζῳ κατορθοῦσθαι ἔλεγε.

[1.] Such things came to pass concerning Augustus. Tiberius, on the other hand, was a patrician and had been well-educated, but possessed a most singular nature. For as he pretended things which he did not desire, and of the things he said, nothing (so to speak) was what he wanted. But making his words the opposite of his actual design, he denied everything which he longed for, and advocated everything which he hated. He would show signs of being angry at those whom he was not in the least bit vexed, but would appear to be mild with those whom he was especially angry. [2] He would make a show of²³³ pitying those whom he punished severely, but would maintain a grudge against those whom he pardoned. Occasionally, he would approach an enemy as if a boon companion, and a close friend as if a complete stranger. On the

²³³ Or 'pretended to'. For the range of translations or possible implications of Dio's use of δῆθεν, see commentary 57.1.2 s.v. δῆθεν.

whole he thought it not advantageous for an emperor to be open about what he was thinking, for, he said, many great mistakes arise from this sort of behaviour, whereas in many cases the opposite behaviour brought about both more frequent and more significant successes.

Dio thus draws the reader's attention to three aspects on Tiberius' character – his birth, education, and nature,²³⁴ but expands on only one of them: his natural inclination for dissimulation. Yet how particular this sort of *εἰρωνεία/dissimulatio* was to Tiberius (sc. φύσει δὲ ιδιωτᾶτι ἐκέχρητο) in the context of the *Roman History* seems at first dubious. As Pelling noted, Dio's Augustus was a master at dissimulation, just as Caligula was decidedly not, and that Tiberius' dissimulation merely highlights (again) one of the work's 'trans-regnal themes'.²³⁵ The same observation may be made of other figures of Dio's republican narrative, with the likes of Caesar and Pompey as good examples.²³⁶ All this is true, but perhaps Dio's point is that Tiberius' peculiarity was that such behaviour came naturally to him, whereas for the others it is a deliberate strategy (which of course it was for Tiberius as well). This is perhaps made Tiberius' nature so singular in Dio's mind.

Dio's elaborate sketch at 57.1 has all of the hallmarks of a programmatic statement. By priming the reader in the way that he does, it would seem that the text is asking the reader to double guess Tiberius' motivations and his actions throughout the subsequent narrative as well. Yet we may wonder how important knowledge of Tiberius' *dissimulatio* is for interpreting the ensuing narrative of Tiberius' reign.²³⁷ Certainly Tiberius' dissimulation sets the tone for Dio's account of Tiberius'

²³⁴ For the importance of birth and education as key features of an individual's character, see commentary below 57.1.1.

²³⁵ Pelling 1997a: 128-9.

²³⁶ E.g. 36.24.5-6 (Pompey); 38.1.1-2 (Caesar); 37.58.1 (Caesar, Pompey, Crassus).

²³⁷ Cf. Pelling 1997a: 126 n. 36.

cunctatio during September A.D. 14. Yet even here it is not given as the sole reason for the emperor's delay: Tiberius' behaviour following the death of Augustus is ascribed to both his natural disposition and his response to external factors.²³⁸ Perhaps, therefore, we need to think about 57.1 not just in terms of the role of Tiberius' dissimulation in explaining his conduct throughout the ensuing narrative. The important feature of 57.1 is the emphasis on social interaction and behaviour. Dio's focus emphasises how difficult it was for those individuals who came into contact with Tiberius to deal with the cryptic emperor (57.1.3-6).²³⁹ In an important way it is this feature that neatly anticipates the tenor of much of the following narrative, which contains many anecdotes of Tiberius' interactions with individuals from all strata of Roman society: from men of consular rank to assorted political non-entities.²⁴⁰

Dio's portrayal of Tiberius' handling of these various individuals and the groups within Roman society provided him with the opportunity to develop the most striking feature of his characterisation of the emperor. Although so difficult for others to read, Dio's Tiberius is something of a master interpreter of human nature and motivation. Hence, Tiberius grooms Caligula, knowing full well the latter's viciousness (58.23.1-4).²⁴¹ He remains one step ahead of his opponents, real or

²³⁸ 57.3.1, 57.3.5.

²³⁹ Edmondson (1992: 51): 'His [sc. Tiberius'] subjects, and especially the senatorial order, could not handle this dissimulation: it prevented the sort of dignified working relationship between emperor and senate in which Dio firmly believed.'

²⁴⁰ For the latter, note the exchange between Tiberius and the inventor of unbreakable glass: 57.21.5-7 [Xiph.]. The story, of course, provides a neat illustration of Tiberius' jealousy (*φθόρος*) – a characteristic that Dio leaves otherwise undeveloped.

²⁴¹ Cf. Dio's comments regarding Severus and Caracalla (77(76).14.1 [Xiph.], 77(76).14.7 [Xiph.]). Interestingly, in the case of Augustus' adoption of Tiberius, Dio neither endorses nor refutes the view that Augustus appreciated Tiberius' nature (56.45.3; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.10.7; Swan 2004: 350). This is consonant with Dio's characterisation of Tiberius' generally inscrutable nature.

imagined. Tiberius outmanoeuvres the popular Germanicus at the start of his reign.²⁴² Later, with respect to Sejanus – again a man whose nature, we are told, Tiberius understood thoroughly – Tiberius removed the praetorian prefect before he became a more serious threat to his position. The same is seen in Tiberius’ handling of the Senate. Dio portrays Tiberius’ treatment of the Senate as characterised by an unsettling mixture of deference and menace.²⁴³ Perhaps the most vivid episode comes in Book 58 following the fall of Sejanus. Dio notes how the Senate attempted to instigate measures that would enable them to assassinate the emperor with ease.²⁴⁴ Tiberius, however, sidesteps this possible threat by showing honour to the Senate while augmenting the loyalty of the praetorians.²⁴⁵

In a comparison between Tiberius and his successor, Dio makes the observation that whereas Tiberius concentrated power in his own hands, and used agents to carry out his wishes,²⁴⁶ Gaius was the slave of charioteers and other (socially and morally) unsavoury types (59.5.2). The idea responds directly to Tiberius’ own precept quoted at 57.1.2, that an emperor should avoid disclosing his own thoughts. The revelation of these *arcana imperii* effectively bookend the Tiberian narrative and provide another level of interpretative framework for which the reader may use for understanding Dio’s account of the emperor’s reign.

It is also possible to think about 57.1 not solely in terms of the narrative of his reign, but retrospectively in terms of the pre-accession narrative. Pelling is certainly

²⁴² See commentary below 57.6.3: οὐ γὰρ που καὶ φρονεῖν οὕτως <ὡς> ἐδόκει, ... ὑπελάμβανεν.

²⁴³ Xiphilinus juxtaposes two anecdotes that illustrate these two methods: 57.24.5 [Xiph.], 57.24.8 [Xiph.].

²⁴⁴ For the senators’ (presumed) murderous intent, note Dio’s vivid turn of phrase at 58.17.1: καὶ μηδ’ ἀπαρνήσασθαι τινος δυναμένου τὸ μὴ οὐ καὶ τῶν σαρκῶν ἂν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως ἐμφαγεῖν.

²⁴⁵ The issue of the proposed senatorial bodyguard for Tiberius (and related measures) is described at length: 58.17.3-18.6. Dio’s emphasis is markedly different from the parallel account of Tacitus (*Ann.* 6.2-3).

²⁴⁶ Such as Sejanus, or the Senate itself (58.16.3-5)

right when he notes that virtually nothing in the pre-accession narrative suggests Tiberius' possession of such a nature.²⁴⁷ Nevertheless, Dio's account of Tiberius' nature answers one question that Dio must have had in his mind when confronted with the history of Tiberius' early career. How was it that Tiberius, although desiring the imperial power for over thirty years did not make any attempt to seize the throne from Augustus?²⁴⁸ This fact must have struck Dio as exceptional. After all, this would have been the natural response according to what we may regard as Dio's standard reading of imperial psychology. Certainly this is how a range of emperors and pretenders such as Severus, Avidius Cassius, or indeed a Caligula, would have behaved.²⁴⁹ Tiberius instead bided his time.

Thinking with Tiberius: b) virtues and vices

Tiberius' virtues and vices, which, as we saw, were so underdeveloped in the pre-accession narrative, receive greater attention over the course of Books 57 and 58. Yet even here there are problems of interpretation. Although Dio describes Tiberius by using a more conventional ethical vocabulary during the course of Books 57 and 58, the results are somewhat lacklustre.

Nowhere is this truer than at the close to Dio's narrative of Tiberius' reign. Dio's judgement is surprisingly bland (58.28.5):

Τιβέριος μὲν δὴ πλείστας μὲν ἀρετὰς πλείστας δὲ καὶ κακίας ἔχων, καὶ ἑκατέραις αὐταῖς ὥς καὶ μόναις κεχρημένος [...]

²⁴⁷ Pelling 1997a: 126-7, although noting 54.9.5-7, 55.11.2 as possible examples.

²⁴⁸ Cf. 54.9.5 discussed above.

²⁴⁹ Cf. 74(73).14.3-4 [Xiph.] (Septimius Severus, Pescennius Niger, Clodius Albinus); Avidius Cassius 72(71).22.2-23.2 [Xiph.]; 58.28.2-3 (Caligula). We need not confine this observation to the Imperial period, for it applies equally to Dio's late Republican dynasts. For this mindset in the Republican narrative, see Rich 1989: 92-3.

Tiberius had a great many virtues indeed, but also a great many vices, and had used one or the other as if he possessed those <qualities> alone.

It is a low-key close to Dio's two-book account of Tiberius' reign. The passage invites comparison with Tacitus' more elaborate close to Book 6 of the *Annales*. Indeed comparison is instructive. Tacitus says (*Ann.* 6.51.3):

morum quoque tempora illi diuersa: egregium uita famaue, quoad priuatus uel in imperiis sub Augusto fuit; occultum ac subdolum fingendis uirtutibus, donec Germanicus ac Drusus superfuere; idem inter bona malaque mixtus incolumi matre; intestabilis saeuitia, sed obtectis libidinibus, dum Seianum dilexit timuitue: postremo in scelera simul ac dedecora prorupit, postquam remoto pudore et metu suo tantum ingenio utebatur.

On the face of it, Tacitus says exactly what Dio does not.²⁵⁰ The descent into all-consuming vice that is a feature of the Tacitean account is absent from Dio's brusque summation. This is surprising, and the reader perhaps expects more from the historian. As we have already seen, Dio uses the death of Germanicus to signal a change in Tiberius' behaviour, and leads us to expect such a negative change in Tiberius' conduct (57.13.6). Certainly, there are profound negative trends in Tiberius' conduct following the death of Germanicus, but Dio does not appear to be claiming simply that the death of Germanicus brought out Tiberius' vices.²⁵¹ Nor does Dio claim that Tiberius' conduct was unimpeachable in the period before Germanicus' death. Hence, the change brought about by the death of Germanicus is not one of total moral disintegration. Tiberius may appear less like the good emperor than he did in

²⁵⁰ For Tacitus' summation (the interpretation of which is by no means straightforward), note Martin 2001: 192-6, 199-202; cf. Woodman 1989 = 1998: 155-67; Pelling 1997a: 122 n. 25.

²⁵¹ See further commentary at 57.13.6.

the narrative prior to Germanicus' death, but Germanicus' death does not trigger a change into a Caligula-like monster.²⁵²

Indeed, a passage preserved in the *EVV* suggests that Tiberius was still about to act in a praiseworthy manner, despite the loss of his rival (57.19.8 [*EVV*]):

τὸ μὲν οὖν σύμπαν οὕτω μετὰ τὸν τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ θάνατον μετεβάλετο
ὥστε αὐτὸν μεγάλως καὶ πρότερον ἐπαινούμενον πολλῶ δὲ τότε μάλλον
θαυμασθῆναι.

So thus was the general change in Tiberius after Germanicus' death that just as he was previously the object of great praise for many things, after this point these were the cause of even more amazement.

We may suspect the *EVV* has here preserved Dio's wording closely if not exactly. At any rate, the punch-line is appropriately Dionian, and does not seem to be a gloss made by one of the compilers of the *Excerpta*.²⁵³ Moreover, the comment at 57.19.8 is consonant with Dio's summation at 58.28.5 and is entirely appropriate to his intervening narrative.

The ambivalent tone of 58.28.5 is fairly indicative of the tenor of Dio's account of Tiberius' reign in Books 57 and 58, where praise and censure are interspersed.²⁵⁴ The annalistic sections following Dio's sketch of the general manner of Tiberius' conduct (57.7-13), but before the death of Germanicus, contain a mixture of anecdotes that do not always reflect well on Tiberius. For example, Dio highlights instances of Tiberius' inconsistency – both in terms of his behaviour when confronted

²⁵² Sulla would perhaps be a better example of such a change, at least in terms of Dio's narrative: F 109.1-3 [*EVV*].

²⁵³ It should be noted, however, that the excerptors were more likely to alter the beginnings and endings of the text: Roberto 2009: 79. However, changes to the beginnings of excerpted text are more common.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Baar (1990: 228): (on 28.28.5) 'Damit versucht Dio, sowohl der positive als auch der negativen Tiberius-überlieferung gleichberechtigt Raum zu geben, und verzichtet auf eine eigene Ausdeutung dieses Zwitterbildes.'

with similar circumstances, and inconsistency when it came to any deviations from his general pattern of behaviour outlined in 57.7-13.²⁵⁵ Zonaras perhaps captures the sense of this best when he summarizes the period before Germanicus' death by stating simply that 'up to this point Tiberius did many good things and erred in only a few matters' (μέχρι μὲν οὖν τοῦ χρόνου τούτου πλείστα χρηστὰ ὁ Τιβέριος ἔπραξε καὶ βραχέα ἐξήμαρτεν).²⁵⁶

The change between the pre- and post-Germanicus Tiberius is therefore by no means stark. It is true that Tiberius begins to display some of the more characteristic behaviour of a tyrant following the death of his adopted son. He becomes harsh (χαλεπός), he becomes less accessible on account of his withdrawal to Capri,²⁵⁷ and he begins to rule by attempting to instill fear in his subjects.²⁵⁸ Even so, right up to the end of his reign, Dio makes a point of recording Tiberius' actions for which he was praised, not only those which illustrated his vices. Hence, Dio notes Tiberius' generosity to the victims of fires and floods that hit Rome in A.D. 36 (58.26.5), a feature of Tiberius' demonstrative euergetism carried over from his early reign (57.16.2; 57.17.7-8). There is also praise for Tiberius' continuing refusal of honours, as well as sundry acts of beneficence (58.21.5-22.1). Even Tiberius' acts of clemency are not omitted,²⁵⁹ which given the centrality of *clementia*/ἐπιείκεια in Dio's thought world is significant.²⁶⁰

²⁵⁵ E.g. the anecdotes collected at 57.15. Note also Tiberius' execution of the wag who was dispatched to 'carry his own message to Augustus' (57.14.1), an anecdote used by Suetonius to illustrate Tiberius' cruelty. See further commentary *ad loc.*

²⁵⁶ 57.19.1 [Zonar.]. For the attempted reconstruction of this passage, see Boissevain 2.579.

²⁵⁷ See further commentary notes below at 57.11.1.

²⁵⁸ Or more precisely in the Senate: 57.24.5 [Xiph.].

²⁵⁹ E.g. Tiberius' dismissal of the charges against Cornelius Lentulus (57.24.8 [Xiph.]). Tacitus (*Ann.* 4.29) places the event under the year A.D. 24. Note also, the examples of the praetor (and later consul) L. Apronius Caesianus (*PIR*² A 972) and the *eques* M. Terentius (*PIR*² T 64) (58.19.1-5).

²⁶⁰ As noted well by Rich (1989: 97, 103; 1990: 16-17), clemency was perhaps the most important imperial virtue for an emperor to possess in Dio's mind. See also Kuhn-Chen 2002:

The same applies to the reports of Tiberius' vices. Dio was more comfortable condemning the vices in rulers and statesmen than in extolling their virtues.²⁶¹ Yet, Dio is notably (and surprisingly) sparing when it came to reporting Tiberius' reputed personal vices. The hostile historiographical tradition gave him ample material to work with. However, the salacious tales reported by Suetonius and to a lesser degree by Tacitus are largely eschewed by Dio.²⁶² To be sure there are references to Tiberius' sexual excesses and his reputation for licentiousness (ἀσέλγεια).²⁶³ But Dio does little to embroider upon these stories.²⁶⁴ Why this should be the case is not easy to pinpoint. It cannot be due to the fragmentary state of the text. Neither Dio nor his epitomators were prudish when it came to engaging with so called 'discourses of depravity'.²⁶⁵ After all, such anecdotes were of fundamental importance to illustrating an individual's vices, and Dio, with his keen sense of a good anecdote, knew this more than most. Perhaps the most likely explanation for this omission is that Dio did not regard these encounters as having a major influence on the character of his rule: unlike the likes of Caligula, Nero, or Elagabalus, Tiberius never became a slave to any particular paramour, whore, or catamite.

At 57.13.6, when noting the change Germanicus' death brought upon Tiberius' general conduct, Dio professes ignorance as to whether Tiberius was in fact by nature good, or whether he was simply affecting virtue, and leaves the issue there without further discussion. The question of character change was an important one for

160-3. For the importance of *clementia* generally for authors of the second century, see Schettino 1998. For Tiberius' ἐπιείκεια see commentary below at 57.1.1.

²⁶¹ For Dio's *kakoêtheia*, see the still insightful comments of Niebuhr 1875: 62-3.

²⁶² E.g. Suet. *Tib.* 42-45; Tac. *Ann.* 6.1.

²⁶³ 58.22.1, 3-4; cf. 59.4.1. Here the intention is to contrast it with Tiberius' previously most-chaste or self-restrained (sc. σωφρονέστατα) existence (57.13.3).

²⁶⁴ Dio (58.22.3-4) illustrates this charge with the story of Tiberius' intention to seduce the daughter of Sex. Marius (*PIR*² M 295). Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6.19.1.

²⁶⁵ For this term, see Langlands 2006: 319.

the more-ethically minded writers of antiquity.²⁶⁶ Elsewhere, Dio seems to admit the possibility: Commodus, according to Dio, was not naturally wicked, but weak willed, and was led astray to the extent that his new habits became a second nature to him.²⁶⁷ In the case of Tiberius, however, Dio remains evasive.

Dio's deliberate agnosticism may be read in different ways. On the one hand, it feeds into the historian's characterisation of Tiberius. It emphasises the fundamental, enigmatic nature of the emperor: to such an extent that even the (usually omniscient) historian cannot penetrate Tiberius' inner nature.²⁶⁸ On the other, it presents the reader with an important question. Does it matter whether an emperor was by nature good or bad, so long as he behaved in an appropriate manner? Here we appreciate another important departure from the Tacitean and Suetonian Tiberius. So much of their generally pejorative portrayals of Tiberius hinges on charges of hypocrisy, and by extension, uncovering the real Tiberius. Although Dio is an author who made much of identifying the distinction between *logos* and *ergon*, *Sein und Schein*, this seems far less central to his treatment of Tiberius – at least in terms of his overall assessment of the emperor's conduct.

Yet for Dio, appearances mattered as much as realities.²⁶⁹ After all, the sort of shamming exhibited by Tiberius was at the very heart of Dio's (and indeed other

²⁶⁶ For the standard discussions, note Gill 1983; Swain 1989; and Gill 2006: 416-61.

²⁶⁷ 73(72)1.1 [Xiph. EVV]: οὗτος πανούργος μὲν οὐκ ἔφν, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων ἄκακος, ὑπὸ δὲ δὴ τῆς πολλῆς ἀπλότητος καὶ προσέτι καὶ δειλίας ἐδούλευσε τοῖς συνοῦσι, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀγνοία τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ κρείττονος ἀμαρτῶν ἐς ἔθος κακῶς τούτου καὶ ἐς φύσιν ἀσελγῆ καὶ μαιφόνον προήχθη. Similarly, Dio notes that the Tiberius Gracchus' nature underwent a change (F 83.1 [EVV]).

²⁶⁸ Cf. Pelling 2010: 382-3, on this sort of mimetic quality of Tacitus' narrative when dealing with Tiberius. Similarly, note Duff (1999: 231), on Plutarch's *Alcibiades*.

²⁶⁹ Cf. Rich 1989: 100-1. See Kemezis 2014: 136-9 on the symbolic importance the republican magistracies represented in Dio's conception of the Principate.

authors') conception of what may be termed the *ciuilis princeps*.²⁷⁰ Fundamentally, this idea was not peculiar to the Roman imperial period. It is implicit in Aristotle's *Politica*, where Aristotle discusses how a tyrant might reduce the likelihood of being overthrown by affecting kingly behaviour.²⁷¹ Although we cannot say whether or not Dio knew his Aristotle, the comparison between book five of the *Politics* and the imperial books of Dio is, nevertheless, instructive. When Aristotle discusses the two ways in which tyrannies might be preserved he has nothing to say about the inner character of the tyrant. Rather he reduces it to a matter of behaviour – a tyrant might use the traditional methods of oppression or he could affect kingly behaviour. In a way, this is exactly what is played out over the course of Books 57 and 58. Tiberius maintains his power by both appearing as a good king, while at other times employing the tactics of oppression.

Here we are left with a final problem of interpretation. Dio couched his characterisation of Tiberius in what we may describe as moralising terms. Yet the purpose or function of this moralising is not entirely clear. It has been suggested that Dio intended the moralising elements in his characterisations of individuals within the *Roman History* to fulfil a didactic function, providing his readers with models of good and bad behaviour that they should follow or avoid.²⁷²

Yet that Dio's Tiberius is part of a protreptic exercise in morality appears unlikely. Rather, it seems that Dio uses Tiberius as a way of exploring various facets of Roman autocracy, as well as a way of exploring historical questions pertaining to

²⁷⁰ Or as is perhaps more appropriate for Dio, the ἀγαθὸς αὐτοκράτωρ or δημοτικὸς αὐτοκράτωρ. For discussion of these terms and their suitability to Dio's narrative, see Commentary below § IV *Tiberius' Conduct as Ruler*, and 57.8.3 s.v. δημοτικός.

²⁷¹ Arist. *Pol.* 1313a.34-1315b.10; but most explicitly, note 1315a41-1315b1: ὁ γὰρ σκοπὸς φανερός, ὅτι δεῖ μὴ τυραννικὸν ἀλλ' οἰκονόμον καὶ βασιλικὸν εἶναι φαίνεσθαι [...]. The importance for a tyrant to appear (sc. φαίνεσθαι) to act appropriately is key to Aristotle's discussion on the preservation of tyrannies: cf. Newman 1902: 4.466-7.

²⁷² Edmondson 1992: 48-9.

the reign of Tiberius. Certainly Dio's characterisation of Tiberius provides and encourages judgements on the emperor's character and conduct. But if anything, Dio's method is geared to describing and appraising Tiberius' conduct in individual episodes, rather than producing what we might think of as a uniform ethical portrait of the emperor.²⁷³ The language may often be ethically loaded, but it seems to serve no other function than to evaluate, or occasionally to explain Tiberius' actions at any given point. What makes Dio's portrayal of Tiberius so interesting in this regard is that he should construct Tiberius as an *exemplum* of these two modes of kingship. Thus, Dio's account of Tiberius' reign functions best when understood not in terms of Tiberius' individual character, but of the character of his rule. Around the figure of Tiberius, Dio is able to raise questions about, and explore the ways in which an emperor could go about exercising and maintaining his power.

Conclusion

It has become conventional to think about the reign of Tiberius in terms of failure. The phrase 'the tragedy of Tiberius' has become stereotypical. The character of the emperor is central in such appraisals. Yet although the figure of Tiberius is central to Dio's treatment of the years A.D. 14 to 37, such a conclusion is not the picture that emerges from his narrative. For this reason, Dio's account of the reign of Tiberius and the emperor himself, although lacking the 'bite', 'intensity', 'colour' or psychological nuance critics tend to ascribe to the Tacitean counterpart, nevertheless deserves consideration in its own right.

²⁷³ Cf. Kemezis 2014: 102.

The foregoing discussion has discussed the ways in which Dio approached his characterisation of Tiberius. The result, as I have argued, is not without sophistication. Dio's presentation of Tiberius in the pre-accession narrative is faintly, yet consistently drawn – perhaps more than has been hitherto recognised. The figure of Tiberius in this part of the *Roman History* is structured around the question of the succession to Augustus. When it came to the narrative of his reign, the overarching historical problem for Dio, as perhaps it was for Tacitus, was how it was that Tiberius managed to survive as long as he did.²⁷⁴ As the history of the emperors from Augustus down to Dio's own day had shown, out and out tyrants or imperial incompetents did not usually last the twenty-three years Tiberius endured in power. Dio's characterisation of the emperor and his style of rule goes some way to explaining how this was achieved. Dio focuses on Tiberius' actions – his interest in Tiberius is as a political operator, which is best understood in the broader narrative context of the *Roman History*. Tiberius' personal character was of importance to this agenda, but it was not the only aspect that mattered.

²⁷⁴ Syme 1958a: 429.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF BOOK 57

This commentary is based on the text printed in U.P. Boissevain's *editio maior* of the *Roman History*. While I have not endeavoured to produce a new text of Book 57, it seems appropriate at this juncture to say something of the manuscript tradition of Book 57 and where I have adopted different readings from Boissevain. Finally, it is important to acknowledge some of the problems presented by the imperfect preservation of Dio's history and the nature of the Byzantine sources which have been used to reconstruct a large proportion of modern editions of Dio's history.

I

Of the manuscripts that contain the text of Book 57, *Codex Marcianus* gr. 395 (hereafter M)²⁷⁵ is the only manuscript of import, for it is from M that all other surviving manuscripts of book 57 are derived (if perhaps sometimes through an intermediary).²⁷⁶ M has several sizeable lacunae, the most significant of which for the purposes of this study is the loss of several folia from the second half of Book 57. This loss must have occurred before the beginning of the fifteenth century, as all of the manuscripts from that century descended from M contain the same omissions.²⁷⁷ For the reconstruction of the remainder of Book 57 we are dependent on excerpts and

²⁷⁵ M came to Italy as part of the great donation of Greek texts made by Cardinal Bessarion to the city of Venice in 1468. For discussion of this collection, see Wilson 1992: 62-7.

²⁷⁶ For possible *stemma*, see Boissevain 1.lxxxvi and Freyburger-Galland 2002: lxxvii. Note however the precise relationship between M and *Codex Laurentianus* plut. 70.8 (L), which also appears to date from the tenth century, is uncertain. The question of whether L is a copy of M is not relevant to this present discussion, as the Florentine codex does not preserve any of Book 57.

²⁷⁷ Most notably the fifteenth century *Codex Laurentianus* plut. 70.10 (designated Lb by Boissevain), the scribe of which seems to have looked to the text of Xiphilinus to fill in some of the gaps in M: cf. Mazzucchi 1979: 137-9.

paraphrases of Dio found in Zonaras, Xiphilinus, and the *Excerpta Constantiniana*. The point where M breaks off (57.17.8) provides the terminal point of this commentary.

The dating of M is a matter of some controversy. Boissevain believed it to be from the eleventh century – a judgement that has been repeated in subsequent Anglophone editions and commentaries.²⁷⁸ However, the dating of M to the eleventh century has long been rejected by palaeographers.²⁷⁹ In the 1940s Aubrey Diller tentatively posited a ninth century date for M, which found enthusiastic support in the 1970s by Mioni and Formentin.²⁸⁰ This view has gained currency, especially on the continent. In the current Budé edition of Dio, Freyburger-Galland has adopted a similarly early dating for M, albeit conceding a range that includes the early tenth century.²⁸¹ Yet a ninth or early tenth century date seems too early. Mazzucchi noted that the scribal hand of M bears a strong similarity to that of the scribe of the Ravenna codex of Aristophanes (*Biblioteca Classense*, MS 429), a view endorsed by Nigel Wilson after he consulted a facsimile of M in 2014.²⁸² As the Ravenna Aristophanes has been dated convincingly to the mid-tenth century,²⁸³ it is perhaps to this part of this century (c. 950), and thus to the reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, that we should place the creation of M.²⁸⁴

II

²⁷⁸ Boissevain I.lxviii; Rich 1990: 18; Swan 2004: 36.

²⁷⁹ More generally, there was a trend in the late nineteenth century to date manuscripts of classical authors to the eleventh century as a matter of course: Diller 1975: 514-6.

²⁸⁰ Diller 1947: 184 fn. 3; Mioni and Formentin 1975: 31; cf. Irigoin 1975: 22. For a strong rebuttal of this date, see Mazzucchi 1979: 126 n. 137.

²⁸¹ Freyburger Galland 2002: lxvi-lxvii.

²⁸² Mazzucchi 1979: 125-6. I am grateful for Nigel Wilson's generous help on this point.

²⁸³ E.g. Diller 1975: 522-3; Wilson 2007: 5.

²⁸⁴ Thus Mazzucchi 1979: 125-6; Wilson 1983: 139.

In the commentary there are several instances where I have suggested deviations from Boissevain's text. These instances are noted in the table below. Justification for these suggestions is made at the appropriate points in the commentary.

Reference (Boiss. page and line)	Boissevain	Mallan
57.1.3 (560, 8)	ἄν λαμβάνοντες Xiph.	<ἄν> ἀναλαμβάνοντες (ἀναλαμβάνοντες M, <i>Codex Peirescianus</i> [EVV])
57.7.6 (565, 28)	πάρεδρος	πρόεδρος M, Xiph.
57.17.2 (574,12-3)	Μάρκελλός	Πόρκελλός M, Xiph.

III

Throughout the commentary and introductory chapters I have referred to passages that are not preserved in the manuscripts of Dio, but are found in the works of later authors and compilers who made use of Dio's narrative. These extracts and epitomes of Dio's work, which modern editors have used to reconstitute the *Roman History*, represent Dio's narrative with varying degrees of fidelity. As a matter of course, I have indicated the provenance of a particular quotation or reference in square brackets if it is not found in the actual manuscripts of the *Roman History*. The three most important texts which preserve Dio's narrative, the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, Xiphilinus' *Epitome*, and Zonaras' *Epitome of Histories*, all present methodological problems of their own, and I believe need to be treated as texts in their own right.

The *Excerpta Constantiniana* is the modern name given to the fifty-three compendia of thematically arranged excerpts from classical and late Antique authors commissioned by the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus.²⁸⁵ In each of the collections the excerpts are grouped by author. The order of the extracts adheres to the sequence in which they appeared in the source text, although with little (if any) regard to the broader narrative context. On the whole, the excerpts replicate Dio's text verbatim, although the excerptors often modified the beginning of each fragment and occasionally omitted whole sentences from the copied passage.²⁸⁶ Seven extracts from Book 57 are preserved in the *Excerpta de Virtutibus et Vitiis* (EVV).²⁸⁷

The *Excerpta Constantiniana* also preserves for us fragments of now lost works that seem to have relied heavily on Dio's history; specifically, the works of historians Peter the Patrician (sixth century) and John of Antioch (seventh century).²⁸⁸ Of the fragments assigned to Peter the Patrician preserved in the *Excerpta de Sententiis* (ES), three seem to have derived from Book 57.²⁸⁹ In the case of the Antiochene historian, one continuous extract survives, which amounts to a summary of Books 57 and 58 of Dio's history albeit with the likely addition of Eutopian material.²⁹⁰ The techniques of these authors need not concern us unduly, although it

²⁸⁵ For the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, see Lemerle 1986: 323-32; Roberto 2009. Of the fifty-three volumes commissioned, only five survive: *de Insidiis*, *de Sententiis*, *de Virtutibus et Vitiis*, *de Legationibus Romanorum ad Gentes*, *de Legationibus Gentium ad Romanos*. A text preserved in *Codex Parisinus inter supplementa Graeca* 607 and which contains several narratives of sieges may belong to the *Excerpta Constantiniana* (*de Strategematibus*) and may thus be the sixth (partially) surviving volume.

²⁸⁶ Roberto 2009: 79. For examples see Boissevain 3. 767-74.

²⁸⁷ EVV 'Dio' F 184 = 57.1; 185 = 57.13.1-3; 186 = 57.13.6; 187 = 57.14.9-10; 188 = 57.18.6-8; 189 = 57.18.10^b, 57.19.5,7,8; 190 = 57.20.2.

²⁸⁸ Neither of these authors is free from scholarly controversy, but this (happily enough) falls outside the scope of this thesis. For Peter the Patrician see Treadgold 2007: 264-9; and for John of Antioch, see Treadgold 2007: 311-29.

²⁸⁹ ES 'Petrus Patricius' F 4, 5, 6.

²⁹⁰ ES 'John of Antioch' F 22 = F 110 [ed. Mariev] = F 159 [ed. Roberto]; Mariev 2008: 35. For the non-Dionian material, compare John of Antioch: οὕτω τοίνυν τὴν ἀρχὴν διωκῆσατο, φοβεῖσθαι μὲν ὁμότητι, μισαροῦ δὲ πλεονεξία, αἰσχροῦ τε ἡδυπαθεία

seems likely that their practice was to paraphrase certain passages from Dio. We can see this in the case of Peter the Patrician's version of an anecdote told by Dio concerning the payment of Augustus' bequest to the Roman people.²⁹¹ Peter's version is compressed, and the diction is somewhat less polished than we find in Dio.²⁹² Yet the value of these fragments is negligible, at least to this present study.

Xiphilinus' *Epitome* of Dio's history is a work of a different stripe.²⁹³ In many ways a product of the eleventh century in terms of literary taste and outlook, Xiphilinus was the scion of a well-connected family and was in the orbit of at least two emperors, Michael VII and Alexius I.²⁹⁴ Xiphilinus' *Epitome* covers the period from Pompey's commands against the pirates down to the close of Dio's work, corresponding to Books 36-80 of the *Roman History*. Like several of his historiographical coevals, Xiphilinus seldom rose above the level of a copyist – in so far as he copied the text of Dio closely replicating whole passages word for word in a manner not dissimilar to that employed by the Constantinian excerptors. However, Xiphilinus still transformed Dio's text in ways that were often profound. Dio's annalistic structure is almost completely abandoned in favour of Xiphilinus' strong

χορησάμενος, with Eutropius-Paeanius (7.11.1): ἀλλ' ὁ Τιβέριος ῥαθυμῖα τε ἐχρήσατο πολλῇ καὶ ὠμότητι καὶ πλεονεξίᾳ, ἡδοναῖς τε ἐξέδωκεν ἑαυτόν. However, while it is generally assumed that John of Antioch had access to a Greek translation of Eutropius, it is almost certainly not Paeanius' translation: Mariev 2008: 33-4; cf. Roberto 2005: cxxxi-cxxxiv.

²⁹¹ *ES* 'Petrus Patricius' F 4; cf. 57.14.1.

²⁹² Note Peter's use of ληγάτα (sc. 'legacies'/'bequests'). For Peter lapses from an appropriately Attic register, note Menander Protector's censorious judgement (F 6.2 Blockley = *ES* 'Menander' F 11), with Cameron 2011: 660.

²⁹³ Xiphilinus is still in need of a modern edition. Boissevain prints in the third volume of his edition of Dio a text based on that of Dindorf (up to and including the reign of Claudius), Stephanus (Nero to the close of the work), and his collation of two fifteenth century manuscripts. Unfortunately, this work was completed before the oldest manuscript of Xiphilinus' work was discovered, the so-called Mt Athos epitome, Ivron 812, from the fourteenth century (for which, see Barmann 1971; Mariev 2008: 20-1). A current University of Helsinki PhD student, Kai Juntunen, is preparing new text of Xiphilinus.

²⁹⁴ For Xiphilinus' background and context, see Mallan 2013: 612-7.

biographical programme.²⁹⁵ Occasionally Xiphilinus introduces non-Dionian material into his *Epitome*, but there are no apparent instances of this in the Tiberian narrative.

Xiphilinus' treatment of Book 57 shows some significant omissions. Chapter 3 is completely elided from the *Epitome*; likewise the mutiny of the Pannonian legions (Chapter 4). The disorder in the German legions is significantly abbreviated – essentially reduced to two anecdotes.²⁹⁶ Xiphilinus' taste for the anecdotal is on display on every page. Occasionally his desire to insert a good anecdote can get in the way of narrative cohesion. As a result we find, for example, the story of Clemens the pseudo-Agrippa in the *Epitome* even though Xiphilinus had omitted the story of the fate of the (real) Agrippa.²⁹⁷ What mattered to Xiphilinus (as probably to Dio too) was the snappiness of Clemens' reply to the emperor.

The last of our major Byzantine witnesses to Dio's history is the early twelfth century author and one time court functionary, Zonaras.²⁹⁸ In scope and focus Zonaras' historiographical programme was more ambitious than that of Xiphilinus. Zonaras' *Epitome of Histories* spanned the period from Creation down to the reign of the Emperor Alexius I in eighteen books and drew upon a range of sources directly. The style of the *Epitome of Histories* is closer to a summary paraphrase of Dio, and we do not find the same rigid adherence to Dio's language that we see in Xiphilinus or the *Excerpta*.²⁹⁹ Zonaras' treatment of the reign of Tiberius is significantly more

²⁹⁵ Although note the preservation of the names of the *consules ordinarii* at Xiph. 132.26-7D, 135.5D.

²⁹⁶ Xiph. 127.5-10D. For Xiphilinus' taste for the anecdotal, see Brunt 1980: 490-1; Mallan 2013: 632.

²⁹⁷ Xiph. 133.21-27D; cf. 57.16.3-4. Zonaras too includes the story of the pseudo-Agrippa, but also that of the murder of Agrippa Postumus (1.11 [= Dindorf 3.5.3-13], cf. 1.11 [= Dindorf 3.2.9-12]).

²⁹⁸ For a general introduction to Zonaras and his work, see Banchich and Lane 2009: 1-7.

²⁹⁹ Millar 1964: 1-3, 195-203. Zonaras outlines this method, which includes his aim to retain something of the style of his sources in the prologue to the *Epitome of Histories*: Zonar. *praef.* 2 [= Dindorf 1.5.32-6.6]; with Banchich and Lane 2009: 34 n. 5.

condensed than that of his eleventh century historiographical precursor.³⁰⁰ All consular dates are removed, with the exception of the consulship of Tiberius and Drusus,³⁰¹ and Dio's annalistic structure is obliterated.³⁰² Yet Zonaras' tastes too are very much for the anecdotal, and long passages of text read as a succession of anecdotes with little attempt to link the material.³⁰³

In some ways Zonaras' selection of material preserves some of the textures of Dio's narrative better than Xiphilinus. For example, Zonaras includes a summary of the material of Chapter 3 and of the mutiny in Pannonia.³⁰⁴ But there are also insertions of non-Dionian material. Some are little more than trivial glosses, which occasionally reveal Zonaras' control of his material.³⁰⁵ Other insertions are more substantial and alter the focus of Dio's narrative. Most notably, Zonaras incorporates Christian elements into his account of the reign of Tiberius – namely the baptism, crucifixion and resurrection of Christ and the letter of Pilate to Tiberius which Zonaras interpolated from Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, and which he uses to close his account of the reign.³⁰⁶

³⁰⁰ Xiphilinus' account of the reign of Tiberius takes up 31 pages in Dindorf's Teubner. In Zonaras, it takes up only 11 ½ Teubner pages.

³⁰¹ Zonar. 11.2 [= Dindorf 3.6-7]. This is presumably included so that Zonaras can make the observation about the unpleasant deaths that befell all of Tiberius' consular colleagues.

³⁰² Dio's account of A.D. 15 is reduced to two items, A.D. 16 one item, A.D. 17 nothing.

³⁰³ E.g. Zonar. 11.2 [= Dindorf 3.4-5], where for the period up to the death of Germanicus, we are given the story of Tiberius' response to the man who asked a corpse when Augustus' bequest would be paid (cf. 57.14.1-2), Tiberius' behaviour after the death of his grandson (57.14.6), the encounter between Tiberius and the pseudo-Agrippa (57.16.3-4), the emperor's treatment of Julia (57.18.1^a), and Tiberius' response to the proposal to rename the month of November in his honour (57.18.2).

³⁰⁴ Zonar. 11.1 [= Dindorf 3.2].

³⁰⁵ E.g. Zonar. 11.1 [= Dindorf 3.2.14-15], where he identifies Drusus as Tiberius' child 'from Agrippina his former wife'. It is possible that Zonaras has conflated Tiberius' first wife Vipsania Agrippina with Agrippina the daughter of Julia and Agrippa, but this does not seem likely. In the surviving text of the *Roman History*, Dio only refers to Tiberius' first wife as 'the daughter of Agrippa' (54.31.2) – something Zonaras does as well at the corresponding stage of his narrative (Zonar. 10.34 [= Dindorf 2.444.18-9]).

³⁰⁶ Zonar. 11.3 [= Dindorf 3.11-12]; cf. Euseb. *HE* 1.10.1, 2.2.1-6. Similarly, in his account of the reign of Augustus, Zonaras notes the Nativity of Christ (Zonar. 10.39 [Dindorf 2.456-7]).

57.1.1-6 *Tiberius' Nature*. Dio commences his account of the reign of Tiberius with a character sketch of the emperor. This technique is found in both the imperial and republican books of the *Roman History*, although it is perhaps more pronounced in the former. For this technique, see Edmondson 1992: 36-7 (for the imperial books); Harrington 1971: 75-86. In his sketch of Tiberius, Dio singles out Tiberius' 'most unusual nature' (sc. φύσει δὲ ἰδιωτάτῃ) for discussion. This interest in an emperor's nature is again something Dio displays in other imperial character sketches: e.g. 59.4.1 (Caligula's inconsistency), 68.7.2 [Xiph.] (Trajan's generosity and high-mindedness), 72(71).35.6 [Xiph.] (Marcus' excellence), 73(72).1.1 [Xiph.] (Commodus' 'gormlessness').

Modern opinions of Dio's attempt to capture the essence of Tiberius' character have been generally dismissive: e.g. Syme 1958: 273; Balsdon 1975: 89; but cf. Plass 1988: 108-9; Pelling 1997: 126-7, and above Introduction, *Chapter 2, Dio on Tiberius*. In his sketch, Dio employs his usual rhetorical method of juxtaposing *Sein/Schein*, *logos/ergon* – but with a difference. Dio's concern is to illustrate appearances (in this case what Tiberius did) with reality (what Tiberius thought or desired). The result is an outline Tiberius' characteristic patterns of behaviour and creates a picture of Tiberius as the quintessential dissimulator; a sketch which has much in common with the Theophrastan 'Ironical Man' (Theophr. *Char.* 1). Dio's language throughout this passage is deliberately abstract, and although his stated aim is to outline Tiberius 'most individual nature' he does so in generalising terms.

The central theme of this section, Tiberius' habit and policy of dissimulation, feeds into one of Dio's recurring motifs in the *Roman History* (cf. Pelling 1997a: 128-9). Indeed, at 57.1.2 Dio makes Tiberius (the natural dissembler) the mouthpiece for the political benefits of practising dissimulation. As such this section has a general quality which goes beyond the immediate narrative context. That a leader should obfuscate his intentions in order to achieve success is a recurring thought process in Dio's work and as such is neither unique to the character of Tiberius, nor is it a necessarily pejorative characteristic in a leader, e.g. 36.24.5-6 (Pompey); 37.58.1 (the triumvirs). Note also F. 16.1 [ES]: ὅτι τὸ κρύφιον τῶν βουλευμάτων καὶ τὸ καίριον τῶν πράξεων, τό τε ιδιοβουλεῖν τινα καὶ τὸ μήτ' ἀναχώρησιν ἐς μηδένα ἄλλον μηδεμίαν ἔχειν καὶ τῶν συμβαινόντων αὐτὸν ἐφ' ἑκάτερα τὴν αἰτίαν λαμβάνειν, μέγα μέρος ἐς τὸ κατορθωθῆναι τι συμβάλλεται.³⁰⁷ These ideas are indubitably commonplaces: indeed the general idea is summarised by Francis Bacon in his discussion of simulation and dissimulation in the *Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall*.³⁰⁸ But the fact that these ideas are commonplaces is important. Hence, Dio's sketch of Tiberius's nature functions as a representation of a type of ruler, an instigator of a particular kind of political policy, as well as Dio's attempt to distil what he thought was the most important characteristic of Tiberius' imperial behaviour, and the ramifications of this behaviour.

³⁰⁷ The context for this fragment is not known. It may be Dio's authorial comment, or an extract from a speech. Boissevain (1.42), following Bekker, thought it was a comment about the office of *dictator*.

³⁰⁸ (E3^v [= Kiernan 2000: 22]): 'The great *Advantages* of *Simulation* and *Dissimulation* are three. First to lay asleep Opposition, and to Surprise. For where a Mans Intentions, are published, it is an Alarum, to call up, all that are against them. The second is, to reserve to a Mans Selfe, a faire Retreat [...] The third is, the better to discover the Minde of another [...].' Unsurprisingly, for Bacon (who knew his Tacitus) Tiberius was his historical *exemplum* for dissimulation (E1^r [= Kiernan 2000: 20]).

1.1 Ταῦτα μὲν κατὰ Αὐγούστον ἐγένετο, Τιβέριος δὲ ... ἐκέχρητο: An abrupt transitional sentence. Cf. 59.1.1: περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ Τιβερίου ταῦτα παραδέδονται, διεδέξατο δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Γάιος [...]; 45.1.1; etc. Contrary to the standard editorial consensus following Bekker,³⁰⁹ it seems unlikely that the words ταῦτα μὲν κατὰ Αὐγούστον ἐγένετο belong at the beginning of Book 57. The incipit of Book 57, as preserved in M and its descendent Lb, reads Τιβέριος δὲ ... ἐκέχρητο (M, fol. 208^v; Lb, fol. 297^r), and ταῦτα μὲν κατὰ Αὐγούστον ἐγένετο is the concluding sentence of Book 56. Xiphilinus too begins his account of the reign of Tiberius with the same opening as M and Lb (sc. Τιβέριος δὲ ... ἐκέχρητο), although Xiphilinus' biographical programme did not compel him to abide by Dio's book divisions. It should be noted that the μὲν ... δὲ ... construction does not preclude it from straddling two books, as seen in the transition from the seventh to the eighth book in the received text of Thucydides (Thuc. 7.87.6-8.1.1; with Hornblower 2008: 745, 749: ταῦτα μὲν τὰ περὶ Σικελίαν γενόμενα. || Ἐς δὲ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐπειδὴ ἡγγέλθη...),³¹⁰ and in the Plutarchan corpus (cf. Duff 2011: 246 with n. 154 for examples).

As is the case with Thucydides' opening to Book 8, there is some stylistic merit in Dio's decision to begin Book 57 with an abrupt δέ clause. It indicates a firm point of departure from the content of the previous book, which amounts to both a shift in focus from Augustus to Tiberius and a break in the annalistic chronology of the *Roman History* (for which see below, § I, *Dio and the Chronology of August –*

³⁰⁹ Bekker 2.133; Boissevain 2.556; Melber 3.260. Cary in the Greek text of his Loeb edition prints the clause at the beginning of 57.1.1 (following Boissevain's text), but translates it at the end of 56.47.2.

³¹⁰ The eight book division of Thucydides found in all modern editions was the most common in antiquity, although an edition of Thucydides divided into thirteen books and perhaps even nine books was also known. For further see, Bonner 1920; cf. Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 24.

October A.D. 14). But the transition operates on a more subtle level as well. Duff's comments concerning similar transitional sentences in Plutarch, could well apply to Dio (Duff 2011: 248):

‘Such transitional sentences, then like those with μέν, signal closure but also mediate transition; they both look backwards and point forwards.’

For Dio, the transition at the end of Book 56 and the beginning of Book 57 points to continuities as well as changes. The emphasis on the points of contrast (and comparison) between Augustus and his successor had begun in the closing chapters of Book 56. The end of Book 56 foreshadows the tenor of Tiberius' reign by ostensibly contrasting it unfavourably with that of his predecessor. The closing chapters of book 56 are important, and 56.45 especially so (Swan 2004: 349-50). At that point, Dio asserts that the transition from Augustus to Tiberius represented a change in the established order of things. If to live in Augustus' regime represented 'self-disciplined liberty and monarchy without fear' (ἐν τε ἐλευθερίᾳ σώφρονι καὶ ἐν μοναρχίᾳ ἁδελῇ) (56.43.4), we are left with the sense that Tiberius' regime (and perhaps those of his successors) would be something different. Yet in all this there are important points of thematic continuity: namely, the continuation of the Augustan monarchy, and the related question of the degree to which the individual character of the emperor set the tone for his reign.

εὐπατρίδης: Here Dio uses εὐπατρίδης in the technical sense of 'patrician' (he never uses the transliteration πατρίκιος).³¹¹ Dio's comment, however, serves to emphasise the more general observation that Tiberius was 'well born' or 'noble'

³¹¹ πατρίκιος is found with varying degrees of frequency from the Hellenistic period onwards, e.g.: Polyb. 10.4.2; Diod. Sic. 12.25.2, 3. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.47.1, *passim*; Plut. *Mor.* 278D [*Aetia Rom. et. Graec.*].

(ἐυγενέτης), as these terms could be used interchangeably (cf. Freyburger-Galland 1997: 76-8). For further comments on Dio's usage, see below 57.15.4 εὐπατορίδην.

Born on 16 November 43 B.C.,³¹² Tiberius was the son of Livia Drusilla (*PIR*² L 301) and Tiberius Nero (*RE* 3 cols. 2777-8 = Claudius 254 (Münzer)), hence a member of the *gens* Claudia through both his mother and father.³¹³ Although Claudii were undoubtedly one of the more politically conspicuous of the great republican houses, the Claudii Neronēs, the branch to which Tiberius' father was born, were relatively undistinguished throughout the middle and late Republic, with no consular appointments between 202 B.C. and 13 B.C.: the date of Tiberius' first consulship.³¹⁴ Whether Tiberius had direct connections to the more illustrious Claudii Pulchri is a matter of conjecture. It is generally thought that Tiberius was related to the Claudii Pulchri through Livia (Barrett 2002: 6-7). However, Huntsman (2009: 130-1) has demonstrated the possibility that Livia's father M. Livius Drusus Claudianus was in fact a Claudius Nero.

Dio's simple acknowledgement that Tiberius was a patrician is conspicuous for what he chooses not to say. The Claudii were the targets of one of the more hostile traditions in Roman republican and early imperial historiography (cf. Wiseman 1979: 57-139; cf. Alföldi 1963: 159-64; Thiel 1970: 6-15). Both Tacitus and Suetonius exploit this tradition by contextualising Tiberius in a republican historiographical framework (Suet. *Tib.* 1-3; Tac. *Ann.* 1.4.3; cf. Thiel 1970: 1-26). Dio, by contrast,

³¹² Tiberius' *dies natalis*: 57.18.2; Suet. *Tib.* 5; *EJ*²: 54. For the epigraphic evidence, see Snyder 1940b: 235.

³¹³ For a reconstruction of Livia Drusilla's early life and political connections, including those of Tiberius Nero, see Huntsman 2009.

³¹⁴ Brunt 1982: 17. NB with the correction (*pace* Brunt) that the last consular appointment before the future emperor Tiberius, was Ti. Claudius Nero, cos. in 202, not 204.

eschews direct engagement with this tradition. Why this was so is not difficult to appreciate. The anti-Claudian tradition was essentially a relic of republican historiography, and was fed by the continual prominence of the Claudii in political affairs. The scope and focus of Dio's work meant that he had little use for maintaining such a tradition. Dio was interested in placing Tiberius in an imperial, not republican frame of reference. If Dio wanted the reader to think about Tiberius in a wider context, it was as an emperor, not as a representative of the Claudian *superbia*. Moreover, it could be argued that Dio deliberately rejected such an approach to Tiberius by his comment that Tiberius 'possessed a most individual nature' (φύσει δὲ ιδιωτάτη ἐκέχρητο, below).

καὶ ἐπεπαίδευτο: 'and had been well educated'. Dio's choice of verb might invite (false) comparison with Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.4.4: *hunc et prima ab infantia eductum in domo regnatrice*) but Dio's point is surely about the quality of Tiberius' education rather than the context in which he was raised, as in Tacitus. An individual's education and birth were considered important elements of an individual's character, with education, moreover, generally regarded as a force which could modify or moderate the passions or the nature of a particular individual (e.g. Gill 1983: 473-5; Halliwell 1990: 32; cf. 72(71).35.6 [Xiph.]).³¹⁵ Dio's comments in this opening sentence of Book 57 are indicative of Dio's biographical method in general, whereby Dio comments on an individual's education, origin, or other defining characteristics (Harrington 1971: 75-86; cf. Graham 1974: 144-6). As was conventional, Dio believed that an educated ruler was preferable to an uneducated one, and regarded

³¹⁵ For an illustration of this with respect to Plutarch, see Pelling 1989; Swain 1989: 63, 65; Duff 1999: 62, *passim*; Duff 2008.

attainments in *paideia* highly, e.g. Hannibal: F 54.3 [ES]; Octavian: 45.2.8; Claudius: 60.2.1 [Xiph.]; Marcus Aurelius 72(71).35.1-6 [Xiph.]; cf. Swain 1996: 405-7.

The characterisation of Tiberius as a *pepaideumenos* has been congenial to biographers ancient and modern. It is an aspect of Dio's characterisation that Dio will return to over the course of Book 57, with respect to Tiberius' linguistic pedantry (below 57.15.1, 57.17.1), which is especially appropriate for a *pepaideumenos*. Yet as we saw in the Introduction (*Chapter 2: Dio on Tiberius*), Dio pays little attention to the nature or direction of Tiberius' educational pursuits. This is in marked contrast with some of Tiberius' latter-day biographers, who have speculated on the nature of Tiberius' education and its subsequent influence on his life and conduct. As a result, we have been left with several characterisations of Tiberius as the one-time friend of Horace and keen astrologer (Tarver 1902: 154-62, 193, 420), the diligent scholar (Kornemann 1960: 34-7), the Stoic (Levick 1976: 18, 82-3) and the Sceptic (Syme 1986: 355-6). Arguments have been mounted to suggest that Tiberius subscribed to and followed the precepts of a particular philosophical school on account of his association with various philosophers. Levick sought to show how Tiberius' association with the astrologer Thrasyllus and others indicated Tiberius' adherence to Stoicism, whereas Syme (1986: 355-6) regarded the dedication of a commentary on the philosopher Timon's *Sylloi* by Apollonides as evidence for Tiberius' alleged Sceptic beliefs (cf. Diog. Laert. 9.(12).109). Although we possess fragments of Timon's *Sylloi*, in truth little is known for certain about the writings and doctrines of Timon,³¹⁶ and even less about Apollonides, and the conclusions drawn from such

³¹⁶ Pfeiffer's (1968: 97-8, 170) caricature of Timon as being but a snide critic of Stoics, Epicureans and the scholars of the Alexandrian museum is perhaps a little crude. For a discussion of Timon's *Sylloi* and their relation to the philosophical views of Pyrrho, see Bett

arguments based on association must remain tenuous. As a rule, association with philosophers does not imply the adoption of their doctrines, any more than the ownership or receiving a dedication of a book imply the recipient's adherence to the views espoused by the author of the book (as outlined by Griffin 1989).

φύσει δὲ ιδιωτάτη ἐκέχρητο: 'but possessed a most singular nature'. Here 'nature' (sc. **φύσει**) is understood literally in terms of Tiberius' natural disposition, rather than shorthand for his 'character' (ἦθος). This is an important phrase, the key to the opening section of Book 57, not only because it qualifies Dio's positive statements about Tiberius' birth and education, but also because it addresses those aspects of Tiberius' disposition, which were neither formed nor modified by external factors, but which explained (in part) Tiberius' actions described in the immediately following narrative and at various stages throughout the opening of the Tiberian narrative in Book 57 and continued in Book 58.

οὔτε γὰρ ὧν ἐπεθύμει προσεποιεῖτό τι, καὶ ... ἐβούλετο: 'For as he pretended things which he did not desire, and of the things he said, nothing (so to speak) was what he wanted'. The οὔτε ... καὶ... construction is almost unknown in classical Greek usage, with the exception of Eurip. *IT* 591-2, (which itself has been regarded by some commentators as suspicious).³¹⁷ However, the construction occurs with some frequency in Dio (e.g. 42.46.1, 43.6.3, 43.34.1, 44.21.4, 50.35.4, etc.) and in other authors of the Second Sophistic (e.g. Lucian *Dial. Meretr.* 2.4; see also Schmid *Attic.* 3.90, 4.562). The sense of the construction is generally regarded as analogous to the

2000: 112-69, although the best introduction to Timon's life and works remains Long 1978: 68-91. For the fragments of Timon, see Parsons and Lloyd-Jones 1983: 368-95 (= nos. 775-840).

³¹⁷ Cf. Platnauer 1938: 111.

Latin *neque ... et...* ‘for on the one hand not... on the other hand (not)’. **ἐπεθύμει**: ‘desired’. The first of three ‘appetitive’ verbs used by Dio in this opening passage: the other two being ἐβούλετο, ἐπόθει. Tiberius’ ‘nature’ is illustrated by considering his three natural impulses: desiring, wishing, yearning. All three are verbs of wanting in the broadest sense, although ἐπεθύμει suggests non-rational desire, ἐβούλετο a rational wish, whereas ἐπόθει suggests a desire for things which are absent. **προσποιεῖτό**: ‘pretended’. The actions are typical of the dissembler (cf. Theophr. *Char.* 1.4-5). Dio uses this verb three other times in the opening chapters of 57 to denote Tiberius’ actions, thus providing a sense of continuity of motivation in his portrayal of Tiberius (57.3.2, 57.6.4, 57.9.2, cf. 58.19.6). **ὥς εἰπεῖν**: ‘so to speak’ or ‘practically’. Dio frequently uses this expression to qualify universalizing statements (e.g. 39.40.4, 41.7.1, 50.20.2, 57.10.3). Obviously, Dio’s point is about Tiberius’ general patterns of behaviour, not how he behaved *at all* times (as below at 57.1.5).

ἀλλ’ ἐναντιωτάτους τῇ προαιρέσει τοὺς λόγους ποιούμενος ... προετείνεται: ‘But making his words the opposite of his actual designs, he would deny everything which he longed for, and advocate everything which he hated.’ A common, and enduring feature of the (anti-)Tiberian tradition. Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.11.2; 13.3.2) too notes the studied ambiguity of Tiberius’ speeches (cf. Woodman 1998: 47-8). A similar sentiment is echoed by Aurelius Victor (*Caes.* 2.1): *subdolanus et occultior* [i.e. Tiberius], *hisque saepe simulando infensus, quae maxime cuperet, et insidiosae deditus, quae odio erant*. For Victor’s possible use of Dio, see Dufraigne 1975: xxviii n.96, 69. There is also much that is timeless about this observation. Cf. Procopius’ comments about Justinian (*Anec.* 13.14): τὰ γὰρ τῆς γνώμης αὐτῷ ἐξ ἐναντίας ἦεν ὧν τε αὐτὸς ἔλεγε καὶ ἐβούλετο ἐνδηλὸς εἶναι. **τῇ προαιρέσει**: A technical term

in philosophical texts denoting a ‘purposive choice’, ‘decision’ or ‘policy’, although here in the sense of ‘actual design’. Literally προαίρεσις suggests ‘a choice before a choice’ (cf. Arius Didy. *Epit.* 9a): προαίρεσιν δὲ αἵρεσιν πρὸ αἰρέσεως), but whether this refers to a temporal sense (i.e. the first in a sequence of choices), or in a preferential sense, is the matter of some philosophical debate (cf. Woods 1992: 143). Dio’s vocabulary throughout this opening chapter seems geared to achieving a particular philosophical register for his outline of Tiberius’ nature.

ὠργίζεται τε ἐν οἷς ἥκιστα ἐθυμοῦτο ... εἶναι: ‘He would show signs of being angry at those whom he was not in the least bit vexed, but would appear to be mild with those whom he was especially angry. He would make a show of pitying those whom he punished severely, but would maintain a grudge against those whom he pardoned.’ Dio’s thoughts seem to follow the pattern A-B-A-B: that is, those whom Tiberius pitied (after punishing) are those whom he had shown his anger. Likewise, those whom he treated mildly (ἐπιεικής) were presumably those whom he maintained a grudge (ἐχάλεπαινεν).

ἐπιεικής: ‘mildness’ or ‘moderation’. Cf. 57.11.1 (below). The semantic range of ἐπιείκεια encompassed two important virtues espoused by Tiberius, *moderatio* and *clementia*.³¹⁸ Mildness (ἐπιείκεια), whether understood as cognate with *clementia* or *moderatio*, is an important concept in Dio’s ethical vocabulary and in particular in his assessment of emperors (e.g. Rich 1990: 16-7; Kuhn-Chen 2002: 160-3; Adler 2011: 149-50; Davenport and Mallan 2014: 646), and the idea of imperial clemency is the

³¹⁸ Dio, as with other Greek authors, occasionally translates *clementia* as ἐπιείκεια (e.g. 44.6.4; cf. App. *BC* 2.106.[443]; Plut. *Caes.* 57.4).

central theme of two speeches in his imperial narrative.³¹⁹ For *clementia*/ἐπιείκεια as a commonplace imperial virtue for authors of the second and third century, note: Dio Chrys. 1.6, 3.5; [Arist.] *Or.* 35.22-3; Poll. 1.40-1). For its Latin cognate, *clementia* in Roman political thought, see (among more recent contributions) Barton 2001: 173-9; Dowling 2006: 169-218; Braund 2009: 30-44.

Here, however, Dio's point is that Tiberius *pretended* to show moderation (ἐπιεικῆς ... ἐδόκει εἶναι). A similar observation is made by Suetonius (*Tib.* 57.1) who says that it was with simulated moderation (*moderationis simulatione*) at the beginning of his reign that Tiberius endeavoured to gain general goodwill (*fauorem hominum*). It is unlikely that Dio is critiquing Tiberius' reputation for *moderatio*, which features so prominently in the pro-Tiberian narrative of Velleius Paterculus (e.g. Vel. Pat. 2.122.1) and in the documents of his reign (Rogers 1943 60-87; Downey 1975: 98-105; Levick 1975b; Dowling 2006: 170-84).³²⁰ It is more likely that Dio is tapping into Tiberius' later reputation for feigning moderation (Suet. *Tib.* 57.1; Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.5, *passim*; cf. Goodyear 1972: 149-51). But Dio's comments at this point are not wholly pejorative, and his understanding of Tiberius' acts of clemency is different from that which we find in Tacitus and Suetonius. That a ruler should *affect* mildness or clemency (irrespective of the ruler's natural disposition) is not a negative characteristic in Dio's mind. Indeed, the Livia-Augustus dialogue in Book 55 is built on the theme that it is more profitable for a ruler to demonstrate mildness towards political malcontents. Yet in the same dialogue the point is made that bearing grudges is likely to engender fear and resentment (55.16.6).

³¹⁹ i.e. the Livia-Augustus dialogue (55.14.2-21.4) and the Speech of Marcus Aurelius concerning Avidius Cassius (72(71).24.1-26.4 [Xiph.]).

³²⁰ E.g. Oliver *GC* no.15, line 20; *SCPP* ll. 17, 100. For discussion of Tiberius' *moderatio* in the *SCPP*, see Flower 1999: 108.

1.2 **ἡλέει**: ‘pitied’. Dio here is conveying the fact that Tiberius’ behaviour indicated a sense of compassion, which Dio is possibly associating with Tiberius affected **ἐπιείκεια**. Yet whereas **ἐπιείκεια** represented Tiberius’ habitual behaviour, **ἡλέει** here represents Tiberius’ temporary, but repeated emotional state or his reaction to a particular event (note Dio’s use of the imperfect). For the distinction between clemency and pity, see Konstan (2005: 342-5). Compassion (**κατοίκτισις**), although it had been on occasion recognised as part of the profile of a good king (e.g. Xen. *Cyro.* 6.1.47; cf. 7.3.8-16; Arrian, *Anab.* 2.12.8), appears rarely to be discussed as an imperial virtue in itself (cf. Farber 1979: 509-10). Interestingly, Xiphilinus (in Hadrian’s speech nominating Antoninus Pius as his successor) includes the unusual adjective **εὖοικτος** to describe one of Antoninus’ qualities which made him *capax imperii* (69.20.4 [Xiph.], with Davenport and Mallan 2014: 645-6).

δῆθεν: ‘make a show of’. As noted by Denniston (*GP*² 264-66; cf. Rich 1990: 15) the particle **δῆθεν** has an ‘ironical colour’ and is well-suited to Dio’s assessment of Tiberius’ dissembling or ‘ironic’ nature. In this opening section of Book 57, Dio uses **δῆθεν** at 57.2.2 and 57.2.5 with similar effect.

ἐχάλεπαινεν: ‘would maintain a grudge’. Here Dio introduces another problematic characteristic of Tiberius’ nature. That a ruler should affect mildness or clemency (irrespective of the ruler’s natural disposition) is not a negative characteristic (see above). However, again the Livia-Augustus dialogue makes the point of identifying the holding of a grudge as the sort of behaviour to engender fear and resentment

(55.16.6). Cf. Cic. *pro Deio*. 9, where Cicero claims that Caesar did not hold grudges against former foes.

τόν τε ἔχθιστον ὡς οἰκειότατον ... προσεφέρετο: ‘Occasionally, he would approach an enemy as if a boon companion, and a close friend as if a complete stranger.’ Cf. Theophr. *Char.* 1.2: ὁ δὲ εἴρων τοιοῦτός τις οἶος προσελθὼν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἐθέλειν λαλεῖν. Again quintessentially dissembling behaviour from Tiberius. As noted by Diggle (2004: 170), ‘[c]onventional morality dictates that enemies should be treated as enemies’, and here Tiberius’ treatment of his friends (and enemies) would in terms of conventional morality reflect on him negatively (cf. Dover 1974: 180-1; Morgan 2007: 68-70). Yet, perhaps Dio’s comments here feed into deeper themes of the *Roman History*, where conventional morality is less appropriate to the world of imperial politics. One of Augustus’ chief worries in the Livia-Augustus dialogue (touching on a well-worn commonplace) was how he (as a king) should treat his friends, given that plots against a ruler often began among his close associates or friends (55.15.4-7; cf. Xen. *Hiero.* 3).

τό τε σύμπαν οὐκ ἡξίου ... ἔλεγε: ‘On the whole he thought that it was not advantageous for an emperor to be open about what he was thinking: for, he said, many great mistakes arise from this sort of behaviour, whereas in many cases the opposite behaviour brought about both more frequent and more significant successes’. **ἔλεγε:** The first of the Tiberian *dicta* (for which see above, Introduction, *Chapter 1: The Roman Historian at Work*). Dio’s subtle shift in focalization to Tiberius adds authority to his assessment of Tiberius, but it also problematizes it. In the previous sentence, Dio has made it clear that what Tiberius said was not the same as what he

wished or desired, and that his words indicated the opposite of his intentions. Hence his choice of a verb of speaking rather than a verb of thinking adds a neat layer of irony to the apophthegm. Dio leaves the reader with a paradox and the need to confront the ambiguities and apparent contradictions in the language, as part of the process of understanding Tiberius' dissembling nature, as well as the validity of this *arcanum imperii*.

1.3 καὶ εἰ μὲν μόνον ταῦτ' εἶχεν ... ἀπέκτεινεν: 'But if he had just abided by this alone, etc.'. This is another long sentence, which Dio uses to convey further the complexities of Tiberius' nature. The first part (before the resumptive δέ) expresses a past conditional (with the protasis representing a supposition contrary to fact). Dio's point is not about any alleged inconsistency on Tiberius' part (the inconsistent emperor was something that Dio would play with later in his account of Caligula, but note also 57.15), but on his (consistent) practice of punishing those who understood his policy of dissimulation. τοῖς ἐξ πείραν αὐτοῦ ἐλθοῦσιν: 'for those who came up against him' or 'had experience of him'. The sense of ἐξ πείραν seems to convey the sense of experience through trial, cf. Thuc. 2.41.3: μόνη γὰρ τῶν νῦν ἀκοῆς κρείσσων ἐξ πείραν ἔρχεται. Dio's focus thus turns from Tiberius to those who associated with him. Dissemblers were always regarded as difficult people to deal with: as an ancient commentator on Theophrastus' 'Ironic Man' noted with a moralistic flourish (*Char.* 1.7): τὰ δὴ τῶν ἡθῶν μὴ ἀπλὰ ἀλλ' ἐπίβουλα φυλάττεσθαι μᾶλλον δεῖ τοῦς ἔχεις. For the remainder of the chapter Dio concentrates on Tiberius' social interactions from the perspective of these hypothetical individuals, so as to illustrate the combined difficulty of Tiberius' natural disposition and adopted policy. As someone who had to negotiate potentially tricky

situations with difficult emperors himself, it is not hard to hear Dio's (senatorial) voice of experience in this summary.

<ἄν> ἀναλαμβάνοντες: Reimarus' emendation ἄν λαμβάνοντες has been adopted by subsequent editors, replacing ἀναλαμβάνοντες found in M and in the *EVV* (*codex Peirescianus*). The repetition of ἄν in the second clause is desirable for the sake of clarity, but the change of ἀναλαμβάνοντες to ἄν λαμβάνοντες for the sake of economy seems unnecessary, as it sacrifices the analytical aspect of ἀναλαμβάνω (in the sense of 'taking up an idea'), which would fit the context better than λαμβάνω. If, however, Dio's text had read ἄν ἀναλαμβάνοντες, it is not difficult to see how ἄν might have dropped out during the copying process: that sort of corruption is a familiar enough occurrence, e.g. F 57.77 [*EVV*]: <ἄν> ἀναγκαζόμενοι; Plut. *Mar.* 11.14: <ἄν> ἀνατρέψωσι; Plut. *Tim.* 10.4 <ἄν> ἀναχθῶσιν.³²¹ It might be argued that ἄν ἀναλαμβάνοντες should be precluded on grounds of cacophony. However, it should be noted that Dio does not shy away from analogous instances of alliteration, e.g. 38.33.1: ἄν ἀνάσχοιτο; 46.25.3: ἄν ἀναγκαιότερον; 47.7.2: ἄν ἀνάγκην; 52.13.6: ἄν ἀνάσχοιντο; 53.13.4: ἄν ἀνακομισθῶσιν. Hence the emendation πρὸς γὰρ τοι τὸ ἐναντιώτατον πάντα <ἄν> ἀναλαμβάνοντες is suggested.

τό τε μὴ βούλεσθαι: 'being unwilling'. For the particular construction, see Goodwin *MT* § 813.

ὠργίζετο: This is the second time Dio uses this verb denoting Tiberius' anger in this opening passage (cf. 57.1.1). The repetition serves to establish the tone of the

³²¹ Cf. West 1973: 20-1, 24.

subsequent narrative, where the anger of Tiberius will play a role. The executions that occur later in Book 58 are ominously foreshadowed here as well (πολλοὺς ... ἀπέκτεινεν), although Dio's statement that these 'many people' were killed on account of understanding (συνενόησαν) his designs is hardly substantiated in the extant narrative. Dio's comment here may recall his earlier statement about Tiberius' design to kill Thrasyllus on Rhodes (55.11.1-2 [Zonar.]), yet even then Tiberius did not actually kill his intended victim (cf. Pelling 1997a: 127). Alternatively, we may see it looking forward to Tiberius' treatment of Asinius Gallus, but again Dio makes it clear that it was not just the fact that Gallus had understood Tiberius' thoughts that incurred his enmity, but that Tiberius resented the fact that Gallus had married Vipsania, his former wife (57.2.7, 58.3).

1.4 ὥστε χαλεπὸν μὲν [...] χαλεπώτερον δὲ συνιέναι: 'Therefore, whereas it was dangerous to have no comprehension of his nature (for inasmuch as those consenting to what was said rather than for what was wished often fell into trouble), it was actually more dangerous to comprehend his nature'. Dio here employs one of his favoured rhetorical devices, where the plight of hypothetical individuals is presented in terms of choosing between two undesirable outcomes (e.g. F 109.13-20 [EVV]). πολλὰ: 'often' (adverbial).

1.5 μόνος οὖν ... διεγένετο ὃς οὐτ' ἠγνόησε τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ οὐτ' ἤλεγξεν: It is difficult to know whether Dio a particular individual in mind when he wrote this passage. Junius Rusticus (*Ann.* 5.4; *PIR*² I 813), a man credited with an appreciation of Tiberius' thoughts, may be one such an individual. But it seems more plausible that

Dio simply envisioned a hypothetical expert courtier, the sort of individual in possession of the political wherewithal to flourish under any regime.

1.6 τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθῶς γενέσθαι τὸ δὲ δοκεῖν βούλεσθαι ἐθέλων: Ostensibly this clause, a summary of Dio's view of Tiberius' nature, is redundant. We may sympathise with the editorial decision of the tenth century compiler of the *Excerpta de Virtutibus et Vitiis*, who chose omit this clause in his otherwise near-verbatim transcription of 57.1. Similarly Xiphilinus offers a cut-down version of this opening sketch.

καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοὺς μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας ... ἤχθαιρε: 'and as a result of this he would hate the one sort of person out of genuine feeling and the other for the sake of appearances'. Dio finishes his opening statement on Tiberius' behaviour strongly with the presentation of something of a paradox. Appearances and realities are again evoked, but this time not as straight antitheses. The text conveys a sense of *aporia*, and Dio again emphasizes again the difficulty of dealing with a cryptic autocrat like Tiberius. As readers, we are left to consider efficacy of the emperor's studied (and inherent) dissimulation.

57.2.1-7.1 *The Accession of Tiberius, August – October 14*. Dio's narrative of Tiberius' accession (57.2.1-7.1) is integrated meticulously with his elaborate sketch of Tiberius' nature (57.1.1-6), and develops the theme of Tiberius' dissimulation and his characterisation as the enigmatic 'ironic man' (cf. Pelling 1997a: 126-7). The material gathered by Dio in these chapters covers the period from the death of Augustus through to the suppression of the mutiny of the Rhine legions by Germanicus (August to October A.D. 14). By doing so, the opening of Book 57 (57.2-7) covers the same

chronological span as the final chapters of Book 56 (56.29.2-47.2).³²² Dio's presentation of events at the beginning of Book 57 is largely impressionistic, and he appears to have deliberately eschewed the documentary detail that characterises his narrative surrounding the death and funeral of Augustus (56.30.5-34.4, 56.43.1-3). Structurally and stylistically, Dio's approach has much to recommend it. He was able to cover the same period without repetition, while creating a sense of contrast between the orderly sequence of events at the end of Book 56, and the confusion wrought by Tiberius' behaviour at the beginning of Book 57. Chronological sequence in these chapters, while distorted, is not entirely abandoned. On occasion, where Dio wants to emphasise a particular point, he does provide markers of chronological sequence (e.g. 57.2.1; 57.2.4; 57.3.2; 57.3.5). In the main, Dio's approach in these opening chapters is a mixture of piquant anecdotes, *dicta*, and occasional authorial commentary.

At the heart of Dio's portrayal of Tiberius' accession is the familiar juxtaposition of *logoi* and *erga*. In these chapters, Dio draws repeatedly the distinction between what Tiberius said and what he did: Tiberius performed the functions of an emperor, while denying that he was emperor. Similarly, he possessed the support of the military (at least in Italy and amongst his bodyguards), but refused the titles associated with imperial power. Although Dio's focus in these chapters is fixed primarily on Tiberius, his agenda is not so much concerned with developing his characterisation of Tiberius as it is with investigating the mechanics of the Tiberian Principate. Here the contrast with Tacitus' approach in the corresponding chapters of the *Annals* is instructive. Tacitus too uses his early chapters to look into the working of the Principate, but his

³²² The last item of Book 56 (the riots at the *ludi Augustales*) and an emergency meeting of the Senate, occurred some time between 5 and 11 of October.

use of Tiberius in the narrative is markedly different. Whereas Tacitus uses the events to feed into his (indirect) characterisation of Tiberius, Dio uses his initial (direct) characterisation of Tiberius to explain the events surrounding Tiberius' accession. By doing this, Dio is able to refocus his narrative through the character of Tiberius, while also addressing a key historical point: that is, determining the reasons behind Tiberius' apparently delayed acceptance of the Principate.

Dio was interested in the cause of Tiberius' evident delay in formally accepting the leadership of the state (see especially 57.3.5). Two dates appear to have confronted Dio. The first was the date of Augustus' death. The second was the date (not explicitly disclosed) at which Dio (57.7.1) believed Tiberius formally accepted the leadership of the state (τὴν τε ἀρχὴν ... ὑπεδέξατο).³²³ Of these two dates, it is clear from his calculation of the length of Tiberius' reign that Dio believed the former was the date of Tiberius' assumption of power (58.28.5).³²⁴ Yet this calculation reveals an important feature of Dio's agenda at the beginning of Book 57. Tiberius' accession serves to emphasise what Dio perceived to be the reality of imperial power. Dio, ever the political realist, knew that the possession of power was not dependent on conformity to constitutionality. This very point had been addressed earlier in his narrative following the settlement of 27 B.C. (53.17.1-18.5), where Dio draws a sharp distinction between the various titles adopted by emperors, which created the republican façade of the Principate, and the reality of autocratic power, which was not dependent on the possession of imperial titles.

³²³ Note the force of the aorist (ὑπεδέξατο), indicating that Dio believed that there was a specific moment when Tiberius accepted the leadership of the state, *contra* Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.13.6) who suggests that simply stopped refusing. For discussion, see below ad loc.).

³²⁴ For Dio's calculation of this date, see § I (below).

Be this as it may, Dio's complicated presentation of material for his account of Tiberius' accession has been a stumbling block for those attempting to reconstruct the historical narrative of the events following Augustus' death. This section addresses two problematic issues arising from these chapters: I) Dio's method of presentation and the chronology of August to October 14; and II) Dio's treatment of senatorial business from September 14.

I. DIO AND THE CHRONOLOGY OF AUGUST – OCTOBER A.D. 14

The following two tables present two chronologies for the period from the death of Augustus to the accession of Tiberius. The first presents a narrative chronology of events as they appear in Dio, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Velleius Paterculus.³²⁵ The second offers a reconstruction of a 'historical chronology' for the same period.

Comparison of 'Narrative' Chronologies from the Death of Augustus to the

Suppression of the Rhine Mutinies

Dio	Tacitus (<i>Annals</i>)	Suetonius	Velleius
Augustus dies at Nola 56.30.1, 5.	Augustus dies at Nola 1.5.3-4	Augustus dies at Nola <i>Aug.</i> 100.1	Augustus dies at Nola 2.123.2
Tiberius accompanies funeral cortège from Nola to Rome 56.31.2	Murder of Agrippa 1.6	Funeral cortège progresses from Nola to Rome <i>Aug.</i> 100.2	Consternation in Rome upon hearing the news of Augustus' death 2.124.1
Arrival of the funeral cortège at Rome, first meeting of the Senate, reading of Augustus' will	Oaths of allegiance sworn to Tiberius by the consuls, prefects, military, and people. 1.7.1-2	Discussion of honours to be granted to Augustus (first meeting of the Senate) <i>Aug.</i> 100.2-	Tiberius accepts the principate after hesitation 2.124.2

³²⁵ For comparison, see comparative tables in Schrömbges 1992: 299, 303.

56.32.2-33.6 Augustus' funeral 56.34.1-42.3	First meeting of the senate convened by Tiberius 1.7.3	3 Augustus' funeral <i>Aug.</i> 100.3	Honours divine and human granted to Augustus (second meeting of the senate) 2.124.3
Interment of Augustus' remains 56.42.4	First meeting of the Senate, reading of Augustus' will 1.8.1-5	Interment of Augustus' remains <i>Aug.</i> 100.4	Electoral reforms 2.124.4
Sextus Pompeius damages his leg on journey from Nola 56.45.2	Augustus' funeral 1.8.6	Augustus' will read (first meeting of the senate) <i>Aug.</i> 101.1-4	Outbreak of the German and Pannonian mutinies 2.125.1-3
Divine honours granted to Augustus (second meeting of the Senate) 56.46.1-5	Divine honours granted to Augustus (second meeting of the Senate) 1.10.8	Agrippa killed upon the death of Augustus. <i>Tib.</i> 21	Suppression of German and Pannonian mutinies 2.125.4.
Riots at the <i>ludi</i> <i>Augustales</i> 56.47.2	Tiberius' call for helpers in the administration of the empire (second meeting of the senate) 1.11-12	Tiberius convenes first meeting of the Senate <i>Tib.</i> 23	
Tiberius sends messages to the armies and provinces from Nola 57.2.1	Proposed honours for Livia (second meeting of the senate) 1.14	Tiberius' <i>recusatio</i> <i>imperii</i> . <i>Tib.</i> 24.1	
Tiberius requests support from the senate for Augustus' funeral 57.2.2-3	Electoral reforms 1.15	Tiberius accepts the Principate <i>Tib.</i> 24.2	
Tiberius' initial <i>recusatio imperii</i> (first meeting of the Senate?) 57.2.4	Proposal for the inauguration of the <i>ludi Augustales</i> (second meeting of the senate?)	Conspiracies and mutinies (Clemens, Libo Drusus, and Rhine army). <i>Tib.</i> 25.1-2.	
Tiberius' plans to divide the empire (second meeting of the Senate) 57.2.4- 7.	Pannonian mutiny 1.16-30	Suppression of conspiracies and mutinies <i>Tib.</i> 25.3.	
Oaths of loyalty to Tiberius made by the soldiers in Italy 57.3.2	Rhine Legion mutiny 1.30-49		

Tiberius sends Germanicus
 assassin from Nola invades Germany
 to kill Agrippa (beyond the Rhine)
 57.3.5 1.50-51.
 Pannonian mutiny
 57.4.1-3
 Blaesus sends
 envoys to Tiberius
 57.4.3
 Drusus arrives at
 Pannonian camp,
 lunar eclipse,
 suppression of
 Pannonian revolt
 57.4.4-5
 Rhine army mutiny
 57.5.1-7
 Germanicus
 invades Germany
 (beyond the Rhine)
 57.6.1
 Tiberius accepts
 the Principate
 57.7.1

‘Historical’ Chronology for August to October A.D. 14 (bold type indicates secure dates).

Event (Date)	Date	Dio	Other Authors
Augustus dies at Nola.	19 August	56.29.2, 29.5.	Suet. <i>Aug.</i> 100.1;
Tiberius from Nola sends assassin(s) to kill Agrippa Postumus.	19 August	57.3.5	Suet. <i>Tib.</i> 22; Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.6.1
Tiberius from Nola sends letters to the armies and provinces.	19 August	57.2.1	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.7.5
Tiberius accompanies Augustus’ funeral cortège from Nola to Rome.	20 August – 3 September	56.31.2	Suet. <i>Aug.</i> 100.2.
Sextus Pompeius damages his leg on the journey from Nola.	> 20 Aug	56.45.2	
Soldiers in Italy swear oath of allegiance to Tiberius.	> 19 August	57.3.2	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.7.2
Outbreak of the Pannonian Mutiny.	30 or 31 August	57.4.1-2	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.16-18, 20-24.
Blaesus sends envoys to Tiberius.	31 or 1 September	57.4.3	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.19

Outbreak of German Mutiny.	1 or 2 September	57.5.1-7	Tac. Ann. 1.31-47.
Tiberius and the funeral cortège arrive at Rome.	3 September	56.31.2	
1 st Meeting of the Senate.	4 September	56.31.2; 56.31.3; 56.32.1 ^a -3; 56.33.1-6; 57.2.1- 2.4; 57.2.2-3; 56.43.1	Tac. Ann. 1.8.1; Suet. Tib. 23; Tac. Ann. 1.8.1-2; Suet. Aug. 101.1-3; Suet. Tib. 23; Suet. Aug. 101.4; Suet. Tib. 24.1(?); Tac. Ann. 1.8.1; Tac. Ann. 1.8.3-5; Suet. Aug. 100.2-3; Tac. Ann. 1.8.5
Augustus' funeral	6 September	56.34-42	Tac. Ann. 1.8.6; Suet. Aug. 100.3.
Interment of Augustus' ashes.	11 September	56.42.4	Aug. Aug. 100.4.
Drusus sent to Pannonia	c. 7 - 18 September		Tac. Ann. 1.24.
2 nd Meeting of the Senate	17 September	56.46.1-5; 57.2.4-6; 56.47.1; 57.12.4; 57.4.4-5.	Tac. Ann. 1.10.8; Tac. Ann. 1.14; Suet. Tib. 50.2-3. Tac. Ann. 1.14.3; Tac. Ann. 1.14.3.
Arrival of Drusus at the Pannonian camp.	26 September	57.4.4	Tac. Ann. 1.24-27.
Lunar eclipse, and suppression of the mutiny by Drusus	27 September	57.4.4-5.	Tac. Ann. 1.28-30.
Riots at the <i>ludi Augustales</i>	5 – 11 October	56.47.2.	Tac. Ann. 1.54
Emergency session of the Senate convened by the tribunes in response to the riots.	5- 11 October	56.47.2	
Suppression of German mutiny.	Late	57.5.7	Tac. Ann.

	October		1.48-49.
Germanicus leads army into Germany (beyond the Rhine)	Late October?	57.6.1	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.50-51

All four of our major authorities indicate varying degrees of what Hornblower has termed ‘narrative displacement’,³²⁶ but in Dio’s account this is particularly strong.³²⁷ It has been noted elsewhere how Dio split his account of the events from the death of Augustus according to whether it pertained to Augustus or to Tiberius (cf. Sage 1982/3: 307 n. 79). As demonstrated by the above tables, this is generally correct. However, the split does not amount to a simple Augustus-Tiberius division of the sort that can be seen in Suetonius’ arrangement in the *Life of the Divine Augustus* and *Life of Tiberius*. Dio’s comment on the influence of Tiberius and Livia on the discussion of divine honours for Augustus (56.47.1), anticipates one of the themes of Book 57; that of Livia’s influence (57.12). Similarly, the closing item in Book 56, the riots at the *ludi Augustales* of October 14 (56.47.2), acts as another omen that the reign of Tiberius would be different from that of Augustus (cf. 56.45.1-46.1),³²⁸ while preparing the reader for the uneasy transition from Augustus to Tiberius.

Sound narrative principles lie at the foundation of Dio’s presentation of his material. The closing chapters of Book 56 perform the functions of providing a fitting summary of Augustus’ career, while anticipating the changes to the Augustan monarchy under the Julio-Claudian emperors. Those chapters are rich in detail and Dio pays careful

³²⁶ For this term and discussion, see Hornblower 1994: 139-48. Cf. Rood 1997: 109-15.

³²⁷ Syme’s (1958a: 688) comment that Tacitus’ account follows the true order of events, overlooks the implications of Tacitus’ apparent annalist division between ‘urban affairs’ and ‘external affairs’ at *Ann.* 1.16.

³²⁸ Tacitus records the disturbances at the *ludi Augustales* at the end of his account of A.D. 14 (*Ann.* 1.54), but uses the event to a contrast between the attitudes of Augustus and Tiberius towards expenditure on games.

attention to chronological sequence (e.g. 56.30.1; 56.31.2; 56.42.5; 56.43.1). *Prima facie*, this linear approach is in violent contrast to that employed at the beginning of Book 57. Yet, Dio's technique of narrative displacement does not indicate his total abandonment of chronology between 57.1-7, but rather his adoption of an elliptical, non-linear presentation of events.³²⁹ Time leaps forwards and backwards. Twice Dio returns to Nola (57.2.1; 57.3.5), to the very place and time of Augustus' death. These passages are important. Only here does Dio make an explicit attempt at synchronising the overlapping narratives of Books 56 and 57. By reorientating the narrative on Tiberius' actions at Nola, Dio is able to emphasise what he believed to have been the real moment Tiberius began ruling as emperor – in actions (the sending of letters to the armies and provinces, and the dispatch of an assassin to liquidate a rival), if not by senatorial sanction. This one fixed point of reference in turn emphasises the central historical theme of 57.1-7, the causes of Tiberius' delay in accepting the Principate.

Tiberius' delay is at the heart of all modern attempts to reconstruct a 'real' chronology for the months August through to October 14, although the nature of our evidence is inimical to the satisfactory resolution of such lines of enquiry. The lack of critical data for such a reconstruction has scuppered the likelihood of ever reaching scholarly consensus. Only four of the above dates are fixed with any degree of certainty: Augustus' death on 19 August; the senate meeting on 17 September, where divine honours were proposed for Augustus; the lunar eclipse on 27 September;³³⁰ and the dates of the *ludi Augustales*.³³¹ The dates offered in the above reconstruction

³²⁹ Indeed, this applies generally to 57.1-13, which sits outside the strict annalistic framework of the *Roman History*. Chapters 8 to 13 in particular describe Tiberius' general behaviour from his accession to the death of Germanicus (cf. 57.13.6).

³³⁰ For which, see commentary below at 57.4.4.

³³¹ For the dates of which, note *Inscr. Ital.* XIII.2 p.195; cf. Lebek 1988: 62.

follow a late chronology for August - October 14, generally following those of Sage (1982/3: 306).³³² Much depends on the calculation of distances and rates of travel, both of which are open to a wide margin of error. Furthermore, neither the standards of the roads nor the weather conditions are known, both of which have a bearing on the speed of troop and courier movement. These problems are exacerbated when it is remembered that some of the key locations are not known: in particular the site of the Pannonian legions' camp (cf. Móscy 1974: 43; Matthews 2010: 73). However, if such a reconstruction has value, it is to show the distinction between what may be called a linear 'real chronology' and Dio's elliptical 'narrative' chronology.

One crucial date is omitted from the second table; specifically, the date at which Dio thought Tiberius 'accepted' the Principate. The question of when Tiberius' *dies imperii* fell is a well-known crux.³³³ Nevertheless, it is not an idle question. Dio believed that there was such a date. Likewise, others before him believed that there was a specific moment when Tiberius formally accepted his position in the state, perhaps cognate with the *statio* Augustus had occupied.³³⁴ That Tacitus does not acknowledge the existence of such a moment cannot be taken as evidence to the contrary.³³⁵ Tiberius' contemporaries believed that his reign commenced on a specific date – a date that was not the same as the death of Augustus (e.g. Ovid *Pont.* 4.13.27-

³³² For alternative reconstructions, see Wellesley 1967: 26; Levick 1976: 68-75; du Toit 1980: 130-1; Swan 2004: 299. Cf. Hohl 1933; Schmitt 1958; *CAH*² 10: 200-9 (Weidemann).

³³³ There are semantic issues at play as well in so far as it is even correct for us to say that there was a 'Principate' for Tiberius to accept. For discussion of this problem, see Gruen 2005: 34-35.

³³⁴ For discussion of the idea of imperial *statio*, note Matthews 2010: 70-1; Lott 2012: 299-300 (on *SCPP* II. 129-30); Woodman 1977: 222.

³³⁵ Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.13.5. That Tacitus should omit details in the interest of his narrative is not surprising. As noted by Goodyear (1972: 175 n. 1): 'T[acitus]'s Tiberius must equivocate to the end. Perhaps to effect this T[acitus]'s artistic sense (or is malice) led him somewhat to pervert the truth.'

8; Vell. Pat. 2.124.1-2; *P. Brit. Mus.* 276).³³⁶ It is possible that the specific event, which our authorities had in mind, was the passing of a (putative) *lex de imperio Tiberii* (cf. Brunt 1977: 97-8). At any rate, for Dio, this moment came when Tiberius was assured of Germanicus' loyalty (57.7.1; with discussion below *ad loc.*). On account of the degree of narrative displacement throughout 57.1-7, Dio's statement cannot be assumed to indicate that Tiberius' acceptance took place after news of the final suppression of the Rhine legion mutiny had reached Rome, which must have been in late October. Hence, we may suspect a date in early October.

Such a position is controversial. That Tiberius accepted the Principate in October has been suggested many times before with varying degrees of vigour, but also rejected with equal degrees of vehemence. Still, our other ancient authorities do not preclude a date in October. Josephus (*AJ* 18.224, with footnote 379 below), who calculated the length of Tiberius' reign to have been twenty-two years, five months, and three days, gives us an accession date of 13 October 14. This date rests, admittedly, on the assumption that that Josephus knew the date of Tiberius' death (16 March 37). Tacitus, in a somewhat cryptic passage, appears to indicate that Tiberius 'hypocritical irresolution' was causing consternation for the senate and people in Rome, at a time when the outcomes of the Pannonian and German mutinies were still not known (*Ann.* 1.46.1). I am inclined to believe that the passage is to be interpreted as indicating that Tiberius' delay in formalising his position in the state continued into late September and early October (cf. Kampff 1962: 45-6; Brunt 1977: 97; Sage 1982/3: 310-11).

³³⁶ As noted correctly by Montevecchi (1985: 272 n. 23) *pace* Levick 1976: 79, who dismisses the problem of Tiberius' *dies imperii* as not being appropriate to the historical situation in A.D. 14.

Even if this reading is correct, then the statement does little to narrow the range of dates for Tiberius' acceptance. However if we may hazard to identify a more specific date, the riots at the *ludi Augustales* might provide a clue. According to Dio, an emergency session of the Senate was convened by the tribunes some time between 5 and 11 October (56.47.2). From the urgency of the summons, we may assume that the riots posed a threat. But if this was the case, then we might wonder why the meeting had not been convened by the one of the higher magistrates, or more importantly (if we are to believe that Tiberius had assumed his position as head of state) by Tiberius himself?³³⁷

News of the suppression of the Pannonian revolt would have only reached Rome in early October. We know that the eclipse mentioned in our sources occurred on the morning of 27 September, at which time (or shortly after) the ringleaders of the mutiny were executed. We may guess that Drusus waited at least a day before sending word back to Rome that the revolt had been put down. As already stated, the site of the legionaries' summer camp where the mutiny broke out is not known. However, it seems unlikely that it was at, or in the immediate vicinity of Emona (modern Ljubljana) as has often been supposed, given that Emona remains a strong candidate for the location of the permanent camp of the XVth legion.³³⁸ The permanent camps of the *legio VIII Augusta* and *IX Hispana* are known: the VIIIth was stationed at Poetovio (modern Ptuj) and the IXth at Siscia (the modern Croatian town of Sisak on the river Sava). For the sake of calculation, I have assumed that location of the legionary summer camp to have been at a point between these three locations, and

³³⁷ The *ludi Augustales* were, however, run by the tribunes (56.46.2; cf. Slater 1994: 124-5).

³³⁸ Wilkes 1963: 269; Tóth 2003: 23. Parker (1958: 125), suggests Sirmium as the location of the permanent camp of the XVth, although later (220) he suggests Emona.

have thus calculated the distance from Andautonia (modern Šćitarjevo, south east of Zagreb), a known first-century settlement, which is c. 621 m.p. (c. 920 km) from Rome.³³⁹ A courier, riding at the brisk rate of 80 m.p. per day,³⁴⁰ would have taken at least seven days to reach Rome, and therefore would not have arrived until 5 or 6 October at the earliest. Similarly, news of the suppression of the Rhine mutiny would not have reached Rome until late October.³⁴¹ However, news of Germanicus' attempts to quell the mutiny would have reached Tiberius by early to mid October. The overlap with the dates of the riots at Rome is suggestive, and so indeed is Josephus' date of 13 October. Therefore, it could have been in this climate of emergency at Rome, but with the knowledge that Pannonia was secure and Germanicus loyal to his adoptive father, that Tiberius formally acknowledged his position in the state. (For further discussion, see below at 57.7.1).

II. SENATORIAL BUSINESS

³³⁹ There is no evidence to indicate that there was a legionary camp at Andautonia. It has been chosen simply to provide a median position between the other camps. Traditionally, the distance has been calculated from Rome to Nauportus (modern Vrhnika) or Emona: e.g. Schmitt 1958: 378; Wellesley 1967: 26; Levick 1976: 72; Sage 1982/3: 303; Pettinger 2012: 185, 187. This seems problematic, as it minimises the potential distances that had to be travelled between Rome and the legionary camps (cf. Wellesley 1967: 25 n. 9).

³⁴⁰ The top speed for a dispatch, on good roads, seems to have been around 100 m.p. per day, although the average was between 67 and 41 (Ramsay 1925: 72-3). I have opted for a rate below of 80 m.p. per day, given the (possible) poor conditions of the roads in Pannonia in A.D. 14: Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.20) describes soldiers around Nauportus, around 14 m.p. (21 km) south of Emona) being involved in road building. For comparison, the speed of the imperial post is estimated to have been around 50 m.p. per day (Ramsay 1925: 68-9; cf. Procop. *Anecd.* 30.1-11), whereas the forced march of an infantry unit was 24 m.p. per (five-hour) day (Veg. *Epit.* 1.9). Levick's calculations, based on a rate of 150 m.p. per day, seem overly ambitious (1976: 76).

³⁴¹ Like the Pannonian legions' summer camp, the site of the Lower Rhine legions' summer camp is not known, except that it was in the territory of the Ubii (Tac. *Ann.* 1.31.3; cf. Wells 1972: 134-136) The 1000 m.p. from near *Colonia* (modern, Cologne), the putative site of the Lower Rhine legions' camp, would have taken around 12 days, assuming a rate of 80 m.p. per day, or just over 6, assuming the rapid rate of 150 m.p.

The two known meetings of the senate, which were convened in September A.D. 14, have attracted much scholarly attention.³⁴² These discussions have focussed primarily on Tacitus' descriptions of these meetings, with little attention given to Dio's accounts of these same meetings. The following tables present a reconstruction of the agenda for the two meetings as far as can be deduced from our sources.

Event	Dio	Tacitus and Suetonius
1 st Meeting of the Senate (convened one day after the arrival of Tiberius and the funeral cortège from Nola).	56.31.2	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.8.1; Suet. <i>Tib.</i> 23
Tiberius receives ritual purification for having touched Augustus' corpse.	56.31.3	
Reading of Augustus' will.	56.32.1 ^a - 3	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.8.1-2; Suet. <i>Aug.</i> 101.1-3; Suet. <i>Tib.</i> 23
Reading of Augustus' political testament.	56.33.1- 6	Suet. <i>Aug.</i> 101.4
Tiberius' outright refusal of the empire (?)	57.2.1, 2.4	Suet. <i>Tib.</i> 24.1
Business confined by Tiberius to discussion of funeral plans for Augustus.		Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.8.1
Discussion and proposal of funeral honours.		Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.8.3-5; Suet. <i>Aug.</i> 100.2-3

³⁴² The more important discussions are Lang 1911: 22-26; Marsh 1931: 45-56; Hohl 1933; Kampff 1963: 25-46; Wellesley 1967; Sage 1982/3.

Senatorial decree that all proposals for posthumous honours to be granted to Augustus be put before Tiberius before being debated in the Senate.	56.47.1	
Tiberius' request for bodyguards to accompany Augustus' corpse in case of a disturbance.	57.2.2-3	
Edict issued warning the populace against making a disturbance during Augustus' funeral.		Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.8.5
Period of mourning decreed to follow the funeral.	56.43.1	

2 nd Meeting of the Senate (17 September 14)		
Divine honours proposed for Augustus.	56.46.1-3	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.10.8;
Institution of the <i>ludi Augustales</i>	56.46.4-5	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.54
Honours proposed for Livia	57.12.4	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.14; Suet. <i>Tib.</i> 50.2-3.
Discussion of Tiberius' future role in the state and the proposed division of the imperial powers.	57.2.4-6	Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.11-13.
Tiberius asks the senate for proconsular imperium for Germanicus		Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.14.3
Departure of embassy to Germanicus		Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 1.14.3

Some obvious caveats must be stated concerning this reconstruction. As has been argued by Wellesley (1967: 28) and others,³⁴³ there may have been several meetings of the senate convened as a result of the extraordinary circumstances of those months following Augustus' death. The only business that can be fixed to a particular meeting and specific date is the granting of divine honours for Augustus, which we know from the epigraphic evidence took place on 17 September. This telescoping is most evident with regards to the second meeting. Levick (1976: 79) is surely correct in thinking that Tacitus' description of the second meeting included details from later meetings, at least with respect to the praetorian elections and reform of the *comitia* (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.14; Vell. Pat. 2.124.3-4). If we were to accept Velleius' comment that the praetorian elections were Tiberius' first act as emperor, it is likely that these did not take place until mid or late October.

Specific points pertaining to these meetings will be discussed in the commentary below. However, some general observations may be made here. The above tables reveal two important features of Dio's work. The first is the high level of detail covering these meetings that was available to Dio. Dio's description of procedural detail from the first meeting is particularly impressive, even more so when it is considered that what we know of Dio's account has been reconstructed largely from Xiphilinus' *Epitome*. For example, we hear about the ritual cleansing Tiberius undertook before the first meeting, the styles of dress worn by the senators, and even the lack of musical accompaniment to the proceedings (56.31.2-3). However, in his account of these meetings in Book 57, Dio opts for specific details or *sententiae*,

³⁴³ E.g. Lang (1911: 22-6) suggests that the sources have compressed the contents of three meetings into two. The first which dealt with Augustus' funeral arrangements, the second with Augustus' deification, and a third where the senate offered Tiberius the throne.

rather than lengthy description. In this way, Dio's presentation of the agenda from the second meeting is radically different from that presented by Tacitus. As we would expect, the material is divided along thematic lines: the honours for Augustus are placed in Book 56, and the honours granted to Livia are relegated to 57.12, where Dio groups other material describing the extraordinary position of the Augusta. Similarly, Tiberius' (separate) demonstrations refusing the imperial powers are grouped together (57.2.4-7), although he does not make clear when these took place. The additional items found in Tacitus – the granting of proconsular *imperium* to Germanicus, the proposal to send an embassy to the prince, and the arrangements for the praetorian elections – find no place in Dio's account of these meetings.

The omission of these details calls for little comment, although it is clear enough that his decision was based on sound narrative and editorial principles. As we have seen in the case of his description of Tiberius' career, Dio seldom appears to have felt compelled to describe the legal extent of Tiberius' military powers. It is perhaps for this reason that Dio, unlike Tacitus, did not feel it necessary to record confirmation of Germanicus' proconsular *imperium* at the meeting of the senate on 17 September (Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.3). As a rule, Dio appears to have been interested in recording grants of proconsular *imperium* if they were in some way unusual. Thus, Dio remarks on the grant of *imperium* to Germanicus in 11 (he had not yet held the consulship), and also that of *imperium proconsulare* to Gaius Caesar in 2 B.C. (55.10.18-19 [Xiph., Zonar.]).³⁴⁴ However, by A.D. 14, Germanicus had held the consulship and had been the recipient of such powers in the past, and so it was perhaps because of this that Dio

³⁴⁴ Interestingly, in a fragment preserved concerning Gaius' positing to the Danube sector, which seems to have predated his command in the east, there is no mention of any grant of *imperium* (55.10.17 [EVV]). However, we should not place too much weight on this omission, as the compiler of the *Excerpta* might have omitted such detail.

regarded the confirmation of these powers in 14 as not being particularly noteworthy. Dio knew about the embassy to Germanicus, but introduces it (reasonably enough) during his narrative of the revolt of the German legions (57.5.4), and thus avoided needless repetition. Finally, Tiberius' confirmation of Augustus' candidates for the praetorian elections (which may not belong to the meetings of September at all), played no discernible part in Tiberius' accession, which is the focus of Dio's account, and was reasonably omitted.

Dio passes over many of the anecdotes Tacitus records from the second meeting: only the piquant exchange between Tiberius and Asinius Gallus remains, and even here in an austere form, shorn of the obvious embellishment of the Tacitean version. Indeed, Gallus is somewhat exceptional in so far as he is the only senator identified by name in Dio's accounts of the two meetings: by way of contrast, Tacitus identifies five senators by name.³⁴⁵ As a result Dio shows little attempt to create a dramatic or pictorial account of the meetings. Nor is there any sense of the game that was played out between Tiberius and prominent members of the Senate that emerges from Tacitus' account. Yet we should not look for Tacitean drama in Dio. Indeed, Dio's approach has its own merits. Dio, by eschewing these details, maintained a singularity of focus on Tiberius' actions and the central historical inquiry of the opening of Book 57 – the causes of Tiberius' delay in accepting the Principate.

2.1 **τοιοῦτος οὖν δὴ τις ὢν**: An important, linking phrase, connecting the elaborate sketch of Tiberius' nature with the account of Tiberius' reign. For comments on these linking phrases in Book 57, see Baar 1990: 225-6. Its function is not simply

³⁴⁵ Asinius Gallus, L. Arruntius, Valerius Messalla, Q. Haterius, Mamercus Scaurus.

transitional. In Dio's assessment, Tiberius' dissembling nature was one of the reasons for his staged *recusatio imperii* described in this chapter, and the statement serves to integrate this introductory material with the explanation of Tiberius' behaviour with the following narrative. **τις**: qualifying **τοιοῦτος**, indicating that this was Tiberius' *general* disposition. Dio uses almost identical linking phrases with the same function elsewhere in the imperial books of the *Roman History*. E.g. Claudius: 60.3.1; Macrinus: 79(78).11.4.

ἔξ τε τὰ στρατόπεδα ... ἐπέστειλε: Dio recommences his historical narrative at Tiberius' actions immediately following Tiberius' arrival at Nola (cf. 56.31.1-2; Swan 2004: 305). By making a point of the location from where Tiberius sent his letters (ἀπὸ τῆς Νώλης), Dio emphasises the immediacy of Tiberius' assumption of the functions of imperial office. **ἔξ τὰ ἔθνη**: Used here perhaps in the general sense of 'provincial populations' (cf. below 57.4.2) rather than in the strict sense of 'the provinces', although there is admittedly only a fine line between the two meanings. The varied usage in other third century historians suggests something of the broad semantic range the word had acquired (e.g. Hdn. 1.1.4, 4.2.9, 6.2.1; cf. Whittaker 1969: 1.4-5 n.3; Dexippus *FGrH* 100 F 24). Dio's other term for province, ἀρχή, is used more specifically to denote the area of a magistrate's jurisdiction with reference to a single province. For usage in Dio, see Freyburger-Galland 1997: 34-5, and in general, Sherwin-White 1973: 437-44; Mason *GT* 136. It has been suggested that τὰ στρατόπεδα ... τὰ ἔθνη refers to the 'imperial' and 'senatorial'³⁴⁶ provinces respectively (cf. Jaeger 1910: 16). However, Dio's point seems to be more general than this, indicating his attempt to gain the loyalty of the armies and provinces (cf.

³⁴⁶ Or more precisely, the provinces of the 'Roman people'. The term 'Senatorial province' is a misnomer: Millar 1989.

Dio's comments on Germanicus at 57.6.1). Of course, Tiberius was had the legal authority to send missives to the provinces and to the soldiers given his *imperium maius proconsulare*, which he had held since at least A.D. 13 (Vell. Pat. 2.121.1; Suet. *Tib.* 21.1; and discussion in Introduction, *Chapter 2: Dio on Tiberius* (above).

ὥς αὐτοκράτωρ: 'as emperor'. Here Dio uses the word αὐτοκράτωρ (*autokrator*) in its colloquial sense of 'emperor' (= *imperator*). Dio's vocabulary here has invited criticism for its alleged anachronism (e.g. Schrömbges 1994: 302 n. 14). However, we should not make too much of this. It is clear that the word *autokrator* was used to denote an emperor long before the Flavian dynasty, when the *praenomen Imperatoris* became a standard part of imperial nomenclature. Philo in the *Legatio ad Gaium* and the *In Flaccum*, both written around in the early 40s, uses *autokrator* frequently in this informal sense to denote the position of emperor (e.g. *Leg.* 11, 29, 277; *Flacc.* 9, 150).³⁴⁷

This sentence shows Dio playing with the semantic range of the word *autokrator* as he understood it (cf. 43.44.2-5; 53.17.4-5), that is, denoting an 'emperor', as well as the title (i.e. the *praenomen Imperatoris*) adopted by emperors. For the use of *autokrator* in Dio, and its semantic range, see Mason *GT* 117-120; Freyburger-Galland 1997: 149-51; below (next note), and note at 57.8.1.

μὴ λέγων αὐτοκράτωρ εἶναι: A deceptively complicated expression. Two problems of interpretation are presented by Dio's expression: a) the implications of Dio's use of μή, and b) the meaning of (the second) *autokrator*.

³⁴⁷ The *In Flaccum* and the *Legatio* were probably composed either side of Gaius' death: Gambetti 2009: 16-17.

The construction μή λέγων ... εἶναι is not found elsewhere in Dio, and we are left with the question whether it is the λέγων or the εἶναι the μή negates, hence is the meaning ‘not claiming to be *autokrator*’ or ‘stating that he was not *autokrator*’? Cary (7.114) opts for the former and translates ‘he did not claim to be emperor’. Yet, if Dio had intended it to be the former, we should probably expect οὐ rather than μή, as in οὗ φημι (= *nego*). Montevocchi (1985: 271 n.17) argues in favour of the second interpretation. Few parallels to Dio’s usage exist, although we may compare Dio with Plutarch (*Mor.* 1116a = *Adv. Col.* 15): οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ πῦρ μή λέγων εἶναι τὸν πεπυρωμένον σίδηρον ἢ τὴν σελήνην ἥλιον ... ἀναιρεῖ σιδήρου χρήσιν ἢ σελήνην φύσιν.

In the previous note I have suggested that Dio is playing with the semantic range of the word *autokrator* in this sentence. The conventional reading suggests that Dio uses *autokrator* here again in the colloquial sense of ‘emperor’ (cf. ὡς αὐτοκράτωρ): Cary’s translation reads, ‘though he did not claim to be emperor’. However, the following sentence suggests that he has in mind the title *Imperator* for this second *autokrator*. Hence Dio’s meaning is perhaps close to: ‘[Tiberius] sent letters to the legions and provinces as emperor, stating that he was not <to be called> “*Imperator*”.’ If this is correct, then what Dio is saying is that Tiberius in his letters to the provinces informed them of his (provisional?) rejection of the title *Imperator* (Montevocchi 1985: 271 n. 17). Historically, this is an attractive reading, as Tiberius was reluctant to use the title ‘Imperator’ in his official correspondence (see note below, and at 57.8.1). Moreover, it is worth noting the Cypriot oath of allegiance (*SEG* 18 no. 578), inscribed perhaps not long after news of Augustus’ death had

reached Cyprus, omits the title *autokrator*, but leaves room for the word to be inserted (lines 13, 19), should it be needed at a later date (cf. Mitford 1960: 75, 79).

Be this as it may, the fact that Dio's phraseology is complicated and invites various (mis)readings, suits the narrative context well, and contributes to Dio's overall description of Tiberius' habit of obscuring his intentions.

ψηφισθὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ ... οὐκ ἔδέξατο: 'For although this along with the other titles were voted to him, he would not accept them'. **τοῦτο** corresponds to αὐτοκράτωρ in the previous clause, indicates Tiberius' refusal of the title *Imperator*. Here Dio's connection with Suetonius is strong (*Tib.* 26.2): *Praenomen quoque imperatoris cognomenque patris patriae et civicam in vestibulo coronam recusavit*. **μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὀνομάτων:** 'along with the other titles'. The correspondence raises the possibility that Dio is referring to those titles and honours mentioned by Suetonius, namely that of *pater patriae* and the *corona civica*. There might, however, have been other titles beside, as there had been in A.D. 9 when the Senate moved to confer a suite of honorific titles upon Tiberius, only for the motion to be vetoed by Augustus (*Suet. Tib.* 17.2). The date when these titles were voted (sc. **ψηφισθὲν**), and refused by Tiberius is not given by either Dio or Suetonius. It cannot be assumed that Dio's account here refers to a single sitting of the Senate in September or October when these were voted for Tiberius. Dio knew that it was not customary in the early empire for emperors to have their titles bestowed at once, contrary to the practice of his own day (53.18.4).

Dio uses Tiberius' refusal of the titles associated with imperial power to reinforce one

of his fundamental historical observations: that the possession of titles was not the basis for the possession of political power at Rome. Rather, in his view, the various titles assumed by the emperors served only to create the appearance of constitutionality. The reality was that an autocrat's powers rested with his possession of military might (55.17-18, cf. 44.51.3).

καὶ τὸν κλῆρον ... οὐκ ἔθετο: 'and taking the inheritance of Augustus, he did not adopt his *cognomen*.' Again, Dio's phraseology recalls that of Suetonius (*Tib.* 26.2): *ac ne Augusti quidem nomen, quanquam hereditarium* [...]. The word **ἐπίκλησις** in Dio usually refers to an honorific title or a *cognomen* (e.g. 36.19.3; 40.51.3; 59.3.2; 60.5.8). The *cognomen* is of course that of 'Augustus'. For Tiberius and the *cognomen* Augustus, see below 57.8.1. By **κλῆρον** Dio is referring to Tiberius' patrimony, whereby Tiberius received two-thirds of Augustus' property (56.32.1). However, according to Suetonius (*Aug.* 101.2; cf. *Tac. Ann.* 1.8.1) a further stipulation was that Tiberius and Livia adopt his title (*quos et ferre nomen suum iussit*). For a discussion of the various provisions of Augustus' will, see Swan 2004: 310-19; Ober 1982: 313-24; Champlin 1989: 154-65.

2.2. τοὺς τε σωματοφύλακας: 'bodyguards', cf. *Tac. Ann.* 1.7.5; *Suet. Tib.* 24. The use of bodyguards (particularly foreign ones) was traditionally regarded as the mark of a tyrant (e.g. *Plato Resp.* 8.566b, 567d-e; *Xen. Hiero* 5.3-4; *Arist. Pol.* 5.1315b27-9), and Dio may be seen to be highlighting the tyrannical aspect of Tiberius' assumption of power. Whether Dio has in mind the Praetorian guardsmen (usually **δορυφόροι** in Dio's vocabulary) or an informal group of bodyguards is left unclear. Indeed **σωματοφύλαξ** is an unusual choice of word for Dio; it is not classical, and it

appears rarely in the *Roman History*. Here, however, we may suspect that Dio's choice of words was influenced by the repetition of 'body' words (σωματοφύλακας ... σώματος). Where he does use it elsewhere, it can be in the sense of a private bodyguard (e.g. 44.7.4; 77.(76).10.6), or Praetorian guardsman (55.24.6; 58.9.2; cf. 58.9.5). Here Dio's usage is far more casual than other authors of the imperial period, where the term σωματοφύλαξ implied a sense distinct from δορυφόρος (e.g. Philostr. VA 1.33; Hdn. 1.8.6, 3.12.9, 4.13.1; Euseb. VC 4.51.3). Later, however, the two terms became synonymous (Hesych. Σ 3075). For Dio's terminology, see Molin 2007: 200-1. For imperial bodyguards in general (up until the fourth century), and their development, see Millar 1977: 61-6; Keppie 1996; Bingham 2013.

συνάρασθαί: Dio has Tiberius ask the senators for their 'assistance' or 'co-operation' during Augustus' funeral. Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.8) seems to preserve the senatorial response to Tiberius' request, by stating that the senators volunteered to carry Augustus' funeral couch.

τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ: 'his body': but is it Tiberius' body or Augustus' body? The ambiguity sets up the punch line for an elaborate joke (see 2.3 below).

ἔδεδίδει γὰρ δῆθεν: Again the reader is left to speculate on account of Dio's choice of words: Did Tiberius 'pretend' to fear the mob, or did he 'in truth' fear the mob? (For Dio's use of δῆθεν in the opening passage, see note above 57.1.2). If taken as 'pretend', Tiberius' actions may be seen to conform to the familiar *topos* of a tyrannical figure securing a bodyguard through official sanction after feigning fear of

physical violence, as in the case of Peisistratus or the elder Dionysius (e.g. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 14 with Rhodes 1981: 200; Plut. *Sol.* 30.1-3; Diod. Sic. 13.95.3-6).

ὥσπερ τὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος: The description of the impromptu cremation of Julius Caesar's corpse by the mob is well-attested in the literary sources, and Dio gives the event due treatment (44.50-51; cf. Nic. Dam. *Caes.* 48; Plut. *Caes.* 68; Suet. *Iul.* 84.3-4; App. *BC* 2.147[612]-148[616]). Dio's reference back to Caesar's funeral invites the reader to question Tiberius' intentions further. Why would Tiberius *genuinely* fear a recurrence of the mob violence that had characterised Caesar's funeral? The reaction of the mob in 44 B.C. was brought about by their anger at Caesar's murder. Augustus, by contrast, had died an old man at Nola – at least officially, and Tiberius (in the context of the *Roman History*) had no reason to fear a popular demonstration. Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.8.5) too highlights this as one of Tiberius' concerns, and is suggestive of a source connection. Pettinger (2012: 183-84) has sought a historical basis for Tacitus' and Dio's statements and suggests that Tiberius was in fact fearful lest the news of Agrippa Postumus' death cause some public disturbance. This is plausible, but cannot be affirmed by the available evidence, and would require the news of Agrippa's death to have reached Tiberius in Rome before the first meeting of the Senate on 3 September.

2.3. **κομπευσάμενός τις ἐπὶ τούτῳ φρουρὰν ... ἐσηγήσατο:** 'And some facetious individual proposed that Tiberius be given a guard (as if he did not already possess one)'. κομπεύω, an unusual word in Dio's vocabulary, occurring at 69.21.2 [Xiph.], and 73(72).6.4 [Xiph.], but here it is used in a slightly pejorative sense, denoting a 'tricky' or 'facetious' individual: κομπευσάμενος is glossed as πανουγευσάμενος

by the scholiast on Plato *Resp.* 6. 489b (Schol. Plat. *ad loc.* [p. 238 Greene]). This facetious individual thought he had perceived the real meaning of Tiberius' ambiguous request for assistants to guard 'his body'. The ironic undercurrent of the passage invites comparison with Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.8.6; cf. Woodman 2002), who notes the sardonic reaction of some spectators at Augustus' funeral at the need for Augustus' corpse to possess a bodyguard. The obvious difference is that for Dio, the focus is fixed on Tiberius' actions and the propensity for individuals to misread his intentions.

“οἱ στρατιῶται οὐκ ἐμοὶ ἀλλὰ δημόσιοί εἰσι”: “The soldiers are not mine, but the people's”. Here Dio provides another Tiberian apophthegm, which may have been extracted by Dio (or by an earlier historian) from the *acta senatus*. Genuine or not, the sentiment is consonant with the ‘republican’ rhetoric of the Augustan age (Schrömbges 1992: 302). This exchange must have taken place during the first meeting of the senate, where discussion was confined to Augustus' funeral (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.8). In the context of Dio's narrative, Tiberius' words contradict not only reality ('he already possessed a guard') but also confound expectations. The senators (and the reader) expect Tiberius to accept the bodyguard, after all that is what Augustus had done in 27 B.C. (53.11.5). However, in a move consistent with Dio's sketch of Tiberius' nature (cf. 57.1.1-2), Tiberius rejects the motion to give him a bodyguard when offered to him.

2.4. **τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ... ἐξίστασθαι ἔλεγεν**: ‘For his first action was to say that he would relinquish it entirely on account of his age (for he was fifty-six) and his poor eyesight (for although he could see far at night, he could only see up close during the day)’. **τὸ μὲν πρῶτον**: picked up by **ἔπειτα δὲ** later in the sentence. While Dio

clearly has in mind a sequence of actions, his concerns here are with the methods Tiberius used to delay his acceptance of the Principate, not with documenting when these actions occurred. Hence, it is not clear if Dio has in mind Tiberius' actions at two meetings of the senate or two actions at the same meeting of the Senate. Kampff (1963: 33) places this initial refusal in the second meeting. More unlikely is Marsh's suggestion (1931: 48 with n.1) that this refusal may have not been made in the Senate at all, but informally to his friends in between the two sittings of the Senate. Tacitus offers little help. In his description of the first meeting, he does not mention any outright refusal by Tiberius, but rather that business was confined to discussion of Augustus' funeral (*Ann.* 1.8). The narratives of Dio and Tacitus are not mutually exclusive, and may be reconciled. Tiberius' refusal might have come after Augustus' will had been read, and, perhaps, coincided with his attempt to refocus the debate on the business at hand, namely, the preparations for Augustus' funeral. Tiberius' refusal (as Dio had it) might well have come in the wake of Valerius Messallinus' enthusiastic, yet inexpedient, proposal for an annual oath of allegiance to Tiberius (*Tac. Ann.* 1.8.5). The matter is insoluble.

(πλείστον γὰρ ... τῆς ἡμέρας ἑώρα): cf. Suet. *Tib.* 68.2: *cum praegrandibus oculis et qui, quod mirum esset, noctu etiam et in tenebris uiderent, sed ad breve et cum primum e somno patuissent; deinde rursum hebescebant*. Dio alone of the sources for Tiberius' accession introduces Tiberius' alleged infirmities as grounds for his *recusatio*. Dio's parenthetical comment, where he defines the exact nature of Tiberius' eyesight, may represent the insertion of material from a supplementary source. Furthermore, it reveals his interest in describing obscure medical conditions, especially of emperors. In this respect, Dio seems receptive to the historiographical

trend of the imperial period, where descriptions of the physical condition of emperors were a conspicuous feature of Roman and Byzantine biography and historiography (Rohrbacher 2010; cf. Canter 1928; Head 1980). For a survey of the intellectual background of physiognomy in the Roman world, and its relationship to ancient psychology, see Boys-Stones 2007. For ‘corporeal ecphrasis’ in Suetonius, see Gladhill 2012.

How Dio interpreted Tiberius’ *recusatio imperii* is not altogether clear. Unlike Suetonius (*Tib.* 24.1), Dio does not suggest that Tiberius’ *recusatio* was indicative of his hypocrisy. Indeed, that Tiberius should make a show of refusing the imperial office would not have struck Dio as being particularly unusual, and was what Dio expected good emperors to do. As a young Senator, Dio witnessed Pertinax’s *recusatio imperii*, which Pertinax made partly on the (specious) grounds of his advanced age and poor health (74(73).1.4-5 [Xiph.]). Moreover, Dio seems to have regarded it as a mark of a good emperor not to be naturally desirous of assuming the imperial purple (69.20.5 [Xiph.]). The *recusatio imperii*, as with the refusal of imperial titles more generally, appears to have played an important role in the ideology of the Principate from its inception (e.g. Béranger 1948: 178-96 = Béranger 1953: 137-68; Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 36-7; Ando 2000: 146-8; Vervaeke 2010), although it appears to have fallen largely into abeyance between the reigns of Caligula and Marcus Aurelius.³⁴⁸ It was perhaps on account of the greater ideological relevance of the *recusatio imperii* for the Antonine and Severan periods that Dio paid particular attention to Augustus’ feigned reluctance in accepting the titles and political powers in his Augustan narrative (e.g. 55.6.1, 55.12.3 [Xiph.], 56.28.1, 56.39.6).

³⁴⁸ For a list of supposed *recusationes imperii*, see Béranger 1948: 180 n. 15. That Caligula performed a *recusatio* (not attested in Béranger’s list) is argued by Jacobson and Cotton 1985.

However, this is not to say that Dio distorts the importance of Augustus' behaviour, as Augustus himself made much of his reluctance to accept titles and honours that had been voted to him (e.g. *RGDA* 5-6, 10.2 with Cooley 2009: 127-31), and there seem to be republican precedent for Augustus. Tiberius' behaviour, although fitting into the Augustan pattern, struck Dio as peculiar: for Tiberius' *recusatio* was followed not by reluctant acceptance (as in the case of Pertinax), but a further attempt to delay his formal acceptance of the empire. As Dio makes clear later on, Tiberius had other motivations for delaying his formal acceptance of the Principate (see below 57.3.3).

κοινωνούς τέ τινας καὶ συνάρχοντας: Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.11.1. That some source connection exists between Dio and Tacitus at this point seems reasonable, but the phraseology here seems to be Dio's. For the pairing of κοινωνός and συνάρχων see Antony's comments in his speech before the Battle of Actium (50.20.5): τίς μὲν οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι κοινωνὸς ἐγὼ καὶ συνάρχων τοῦ Καίσαρος ἀποδειχθεῖς;

Tiberius' appeal for helpers provides narrative consistency with what Dio had written earlier concerning Augustus' alleged instructions that the commonwealth be entrusted to men capable of comprehension and action (56.33.4), and echoes a point made in the speech of Maecenas (52.19.1-3). These parallels have caused some to doubt the veracity of Dio's comments at 56.33.4, assuming that Dio has somehow transposed Tiberius' request for colleagues to Augustus' supposed injunction for the same, and by doing so duplicated the one request (Ober 1982: 316; cf. Marsh 1931: 48 n. 4; Hohl 1933: 113). If we were to adopt such skepticism, we might alternatively regard Augustus' injunction as authentic and that of Tiberius, bogus. Such a view, however, would require both Tacitus and Dio to have repeated the same mistake, or to have

followed the same erroneous source, which is not impossible. Swan (2004: 313; cf. Kampff 1963: 30-1; Brunt 1984a: 425), suggests a third and (in my view) the most likely alternative, that both Augustus and Tiberius made this request, thus ‘playing out a tortuous “republican” ritual in solemnizing the first political succession’. Even so, this ritual had meaning in the political context of the Augustan regime. Both Augustus and Tiberius operated with a significant degree of cooperation with the Senate (see below 57.7.2-5) Moreover, both were keen to play up the collegial aspects of their regimes. Hence, we should not be surprised to find Augustus making such statements in any putative political testament, or Tiberius at the outset of his reign. Of course, Dio does not appear to read the scene in these terms, although he is certain in his judgment that Tiberius’ claims were insincere.

ἀλλ’ ἐξ τρία μέρη ... οἱ λοιποὶ ὑπήκοοι: ‘but dividing the empire into three, he proposed to take one part, while yielding the remainder to the others. The scheme was such that Rome and the rest of Italy was one portion, the armies comprised the second, and the remainder of the subject peoples the third.’ An intriguing passage that raises an obvious, but ultimately insoluble historical question: did Tiberius propose such a division? The accuracy of Dio’s statement regarding the division of the empire has been regarded generally as dubious (e.g. Marsh 1931: 48 n. 4; Hohl 1933: 114; Koestermann 1963: 108; Seager 1972: 54 n.2). It has been posited that Dio’s comments are his own invention (Griffin 1976: 117 n.6; Levick 1976: 248 n. 21), and betray anachronism (e.g. Syme 1958: 690 n. 2, cf. 410 n. 5), although the way in which Dio’s account is anachronistic is not revealed.³⁴⁹ Moreover, if the passage were

³⁴⁹ There was never any such administrative division of the empire in either the Antonine or Severan periods, along the lines described by Dio. Moreover, the supposed plan to divide the empire between Caracalla and Geta (along geographical lines) upon the death of Severus

Dio's invention, it is hard to see what function it fulfilled in the narrative. Others, however, have been less skeptical. Kampff (1963: 34-5, 43) and Pettinger (2012: 167) accept Dio's report, but with little comment. Bosworth (1977: 183-4) too accepts Dio's report, but suggests that the exchange between Gallus and Tiberius was largely stage-managed by Tiberius. In Bosworth's view, Tiberius' proposal was presented to the Senate as part of his *recusatio*, but only with the intention of prompting Gallus' response indicating the indivisibility of the empire (and thus the impracticability of the scheme), and thus the necessity for Tiberius to accept the whole rule. Schrömbges (1992), more cautiously, has suggested that there may be a historical basis to Dio's comments.

This theory deserves greater attention. Schrömbges (1992: 305-7; cf. Pettinger 2012: 163-4) notes that Tiberius' suggestion is not dissimilar to the administrative settlement of 27 B.C., where the foundations for the Augustan administration were established (cf. 53.12-13). These parallels are evident if τὰ στρατόπεδα is taken to mean those provinces with a legionary presence (the imperial provinces) and οἱ λοιποὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ the provinces of the 'senate and people' (cf. Levick 1976: 248 n. 21). Moreover, it may be added to Schrömbges' thesis that the creation of the third administrative division in Tiberius' plan, that comprising Rome and Italy, was not unprecedented, in fact it was already in existence in A.D. 14. Dio describes the administration of Rome and Italy being conferred to Maecenas in 36 B.C. (49.16.2; cf. 51.3.4). Moreover, after the settlement of 27 B.C. Italy fell under the administrative orbit of the annually elected praetorian magistrates (53.13.6). If this is

described by Herodian (4.3.5-9), although accepted by some, seems to me to be a likely fiction.

correct, then Tiberius' plan of A.D. 14 may have been simply a reiteration of Augustus' plan of 27 B.C., designed, to maintain the *status quo*.

2.5 οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ... ἐδέοντο αὐτοῦ ἄρχειν πάντων: 'And when the other senators apparently began to beg him to rule the whole'. δῆθεν: Again Dio employs the 'ironic particle' (see above, 1.2, 2.2), but this time to refer to the actions of the senators, not Tiberius.

Ἀσίνιος δὲ δὴ Γάλλος: C. Asinius Gallus (*PIR*² A 1229). For a coherent survey of Gallus' career, see Shotter 1971: 443-57. Some words may be said at this point on the role of Gallus in the *Roman History*. Dio's portrayal of Gallus conforms largely to the Tacitean tradition, where he is depicted as an opponent of Tiberius. Yet, perhaps the most conspicuous feature of Dio's portrayal of Gallus, when viewed alongside that of Tacitus, is how little Dio employs him in the extant narrative. Tacitus was clearly interested in tracking Gallus' career, and appears to have taken pains to record many instances of Gallus' involvement in senatorial proceedings, contributing to the portrayal of Gallus as an ambitious (potential) rival to Tiberius (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.13).³⁵⁰ Not so with Dio, who is more interested in Gallus' unusual fate at Tiberius' hands (he was kept under house arrest for three years while awaiting a capital sentence). As a result Gallus performs a somewhat clearer narrative role in Dio, than in Tacitus. That Gallus suffered as a result of Tiberius' enmity is signalled right from his introduction into the Tiberian narrative.³⁵¹ He then disappears from the surviving text until such a time as Dio (Xiphilinus) describes his fall, where he is reintroduced once again in

³⁵⁰ Dio (wisely) eschews Tacitus' story of Augustus' discussion of the *capaces imperii* (*Ann.* 1.13): cf. Syme 1986: 137-8.

³⁵¹ Gallus first appears in the narrative as *consul ordinarius* at 55.5.1.

terms of his παρρησία (see next note), his marriage to Vipsania, and Tiberius' hatred of him. The details of Gallus' punishment (58.3.3-6 [Xiph., EVV]) are described in detail by Dio as a means for illustrating not only Tiberius' cruelty, but also his paradoxical treatment of his enemy (cf. 57.1.1-3). Tiberius' treatment of Gallus is then used as a frame of reference for his treatment of another political foe, Junius Gallio (58.18.4; *PIR*² I 756). The pattern is confirmed by Dio's note on Gallus' death, where he again emphasises the manner of Gallus' punishment (58.23.6). Gallus' primary role in the narrative is to function as a foil to Dio's characterisation of Tiberius, not as an active opponent of his regime, but as an exemplum of Tiberius' treatment of his enemies.

παρρησία ἀεί ποτε πατρός: 'always [employed] the outspokenness of his father'. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.12.4: *Pollonisque Asinii patris ferociam retineret*. The close similarities with Tacitus for the whole anecdote require us to think in terms of Dio's familiarity with either Tacitus' account or a common source that both freely adapted (cf. Goodyear 1972: 179-80). Gallus' father was the historian and consular C. Asinius Pollio (*PIR*² A 1241). Long characterised as an outspoken opponent of the Augustan regime (e.g. Syme 1939: 482-6), this view of Pollio's political stance has since been challenged or modified (e.g. Bosworth 1972b; Morgan 2000: 65-8). Pollio's fleeting appearances in the *Roman History* do not seem to justify his reputation for *parrhesia* (45.10.3-5; 48.15.1; 48.41.7), although Dio might well have been familiar with at least some of the anecdotes that were in circulation concerning Pollio's outspokenness (e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 43.2).

Dio's decision to characterize Gallus as an exemplum of παρρησία has particular resonance in the context of the *Roman History* and it cannot be understood as simply a gloss for the Latin *ferocia*.³⁵² Gallus' *parrhesia* can be seen to function in several ways in this passage. Gallus' outspokenness establishes a sharp contrast between Gallus' behaviour and the implicit servility shown by other senators, who put up an show of rejecting Tiberius' plans for dividing the imperial powers (οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ἀντέλεγον δῆθεν ... Ἀσίνιος δὲ δὴ Γάλλος παρρησίᾳ). The other senators seemingly know what is going on, and are content to go along with it. Gallus, by contrast, knows what is going on, but calls Tiberius' bluff. The effect of the scene is heightened by Dio's decision to keep the scene clear of other identifiable voices. The other senators are anonymous: the only speakers are Gallus and Tiberius. Hence, in a similar way, Gallus' *parrhesia* becomes a further point of contrast with Tiberius. Dio's Tiberius always knows what needs to be kept hidden from his speech and emotions. Gallus, in contrast, is outspoken to his own risk (ὕπερ τὸ συμφέρον αὐτῷ). Moreover, Dio is able to use this exchange to anticipate his further discussion of Tiberius' treatment of individuals who exercised *parrhesia* (see below 57.7.3-4).

“ἐλοῦ” ἔφη “ἣν ἂν ἐθελήσης μοῖραν”: “Choose”, he said, “whichever part you want.” Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.12.2: “*interrogo*”, *inquit*, “*Caesar quam partem rei publicae mandari tibi uelis*.” The similarities between Dio and Tacitus are indicative of some source relationship, although its nature cannot be determined (Goodyear 1972: 179-80).

³⁵² It has been argued (Traub 1953) that Tacitus' *ferocia* denoted a quality cognate with Dio's παρρησία.

2.6. “καὶ πῶς οἶόν τέ ἐστίν”, εἶπεν, “τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ νέμειν τι καὶ αἰρεῖσθαι;”:

“How can”, he said, “the same man divide and choose?” One of the *arcana imperii* – and Augustus had done just that in 27 B.C., as Dio knew well.

Dio gives Tiberius’ an appropriately punchy, yet somewhat gnomic reply to Gallus’ question. The differences between Dio and Tacitus at this point widen. Tacitus says (*Ann.* 1.12.2): *perculsus inprouisa interrogatione paulum reticuit; dein collecto animo respondit nequaquam decorum pudori suo legere aliquid aut euitare ex eo cui in uniuersum excusari mallet*. Leaving aside the speculations of *Quellenforschung*, what is worth noting is the different effect Dio manages to achieve with apparently the same material as Tacitus. The exchange between Gallus and Tiberius is the companion piece to the exchange between the unnamed senator and Tiberius at 57.2.3. In both cases Tiberius is presented as replying (quickly) to his interlocutor, and thus evading the need to reveal his position. Unlike Tacitus, Dio shows little interest in embellishing the context around these exchanges. It is what Tiberius says (or does not say) that matters to Dio, not the way he says it. Tiberius’ question is ironic, and there is an obvious answer to it – an emperor (or king) can both divide and choose which part he wishes to rule. To be sure, Dio draws attention to the fact that Augustus’ reforms resulted in his assumption of monarchical powers behind a republican façade (e.g. 53.12.1; 53.13.1; 53.16.1). Here, however, Dio uses the exchange between Gallus and Tiberius to articulate this incongruity, between the reality and appearance of the Augustan (and Tiberian) Principate.

συνεῖς οὖν ὁ Γάλλος ἐν ᾧ κακοῦ ἐγεγόνει: ‘So Gallus, realising the trouble into which he had fallen.’ However, if Gallus believed his position was due to what he

said, he was mistaken (see note below, sc. ὅθενπερ ... ἦν). Another reminder of the opening sketch of Tiberius (esp. 57.1.3-6), outlining the predicament which ‘those who came up against him’ (τοῖς ἐς πείραν αὐτοῦ ἐλθοῦσιν) fell into.

2.7. τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ τὴν προτέραν ἐγγεγαμήκει: i.e. Vipsania Agrippina (*PIR* V 462), a daughter of M. Vipsanius Agrippa and Caecilia Attica, whom Tiberius had married *circa* 20 B.C. and divorced soon after her father’s death in 12 B.C. (Levick 1976: 27; cf. Syme 1986: 314). According to Nepos (*Att.* 19.4), the marriage to Vipsania was arranged when she was one year old. Dio’s interest in Vipsania and her relationship with Tiberius is slight: indeed he never refers to her by name. At 54.31.2 she appears simply as ‘Agrippa’s daughter’. Even here it is worth noting how little Dio develops his notice of Tiberius’ resentment of Gallus for marrying Vipsania. Dio has no interest in reporting the story of Vipsania as Tiberius’ lost love: a story more congenial to the pages of Suetonius (and, indeed, Robert Graves), than to Dio.

τόν τε Δροῦσον ὡς υἱὸν προσεποιεῖτο: A fascinating detail, preserved only here, and one of Dio’s few significant departures from the parallel narrative of Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.12.4; cf. Goodyear 1972: 179). Herbert-Brown (2004: 132) has challenged the veracity of the statement on the grounds that ‘it would have been tantamount to an admission of adultery on the part of both himself [i.e. Gallus] and Vipsania’. However, against this, note Dio’s use of the (conative) imperfect (προσεποιεῖτο), presumably indicating simply that it was Gallus’ intention to ‘pass Drusus off as his son’ (perhaps through the process of adoption?). It has been suggested by Schrömbges (1992: 305-6) that Dio’s information indicates his use of an anti-Tiberian or anti-

Claudian source,³⁵³ possibly the *Memoirs* of the younger Agrippina, which undermined the claims of members of Tiberius' family to the throne (as opposed to the descendants of Germanicus). If there is truth behind Dio's statement, then it is possible that it refers to the domestic arrangements of Gallus during last decade B.C. Drusus, born in 14 B.C., after all, was an infant when Tiberius and Vipsania divorced and was barely a stripling when Tiberius entered his self-imposed exile on Rhodes. It seems likely that Drusus spent his early years in the household of Vipsania and Asinius Gallus, not of Tiberius or the elder Julia, especially following the latter's fall.

ὁθενπερ καὶ πρότερον διὰ μίσους αὐτῷ ἦν: Gallus' attempt to assuage Tiberius' anger is unsuccessful, not because of what Gallus had said (Dio believed that Tiberius did not generally punish people for their *parrhesia*: 57.7.3-5, 57.17.3), but in typically (unexpected) Tiberian fashion, because of a long held grudge. The insistence by Dio and Tacitus that the enmity between Gallus and Tiberius originated in Gallus' marriage to Tiberius' former wife, is ultimately improvable, but fits broadly into Dio's assessment that Tiberius was wont to hold grudges (cf. 57.1.2). Herbert-Brown (2004: 132-48) has argued against the notion that Tiberius' divorce from Vipsania was the cause of Tiberius' enmity, preferring instead Gallus' alleged snub of Tiberius, which took place while Gallus was governor of Asia and Tiberius was on Rhodes. In any event, if such an enmity did exist, it was clearly not inimical to Gallus' political fortunes under Tiberius (and those of his descendants), at least until Gallus' fall late in Tiberius' reign (Bosworth 1977: 173-4, *passim*). If the claims of Tiberius' long-standing enmity of Gallus are anachronistic to the situation in A.D. 14, then it is possible that they are derived from later rumours, which must have circulated in the

³⁵³ The limitations of such designations have been argued persuasively by Levick (1975a: 29-38).

period just after Gallus' long period of house arrest and death, which in turn entered the literary record of Tiberius' reign.³⁵⁴

3.1 **τά τε στρατεύματα, ... ὑπετόπει**: 'because he was ever wary of the armies, especially the Pannonian and German legions.' The idea that there was reason to be suspicious of potential unrest was flagged at 56.31.1, where Dio believed that Livia withheld the information of Augustus' death in fear that there might occur some sort of revolution (φοβηθεῖσα μὴ [...] νεωτερισθῇ τι). Historically, Tiberius' suspicion of the armies in Pannonia appears to have been well founded, and would have predated the death of Augustus. Tiberius had just arrived in Pannonia³⁵⁵ when he was diverted back to Nola upon hearing of Augustus' declining condition (56.31.1; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.123.1; Suet. *Aug.* 97.3; Tac. *Ann.* 1.5.3). The nature of Tiberius' mission is not known, but it is possible that it was connected with discontent among the soldiery over their prospective settlement plans after de-mobilisation (Móscy 1974: 39-40).

τὸν Γερμανικὸν ... ἐδεδίει: 'he stood in fear of Germanicus, who was in command over Germania and was well-liked by the soldiers'. τῆς τότε Γερμανίας ἄρχοντα is surely not to be understood as 'governor of Germania' (Cary, Loeb trans.). Had he wanted to do that, he would have almost certainly have written τὸν τῆς τότε Γερμανίας ἄρχοντα (cf. 55.28.6: Γαίου Σεντίου τοῦ τῆς Γερμανίας ἄρχοντος). It

³⁵⁴ Bosworth (1977: 186) proposes the histories of M. Servilius Nonianus as the possible source from which Dio and Tacitus derived their portrayals of Gallus as an opponent of Tiberius. Yet, as Bosworth himself maintains (wisely), any attempt at identification must remain tenuous.

³⁵⁵ Pannonia seems to be the Tiberius' likely destination, but the sources are not explicit. The Latin sources all use the general geographical distinction 'Illyricum'. Dio describes Tiberius' destination as Δελματία, hear apparently used in the sense not of the newly formed province of Dalmatia, but of the region of Illyricum, which comprised Pannonia and Dalmatia (Swan 2004: 305, cf. 235-6).

seems to me clear that Dio is simply describing the general geographical location of Germanicus' command along the left bank of the Rhine. For Dio's use of the word Γερμανία to denote the territory on Gallic side of the Rhine (which would come to form the provinces of *Germania superior* and *Germania inferior*) see Swan 2004: 253, 270; cf. Rich 1990: 142. Germanicus had been in overall command of the Rhine legions from late A.D. 13 (Suet. *Calig.* 8.3).³⁵⁶

That Tiberius feared Germanicus is a common feature to the accounts of Dio, Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.7.6; cf. Goodyear 1972: 140-1), and Suetonius (*Tib.* 25). Whatever its historical basis, it is likely that it entered the historical tradition early, and it may have first gained currency among the partisans of the elder Agrippina. In Dio, Germanicus appears as Tiberius' (unwitting) rival and object of Tiberius' fears: see 57.4.1; 57.6.2-5; 57.18.6-9; 57.19.1.

3.2 τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ ὄντας ... προκατέλαβεν: 'For he had earlier taken control of those [soldiers?] in Italy by means of the oaths instituted by Augustus.' It is not clear as to whether τοὺς ὄντας refers specifically to those soldiers stationed in Italy, or to the population of Italy in general. Comparison with Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.7.2) suggests the latter: *Sex. Pompeius et Sex. Appuleius consules primi in uerba Tiberii Caesaris iurauere apudque eos Seius Strabo et C. Turranius, ille praetoriarum cohortium praefectus, hic annonae; mox senatus milesque et populus*. Note, however, the different emphasis of Tacitus and Dio. For Tacitus, the oaths are made without prompting from Tiberius, indicating his existing position within the state and the sycophancy of the Senate; for Dio, Tiberius is the instigator of the oaths, and he

³⁵⁶ Dio's silence on this point is due to the lacuna in M.

employs the oaths in order to secure his position. **τοῖς ὅρκοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Αὐγούστου καταδειχθείσι**: ‘the oaths instituted by Augustus’. Presumably Dio is referring to the oaths sworn by the whole of Italy in 32 B.C. in the lead up to the war against Antony (*RGDA* 25; cf. Timpe 1962: 38-9; Brunt and Moore 1973: 67-8; Cooley 2009: 215-16; Kearsley 2013). It is possible, at least in the context of Dio’s narrative, that ὑπὸ τοῦ Αὐγούστου functions as a cross reference to his earlier narrative where the oath of 32 is described (50.6.6), yet if this were so, we might expect Dio to have written something more explicit: e.g. τοῖς ὅρκοις τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Αὐγούστου. Campbell (1984: 27) suggests that that Dio might have had another, specifically military oath in mind that Augustus had administered (cf. *RGDA* 3). If the oaths of A.D. 14 were the similar to those of 32 B.C., we may assume that there were separate oaths for the civilian population and military forces stationed in Italy (Campbell 1984: 26-7).

The content of the oaths taken in Italy in A.D. 14 is not known. Moreover, it cannot be known whether the oaths in Italy (and elsewhere in the empire) were made spontaneously upon hearing of the death of Augustus (i.e. on an *ad hoc* basis),³⁵⁷ or if news of the emperor’s death was accompanied by instructions from Tiberius requesting an oath conforming to a specific formula.³⁵⁸ The extant oath from Cyprus may offer some clues, in so far as it combines both local elements (e.g. invocation of local deities) and what may be termed standard imperial elements: such as professions of loyalty to Tiberius and his house; and formulaic vows to obey the emperor ‘on land

³⁵⁷ Thus Millar (1963: 328): ‘The oath of A.D. 14, one may suspect, an *ad hoc* formula devised in self protection by the occupants of the most prominent, and exposed, positions in the state.’

³⁵⁸ Such a method may have precedent. Kearsley 2013: 832-3, suggests that the oath of allegiance of 32 B.C. was orchestrated by sending the particular formula to the legions in sealed letters (sc. App. *BC* 5.131[544]), which were to be opened at a specific time.

and sea' (κατά τε γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν). For the text of the Cypriot oath, see Mitford 1960 = *SEG* 18 (1962) no. 578.

ἰδιωτεύων σωθῆναι: Dio's explanation here of Tiberius' motives has been generally regarded as weak (e.g. Syme 1958: 689; Levick 1976: 71). Certainly, from a strictly historical perspective, these criticisms of Dio are sound. However, in the context of Dio's developing portrayal of Tiberius and his understanding of psychology, they have some merit. Dio's Tiberius is first and foremost a safe politician. This aspect of his portrayal begins long before Book 57. It was out of his fear of Gaius and Lucius Caesar's anger that Tiberius sought safety in the guise of a private citizen during his retirement to Rhodes (55.9.5-6).³⁵⁹ For this aspect of Dio's portrayal of Tiberius, see *Chapter 2: Dio on Tiberius* (above).

ἄρρωστεῖν προσεποιεῖτο: Feigning illness was a characteristic of Theophrastus' 'Ironical Man' (*Char.* 1.4), and as we have already seen with Dio's account of Tiberius' *recusatio* (57.2.4), is a motif in Dio's/Xiphilinus' portrayal of Tiberius (cf. 58.4.9), as it was for Suetonius (*Tib.* 25.3).

57.3.3-5: *The Causes of Tiberius' Delay*. As noted long ago by Schwartz (*RE* 3 col. 1715 = Cassius 40; cf. Jaeger 1910: 20-1), the content of 57.3.3-4 is almost identical to Tac. *Ann.* 1.7. Both Dio and Tacitus provide a list of causes for Tiberius' behaviour at the outset of his reign, and we must deduce either Dio's use of Tacitus or a common source. Yet, even if we suspect Dio lifted the basic form of his analysis from

³⁵⁹ Dio's original narrative of Tiberius' retirement to Rhodes is lost: the reconstruction is a confection of Xiphilinus, Zonaras, and the *EVV*. For the reconstruction of the passage see Boissevain 2.487-489.

his source, Dio's comments here bear his individual authorial stamp. Dio's remarks, unlike Tacitus', are presented as a first person interjection (his first of Book 57), culminating in a clarification of his position (57.3.5). Dio's interaction with his material shows himself to be very much in the persona of the critical historian, reporting a range of views, while delivering his own judgement. We might also detect something of Dio's intellectual debt to Thucydides in these passages. The notion of several coexisting causes (although with some being more important than others) is found throughout Thucydides (most notably 1.23.5-6, but also 1.11.1, 6.15.2, etc.).

3.3 ἤδη μὲν γὰρ ἤκουσα ὅτι: 'For I have even heard that...' It is possible that Dio is commenting on the fact that these reports were still being discussed in his own day. The idea that the actions and behaviour of earlier emperors was the topic of debate among Dio's (senatorial?) peers in the early third century is an appealing one. Yet it seems equally plausible that Dio's choice of verb (ἤκουσα) is referring to those reports he found written in his literary sources, rather than oral hearsay, given the aural experience of reading in the Roman world. That verbs of hearing could introduce evidence drawn from reading or from the interrogation of witnesses, see Polyb. 12.27.3 (cf. Walbank *HCP* 2.409; Marincola 1997: 72).

ἐπειδὴ ἡ Λιουία ... ἐλέγετο: 'Since Livia was said to have secured the empire for him contrary to Augustus' wishes'. For the repetition of this idea, see note below 57.12.3 (καὶ τὸν Τιβέριον αὐτὴ [sc. Livia] αὐτοκράτορα πεποιηκέναι ἔλεγε). However, it is important to note that Dio does not specifically endorse or refute the authenticity of these claims at this point. Indeed, it is difficult to appreciate the degree to which Dio believed Livia was responsible for Tiberius' adoption: the only evidence

comes from a confused passage of Zonaras (55.13.1a-2 = Zonar. 10.36 [Dindorf II p. 449]), where Zonaras notes that Augustus' decision to adopt Tiberius was made in part due 'to circumstances' and in part because 'Julia' (surely an error) persuaded Augustus (cf. Swan 2004: 141). That Livia stage-managed Tiberius' adoption and accession seems to have entered the anti-Tiberian tradition early on, and it is found in Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.7.7; 4.57.3), Pliny (*Pan.* 7.4), and elsewhere. Similar rumours underpin Dio's portrayal of the younger Agrippina (61.7.3; cf. 62(61).13.2 [Xiph.]; 62(61).14.1 [Xiph.]), who Dio says reminded Nero that it was she who made him emperor ("ἐγὼ σε αὐτοκράτορα ἀπέδειξα").

αὐτῇ ἡχθετο: Tiberius' alleged hatred of Livia is a prominent feature of Suetonius' account (Suet. *Tib.* 50.2-51.1-2), but here it appears as little more than a parenthetical comment. The theme of discordant relationships between imperial mothers and their sons was something that Dio would play with elsewhere in the *Roman History*: Julia Domna is described as having hated her son Caracalla (79(78).23.1; 79(78).24.1), and Nero's plans to destroy his mother Agrippina is one of the great set-pieces of the history (62(61).11.2-13.5 [Xiph., Zonar., EVV]).

ἀλλὰ παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς ... εἰληφέναι: 'but wanted to make it appear that he was compelled to accept it by the Senate, on account of excelling them in virtue.' Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.7.7: *dabat et famae ut uocatus electusque potius a re publica uideretur quam per uxorium ambitum et senili adoptione inrepsisse*. However, in the case of Tiberius there is an additional twist in Dio's account (with plays on the theme of Tiberius' dissimulation), in so far as Tiberius seemingly believes himself to be the best man and

wants to be offered the position by the Senate, but refuses it when the Senate offer it to him.

The idea that the *princeps* owed his position to the consensus of the senate, acknowledging him to be the *optimus uir*, is an idea central to several important modern attempts to understand the ideological foundations of the Principate (cf. Wirszubski 1950: 153-4; Ando 2000: 146-8; Lobur 2008: 12-36). Dio himself appears to have subscribed to the ideal that an emperor should be chosen on account of his personal qualities or virtues (cf. 69.20.1-5 [Xiph.], with Davenport and Mallan 2014: 640-50). However, Dio had enough historical insight and ingrained cynicism to realise that such a system, which ensured the succession of the best man, never existed beyond the confines of abstract political theory. The imperial succession, as he knew well, depended almost entirely on dynastic considerations, personal favouritism, or the possession of military might and wealth. Displays of senatorial consensus were all about constitutional appearances, rather than realities of power under the Principate. Dio's experiences as a participant in similar shows of unanimous senatorial support for such unworthy candidates as Didius Julianus, Macrinus, and Elagabalus, would only have confirmed this view.

3.4 τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὁρῶν ... ἐγένετο: 'seeing that other men were hostile towards himself, he began to delay and prevaricate, so that they might not launch their revolutionary designs in the hope that he might voluntarily abandon the command, until such a time as he established his mastery throughout the whole empire'. Tac. *Ann.* 1.7.7: *postea cognitum est ad introspiciendas etiam proceram uoluntates inductam dubitationem: nam uerba uultus in crimen detorquens recondebat*. Again

some contact with the Tacitean tradition is discernible, but the nature of the connection is unclear (cf. Goodyear 1972: 142). The identities of these hostile men known to Dio's source cannot be recovered.

3.5 οὐ μέντοι καὶ ... στρατιωτῶν: 'Of course, I do not record these things being so much the causes of the delay, as that was due more to the combination of his customary habit of thought and the disorder among the soldiery.' **αἷτια τῆς διαγωγῆς ταύτης:** 'the causes of his delay'. **διαγωγή,** an unusual word in Dio (appearing at 48.5.1, 48.51.2; 73(72).23.4 [Xiph.]) and only here in the sense of 'delay' (cf. *LSJ* s.v. διαγωγή II.3). **ἐπιτήδευσιν:** 'habit' cf. 57.1.4.

Dio concludes his discussion of causes with a final first person statement, this time in the present tense. The voice is unmistakably Dio's and there are direct parallels elsewhere in the history, e.g. 38.15.5; 49.4.4, etc.

τὸν μὲν γὰρ Ἀγρίππαν ... ἀπέκτεινε: 'For he had Agrippa murdered forthwith, having sent someone from Nola'. The murder of Agrippa Postumus, the son of Augustus' daughter Julia and M. Vipsanius Agrippa, has been a topic congenial to historians and would-be conspiracy theorists alike. To argue whether Dio was right or wrong in his belief that Tiberius was responsible for Agrippa's murder would be quixotic, and will not be attempted here. For a range of views and studies, see Allen 1947; Lewis 1970; Bellemore 2000.

Dio's account of the 'first crime of the new Principate' is a model of clarity in comparison to Tacitus' convoluted, and much studied account (*Ann.* 1.6, for the

analysis of which see Woodman 1995). Dio reduces Agrippa's assassination to the essentials: Tiberius immediately (παροχρήμα) sends an assassin to eliminate a potential rival. The speed with which he acts further highlights his delay in accepting the Principate. There is thus a narrowness of focus in Dio's account, designed to illustrate Tiberius' *modus operandi* (hence there is no doubt that Tiberius had Agrippa murdered). The identities of participants, aside from Tiberius and Agrippa, are not revealed. If we wonder why there is no mention of Sallustius Crispus, a figure so prominent in the Tacitean version, the answer is surely because Dio had no need to introduce him (he is not mentioned anywhere in the *Roman History*). Moreover, Dio draws attention to the swiftness of Tiberius' actions. Just as with his decision to send letters to the armies and the provinces, so Tiberius sends his assassin to kill Agrippa, while at still at Nola (cf. 57.2.1), emphasizing the contrast with his delay in accepting the Principate.

λογοποιεῖν: 'to invent stories'. As implied by Lewis' reading of Dio (Lewis 1970: 167) λογοποιεῖν is here used with the sense of inventing stories, *contrary to fact*, rather than simply writing stories.

III. DIO ON THE PANNONIAN AND GERMAN MUTINIES

Dio's narrative of the mutinies of A.D. 14 is clearly defined by its structural artificiality. As in Tacitus' narratives of the mutinies of the Roman armies in Pannonia and on the Rhine, Dio organises his account with the intention of presenting

a clear narrative symmetry between the two mutinies.³⁶⁰ This is demonstrated in the table below.

Pannonia	Germania
Soldiers come together (συνελθόντες) and revolt upon hearing news of Augustus' death. (57.4.1)	The soldiers, having been gathered together (ἡθροισμένοι), revolt. (57.5.1)
Threat to the life of Junius Blaesus and his slaves. (57.4.2)	Threat to the life of Germanicus (57.5.2)
Revolt temporarily suppressed by Blaesus. (57.4.3)	Revolt temporarily suppressed by Germanicus. (57.5.3)
Arrival of troops from Rome. (57.4.4)	Arrival of delegation from Rome. (57.5.4)
Revolt flares up again and members of Drusus' party are threatened. (57.4.4)	Revolt flares up again, and members of the delegation are threatened, Agrippina and Gaius are seized. (57.5.5-6).
Lunar eclipse and the great storm. (57.4.4-5)	'Passage of time' (57.5.7)
Boldest men (θρασύτατοι) executed by either Drusus or his followers. (57.4.6)	Boldest men (θρασύτατοι) executed by the soldiers. (57.5.7)
Soldiers have a change of heart and turn over the ringleaders for punishment. (57.4.5)	Soldiers try and condemn ringleaders. (57.5.7)

³⁶⁰ For an illustration of this (same) pattern as it appears in the Tacitean narrative, see Woodman 2006: 305-7; cf. Ross 1973: 211.

Dio's decision to follow, or better replicate, this artificial structure is highly suggestive of a common source tradition behind the accounts of the mutinies found in Dio and Tacitus.³⁶¹ The differences between the versions of the two consular historians, which have perhaps been over-emphasised by those who see Dio and Tacitus as following different traditions, may be the result of authorial invention or the insertion of material from a supplementary source. Although the character of this putative common source is irretrievable, it seems at least likely that it was closer in length to Tacitus' version than to Dio's, given the additional details found in Tacitus. Hence, we may assume that Dio compressed his source into two chapters (57.4-6.1). A third chapter (57.6.2-6) dealing with Tiberius' (mis)understanding of Germanicus' motivations is likely to be predominantly Dio's own analysis, and serves to connect the narrative of the mutinies with his overarching discussion of Tiberius' nature and its bearing on his political *modus operandi* at the time of his accession.

Dio's compression and reworking of the mutiny narratives was justified on historical and narrative grounds. Like Dio's accounts of the meetings of the senate, his account of the mutinies is stripped largely of dramatic elaboration. By avoiding the sort of prolixity that characterises Tacitus' account, Dio is able to contain the revolt narratives inside the broader narrative arc of Tiberius' refusal of the Principate.³⁶² Moreover, there was little need for Dio to develop his narrative of the mutinies into great set-pieces as Tacitus did in Book 1 of the *Annals*. Dio had already portrayed at

³⁶¹ As always, the source question is problematic and divisive. I am convinced by the arguments, which maintain a source connection between Tacitus and Dio, on account of the similarities of specific details and adherence to the same parallel structure of not just the Rhine mutiny, but of the two mutinies (cf. Malloch 2004: *passim*; Pelling 1993: 66 n. 15). For the opposite view, see Hurley 1989: *passim*; Marsh 1931: 267-71.

³⁶² Tacitus, of course, divorces the mutinies from his narrative of the accession by the sharp division between internal affairs and external affairs at *Ann.* 1.16.1.

least one set-piece mutiny narrative, replete with a rousing speech, in his narrative of Caesar's suppression the mutiny at Placentia,³⁶³ and it is unlikely that he would have felt the need to present another at this point.³⁶⁴ Yet compression does not preclude artistry, and the brevity of Dio's accounts of the mutinies emphasises the points of symmetry between his portrayals of the two narratives, and draws out effectively some of the greater political and narrative themes of both Book 57 and the *Roman History*.

The parallelism and symmetry of Dio's two narratives, as indicated in the above table, emphasise the few points of *asymmetry*, which in turn prompts the reader to consider the differences between the two mutinies. For example, the soldiers in Pannonia planned to appoint a new emperor only if their demands were not met by Tiberius, but in Germania, Germanicus is proclaimed emperor by the troops because they recognised him to be *capax imperii*. In both narratives the ultimate quelling of the mutiny is brought about by the soldiers themselves. In the case of the Pannonian legions this change was brought about by a multiplicity of external forces – the lunar eclipse, the 'great storm', the execution of the 'boldest spirits' – whereas the Rhine mutiny collapses due to the failure of the troops to achieve their aims after an indeterminate period of time (χρόνον δ' οὐν ποτε καὶ τότε, ὥς οὐδὲν ἐπέβαινον, ἡσύχασαν).

³⁶³ For Dio's narrative of the revolt at Placentia, see Fulkerson 2013: 175-6; cf. van Stekelenburg 1976: 53-7.

³⁶⁴ From the traces of direct speech preserved by Zonaras (Zonar. 9.10 [Dindorf 2. 279-80]), it is likely that Dio included a speech in his narrative of Scipio Africanus' suppression of the mutiny at New Carthage in 206 B.C.: for discussion, see Simons 2009: 217-18; Fulkerson 2013: 169-74.

The process of compression was certainly one of the reasons why Dio omits the identities of all but the most important players. Hence in his accounts of the mutinies, Dio identifies only Tiberius, Germanicus, Drusus, Gaius Caligula, Agrippina, and the Pannonian commander Junius Blaesus by name. Yet with the exception of Germanicus, and to a lesser extent Tiberius, these named characters receive little by way of characterisation. Conversely, while Dio does not identify any of the mutineers by name, it is arguably the army as a collective group that receives the greatest degree of direct characterisation through the narratives of the revolt.

Dio's view of the army throughout the *Roman History* is remarkably consistent, and generally pejorative (cf. De Blois 1997a: 2667; Ash 1999: 21; Kuhn-Chen 2002: 167-8). In the narratives of the Pannonian and Rhine mutinies, the army is portrayed as greedy, but also dangerously changeable. In both narratives the soldiers vacillate between order and disorder and are resistant to moderate coercion. This characterisation is developed in typical Dionian fashion through the soldiers' interactions with members of the senatorial elite and imperial family, and by their reactions to external forces, be they acts of men (e.g. Drusus, Germanicus) or natural phenomena (e.g. the eclipse, the great storm).

The comparison with Tacitus' account of the mutineers' demands reveals how Dio could rework what was essentially the same data. Tacitus, like Dio, saw the revolt as springing ultimately from the soldiers' greed (*Ann.* 1.16.1-2). However, Tacitus then re-focalises his narrative through the character of Percennius, one of the ringleaders of the mutiny, whom he gives a speech (in *oratio obliqua*), which provides a description of the soldiers' miserable living conditions. The result is a juxtaposition of ideas: the

moralizing judgement of the historian opposed to the persuasive argument of the mutineer. The character of the speaker may be unsympathetic (cf. *Ann.* 1.16.3), but his speech is nevertheless persuasive, both within the context of the narrative and even for the reader. Percennius' eloquence and the emotive description of the wretched and withered veterans (*Ann.* 1.18.1), by providing additional context for the mutiny, forces the reader to wonder if perhaps the soldiers have a legitimate cause for complaint. In the case of Dio, by removing individual personalities and indeed context from his presentation of the narrative, the soldiers' actions appear less as a reaction to a specific set of circumstances than as an example of characteristic behaviour brought about by the death of an emperor. Hence, by embedding the narrative of the mutinies in the context of Tiberius' delay in accepting the Principate, Dio was able to explore one of the *arcana imperii*, namely the very real potential for the military to make and dispose emperors. That Dio should choose to explore this in the narrative of the first post-Augustan emperor establishes what would become a familiar pattern in imperial history. To this end, Dio furnishes the soldiers with a set of generalised motivations which will recur elsewhere in his imperial narrative, in particular the motivation to promote a contender for the throne who would best serve their own avaricious desires.³⁶⁵

On a deeper level, Dio constructs his narrative not only around parallels, but by introducing a series of binary relationships. Some of these are minor, yet important for the purposes of characterisation. The soldiers' treatment of Blaesus, Drusus, and Germanicus and his family functions as a way of emphasising the extreme disobedience of the soldiery, and with the exception of Germanicus, does little to

³⁶⁵ See examples listed at 57.4.3 (sc. ἢ αὐτὸν ἐκφοβήσαντες ἢ καὶ ἄλλω τινὶ τὸ κράτος δόντες).

develop the characterisation of these named individuals. Given the attention Dio gives to the characterisation of Germanicus, we would expect to find a Drusus-Germanicus binary, but curiously this one is barely noticeable in Dio's account, especially in contrast with the narratives of Tacitus and even Velleius.³⁶⁶

Most important of all, Dio's profile of Germanicus feeds into a Tiberius-Germanicus binary. This binary serves to develop the characterisation of both Germanicus and Tiberius in several interesting ways. Superficial similarities of circumstances are used to draw out differences of motivation. Both Tiberius and his nephew are offered the Principate, one by the senate, the other by the army, and both make a show of refusing it. In the case of Tiberius, his decision was made on the grounds of personal safety, whereas for Germanicus it is implied that he refused it for less selfish reasons. Dio does not use this necessarily as a point of criticism of Tiberius, but rather as a part of his more general exploration of motivation. Germanicus' refusal becomes paradigmatic for other potential imperial contenders who found themselves proclaimed emperor by the military. If this reading is correct, then we may see Dio establishing Germanicus as a positive *exemplum*, like Verginius Rufus, of an individual who refused the acclamation of his soldiers to become emperor. Tiberius too emerges as a paradigmatic figure. The resulting image is not as unambiguously positive as Germanicus, but Dio is nevertheless able to use the narratives of the mutiny to reinforce his image of Tiberius as a 'safe emperor', while also critiquing the effectiveness of Tiberius' policy of dissimulation.

³⁶⁶ Ross (1973: 211) speaking of the Tacitus' account: 'Obviously the two accounts are paratactic, and obviously the central focus for the contrast will be the figures of the two 'sons' of Tiberius.'

4.1 **τοῦτον μὲν ... ἐφοβείτο**: ‘So this man [sc. Agrippa Postumus] he removed at once, but he still remained in great fear of Germanicus’. Again Dio emphasises Tiberius’ (great) fear of Germanicus (τὸν δὲ δὴ Γερμανικὸν δεινῶς ἐφοβείτο), establishing it as one of the central themes of his portrayal of Tiberius in Book 57 (cf. 57.3.1, 57.6.2, 57.13.6; 57.19.1 [Xiph.]). The pairing with Agrippa Postumus indicates that Dio saw Germanicus and Postumus as potential rivals to the Principate, and his focus is directed to how Tiberius attempted to neutralize the potential threat posed by these two grandsons of Augustus. However, the sentence functions somewhat awkwardly as a segue into his narrative of the legionary mutiny in Pannonia, and serves more to anticipate the mutiny in Lower Germany and the role of Germanicus in the ensuing narrative (57.5-6).

οἱ ἐν τῇ Παννονίᾳ στρατιῶται: It is known from Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.23.6; 1.30.4) that the three legions stationed in the then newly-formed province of Pannonia and which participated in the mutiny were the *VIII Augusta*, *IX Hispana*, and *XV Apollinaris*. That Dio should choose not to identify these legions is hardly surprising. With the exception of his register of the legions at 55.23-25, Dio rarely identifies individual legions, preferring instead to identify them by their geographical location. Hence, above (57.3.1) Dio speaks of the ‘Pannonian and German <legions>’ (τὰ Παννονικὰ καὶ τὰ Γερμανικὰ).³⁶⁷ We may suspect that such a decision was one as much of ease of composition as it was of style. Where Dio does provide his list of legions, his aim is to describe their deployment in the early third century, perhaps with a view to providing details of the greatest utility for his immediate readership (cf. Swan 2004: 159), much in the same way as Ptolemy’s descriptions of legionary deployment in his

³⁶⁷ Cf. 80(79).4.6 where Dio calls the *legio II Parthica*, the ‘Alban legion’.

Geography, or Appian's proposed summary of the military forces which was to conclude his history (App. *Praef.* 15[61]), supplied such a need for the second century. For Dio's register of the legions see Swan 2004: 158-68. For a survey of the recent scholarship on the three legions involved in the Pannonian mutiny, see Wilkes 2002: 532-3.

ἐπειδὴ τάχιστα ... ἥσθοντο: 'revolted just as soon as they had heard of the death of Augustus'. We may detect a current of subtle irony in Dio's narrative. According to Dio (56.31.1), Livia had suppressed knowledge of Augustus' death until Tiberius could be on the spot, lest some uprising occur. Tiberius accordingly sent letters to the provinces to tell them of Augustus' demise and to secure his position. However, the reading of the letter results in the opposite reaction to the one hoped for by the sender. For this *topos*, see Rosenmeyer 2001: 143.

συνελθόντες ἐς ἓν τεῖχος: 'Gathered together in the one camp'. Dio's choice of verb (συνελθόντες) suggests that the soldiers came together on their own accord. Dio is likely drawing a contrast with his description of the legions Lower Germany, who had been 'gathered together on account of the war' (διὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἡθροισμένοι) (see below 57.5.1). According to Tacitus, the three Pannonian legions had been quartered together for the duration of the summer of A.D. 14 (Tac. *Ann.* 1.16.2). The two accounts are not of course mutually exclusive, but if Tacitus is right, then it does indicate a degree of deliberate vagueness on Dio's part. However, we should perhaps question our assumption that Tacitus (or his source) got this right in the first place. The massed summer camps (*aestivae*) only seem to have been used if there was a campaign, and there is no evidence of a campaign in Pannonia in 13/14. Moreover, if

we think of Pannonia in the context of A.D. 14 – a province newly established and just recovering from the Great Revolt – it is hard to see the value in massing all of the legions in one place for the summer. Hence, it is possible that Dio is correct in his description of the soldiers coming together.

Be this as it may, as discussed above, the site where the three Pannonian legions revolted is unknown, and it is a detail that appears to have disappeared (if it was ever known) from the historiographical tradition at an early date. It is likely that the reason for this is because the site of the camp never became an identifiable location. Tacitus indicates that following the suppression of the revolt the camp was regarded as polluted by the soldiers and was subsequently abandoned (*Ann.* 1.30.3). Moreover, it is likely that the location of the camp will continue to elude precise identification, as summer camps, unlike the soldiers' more permanent winter quarters, were largely made up of temporary wigwam-like structures, and would not have left a trace in the archaeological record (cf. Hanel 2007: 407-10).

The point that interested Dio was the coming together (συνελθόντες) of the Pannonian armies and the effect of this on military discipline. The concentration of troops in one location was, according to Dio, a catalyst for mutinous behaviour. Dio was not the first to draw such a conclusion: the idea is implicit in Xenophon (*Anab.* 5.7.3) who makes a point of ensuring that his potentially disgruntled soldiers did not band together on their own initiative when faced with a potentially mutinous situation. Indeed, the idea seems to have been picked up by later Roman military thinkers, and it appears again in Vegetius' handbook on military science (*Veg. Epit.* 3.4.1). Yet it is an idea that informed Dio's understanding of historical motivation and causation.

During his narrative of the Pannonian Revolt, Dio reports that Tiberius broke up his army into separate divisions, fearing that they would revolt if they stayed together (56.12.2). Towards the end of his work, Dio reports an outbreak of disorder over Macrinus' partial repeal of Caracalla's plan to increase legionary pay. This disorder, in Dio's view, was being brought about by the fact that the news was announced when the troops were concentrated in their summer army camps (79(78).29.1-2). Cf. 49.13.1 (the revolt of Octavian's soldiers in Sicily).

4.2 **τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα ... ἐπεχείρησαν:** 'For amongst their various acts, they even intended to kill their commander, Junius Blaesus'. Compare Dio's description of the death of the equestrian governor of Mesopotamia, Flavius Heracleo, following a mutiny during the reign of Alexander Severus (80.4.2): *τολμήσαι τοὺς ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ τὸν ἄρχοντα σφῶν Φλάουιον Ἡρακλέωνα ἀποκτείνειν*. In both instances Dio characterizes soldiers according to the manner in which they treated their commanders. Here Blaesus' sole role in the narrative is as the victim of the soldiers' actions. Dio has no interest in offering a critique of Blaesus' command as is found in Tacitus' account of the revolt.³⁶⁸

Ἰούνιον Βλαῖσον: Q. Iunius Blaesus (*PIR*² I 738; cf. Syme 1986: 302-4 with Table XXIII; Birley 2007: 124-5). Blaesus, *consul suffectus* in A.D. 10 (*EJ² Fasti* p. 40). The date he took up his command in Pannonia (as *legatus Augusti pro praetore*), is unknown but was likely to have been before 14 (cf. Marsh 1926: 239). Blaesus was also the maternal uncle of Sejanus, however Dio, unlike Tacitus, leaves Blaesus'

³⁶⁸ Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.16.3) apports at least some of the responsibility of the outbreak of the mutiny to Blaesus' decision to allow the soldiers rest from their usual duties upon hearing the news of Augustus' death.

familial connections unrecorded, at least in the extant portions of Book 57. Indeed, Blaesus appears only here in the extant portions of the *Roman History*, although it seems likely that Dio would have included the honours granted to him following his military actions against the North African rebel leader Tacfarinas in A.D. 22 while proconsul of Africa (cf. Vell. Pat. 2.125.5; Tac. *Ann.* 3.74).

τούς τε δούλους αὐτοῦ συλλαβόντες ἐβασάνισαν: ‘arrested and tortured his slaves’. Blaesus was believed to have had a group of gladiators amongst his slaves whom he employed to brutalise the soldiers under his command. Tacitus records this event as occurring after the mutiny was revived by the arrival of a detachment from Nauportus. In Tacitus’ account (*Ann.* 1.22-3), Blaesus’ slaves were arrested following the spurious accusation made by one of the mutineers that his ‘brother’ had been murdered by Blaesus’ gladiators. However, beyond recording the arrest and torture of the slaves, Dio has nothing to say about the event. Dio’s sole concern is for showing how soldiers’ actions were broadly illustrative of their insolent behaviour, rather than documenting the specific details of their crimes.

τό τε σύμπαν ... ἡξίου: ‘In general they wanted their military service not to exceed sixteen years and to receive a drachma every day, and they were expecting to receive these prizes then and there in the camp.’ Under the year 13 B.C., Dio records Augustus capping the length of service at sixteen years (54.25.6), but this policy fell into abeyance in the intervening period and it was increased in A.D. 5 to twenty years for soldiers not in the Praetorian Guard (55.23.1).³⁶⁹ For these changes, see Keppie

³⁶⁹ For a point of comparison, the standard period of service for an enlisted man in the British Army for the period 1815-1847, was twenty-one years. From 1847, the period was reduced to

1984: 147-8; Keppie 2000: 52-3; cf. Smith 1958: 70-4. In practice, military service was often longer: a group of military diplomas pertaining to soldiers from *legio VII*, found in Naronia (mod. Croatia) from c. A.D. 14, indicates that some soldiers served in excess of 25 years (Keppie 2000: 54-5; Keppie 2003: 36-7). **δραχμήν**: For Dio's equation of one *drachma* with one *denarius*, see Swan 2004: 382-3. Dio's report of the soldiers' demands may be corroborated with Tacitus' parallel account (*Ann.* 1.17.5). Ultimately, there was no increase in the pay of a standard legionary soldier, which was unchanged in the period between Julius Caesar and Domitian at HS 900 (= 225 *denarii*/drachmas) *per annum* (Speidel 1992: 88). For discussion of the pay of soldiers during the Principate, see Speidel 1992; Alston 1994; cf. Watson 1969: 89-99; Herz 2007: 308-13.

In what is otherwise a highly abbreviated account of the mutiny, such details might have been easily omitted – as indeed they were by Suetonius (*Tib.* 25.2; cf. *Cal.* 1.1) and Velleius (2.125.2). The soldiers' demands touched on two issues of particular interest for Dio. That legionary service should be capped at a fixed number of years was a topic Dio felt important enough to raise in the speech of Maecenas (52.27.2), and it appears in his Augustan narrative (54.25.6, 55.23.1), and again in his account of the mutiny of the German legions (below 57.5.3 and 57.6.5). Likewise, the issue of legionary pay was a particularly sensitive one for Dio. Perhaps no single source provides as much information on legionary pay and the granting of donatives during the Principate as Dio. Moreover, Dio appears to have made a considerable effort to record these details accurately (e.g. 67.3.5 [Zonar.]; 74(73).5.4 [Xiph.]; 74(73).8.3-4 [Xiph.]). Dio's concern to report on these matters may be traced (as with so many

twelve years active service, and from 1870 a soldier was to serve six years active service and six with the reserves. For brief summary of these figures, see Ensor 1937: 13.

aspects of Dio's political views) to his negative reaction to the political attitudes of the Severan age, which saw a series of attempts to increase or control military spending. The problems associated with this increase in military expenditure were not, in Dio's mind, simply fiscal. Rather, Dio believed that the increase in pay to the military was the primary cause of the disintegration of military discipline following the death of Septimius Severus (79(78).3.4; 80(80).4.1-2 [Xiph.]; cf. 75(74).2.3-4 [Xiph.]; 77(76).15.2 [Xiph.]). Dio's comment that the soldiers wanted to receive their awards 'then and there in the camp' (εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ) feeds into his generally pejorative characterisation of the nature of the army, as being naturally given to rashness, greed, and ill-discipline (Kuhn-Chen 2002: 224-6).

τό τε ἔθνος ἀποστήσειν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἐλάσειν: 'to incite the province to revolt and to march on Rome.' These details are unique to Dio's account, and there is no trace of such plans in Tacitus' extensive narrative of the revolt with the exception that the soldiers planned to profit from civil conflict (*Ann.* 1.16.1). Tacitus' silence does not preclude the veracity of Dio's claim. Velleius (2.125.2) indicates that the soldiers made threats to the senate and the emperor, and there is nothing implausible in the soldiers' threats as Dio records them. The great Pannonian revolt had only recently been subdued, and it is easy to see how the threat of a further revolt might have been used to gain political leverage at Rome.

4.3 τῇ μεταβολῇ τῆς ἀρχῆς: 'the change of government'. Dio's is likely to be thinking along the same lines as Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.16.1): *nullis nouis causis nisi quod mutatus princeps licentiam turbarum et ex ciuili bello spem praemiorum ostendebat*. In Dio's political world-view, change (μεταβολή) always represented the potential

for conflict and disorder (cf. F 12.3^a [ES]). Dio's language at this point picks up the language he uses at 56.45.2 to describe the political change Tiberius' accession brought to the Augustan system (τὴν μεταβολὴν τῆς καταστάσεως). That the soldiers attempted to push through their demands upon the accession of a new emperor would become a feature of the later Principate.

ὅσα ἐπεθύμουν: 'as much as their hearts desired'. Here again we see Dio (with economy of expression) grafting onto the soldiers something of a standard psychological profile of being naturally inclined to greed. Note Dio's use of the same phraseology (sc. ὅσα ἐπεθύμουν) to describe the reasons behind the soldiers' mutiny at Placentia (41.26.1).

ἢ αὐτὸν ἐκφοβήσαντες ἢ καὶ ἄλλῳ τινὶ τὸ κράτος δόντες: 'either by frightening him or even by giving the power to another.' Again, Dio is perhaps looking ahead to the later Principate, where the army made and deposed emperors according to whether they acceded to their demands. This is the rationale Dio gives to the soldiers who aspired to make Verginius Rufus (63.24 [Xiph]), then Vitellius emperor in A.D. 68-69 (63(64).4.1-2 [Xiph.]), and is at the heart of his accounts of the fall of Pertinax (74(73).8.1 [Xiph.]) and Macrinus (79(78).28.1). Note also Dio's comment at 46.46.6-7 concerning the attempt of the troops to frighten Septimius Severus into giving them a donative, with Millar's note (1964: 209). This is not to suggest that his comments are anachronistic to the context of A.D. 14, *per se*. Velleius comments that the soldiers in Pannonia and Germany aimed to revolutionize the state (2.125.1): *nouum ducem, nouum statum, nouam quaerebant rem publicam*. But Velleius' statement is perhaps too rhetorically stylized to be taken literally, and the extent to

which the Pannonian mutiny had a political dimension is a matter of some debate (cf. Wilkes 1963; Woodman 1977: 228-9).

4.4 τοῦ Δρούσου σὺν τοῖς δορυφόροις ἐπελθόντος: The composition of these two Praetorian cohorts is provided by Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.24). When these troops were dispatched from Rome has been the subject of controversy, hinging on a reading of Tacitus *Ann.* 1.14.3, which seems to indicate that Drusus was present at the meeting of the Senate on 17 September.³⁷⁰ However, du Toit (1980b) has shown that it would have been possible for Drusus to have attended the meeting of the Senate and arrived at the Pannonian camp on (or before) 26 September (the day before the eclipse). The striking feature in Dio's report of Drusus' Praetorian entourage is that he resists the opportunity to report the presence of L. Aelius Sejanus. Dio must have known about the presence of Sejanus in the group, but made the decision to delay his introduction into the narrative. Indeed, Dio withholds Sejanus from his narrative until 57.19.5 (see also note below at 57.14.9). Tacitus, we may suspect, introduced Sejanus at this point so as to signal his importance for the narrative to come, although he does not make his formal introduction until the beginning of *Annales* 4. Dio holds Sejanus back until just after the death of Germanicus as a way of demarcating the 'good' phase of Tiberius' rule, from the 'bad' phase.

τῆς δὲ δὴ σελήνης ἐκλιπούσης ἐνθυμηθέντες ἀπημβλύνθησαν: 'But, in fact, after an eclipse of the moon, the men pondered its significance and their keenness was dulled'. The eclipse may be dated securely to the early morning of 27 September

³⁷⁰ The problem hinges on the interpretation of Tacitus' expression *praesensque erat* (*Ann.* 1.14.3) Matthews (2010: 76) has argued that it need not mean that Drusus was present at the meeting of the Senate on 17 September.

(Schove 1984: 4-5). Dio's description of the soldiers here recalls that of Thucydides (7.50.4): ἡ σελήνη ἐκλείπει [...] καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οἳ τε πλείους ἐπισχεῖν ἐκέλευον τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἐνθύμιον ποιούμενοι [...]. In Dio, as in Thucydides, the eclipse resulted in a change of heart for the soldiers, although it is interesting that Dio seems to have eschewed the temptation to employ a stronger verbal allusion to Thucydides. Dio seems to have believed that those individuals or groups who possessed an excitable nature were more prone to becoming influenced by eclipses and other natural phenomena (64(65).11.1 [Xiph.]; cf. Zonar. 9.23 [= Dindorf 2.316-17]). Hence, Dio (via Xiphilinus) remarks with apparent surprise that the soldiers under Vitellius did not react to the onset of a sinister eclipse prior to the second battle of Cremona (64(65).11.2 [Xiph.]). For the commonplace that the army was susceptible to 'irrational forces', see Fulkerson 2013: 164.

Τιβέριον ἀποστεῖλαι: The dispatch of this second embassy is noted by Tacitus as well (*Ann.* 1.29); however, it is typical of Dio's treatment of the mutiny that the identities of the ambassadors are not disclosed. Moreover, Dio presents the decision to send the embassy as being one made entirely by the soldiers, and as a consequence of their more subdued condition following the eclipse.

κάν τούτῳ χειμῶνος μεγάλου γενομένου: 'at this point a great storm broke out'. Dio seemingly compresses what was, at least according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.30), a series of storms and the onset of an early winter, into a single great storm. By doing so, Dio gives the onset of the storm a portentous feel, the appropriate counterpart to the lunar eclipse.

4.5 οἱ τε θρασύτατοι ... ἐφθάρησαν: ‘the boldest of the soldiers (having been summoned as though were for some other reason) were put to death either by Drusus and in his own tent or by those who had accompanied him, some killed in one way and some in another’. θρασύτατοι: ‘the boldest’, a description always used pejoratively by Dio to describe the fomenters of civil or military discord. The execution of the ‘boldest men’ (θρασύτατοι), who, it may be added, were not necessarily those responsible for the disturbance (see next note), appears to have been for Dio the standard (and most effective) response for quelling a mutiny, as exemplified by Caesar’s actions at Placentia (41.35.5), and elsewhere in Dio’s history (e.g. Zonar. 9.10 [Dindorf 2.280]; 47.23.4; 57.5.7). Importantly, Dio is agnostic as to whether it was Drusus or one of his companions who gave the order for the execution of these men: what mattered was that the decision was made. Unlike Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.29) or Velleius (2.125.5), Dio does not use the execution of these bold spirits to illustrate the *severitas* (or *crudelitas*) of Drusus, and thus does not develop his characterisation of Drusus at this point. The rumour that soldiers were executed (and buried) in Drusus’ tent is found in the Tacitean version.

καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ... ἐκδοῦναι: ‘The remainder settled down, with the result that they even handed over for punishment some men on the grounds that they had been actually responsible for the sedition’. A detail found only in Dio: Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.30.1) records only the execution of the mutinous soldiers ‘by the centurions or soldiers of the praetorian cohorts’ (*a centurionibus aut praetoriarum cohortium militibus*). ὥστε καὶ ... καὶ: The repetition of καί (used in both instances adverbially) (cf. Denniston *GP*² 324) serves to emphasise the soldiers’ almost total *volte face*. Dio’s interest in the Pannonian mutiny is almost exclusively on what it

revealed about the character of the army. Here, as in his description of the German mutiny (see below 57.5.7), Dio draws attention to the fundamental capriciousness of the army. Dio's main point about the Pannonian mutiny was the swiftness of the army to change its course in the face of external forces, whether it be the onset of a lunar eclipse, or the execution of the 'boldest' of their number.

5.1 οἱ δὲ ἐν τῇ Γερμανίᾳ: Cf. 57.3.1 (above). As with the Pannonian legions, Dio speaks generally of the armies in 'Germania', and makes no attempt to discern which legions were involved. In A.D. 14 there were two German army groups stationed along the Rhine, which comprised some eight legions (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.31): *XXI Rapax*, *V Alauda*, *I Germanica*, *XX Valeria Victrix*, forming the lower army; *II Augusta*, *XIII Gemina*, *XIV Gemina*, and *XVI Gallica* in upper army. According to Tacitus, the revolt was confined to the armies in the lower army group, which was based in the territory of the Ubii (near modern day Cologne). For discussion of the site, see Wells 1972: 97, 134-6; Heinrichs 2010.

καὶ πολλοὶ διὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἡθροισμένοι: 'both because many had been brought together for the war'. For ἡθροισμένοι see note above at 57.4.1. **διὰ τὸν πόλεμον:** The comment serves as a point of contrast with the legions in Pannonia. Dio's reminds his readers of the ongoing struggle between the legions on the Rhine and the German tribes in the wake of the *clades Variana*, last mentioned at 56.25.3. Due to the lacunose state of Book 56 it is possible that Dio's account contained further descriptions of the war. The legions under Germanicus would appear to have won a victory in 13 or early 14 which resulted in the prince receiving the salutation of *imperator* by his soldiers (cf. Syme 1979: 317-20 = *RP* 3.1207-10).

τὸν Γερμανικὸν καὶ Καίσαρα καὶ πολὺ τοῦ Τιβερίου κρείττω ὁρῶντες ὄντα:

‘and seeing that Germanicus was at once both a Caesar and in a far stronger position than Tiberius’. **Καίσαρα:** Germanicus was, like Tiberius, a ‘Caesar’ following his adoption by Tiberius in A.D. 4. Dio’s point that the soldiers were drawn to supporting Germanicus, in part on account of his membership to the *domus Caesaris*, is genuine historical insight, and it anticipates the Praetorians’ acclamation of Claudius (60.1.3 [Xiph.]). **κρείττω:** The sense seems to be ‘stronger’, with reference to Germanicus’ military strength on the Rhine, rather than ‘superior’, which might suggest Germanicus’ moral superiority as an individual. The ambiguity may even be deliberate: in the same way as Alexander’s reputed desire to leave his empire τῷ κρατίστῳ (e.g. Arr. *Anab.* 7.26.3; Diod. Sic. 17.117.4.).

While Dio’s portrayal of Germanicus is positive, he never asserts that Germanicus was the rightful successor to Augustus, and the fact that the observation is focalized through the eyes of the soldiers (ὁρῶντες) renders it problematic. That individuals or groups are likely to support the stronger party over the weaker is a commonplace deeply embedded in Dio’s understanding of human nature and historical causation, e.g. 79(78).20.2: οὕτως που πολὺ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ αἰδοῦς ἐς τὸ κρείττον καὶ καταφρονήματος πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον ἐμπέφυκεν. See also 38.54.7; 41.6.4, etc. We might also note the contrast between the ideas expressed in this passage and those in 57.3.3, which amounts to a juxtaposition the three modes of imperial succession: succession by birthright, by the possession of military strength, and succession by appointment on account of innate virtue.

τὰ αὐτὰ προτεινόμενοι: ‘putting forward as a pretext the same things’. **τὰ αὐτά:** i.e. the same demands as the Pannonian legions (cf. 57.4.2). **προτεινόμενοι:** here used in the sense of offering up something as a pretext (cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. προτείνω I.3). Dio’s explanation of causation again returns to the familiar *prophasis/aitia* binary.

τὸν Γερμανικὸν αὐτοκράτορα ἐπεκάλεσαν: ‘they hailed Germanicus *imperator*’. Again Dio may be looking ahead to the later Principate, as the acclamation of a military commander as *imperator* was tantamount to a declaration of imperial aspirations (see also below 57.6.1). We may also detect a point of ironic contrast with Tiberius’ actions at 57.2.1 (ὡς αὐτοκράτωρ ... μὴ λέγων αὐτοκράτωρ εἶναι). **ἐπεκάλεσαν:** the context of the passage renders the meaning of the word clear enough, however, it is interesting that Dio does not opt for ἀνεῖπον (or a form of ἀναγορεύω), which is more common in instances of soldiers declaring an imperial candidate (64(65).8.4 [Xiph.]; cf. Plut. *Galba* 2.2; Hdn. 7.8.11; etc.).

5.2 **αἰάζοντες:** A somewhat odd choice of word for Dio, if M is correct, and an instance of a *hapax legomenon*. The tragic register seems inappropriate to the context, unless it was Dio’s intention to highlight the strong (irrational) emotions of the soldiery. χλευάζοντες, τωθάζοντες, and ἐμπαίζοντες have been suggested as possible emendations (cf. Boiss. 2. 563 *app. crit.*), yet none is particularly attractive. Such an emendation would change the sense profoundly from ‘wailing’ to ‘mocking’. There is little indication in Dio’s narrative that the soldiers ever turned against Germanicus in sufficient numbers to warrant ‘mocking’ to be preferred over ‘wailing’. A little later Dio (57.5.6) describes the soldiers pressuring (ἐνέκειντο) Germanicus, presumably to accept their acclamation, and notes the attachment of the

legions to Germanicus (57.6.2). If an emendation is called for, of the three, χλευάζοντες seems the most likely based on frequency: χλευάζω appears but once in the extant text of the *Roman History* (F 109.13 [EVV]), but the noun χλευασία occurs with some regularity.

“τοῦτο” ἔφη “λάβε· τοῦτο γὰρ ὀξύτερόν ἐστιν.” “Take this one,” he said, “it’s sharper”. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.35.5: *et miles nomine Calusidius strictum obtulit gladium, addito acutiorē esse*. We see here, as elsewhere, when Dio and Tacitus report the same apophthegmata, Dio shows a tendency to report more fully in *oratio recta* what Tacitus records in indirect speech: cf. 57.2.5-6 and Tac. *Ann.* 1.12.2 (Tiberius and Asinius Gallus); 57.16.4 and Tac. *Ann.* 2.40 (Tiberius and the pseudo-Agrippa). Tacitus supplies a name for this bold, yet otherwise unattested malcontent – Calusidius. By leaving the soldier anonymous, Dio does not, however, lessen the extent of the soldier’s insubordination. The anonymous soldier’s comment forms a neat pendant to Asinius Gallus’ remark to Tiberius (57.2.5-6), in so far as both Gallus and the soldier challenge the sincerity of Tiberius’ and Germanicus’ reluctance to take hold of the Principate.

ὁ οὖν Γερμανικὸς ... ἤλπισε: ‘So Germanicus, seeing how far the matter had progressed, did not venture to kill himself (for apart from anything else, he did not expect that such a course of action would reduce the disorder in the army)’. The implication is, of course, that if Germanicus had felt that his death would bring a close to the mutiny he would sacrifice himself. Again Dio’s portrayal of Germanicus’ conduct charts a course independent of Tacitus (but not necessarily the Tacitean

tradition), who portrays Germanicus as being shepherded away by his lieutenants following Calusidius' interjection.

5.3 γράμματα δὲ δὴ τινα ὥς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Τιβερίου πεμφθέντα συνθείς ...

ἀφήκε: 'So instead he composed a letter, pretending it was sent by Tiberius, and gave them twice the donative left for them by Augustus (but again pretending that this grant was from Tiberius), and released those who were over the age [sc. for military service]'. Germanicus too shows his capacity for trickery, and Dio appears keen to juxtapose Germanicus' style of deception with that of Tiberius. Forged missives were a typical mode of deception in Greek historiography, and feature elsewhere in similar contexts in the *Roman History* (cf. F 40.9-10 [EVV]; Zonar. 9.10 [= Dindorf 2.279]). ὥς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Τιβερίου ... ὥς καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου ἔδωκε: Dio is at pains to emphasise that Germanicus was not trying to seduce the soldiers with a donative for his own political advantage. For this idea, compare what Dio says here, with the charge against Piso in the *SCPP* (lines 54-5) where Piso is charged with corrupting the soldiers with a 'donative given in his own name, but drawn from the official purse' (*sed etiam donatiua suo nomine ex fisco principis nostri dando*). **τὴν τε δωρεάν:** Dio says that Augustus left 75 *denarii* (δραχμάς ... πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα) to each of the soldiers who were not Praetorians or enrolled in the urban cohorts (56.33.2; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 101).

ἐκ τοῦ ἀστικού ὄχλου ... προσκατέλεξεν. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.31.3: *nuper acto in urbe dilectu, lasciuias sueta, laborum intolerans, implere ceterorum rudes animos*. Both Dio and Tacitus make references to the *dilectus* carried out in A.D. 9 or 10 following

the loss of Varus' three legions in the Teutoberg Forest (56.23.2-3).³⁷¹ τοῦ ἀστικοῦ ὄχλου: Only here does Dio specifically denote the 'urban mob' (i.e. with the addition of the adjective ἀστικός), and one may detect a certain Dionian sneer behind the expression (Dio almost always uses ὄχλος pejoratively). I cannot agree with Freyburger-Galland's (1997: 88) contention that Dio, in imitation of Thucydidean usage,³⁷² uses ὄχλος as 'troops' (hence 'urban troops' = *cohors urbana*). First, Dio's expression, while highly unusual, is found in Plutarch (*Sulla* 7.6) where the meaning is unambiguously 'urban mob'. Second, the historical context of the *dilectus* of A.D. 9-10 must preclude Freyburger-Galland's reading. προσκατέλεξεν appears to be used by Dio in the technical sense of a levy intended to augment existing legions (*supplementum*), rather than the creation of new legions (cf. 36.46.1; 40.60.1; 46.47.3).³⁷³ For a discussion of Greek terminology for *dilectus/supplementum*, see Brunt 1971: 637-8; Freyburger-Galland 1997: 205 (NB both exclude the verb προσκαταλέγω). It is possible that Dio's interest in recording this detail was connected with the fact that by the late second or early third century A.D., the conscription of soldiers from the urban population of Rome was unheard of. Indeed, it has been argued that the *dilectus* at Rome in 9-10 was the last to be carried out in the capital. For conscription during the Principate, see Brunt 1974b and Watson 1982.

5.4-5 ὕστερον δὲ πρεσβευτῶν ... τὸν Γερμανικὸν μαθεῖν ἠθέλησεν: The beginning of a long digression on Tiberius' motivations for withholding information

³⁷¹ This *dilectus* may be the same as that recorded on an inscription from Alexandria Troas (AE 1973.501 = *IK* 53.34), although it is by no means certain. For discussion of the date of the *dilectus* mentioned on the inscription, see Brunt (1974: *passim*) (A.D. 6); Orth (1978 57-60) and Syme 1979: 318 = *RP* 3.1207-8 (A.D. 9/10).

³⁷² Cf. Thuc. 3.109.2, 4.56.1, 6.64.1, etc.

³⁷³ Not in the sense of *adlego* as it appears in the *Res Gestae* (1.2): ἡ σύνκλητος ἐπαινέσασά | [με ψηφίσμασι] προσκατέλεξε τῇ βουλῇ / *senatus decretis honorif[i]s in ordinem suum m[e adlegit]*.

from the delegation, and therefore from Germanicus. The resulting sentence is stylistically cumbersome, but Dio certainly seems to have felt that it was necessary as a way of integrating his narrative of the revolts into his overarching description of Tiberius' behaviour. The two characteristic elements of Dio's portrayal of Tiberius are present: Tiberius' secrecy (sc. ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ), and his reluctance to reveal his thoughts or intentions to others (cf. 57.1.2).

5.5 πολυπραγμονήσαι: Dio certainly has in mind the dangerous meddlesomeness which spurred revolutions and civil disorder (e.g. 44.53.6; F. 109.15 [EVV]). As Livia advised Augustus in the dialogue in Book 55, it was necessary for a ruler to remove the meddlesome man from the state (55.18.1). But here Dio's account is deeply ironic, as Tiberius is portrayed as attempting to guard against precisely the sort of meddlesomeness which Germanicus (has, in narrative terms, already) employed in restoring order amongst the soldiers (i.e. the forged letter purporting to be from Tiberius).

τούτων οὖν ἀφικομένων: Dio rightly sensed the need to re-orientate his focus onto the arrival of the delegation from Tiberius, after his involved digression on Tiberius' motivations for withholding information from the delegation.

οἱ στρατιῶται ... ἐθορύβησαν αὐθις: cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.39. Tiberius' secrecy now is shown to have consequences, revealing Germanicus' ruse and causing the soldiers to fall into revolt once again. As a result we are left to think more carefully about Tiberius' belief that secrecy led to greater successes (57.1.2). **ὑποπτεύσαντες:** Dio's soldiers are instantly suspicious of the motivations of the delegation from Tiberius,

assuming that the real agenda of the delegation was different from that which they (presumably) professed. By doing so, the army almost takes on the sort of behaviour characteristic of Tiberius (cf. 57.3.1; 57.6.3), or indeed a conventional tyrant.

5.6 τῶν τε πρέσβων ὀλίγου τινὰς ἀπέσφαξαν: ‘They almost killed some of the ambassadors’. As we have seen throughout his narratives of the Pannonian mutiny, Dio refrains from identifying individuals in the delegations sent by to the mutinous armies. Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.39) closely parallels Dio, but he supplies the name of an individual who was threatened: the consul of A.D. 13, L. Munatius Plancus (*PIR*² M 729; cf. 56.28.1). **ὀλίγου:** ‘almost’ cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. ὀλίγος IV.1.

Ἀγριππῖναν: The first appearance of the elder Agrippina (*PIR*¹ V 463) in the *Roman History*. Dio defines Agrippina in a quasi-heroic fashion by listing her illustrious descent from Agrippa and ultimately Augustus (τοῦ τε Ἀγρίππου καὶ τῆς Ἰουλίας τῆς τοῦ Αὐγούστου θυγατρὸς θυγατέρα), perhaps as an indication of her future role in the narrative as one of Tiberius’ high-profile victims (cf. 57.6.3; 58.22.4-5). Note also a parallel between Agrippina’s introduction here with Dio’s obituary notice of her daughter, the younger Agrippina (62(61).14.1 [Xiph.]): ἡ Ἀγριππῖνα ἡ τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ θυγάτηρ, ἡ τοῦ Ἀγρίππου ἑγγονος, ἡ τοῦ Αὐγούστου ἀπόγονος [...]. Dio’s portrayal of the elder Agrippina is meagre, a situation no doubt exacerbated by the fragmentary text for Books 57 and 58. Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.41.2) again uses material strikingly similar to Dio, but focalises these observations through the soldiers: *pudor inde et miseratio et patris Agrippae, Augusti aui memoria, socer Drusus*, [...]. For further comments on this passage, see Malloch 2004: 203-4.

ὃν Γάιον Καλιγόλαν ... προσωνόμαζον: Dio explains why Gaius obtained the nickname ‘Caligula’, in much the same way as he does for other Emperors known by informal appellations, e.g. Caracalla (79(78).3.3, Verissimus (69.21.1 [Xiph.]), Tiberius (80(79).1.1). The impulse to explain nicknames is a feature of both Latin and Greek historiography and biography (e.g. Plut. *Cic.* 1.2 “Cicero”; *Fab.* 1.3 “Verrucosus” and “Ovicula”), and similar explanations of Caligula’s name are found in Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.41.3), Suetonius (*Cal.* 9.1), and in the late antique tradition (Vict. *Caes.* 3.4; [Vict.] *Epit.* 3.2). For discussion of imperial nicknames more generally, see Bruun 2003: 74-98.

τὸ πλείστον τραφεῖς τοῖς στρατιωτικοῖς: ‘Raised for the most part in the camp’. Hurley (1989: 326) has suggested that Dio’s statement was influenced by Suetonius (who asserted that Caligula was not born in a legionary camp), although Malloch (2004: 205-6) has attempted to refute this position. Dio’s apparent insistence that Caligula was raised in the camp (but without commenting on his place of birth) seems at least to suggest Dio’s awareness of the debate over Caligula’s place of birth, but his reluctance to engage with it.³⁷⁴ This (to us) minor controversy seems to have originated during the emperor’s own lifetime. The younger Seneca places Gaius’ birth in the camp (*Const.* 18.4), and Suetonius describes the scholarly controversy between the first century writers Cn. Lentulus Gaetulicus and the elder Pliny, before settling the issue by asserting that the future emperor was born at Antium (*Cal.* 8). The results of Suetonius’ investigation have been, in turn, read as a correction of Tacitus (*Ann.*

³⁷⁴ Dio’s coeval, Aelian, in his work *On Divine Manifestations* preserves the version that Caligula was born in the camp (Ael. F 24 [Herscher 2.196-7]), as too Athenaeus (4.148D). We do not know if Dio knew Aelian’s work, but these conflicting citations do indicate that the debate as to whether Caligula was born or simply raised in the camp continued long after Suetonius and was maintained by Dio’s contemporaries.

1.41.2), who stated that Gaius was born in the camp (*in castris genitus*).³⁷⁵ The erudite biographer's arguments did not settle the issue: the fourth century Latin tradition preserved in Victor (3.4) and the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (3.2) perpetuated the story that Gaius was a scion of the camp.

Be this as it may, Dio's version appears to have been perpetuated by the author (possibly John of Antioch)³⁷⁶ of a historical fragment preserved in the *Excerpta Salamasiana* (cf. Boissevain 3.764-5):

ἐλέγετο δὲ Καλλιγούλας, ὅτι ἐκ μικρᾶς ἡλικίας ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τὰ πολλὰ ἐτρέφετο, καὶ τοῖς στρατιωτικοῖς ἐχρῆτο ὑποδήμασιν· ἐκ τῶν καλλίγων οὖν Καλλιγούλας ἐλέγετο.

A source connection between Dio and the late antique author of the fragment is likely, although the comparison brings out an important point of contrast, in that Dio did not feel the need to additional definition (sc. ἐκ τῶν καλλίγων οὖν Καλλιγούλας ἐλέγετο).³⁷⁷

ὑπεκπεμφθέντας ποι: 'having been sent away secretly to some location'. Again we see that Dio's Germanicus, like Tiberius, is able to operate with subtlety. **ποι:** Malloch (2004: 204) has offered a delicate and convincing explanation for Dio's choice of words: 'Dio gives the destination of Agrippina and Gaius as 'somewhere' [...] a more specific designation would have conflicted with the sense of secrecy

³⁷⁵ Hurley 1989: 326-7; Wardle 1994: 44.

³⁷⁶ The identity of this author is controversial: Roberto in his 2005 edition of John of Antioch included all of the Salamasian fragments (believing them to be derived from a putative epitome of John's work), whereas Mariev in his edition of 2008 rejected all of the Salamasian fragments.

³⁷⁷ The *Suda*'s entry on Caligula (K 216 = Adler 3.18) is a composite of Aelian (F 24) and the author of the *Excerpta Salamasiana*.

surrounding their departure, but it has no such function on a narrative level as that information has in Tacitus.’

5.7 τὴν μὲν Ἀγριππῖναν ... κατέσχον: ‘And whereas they released Agrippina (who was pregnant) having been urged by Germanicus, they continued to detain Gaius’.

ἐς τοσαύτην γε μεταβολήν: The phrase parallels the similar change of heart felt by the Pannonian legions. Dio’s choice of words indicates the violent change of heart felt by the army, feeding into his characterization of the army as being ultimately fickle (cf. 57.5.2). In this sense, the army is portrayed so as to conform to the stereotype of the mob (cf. Fulkerson 2013: 163, for the *topos* of the army as a ‘supercrowd’). Note Dio’s use of the same language of ‘extreme change’ to describe the mob at Rome (48.31.4). This is of course even more appropriate for an army recruited ἐκ τοῦ ἀστικοῦ ὄχλου.

τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐς τὸ μέσον ἀγαγόντες ἔπειτα πρὸς τὸ τῶν πλειόνων βούλημα τοὺς μὲν ἀποσφάξαι τοὺς δ’ ἀπολύσαι. Dio’s account of the mutiny ends with this notice of the mob justice meted out to some of the ringleaders of the mutiny (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.44.2-3). Dio can be seen to omit the bloody suppression of the remnants of the mutiny at Vetera (mod. Xanten), a story in which Germanicus, at least in Tacitus’ telling, emerges with little credit (*Ann.* 1.48-49.2; cf. Shotter 1968: 199; Ross 1973: 218-20; Pelling 1993: 62-7).

6.1 φοβηθεὶς δ’ οὖν καὶ ὥς ὁ Γερμανικὸς μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς στασιάζωσιν, ἐς τὴν πολέμιαν ἐνέβαλε: Dio finishes his account of the mutiny as he began, with a

protagonist motivated by fear. At 57.4.1 Tiberius' fear of Germanicus was one of the reasons that caused him to delay accepting the Principate. Now Germanicus' fear of the legions prompts his invasion of Germany beyond the Rhine. It is important to note Dio's decision to make clear that this campaign was the deliberate intention of Germanicus, as opposed to Tacitus' more passive Germanicus who is portrayed as responding to the soldiers' enthusiasm (Tac. *Ann.* 1.49.4; cf. Goodyear 1972: 313-4). Dio's interest in identifying fear as the motivation for both Germanicus and Tiberius, serves to draw out the comparisons between the two: Tiberius' fear arises out of his desire to remain secure in his position (see also below 57.6.2), whereas Germanicus' concerns his own ability to keep his legions in check. **στασιάζουσιν**: 'mutiny', e.g., 41.26.1, 48.30.3, 56.12.2; cf. Freyburger-Galland 1997: 69-70.

ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσχολίαν: That soldiers should be occupied in warfare against a foreign foe in order to lessen the likelihood of military revolt was one of the precepts outlined by Maecenas in his speech to Augustus (52.27; cf. 49.36.1). Thus, Germanicus' decision to take his time over his military operations may have made good sense, in so far as it was intended to maintain discipline. It would have also, however, at least according to Dio's understanding of typical 'imperial' psychology, contributed to Tiberius' suspicion of his adopted son (see note below 57.6.3) – just as Augustus had been suspicious of what he perceived to have been Tiberius' delay over his campaigns in A.D. 6-7 (55.31.1).

ἐκ τῶν ἄλλοτριῶν: Germanicus' campaign in late 14 seems to have been directed against the Marsi, but also drew in some of the neighbouring tribes (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.50-51; cf. Koestermann 1963: 183-8; Goodyear 1972: 317-18). It is possible that

Dio's phraseology here covers Germanicus' campaigns for not only 14, but also 15-16, which are summarized by Xiphilinus at 57.18.1, but have been displaced from their annalistic positions. For Dio's technique of compressing the events of several years and annalistic displacement, note his comments at 51.27.1-2.

6.2 ὁ μὲν δυνηθείς ἂν τὴν αὐτοκράτορα ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν ... οὐκ ἠθέλησε:

Germanicus represented for Dio, more than anything else, an unusual individual who, although possessing a power-base sufficient to seize power in the Roman world, declined to do so. Verginius Rufus is the obvious imperial parallel, but for a similar idea in the late-Republican context, see Dio's comments on Pompey, following his return to Italy after his command against the pirates in 67 B.C. (37.20.5): δυνηθείς τ' ἂν δι' αὐτῶν τὴν τε Ἰταλίαν κατασχεῖν καὶ τὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων κράτος πᾶν περιποιήσασθαι, [...] οὐκ ἠβουλήθη τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. See also below 57.6.3. **τὴν αὐτοκράτορα ἀρχήν**: 'imperial power' or perhaps just 'supreme command'. For the phraseology (with *autokrator* used as an epithet noun), see 51.21.6. Cf. Mason *GT* 110 who equates the phrase with *imperium principis*.

ἡ γὰρ εὖνοια πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν τε Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν ὑπηκόων σφῶν ἐς αὐτὸν ἐποίει: A likely imitation of Thuc. 2.8.4: ἡ δὲ εὖνοια παρὰ πολὺ ἐποίει τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἐς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, κ.τ.λ. (cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. ποιέω B.II.2). If so, Dio's paraphrase is apposite. In Thucydides, the passage comes at the point of the outbreak of hostilities between the Athenians and the Spartans (and their allies), whereas in Dio, although the conditions are set for open conflict between Tiberius and Germanicus, no war comes to pass due to Germanicus' selfless actions.

πάντων ἀπλῶς: ‘absolutely everybody’. It is difficult to assess the accuracy of Dio’s comment in historical terms, much in the same way as it is with Thucydides’ statement about the popularity of the Spartans (cf. Gomme *HCT* 2.9-10). Dio’s comments may have been derived from the pro-Germanicus tradition maintained by Suetonius (*Cal.* 4), who attests to Germanicus’ great popularity with the *populus* and the soldiers, and to the respect that Germanicus showed to the communities around the empire (*Cal.* 3.2). Yet Dio’s comments fulfill an important narrative function and should not be seen purely in terms of the putative ‘bias’ of his sources. Dio notes the extent of Germanicus’ popularity, which embraced the military and non-military components of the empire (cf. 57.2.1), so as to emphasise the ease with which he *could* have seized control of the empire. For a parallel, note Xiphilinus’ comments on Vespasian, where the possession of ‘goodwill’ and the support of the military leads to the emergence of a successful imperial challenger (64(65).8.3²-4 [Xiph.]).

Τιβέριος δὲ ἐπήνεσε ... οὐ μέντοι καὶ ἥσθη οἷς ἔπραξεν: A further illustration of the sort of characteristic behaviour Dio described in his opening sketch of Tiberius (57.1.1-2), which he will develop in 57.6.3 (below).

μὲν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ: Presumably Tiberius praised Germanicus for suppressing the revolt and not, as Dio’s text would suggest, for turning down the imperial power. Of course in Dio’s mind, Germanicus’ efforts to suppress the revolt were inextricably linked with his refusal of the soldiers’ desire to put him forward as an imperial candidate.

τῇ Ἀγριππίνῃ: That Tiberius communicated with Agrippina as well as Germanicus is a detail found only in Dio. Why he should do so is not immediately clear. That Agrippina played a role in the suppression of the mutiny was part of the tradition known to Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.69), although no such details are found in Dio's version of the mutiny. It seems more likely that this comment should be read as Tiberius' attempt to mollify Agrippina as he regarded her as a possible rival, for which see below 57.6.3.

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ πλείον αὐτὸν ὥς καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα ἀνηρτημένον ἔδεισεν: Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.52.1: *sed quod largiendis pecuniis et missione festinata fauorem militum quaesiuisset* (sc. Germanicus), *bellica quoque Germanici gloriaangebatur*. Both Dio and Tacitus make much of the anxiety Germanicus' actions cause Tiberius, and we may detect a source connection (Jaeger 1910: 30-1; Goodyear 1972: 323). In both cases Germanicus' actions are made to reveal another *arcanum imperii*. We have seen throughout these opening chapters Dio's (and Tiberius') awareness of the importance of military support for an imperial candidate. **ὥς καὶ:** Tiberius already feared Germanicus before the mutiny on account of his popularity with the troops (above 57.3.1). Now Dio shows how Germanicus' actions in suppressing the mutiny, which involved the payment of a largess greater than that promised in addition to the instigation of a (lucrative) campaign, resulted in the further attachment of the troops to Germanicus (τὰ στρατεύματα ἀνηρτημένον) and Tiberius' heightened fear of him.

That the soldiers were specifically loyal to Germanicus (rather than simply being under his command) seems to have been important for Dio when considering the

strength of Germanicus' position. Note, for example, Dio's comments on Salvius Julianus (*PIR*² S 135) (73(72).5.1-2 [Xiph.]):³⁷⁸

καίτοι καὶ Ἰουλιανὸς δυνηθεὶς ἂν μετὰ τὴν Μάρκου τελευτὴν πᾶν
εὐθὺς κατ' αὐτοῦ [sc. Commodus] ὅ τι καὶ ἐβούλετο, ἅτε καὶ
ἐλλογιμώτατος ὢν καὶ στρατιὰν μεγάλην ἐπιτετραμμένος τοὺς τε
στρατιώτας ἀνηρτημένος, πρᾶξι, οὐδὲν ἠθέλησε διὰ τε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ
ἐπιείκειαν καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκείνου καὶ τεθνηκότος εὐνοίαν νεοχμῶσαι.

In both the examples of Salvius Julianus and Germanicus, note Dio's use of the middle voice (sc. ἀνηρτημένος) indicating how the actions of these commanders created the personal loyalty of their troops. In general, the attachment of soldiers to particular commanders (rather than to the state or emperor) was a catalyst for civil war, and it is one of the main themes of late Republican and Imperial history.

Such understanding of motivation can be seen in the documents of the reign of Tiberius. For example, the general suspicion aroused by the actions of popular or generous commanders can be seen in *SCPP* (ll. 52-7, with Lott 2012: 277-9) which notes that after Piso had given large sums of money to the troops (see note above 57.5.3), some started calling themselves 'Piso's men' which was interpreted as Piso's desire to foment civil war. Although there were good grounds for emperors to be suspicious of military commanders who bought the support of their legions, it was also an expectation of a *ciuilis princeps* not to be resentful of successful or popular commanders (e.g. 68.2.4; Pliny *Pan.* 18.1-2; cf. 61(60).30.4-5 [Xiph.]; Tac. *Agric.* 39).

³⁷⁸ This passage survives in Xiphilinus and in the *EVV*. For the text, see Boissevain 3.285-6.

6.3 οὐ γὰρ που καὶ φρονεῖν οὕτως <ὥς> ἐδόκει, ἐξ ὧν ἑαυτῷ συνήδει ἄλλα μὲν λέγοντι ἄλλα δὲ ποιοῦντι, ὑπελάμβανεν: The ironic tone is clear, as Dio returns the reader once again to the opening characterization of Tiberius. Tiberius, the master dissimulator, misreads the actions of Germanicus by reading into the actions of the prince his own habit of thought. Dio also subverts his own familiar appearance/reality binary, in so far as the outward appearances of Germanicus' actions match his real intentions. Although we are left in no doubt that Tiberius has misunderstood Germanicus, we as the readers are left wondering whether Tiberius was unjustified in his suspicion and fears of Germanicus: another (less extraordinary) man might well have acted differently when placed in similar circumstances as Germanicus in 14.

ἀντίπαλον τὸ φρόνημα τῷ τοῦ γένους ὄγκῳ ἔχουσα: 'possessed a spirit matched by the distinction of her birth'. Again Dio draws the reader's attention to Agrippina's lineage (see above 57.5.6), and in particular her status as the granddaughter of Augustus (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.75.1). **τὸ φρόνημα:** a quality not usually associated with women in Dio or other authors, hence making Agrippina all the more noteworthy. Cf. 62.2.2: γυνὴ (sc. Boudicca) Βρεττανίς γένους τοῦ βασιλείου, μείζον ἢ κατὰ γυναῖκα φρόνημα ἔχουσα. For further comparison, note Chariton's characterization of his spirited heroine (*Call.* 2.5.9; 6.4.10; 7.6.12) and Plutarch's comments in his *On the Bravery of Women* (*Mor.* 243C, 258F; cf. Plut. *Brut.* 13.2). More generally, people of spirit (φρόνημα) were less likely to accept the domination of an autocrat and were likely to incur the suspicion of tyrants (e.g. F. 11.3 [EVV]; 52.8.5; Plat. *Resp.* 567a; Arist. *Pol.* 1313b, 1314a; Plut. *Brut.* 8.1; Plut. *Dion* 9.2). Here we see more clearly Dio preparing the way for conflict between Agrippina and Tiberius which followed

the demise of Germanicus. Dio's characterization of Agrippina gives very real grounds for Tiberius' suspicion of Agrippina as representing a potential threat.

6.4 οὐ μὴν ... ἐποιήσατο: 'Yet he pretended not to be vexed by them, but made many laudatory speeches in the senate concerning Germanicus'. προσεποιεῖτο: see note above 57.1.1. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.52.2-3: *rettulit tamen ad senatum de rebus gestis multaque de uirtute eius memorauit, magis in speciem uerbis adornata quam ut penitus sentire crederetur. paucioribus Drusum et finem Illyrici motus laudauit, sed intentior et fida oratione.* The difference between Dio's and Tacitus' presentation of essentially the same material is revealing of the two writers' approaches to the characterisation of Tiberius. Tacitus' version establishes a more complicated characterisation, highlighting Tiberius' insincerity and his tendency to overplay his hand (note the contrast between his speeches on Germanicus and Drusus). Dio is more interested in using his description of Tiberius' thoughts and actions as a way of illustrating his initial characterisation of Tiberius (57.1.1) that outlined his habit of choosing words which were the opposite of his thoughts.

καὶ θυσίας ... καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Δρούσου: A detail found only in Dio. Generally, Dio appears to have been interested to note the passing of decrees ordering sacrifices (e.g. 37.36.3, 54.9.5, 79(78).27.3, etc., and also below 57.15.5). Such details would have been drawn ultimately (either by Dio or one of his sources) from the senatorial records, and I cannot see a reason to share Goodyear's apparent skepticism about the veracity of Dio's report (Goodyear 1972: 322).

τὰ αὐτὰ: Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.52.3: *cunctaque quae Germanicus indulserat seruavit etiam apud Pannonicos exercitus*. For the terms of Germanicus' settlement, see above 57.5.3. Goodyear (1972: 323) has doubted the accuracy of Tacitus and Dio, and suggests that the concessions were extended to other legions in addition to those in Pannonia. Such a reading is consistent with that presented by Suetonius (*Tib.* 48.2), who indicates that Tiberius doubled Augustus' legacy 'to the soldiers' (*militi post duplicata ex Augusti testamento legata nihil umquam largitus est*), but even here the language is not conclusive. Unfortunately, external evidence is lacking for the terms (and extent) of the settlement reached in 14.

6.5 **ἐς ... τὸ ... πρότερον:** 'As it was previously'. A back reference to 55.23.1 where the length of service for non-Praetorians was made twenty years (sc. τὰ εἴκοσιν ἔτη). **ἔπειτα:** Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.78.2) places this reversal of policy under A.D. 15. Dio reasonably saw the benefits of assembling all of the material pertaining to the revolts in the same point in his narrative. **ἔξω τῆς Ἰταλίας:** A somewhat misleading statement. The length of service for troops stationed in Italy (apart from Praetorian cohorts and the non-military corps of Vigiles) remained twenty years (Roxan and Eck 1993: 70 n. 9).

7.1 **νεώτερον:** Presumably a reference not only to the mutinies (which, as we have seen, Dio believed to have a political dimension) but also to the revolutionary plots hinted at 57.3.4.

ἀλλὰ ἀσφαλῶς πάντα τὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐς τὴν ἡγεμονίαν αὐτοῦ συνεφρόνησε: 'but all the Roman world gave its firm (sc. ἀσφαλῶς) consent to his

leadership'. Here the verb συμφρονέω appears synonymous with and may well reflect the Latin *consentio*, and hence referring to such a time as when Tiberius could claim to rule by virtue of universal consensus (sc. πάντα τὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων). Such a reading is attractive in terms of the ideology of *recusatio/cunctatio* and recalls Augustus' claim in the *Res Gestae* (34.1) that he possessed powers *per consensum universorum*. See also note above on 57.3.3.

τὴν τε ὁρχήν ... ὑπεδέξατο: 'accepted the empire' or perhaps 'accepted the rule'. It is tempting to think of ὁρχή in terms of Tiberius' acceptance of his *prouincia*, but it seems likely that Dio is not aiming for terminological precision. **ὑπεδέξατο**: the aorist indicates Dio's belief (perhaps unlike Tacitus) that there was a specific moment when Tiberius assumed his position of leadership in the state. This moment perhaps coincided with the passing of a *lex* (or perhaps even several *leges*) confirming Tiberius' imperial powers and his *prouincia* (cf. Brunt 1977: 97; Liebeschuetz 1986: 355-7).

As argued above (§ I), I believe this to have been a date close to the 13th of October, which is the date asserted by Josephus in the *Jewish Antiquities*.³⁷⁹ Dio's account does not provide any precise date for when Tiberius formally 'accepted' his position in the state. At the end of his account of Tiberius' reign, Dio calculates Tiberius to have reigned for 22 years, seven months, and seven days (58.28.5), based on the (erroneous) belief that Tiberius died on the 26 March A.D. 37, rather than on 16 March (*Inscr. Ital.* XIII.1 p. 191 (*Fasti Ost.*) = *EJ*² p. 43). Adjusting for the additional

³⁷⁹ Josephus reckoned Tiberius' reign to have been for 22 years, five months, and three days (*AJ* 18.224). However, an alternative calculation, perhaps due to a corruption in the text (thus Wellesley 1967: 23 fn. 3), is given in the *Jewish War* (Joseph. *BJ* 2.180), where the reign is given as twenty-two years, six months and three days.

ten days Dio gives to Tiberius, Dio calculated Tiberius' *dies imperii* to have fallen on 19 August 14, leaving no time for a delay between the death of Augustus and the accession of Tiberius.³⁸⁰ There is of course no contradiction. From that time when Tiberius sent the letters to the provinces and armies from Nola, Dio believed Tiberius to have acted 'as emperor' (as above 57.2.1). Dio's final calculation of the length of Tiberius' reign was based on Tiberius' deeds as emperor, not his formal acknowledgement of his position. Dio's approach to dating the real lengths of imperial reigns was no doubt influenced by the habit of emperors, such as Vespasian, who dated their reigns to their acclamation by the troops (e.g. 66.17.3-4 (Vespasian) [Xiph.], 80(79).3.3 (Elagabalus)). For Dio's method of dating imperial reigns in general, see Snyder 1940.

οὐδὲν ἔτι εἰρωνευόμενος: 'without further dissimulation'. Dio breaks his sentence with a phrase indicating a similar break in Tiberius' behaviour. Tiberius' characteristic dissimulation which saw him refuse to acknowledge his position as *autokrator* falls away in an apparent *volte face* at such a time when Tiberius felt secure in his power. This break refers only to Tiberius' behaviour with respect to accepting the Principate; it does not, as we shall see, indicate a departure from his characteristic habit of dissimulation established in the opening chapters of Book 57.

εἰρωνευόμενος: surprisingly for a historian so interested in simulation and dissimulation, this the only place in the surviving portions of the *Roman History* where Dio uses the verb εἰρωνεύομαι (indeed he does not use εἰρων or εἰρωνεία either). That Dio should use this word for Tiberius is appropriate as he was after all the quintessential example of the dissimulating man (cf. 57.1.1). Moreover, Dio's

³⁸⁰ For this calculation, see Snyder (1940a: 45-6) and Béranger (1953: 21-2). Wellesley (1967: 23, n.3) arrives at 20 August.

Tiberius was a man who maintained the pretence of not possessing power, when in fact he did, just as that other ‘ironic man’, Socrates, pretended not to have wisdom. For further on Dio’s characterisation of Tiberius, see Introduction, *Chapter 2: Dio on Tiberius*.

καὶ ἐν τοιῷδε αὐτὴν τρόπον ... διήγαγεν: ‘managed it [sc. the rule] in something like the following manner.’ For the use of διάγω as ‘managed’, see 54.19.6; cf. Polyb. 5.34.3: (sc. Ptolemy Philopator) πανηγυρικώτερον διήγε τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχήν.

ἐφ’ ὅσον ὁ Γερμανικὸς ἔζη: As we have seen in the introduction (*Chapter 2: Dio on Tiberius*) Dio believed that the death of Germanicus marked a turning point in Tiberius’ reign (cf. 57.13.6; 57.19.1 [Xiph.]). That the death of the prince heralded the deterioration in the quality of Tiberius’ reign is found in Tacitus as well.³⁸¹ How the reign of an emperor could be dependant on the survival of a rival (or advisor) was a theme that Dio would return to throughout his history.

IV. TIBERIUS’ CONDUCT AS RULER

This sentence marks the first major division in Book 57. Just as the opening chapters (57.1-6) concentrated on Tiberius’ actions prior to his acceptance of the Principate, so the following chapters provide a general summary of his style of governance. The material gathered in these following chapters (57.7.2-13.6) sits outside of his

³⁸¹ Tacitus seems to have followed a quadripartite division (*Ann.* 6.51).

annalistic framework (which does not resume until 57.14.1).³⁸² *Prima facie*, Dio's aim in these chapters was to provide a general summary of Tiberius' behaviour as emperor. Specific events and details are only on occasion referred to by Dio. Anecdotes, usually so important to Dio, are largely eschewed. Several of Tiberius' *bons mots*, however, are included (e.g. 57.7.4, 8.2, 9.2, 10.5, 13.2). Save for an equestrian prefect (57.10.5), no individual outside the imperial family is mentioned by name.

As has been noted elsewhere, these chapters have a distinct Suetonian feel, with material grouped thematically under general rubrics (Questa 1957: 43; Pelling 1997a: 117). The connection with Suetonius is not just superficial, as there is some overlap between the material collected by Dio and that presented in the *Vita Tiberii* (especially 26-34, 47-52), which may be indicative of an indirect source connection (cf. Questa 1957: 43-4; Champlin 2008: 422, n. 43, and above, *Chapter 1: The Roman Historian at Work*). But it is Tiberius' quality as a ruler rather than as an individual that Dio illustrates in these chapters. Indeed, Dio remains agnostic as to whether these predominantly good actions revealed Tiberius' innate virtues and vices (57.13.6). After all, Dio recognised that even the worst of emperors could perform admirable deeds (59.9.4 (Caligula); 80(79).3.2 (Elagabalus); cf. Plin. *Pan.* 56.1). As with several of his other introductory surveys, Dio seems to draw a distinction between an emperor's way of life and his actions as emperor.³⁸³ The material in these chapters presents an indicative survey of the sorts of behaviour that Dio thought were important for an emperor to display. As is expected from our consular historian, much

³⁸² *pace* Champlin 2008: 422 n. 43, who asserts that Dio places all Tiberius' good deeds under A.D. 14. However, Champlin is not alone in making this assumption.

³⁸³ On this, note Davenport 2014: 103 on Dio's portrayal of Vitellius.

of this material pertains to Tiberius' conduct in the Senate and the courts, in addition to his social interactions with senators.

The image of Tiberius that emerges from these chapters is positive, and represents something close to the general ideal of the *ciuilis princeps*/δημοτικὸς αὐτοκράτωρ.³⁸⁴ Dio conveys this assessment of Tiberius in two ways. The first is to describe Tiberius' interactions with the important social groups that made up the Roman Empire. Hence, Dio describes Tiberius' interaction with members of the Senate and of the *ordo equester*, the Roman people, the subject peoples, his friends, and finally members of his family. The second is to analyse Tiberius' behaviour according to the conventional categories of behaviour by which emperors were judged, for example: his administration of justice, his moderation with respect to honours, his attitude to religion and the imperial cult, his generosity (φιλανθρωπία), and his own self-control.³⁸⁵ As we shall see in the commentary below, the resulting picture has much in common with Pliny's portrayal of Trajan in the *Panegyricus* and Dio employs commonplace themes found in kingship literature from Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman Imperial periods. Yet for all that is seemingly conventional about this portrait, it also reveals something of Dio's own conception of the *ciuilis princeps* model. As we shall see, most of Dio's comments have many direct concordances with his evaluations of other rulers in the *Roman History*. One of the key things that emerge from this model is that it is centred on an emperor's

³⁸⁴ For which in general, see Wilkinson 2012: 134-80; cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1982; Flach 1973: 140; Kuhn-Chen 2002: 200-1. Although I use the term δημοτικὸς αὐτοκράτωρ, as a Greek approximation for the idea of the *ciuilis princeps*, it should be noted that it is not a term found in any ancient (or medieval author). It is a term that, nevertheless, has its uses and is not inappropriate when considering Dio's version of a particular positive type of emperor. For discussion of Dio's use of the term δημοτικός, see below 57.8.3.

³⁸⁵ For Suetonius' use of a similar technique, see Wallace-Hadrill 1995: 144.

performance of specific actions or conforming to (exemplary) patterns of behaviour: the question of whether the emperor was a good or virtuous man is subordinated.³⁸⁶

Dio's decision to highlight only the positive aspects of Tiberius' conduct in this opening summary would appear to mark a departure from his standard formula. Dio's normal technique in these introductory surveys was to contrast the good and bad aspects of an emperor's conduct. It is possible that this difference was due simply to the fact that Dio had not settled into any particular technique when he wrote these chapters; after all Book 57 is the first of his imperial books and the first to open with such a general survey.³⁸⁷ Yet if this is correct, then it can only be part of the answer. By eschewing the negative aspects, Dio's not only sharpens the points of contrast between Tiberius' conduct for the first part of his reign and the post-Germanicus narrative of Books 57 and 58, but also provides a context against which Tiberius' actions leading up to Germanicus' death may be interpreted. As we shall see this technique allows Dio to draw points of comparison and contrast with specific actions of Tiberius described in the annalistic narrative.

This positive, albeit anodyne portrayal of Tiberius' conduct reads somewhat jarringly with the opening six chapters, which contain so much tacit criticism of the new emperor. This change of tack must be regarded as being a deliberate compositional strategy. Dio appears to be making a preceptive statement about the nature of the *ciuilis princeps*. The ideal of the *ciuilis princeps* in essence was that of an autocrat who did not behave as one and who maintained at least the appearance of Republican

³⁸⁶ For similar ideas, with respect to the Agrippa-Maecenas debate, see Kemezis 2014: 131-8. Cf. Davenport and Mallan 2014: 640-57.

³⁸⁷ Note the presence of similar survey chapters in Dio's account of the reign of Augustus, especially 53.21.3-7.

government (see below 57.11.3; 57.15.9). Pretence and dissimulation were therefore the cornerstones of such an ideal. The beginning of Book 57 (Chapters 1-13) serves to emphasise this point. These opening thirteen chapters may be approached as a literary diptych: the first part (57.1-6) describes Tiberius' behaviour prior to acknowledging his acceptance of the imperial power, the second (57.7-13) concerns his behaviour after accepting it. Dio presents the reader with something close to a paradox, in so far as the very quality which made Tiberius so difficult to handle prior to his formal acceptance of power was the same as that which made him such an exemplary ruler, at least while Germanicus lived.

Augustus is a key presence in these chapters. Dio seems to have been particularly interested in the measures Tiberius took to honour Augustus and follow in Augustus' footsteps (see below 57.7.2, 8.4-5, 8.6, 9.2, 10.1-2, 10.4, cf. 12.3). Yet Dio was also careful to note Tiberius' deviations from Augustan practice. Such an interest in Augustus' political legacy is understandable given the scale of Dio's treatment of Augustus in the *Roman History*. But again there is perhaps more than what meets the eye. Dio makes us think closely about the parallels between Augustus and Tiberius. These parallels run on at least two levels. As noted by Pelling (1997a: 128-9), we may read a similar sort of Tiberian dissimulation in Augustus' conduct throughout his reign.³⁸⁸ On another level, Tiberius follows Augustus' conduct with respect to many (but not all) of his actions as a ruler. This is emphasised by the several important concordances between these chapters and the funeral oration for Augustus delivered by Tiberius. More generally, the manner in which an emperor treated his predecessors was an important feature of Dio's method of evaluating emperors (see below 57.8.4):

³⁸⁸ Much of this may be Dio's own analysis of Augustus and his reign: Rich 2010: 171.

a recurring ‘trans-regnal theme’, in Pelling’s terms. Tiberius’ decision to honour Augustus and aspects of his rule anticipates (and contrasts with) Gaius’ resolution not to pay similar honours to Tiberius (59.3.7-8). Of course, whether or not an emperor honoured a predecessor could be a contentious issue: Septimius Severus’ decision to honour Commodus was not met with approval from Dio (76(75).7.4-8.2 [Xiph.]).

πάντα ... ἔξ τε τὴν γερούσιαν ἐσέφερε: Suet. *Tib.* 30: *neque tam paruum quicquam neque tam magnum publici priuatique negotii fuit, de quo non ad patres conscriptos referretur*. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.6.2: *iam primum publica negotia et priuatorum maxima apud patres tractabantur*. Also, see Vell. Pat. 2.126.2 with Woodman 1977: 240. Whatever the source connection with Suetonius (and it seems that one exists), Dio’s comment is formulaic with parallels elsewhere in the *Roman History*. Hence Dio describes Julius Caesar’s conduct (after becoming dictator) at 43.27.1: πάντα δὴ πάντως τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς βουλῆς, ἔστι δ’ ὅτε καὶ πάσῃ αὐτῇ, ἐπεκοίνου, Hadrian’s at 69.7.1: ἔπραττε δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου πάντα τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἀναγκαιότατα, but perhaps most pertinently given its textual proximity, Augustus’ at 56.41.3: οἷς [sc. the Senate] πάντα τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ἀναγκαιότατα ἀεὶ ... ἐπεκοίνου. Here Tiberius appears as the *exemplum* of a consultative emperor, perhaps exceeding even Augustus in so far as Tiberius brought even ‘the smallest matters’ (τὰ σμικρότατα) before the Senate, as opposed to just ‘the greatest and most pressing’ (τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ἀναγκαιότατα). For Tiberius’ and his involvement of the Senate, see Brunt 1984a. For the ideal of the consultative emperor in general see Ando 2000: 152-60 and Wilkinson 2012: 138-48. **τὴν γερούσιαν:** Dio’s use of γερούσια and βουλή to denote the Senate is interchangeable (Freyburger-Galland 1997: 98-9).

ἐπεποίητο ... προκαθίζων ἐχρημάτιζε: Tiberius' conduct of non-senatorial business is resumed at 57.7.6. Dio's assessment of Tiberius' conduct here has numerous close parallels throughout the imperial books, and it is demonstrative of the sort of behaviour Dio expected to see in an emperor (cf. Claudius: 60.4.3, Vespasian: 65(66).10.5 [Xiph.], Hadrian: 69.7.1 [Xiph.]. For a survey of the evidence for the emperor's conduct of public business, see Millar 1977: 228-40; Honoré 1994: 3-32.

βῆμα: a tribunal rather than the Rostra (as it is elsewhere in the *Roman History*, but with the definite article e.g. 47.3.2, 47.8.3, 62(63).5.4 [Xiph.], etc.). It is likely that Tiberius arranged to have erected for himself a (temporary?) tribunal from which he could conduct public business. For a discussion of the physical form imperial tribunals could take, based on artistic representations, see Bablitz 2008.

ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ: Most likely the *Forum Romanum*, but it is worth noting that emperors could set up their tribunals in several locations: Trajan conducted business in the Portico of Livia and the *Forum Augusti* (68.10.2 [Xiph.; EVV]). For Dio's purposes here, the exact location is unimportant – what matters to Dio is that Tiberius' actions were conducted in the open and were accessible (see below 57.11.1). We may detect a tacit contrast with the final years of Augustus' reign, where Dio tells us that Augustus sat on a tribunal which had been set up in the palace (ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ἐπὶ βήματος προκαθήμενος) (55.33.5 [Xiph.]; cf. Swan 2004: 218; de Angelis 2010: 145). For discussion of the locations (public or private) of imperial courts of justice, see de Angelis 2010.

ἐχρημάτιζε: Dio's statement below at 57.7.6 (ἐδίκασε ... ὥσπερ εἶπον) suggests that he has in mind Tiberius' participation in judicial matters (cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. χρηματίζω I.5), but it need not be confined to such a narrow interpretation. *χρηματίζω* is often used in Dio (and other authors) to denote dealings with embassies

and the like (e.g. 53.21.6; 55.33.5 [Xiph.], 57.17.9, 61(60).33.7 [Xiph.]; cf. *FGrH* 100 (Dexippus) F 6.2; etc.) which is appropriate in this context.

συμβούλους ... παρελάμβανεν: That a good king or emperor should surround himself with a body of (good) advisors has a long antiquity in Greco-Roman political thought (e.g. Isocr. *ad Nic.* 6; Dio Chrys. 1.8, 1.33; Hdn. 1.4.3-6, 6.1.2; HA *Alex.* 16;), and it was part of the conception of the *ciuilis princeps* (Wilkinson 2012: 138-48). Dio develops this theme throughout the imperial books, but especially in the Augustan narrative (cf. Adler 2012: 502-3). In the Speech of Maecenas, Dio has Maecenas counsel Augustus that he should establish a *consilium* to advise on matters of state (52.15, 52.19.3-4, 52.33.3-4). More broadly, Dio demonstrates the importance of advisors by insertion of speeches delivered by Augustus' advisors, namely the Agrippa-Maecenas debate and the Livia-Augustus dialogue. Moreover, the role of advisor was one that was part of Dio's self-fashioning, as he portrayed himself during the Severan narrative as an advisor to both Septimius Severus and Caracalla (Severus: 76(75).16.4 [Xiph.], 77(76).17.1-2 [Xiph.]; Caracalla: 78(77).17.3-4 [Xiph.]; cf. Swan 2004: 218; Davenport 2012: 800).

κατὰ τὸν Αὔγουστον: Dio placed the inauguration of the *consilium principis* in his survey of Augustus' legislation following the settlement of 27 B.C. According to Dio, the *consilium* originally comprised fifteen senators (determined by lot) in addition to the consuls and one of each of the other senatorial magistracies (53.21.4; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 35.3). Little evidence of this original *consilium* exists, save for one document from 4 B.C. (*EJ*² no. 311, line 87 = *SEG* 9, no. 8, line 87 = Oliver *GC* no. 12). Later in A.D. 13, the senatorial membership of the *consilium* was increased from fifteen to

twenty and was no longer determined by lot, but by Augustus (56.28.2-3). Furthermore, according to Dio, the *consilium* now included members of the imperial family as well as Augustus' *amici*.³⁸⁹ Although consultation with a group of (respectable) advisors became one of the hallmarks of the *ciuilis princeps*, the idea of an *official* 'cabinet' of advisors was deeply un-Republican (cf. Syme 1939: 408). It was perhaps for this reason that this experiment in pseudo-cabinet government never really developed; for after the reign of Augustus the emperor's *consilium* appears to have become less formalised and its membership seems to have been determined on an *ad hoc* basis, depending on the issue at hand (see below 57.17.9; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 55). Hence, the *Tabula Siarensis* preserves a reference to Tiberius' *consilium*, made up of members of the *domus Augusta*, which determined the posthumous honours to be granted to Germanicus (*TS* lines 100-105; cf. Lott 2012: 213-14; Severy 2000: 320-21).³⁹⁰ For a general discussion of imperial *consilia*, see *CAH*² 11.195-213 (Eck); Millar 1977: 268-9; Crook 1955: 8-17 (Augustus), 18-20, 36-9 (Tiberius).

οὐ μέντοι ... ἐπεκοίνου: a contrast with Augustan procedure? The interpretation depends on whether **μέντοι** is taken as adversative or progressive. Dio may have in mind a change to the situation described at 56.28.2-3 whereby policies determined upon by Augustus and his *consilium* carried force of *senatus consulta* without further deliberation from the Senate. Dio might also be emphasising a more general point about Tiberius' inclusion of the Senate (see below **τοῖς ἄλλοις**) in the deliberative

³⁸⁹ This seems to be partially confirmed by *P.Oxy.* 2435 (verso), a document detailing the reception of an Alexandrian embassy by Augustus' *consilium* in A.D. 13, which notes the presence of Tiberius and Drusus, along with several senators, whose names, with the exception of Valerius Messalinus Corvinus (*PIR*¹ V 93), are obscured (lines 34-40). For possible reconstruction of these names, see Bowman 1976: 154.

³⁹⁰ For an example of the composition of an early Severan era *consilium*, note *P.Oxy.* 3019 which describes Severus' court comprising 'friends and men summoned to the consilium' (τῶν φίλων καὶ τῶν εἰς τὸ συμβούλειον κεκλημένων). Cf. the Hadrianic *P.Oxy.* 2177 [= Musurillo AA 10, ll. 61-3].

process. For this interpretation, note the parallel with Dio's comment about Tarquinius Superbus (F 11.5 [EVV]): οὔτε τοῖς καταλοίποις λόγου τι ἄξιον ἐπεκοίνου). **τοῖς ἄλλοις**: presumably 'with the Senate' rather than with his advisors.

7.3 καὶ ἔς γε τὸ μέσον ... ἔφερε: The general content of this passage seems to be encapsulated by Suet. *Tib.* 31.1: *quaedam aduersus sententiam suam decerni ne questus quidem est*. **παρηρησίαν**: Dio associated *parrhesia* with the Republican form of government.³⁹¹ For Dio, the coming of 'monarchy' at Rome signalled the end of free or frank speech (43.10.4-5; 47.39.2-3). Thereafter, an individual's ability to speak candidly was dependent on the will of the emperor. Hence, an emperor's willingness to allow displays of *parrhesia* (almost always used to describe the expression of a position contrary to that held by the emperor) was regarded as a mark of the *ciuilis princeps* (e.g. 52.33.6; Plin. *Pan.* 76.1-4; Suet. *Aug.* 54-55; Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 38-9 with n. 51) as it had been of the Classical/Hellenistic ideal of the good king (e.g. Isocr. *ad Nic.* 28). Dio looked upon imperial reactions to displays of *parrhesia* as one of the measures of their quality as rulers. This could take two forms. On the one hand, the ability to speak freely to a king was seen as a mark of a good advisor, as opposed to a flatterer (cf. Plut. *Mor.* [*How to Tell a Flatterer*] 66a-74e; Max. Tyr. 14.7-8). Hence, Augustus is praised for allowing his friends to employ such outspokenness when offering him good advice (56.43.1; cf. 56.40.3; 52.3.3), likewise Septimius

³⁹¹ Unlike Polybius before him (Polyb. 6.9.4-5 with Walbank *HCP* 1.657). Dio's assessment was no doubt influenced by the traditional association of *parrhesia* with the Athenians and in particular with the Athenian democracy, for which see Konstan 2012; Barrett 1964: 236 on Eurip. *Hipp.* 421-423; cf. Eurip. *Ion* 671-675, Dem. *Epit.* 26; etc. N.B. Wirszubski (1950: 13): 'In fact the Roman republic never was, nor, on the whole, was meant to be, a democracy of the Athenian type; the *eleutheia* with *isonomia* and *parrhesia* as its chief expressions appeared to the Romans as being nearer to *licentia* than *libertas*.'; Barton 2001: 160-3.

Severus with his advisors (77(76).17.1 [Xiph.]). On the other hand, an emperor was expected to tolerate (at least to a degree) harmless political opponents. Severus is commended for not punishing Cassius Clemens (*PIR*² C 489), a one time partisan of Pescennius Niger, for Clemens' display of *parrhesia* during his trial (75(74).9.1 [Xiph.]; 75(74).9.4 [Xiph.]), and finally, but perhaps most interestingly, Dio praises Vitellius for his mildness (ἐπιείκεια) following a heated exchange in the Senate with Helvidius Priscus (64(65).7.2 [EVV]). For Tiberius' toleration of people who displayed *parrhesia*, see 57.2.5-6 (above) and 57.17.3 (below).

αὐτὸς ψήφον πολλάκις ἐδίδου: Perhaps an indication of the senatorial procedure of Dio's own day in so far as his comment expresses surprise that Tiberius cast a vote along with the other senators. According to Talbert (1984: 183), the Severan emperors, as with those of the third century in general, rarely attended meetings of the Senate, and did not participate in debate, preferring instead to issue imperial rescripts coinciding with meetings of the Senate on the Kalends and the Ides. It should be noted, however, that this view is largely based on inference *ex silentio*. Had Dio's narrative of the Severan period survived, we would indubitably have a more complete picture of senatorial procedure from the early third century. For the position of the emperor in the Senate in general, see Talbert 1984: 164-83.

ὁ μὲν γὰρ Δροῦσος ... ἐποίει: It may be that Dio is extrapolating from the instance described by Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.22) where Tiberius exempted Drusus from speaking first during the trial of Aemilia Lepida (*PIR*² A 420) in A.D. 20, when Drusus was consul designate.³⁹² However, Dio seems to be making a general point about Drusus'

³⁹² It was customary for consul designates to be called upon to speak first: App. *BC* 2.5[18].

participation in senatorial debate, and forming a point of comparison with Tiberius (ὁ μὲν γὰρ Δροῦσος ... ἐκεῖνος [sc. Tiberius] δέ ...), who as we see (next note) sometimes remained silent during senatorial debates. Yet Drusus' presence in this sentence is not simply to act as a foil to Tiberius. Drusus' conduct within meetings of the Senate perhaps struck Dio as peculiar and appropriately 'Republican' (cf. below 57.14.9, 57.15.9). Drusus, as the biological son of Tiberius, must have seemed to Dio to have been the natural successor to Tiberius, and thus Dio was alert to possible signs of his advancement or preferential treatment. It is likely that by Dio's day imperial sons (adopted or natural) were granted special privileges when it came to senatorial business. According to the *Historia Augusta*, Marcus Aurelius was given the right to bring before the Senate five *relationes* every meeting, as Caesar to Antoninus Pius in 147 (HA *Marc.* 6.6; cf. Talbert 1984: 166).

7.4 ἐκεῖνος δὲ ... ἀπεδειξάμην: In theory, the emperor should have spoken first during the *interrogatio* (providing he was not presiding), as he headed the *album*, although it appears that speaking order could vary from meeting to meeting. For order of speaking in the Senate, see Talbert 1984: 240-8. Yet, as recognised by Dio and those before him, had he spoken first there was the likelihood that all would follow his lead (55.34.1, 57.24.7 [Xiph.]; Tac. *Ann.* 1.74.5, cf. Sen. *Clem.* 1.15.4). **ἵνα δὲ μὴ δοκῇ ... ἀφαιρεῖσθαι:** A typical Dionian idea. A good emperor was one who maintained the *semblance* (sc. **δοκῇ**) of republicanism (cf. 57.9.1, 57.15.9), in this case, the capacity for senators to exercise *parrhesia* (for which see above 57.7.3). For the concern of senatorial authors about speaking order in the Senate, and the right to express a free opinion and vote accordingly, see Pliny *Pan.* 76.2-4, cf. 56.40.3 (funeral speech of Augustus). **“εἰ γνώμην ἐποιούμην ... ἀπεδειξάμην”:** Again Dio

preserves another deceptively anodyne saying attributed to Tiberius, this time illustrating the way in which a *ciuilis princeps* could influence opinion within the Senate. Note also the similar saying attributed to Tiberius, quoted at 57.21.1.

7.5 καὶ ἦν μὲν καὶ τοῦτο τὴν ἴσην τῷ ἑτέρῳ ἰσχὺν ἔχον: ‘And this tactic was just as effective as the other’. τῷ ἑτέρῳ: i.e. Tiberius disclosing his opinions openly (sc. τὰ ... ἀντικρὺς ἀπεφαίνετο). Dio deftly sets this up to make it appear that Tiberius’ methods would have stymied opposition, but then goes on to reveal (contrary to expectations) that this was not the case (see next note).

καὶ ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ ἐπεκράτουν: ‘and sometimes carried the day’. Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 31.1: *quaedam aduersus sententiam suam decerni ne questus quidem est*. Unlike Suetonius (*Tib.* 31.1-2), Dio does not go on to provide specific examples of this concessionary behaviour: his aim in these chapters is just to sketch the general pattern. Cf. 57.15.9 (below).

οὐδενὶ μέντοι παρὰ τοῦτο ὀργὴν εἶχεν: A likely reminder of one of the key aspects of Tiberius’ general (natural?) behaviour (57.1.1). We as readers are left to wonder if Tiberius was genuinely not angry on these occasions, or simply did not *show* his anger. For Dio, the point here is that Tiberius conducted himself appropriately by not reacting in anger against those who voted against him. Cf. 57.6.2 (above), 57.17.3 (below), and 58.27.3.

7.6 ὥσπερ εἶπον: Dio resumes his narration of Tiberius’ performance of his non-senatorial duties, raised at 57.7.2.

τὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων δικαστήρια: Perhaps a general reference to the courts of the praetors and the *quaestiones perpetuae* as opposed to the senatorial court or that of the emperor. See *CAH*² 10.405-8 (Galsterer), and now Bablitz 2007: 13-50 for a description of these courts during the early empire, their function and locations in Rome.

καὶ παρακαλούμενος ... καὶ ἀπαράκλητος: Dio's phraseology recalls that of Thuc. 1.118.3: καὶ αὐτὸς ἔφη ξυλλήψεσθαι καὶ παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἄκλητος. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 403b [*On the Oracle at Delphi*] (paraphrasing Thucydides): καὶ βοηθήσειν αὐτὸς καὶ παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἀπαράκλητος. I suspect Dio's somewhat unusual turn of phrase (**ἀπαράκλητος** appears only here and at 41.33.1) was little more than a stylistic flourish. The slightly religious register of the phrase is, however, consistent with the sort of similarly quasi-religious language used by other authors when describing the actions of emperors as dispensers of justice (e.g. Dio Chry. 1.42-46).

ἐπὶ τοῦ βάθρου τοῦ κατάντικρύς σφον κειμένου καθίζων: There is considerable concordance between Dio's description here, and that provided by Suetonius (*Tib.* 33) and Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.75.1), made all the more strong (paradoxically) by the fact that each provides a slightly different description of where Tiberius was wont to sit. Tacitus maintained that Tiberius sat at the corner of the praetor's tribunal (*in cornu tribunalis*), whereas Suetonius (*Tib.* 33) says that Tiberius sat either beside or opposite the judges (*assidebatque iuxtim uel exaduersum in parte primori*). The point of all three accounts is that Tiberius did not take the place of the presiding magistrates

in the courts (for which, see notes below). Two options present themselves to explain the source connection. (i) Suetonius represents an attempt to reconcile two different sources, the traces of which are found in Tacitus and Dio. (ii) Suetonius' account represents something close to an original report found in a source common to Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio which described Tiberius' seating positions in the court (that is Tiberius sometimes sat at the corner of the praetor's tribunal, and at other times opposite the praetor). Yet for compositional purposes Dio and Tacitus preferred to choose one of the two reports for their narratives. This seems the most likely explanation (cf. Bablitz 2009: 122).

ἔλεγεν ... ὥς πρόεδρος: a textual crux, which hangs on our understanding of ὥς πάρεδρος/πρόεδρος. The reading of M and Xiphilinus is ὥς πρόεδρος, Boissevain follows Reiske's emendation and prints ὥς πάρεδρος, whereas Reimarus offered ὥς πρόσεδρος as an emendation. For the reasons outlined below, I am inclined to reject the emendations, and restore the MS reading.

(i) ὥς πρόσεδρος. We may dismiss Reimarus' (2.852) emendation with little difficulty. πρόσεδρος appears only once in Greek literature prior to the fifth century, and that is in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* (794). Hesychius (Π 3710) glosses πρόσεδρος as ὁ παρακαθήμενος, σχολάζων, which does not appear to be appropriate to the context of the passage. It is true that παρακαθήμενος may be used to denote someone sitting as a co-assessor in a trial (cf. 75(74).9.2 [Xiph.]), but I cannot see why Dio would choose to employ such patently *recherché* language at this point to express such a simple idea.

(ii) ὥς πάρεδρος. Dio's editors have been almost unanimous in their acceptance of

Reiske's emendation, indicating that Tiberius behaved during these trials 'as an assessor'. πάρεδρος could be used to denote an *adsessor* or *consiliarius* in the imperial period. The scholiast on Demosthenes *Against Meidias* 178 (607 = ed. Dilts 2. 240) glosses πάρεδρος as συγκάθεδρος, the latter a word not found in Dio, but it appears in documents of the imperial period to identify an *adsessor* in a trial (*IG Rom.* 1.933; cf. Mason *GT* 175). Boissevain appears to have looked to Suetonius (*Tib.* 33) for the basis of his emendation, where Tiberius is described as offering his services to the presiding magistrates as a *consiliarius* (sc. *plerumque se offerebat consilium*). In support of this reading we might turn to 55.34.1 where Dio uses the participle of the verb παρεδρεύω to describe those individuals who sat as assessors to Augustus during trials. In this example, Dio clearly is adhering to classical usage. Compare Dio (55.34.1): οἱ παρεδρεύοντές σφισιν [sc. Augustus], with Demosthenes (*Meid.* 178): παραδρεύοντος ἄρχοντι τῷ υἱεῖ. However, we should exercise caution. Dio's use of the noun πάρεδρος is particularly idiosyncratic (note Mason *GT* 154; Rich 1990: 146), and he makes a deliberate point of defining it as a *legatus* serving under a provincial governor (53.14.6-7, cf. 55.27.6, 57.14.4, 73(72).11.4 [Xiph.]).³⁹³ Moreover, in the few instances apart from 55.34.1 (quoted above) where Dio uses the verb παρεδρεύω it is almost always in the sense of 'serving as a *legatus* to a provincial governor' (53.14.6, 60.25.6).³⁹⁴ Hence, that Dio should use it here in such a fashion seems especially odd, when he could have used a more familiar word like σύμβουλος to denote a *consiliarius*, if this was indeed what Dio intended to indicate.

³⁹³ A further example may be added (80(79).3.1), but the lacunose state of the MS (*Cod. Vat. Gr.* 1288) precludes any definite reading.

³⁹⁴ The only other instance (73(72).5.3 [Xiph.]), may or may not refer specifically to the holding of such posts.

(iii) ὡς πρόεδρος: a word unattested elsewhere in the surviving portions of Dio, but one familiar in Classical sources. Were it not for the fact that both M and the Xiphilinus MSS read πρόεδρος we might suspect it to be a Byzantine corruption or marginal gloss that entered the tradition, and thus opt for deletion. *Proedroi* were Byzantine court officials of the mid-10th, 11th and 12th centuries (e.g. Const. Porph. *De Cerem.* 1.97 [= ed. Reiske 1.440-443]; cf. *ODB* 3.1727). But it seems unlikely that both the copyist of M and Xiphilinus (who date to the 10th and 11th centuries respectively) should have included the same gloss independently of one another. If M and Xiphilinus are correct, then we must ask whether *proedros* (which would mean something like ‘president of the court’ or ‘presiding magistrate’) would make any sense in the context of the passage. Contemporaneous references to *proedroi* are scarce. However, a clue may be found in Achilles Tatius, writing perhaps in the second century, who uses *proedros* both to denote the presiding magistrate at a court who appears to have been in charge of procedural matters (e.g. 8.7.6),³⁹⁵ as well as ‘judges’ in general (8.9.8).

Finally, that Tiberius acted ‘as though a presiding magistrate’ seems to fit the context of the passage best of all. If Dio had wanted to say that Tiberius was acting as a *consiliarius*, we would expect him to have sat with the judges or members of the judicial *consilium*, but instead Dio says that he sat *opposite* the magistrates. Moreover, Dio’s statement that Tiberius spoke ‘as often as seemed appropriate to him’, suggests the conduct not of a *consiliarius*, but of a presiding officer of a court (*pace* Freyburger-Galland 1997: 199). If this is correct, then I suggest that Dio’s

³⁹⁵ Such was the function of a *proedros* in the Classical Athenian *boule* and *ekklesia* ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 44.2-3). *Proedroi* are attested at Athens performing similar functions well into the third century A.D. (e.g. *SEG* 30, no. 82 line 24).

proedros denotes the position of a *quaesitor*, a title given to the presiding magistrates of *quaestiones perpetuae*. Such a gloss accords with what we know of Dio's practice of using classical terminology for Roman magistrates and institutions. Moreover, we know from Asconius (45C. 22-26) that certain *quaesitores* could be quite energetic in their interjections during court sessions, which accords well with Suetonius' description (*Tib.* 33) of Tiberius' (unexpected) interjections in hearings, presumably where he felt procedural standards were not being upheld.

Tiberius' participation in these court proceedings, 'summoned or un-summoned' illustrates once again the problematical nature of the *ciuilis princeps*. It was an expectation of a good emperor to ensure the proper management of the law and justice, like a latter-day Rhadamanthys or Minos, yet by doing so the emperor undermined the authority of the presiding (Republican) magistrate (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.75.1: *set dum ueritati consulitur, libertas corrumpebatur*). It was a fine balance for a king to be seen to administer justice well, but not to usurp the authority of the presiding magistrates (cf. Plin. *Pan.* 77.4-5). This passage highlights Dio's acute awareness of this fundamental conflict. On the one hand, Tiberius gives the impression that he is not usurping the authority of the magistrates in so far as he does not displace them from their official seats (ἐπὶ τοῦ βάθρου τοῦ κατάντικρύς σφῶν κειμένου καθίζων), but on the other hand, by interjecting (as though a πρόεδρος) or appearing un-summoned, he is by his actions undermining their authority.

8.1: οὔτε γὰρ ... ἐφίει: 'For he neither allowed himself to be called master by free men nor *imperator* except by the soldiers.' δεσπότην: 'master' (sc. *dominus*) Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 27: *dominus appellatus a quodam denuntiauit, ne se amplius contumeliae*

causa nominaret. Note also Tacitus *Ann.* 2.87: *acerbeque increpuit eos qui diuinas occupationes ipsumque dominum dixerant*. Tiberius may be seen to be following Augustan precedent; at 55.12.2 Dio³⁹⁶ describes Augustus refusing to allow people to address him as ‘master’ (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 53.1; Ovid *Fasti* 2.142; Tert. *Apol.* 34.1 Swan 2004: 137). Later emperors were less reticent. Domitian was notorious for requiring senators to address him formally as ‘master’ (67.4.7 = Zonar. 11.19 [= Dindorf 3.59]; 67.13.4; cf. Plin. *Pan.* 2.3, 7.6; Suet. *Dom.* 13.1-2; etc.).³⁹⁷ Yet it was customary (or became customary) to address an emperor as *domine*, as is amply demonstrated by the letters of Pliny to Trajan or those of Fronto. For the early third-century context where we see Caracalla styled ‘Master of Earth and Sea’, note *CIG* 2, nos. 2912, 2913, 3484, 2264n, *CIG* 3, no. 4680. For summary of usage and discussion, see Dickey 2002: 76-8, 94-9; Dickey 1996: 95-8 (for the semantic range of δέσποτα as a form of address); cf. Sherwin-White 1966: 557-8; Dvornik 1966: 2.508-9; Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 37-8; Noreña 2011: 227-8.

αὐτοκράτορα: As we have seen previously (above 57.2.1) Dio appreciated the broad semantic range of the word αὐτοκράτωρ/*imperator*. He seems to have used it in four distinct ways: (i) as a designation of the independent military authority of a general who held *imperium* (e.g. F. 57.81, 43.44.3); (ii) as a salutation given to a victorious general by his troops (e.g. 37.40.2); (iii) as informal shorthand for the ‘position’ of emperor/*princeps*; (iv) as the *praenomen Imperatoris*. Dio believed that the title *imperator* (iv) denoted an emperor’s *imperium* (i) (cf. 53.17.4-5; Rich 1990: 149-50).

³⁹⁶ The passage is preserved by both Xiphilinus and Zonaras (cf. Boissevain 2.497).

³⁹⁷ As noted by Gradel (2002: 160), there is no epigraphic evidence for Domitian adopting ‘dominus et deus’ as a formal style.

Dio claims that the Senate voted Julius Caesar not only ‘the name *Imperator*’ (τὸ ... τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος ὄνομα), but the right for his descendants to hold it as well (43.44.2-3; cf. Suet. *Iul.* 76.1).³⁹⁸ Dio believed that this was the origin for the use of the word employed in his own day, to denote the position of emperor as opposed to the name given to a victorious general, or someone who held an independent military command (43.44.3). Yet, as noted by Syme (1958b: 184, 185 n.1 = *RP* 1.374 with fn.3), it was only with the accession of Vespasian that the *praenomen Imperatoris* becomes a standard feature of imperial nomenclature. Numismatic evidence indicates that Augustus had adopted the *praenomen Imperator* during the internecine struggles of the 30s B.C.,³⁹⁹ and perhaps used it as a counter to Sextus Pompeius’ reinvention as ‘Magnus Pius’ (Syme 1958b: 182 = *RP* 1.372). In contrast with its later applications, *Imperator* was used by Augustus as his actual *praenomen* (replacing Gaius), rather than a title denoting his position (Syme 1958b: 182 = *RP* 1.372-3), which appeared before the emperor’s (pre-imperial) *praenomen*.

Dio is silent on Augustus’ adoption of this name in the triumviral period. However, he does note that Augustus assumed the *title* ‘*Imperator*’ (τὴν τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος ἐπικλησιν ἐπέθετο) in 29 B.C., presumably after having it officially granted to him by the Senate (52.41.3-4; Reinhold 1988: 210). If we accept Dio’s note here, and there is no convincing reason why we should not, then it is likely that the Senate offered the title again to Tiberius in A.D. 14 (see above 57.2.1), as a gesture acknowledging his position of supremacy within the state, as Augustus’ was in 29

³⁹⁸ For the more important contributions to this discussion, see Grant 1946: 408-41; Syme 1958b = *RP* 1.361-77; Weinstock 1971: 103-11.

³⁹⁹ The earliest example is from 38 B.C., where he appears on coins variously styled IMP. DIVI IVLI F. TER. III VIR R.P.C., or IMP. CAESAR DIVI IVLI (*RRC* no. 534); Crawford 1974: 535; Grant 1946: 415.

B.C. and Caesar's in 45 B.C.

πλὴν τοῖς στρατιώταις: That Tiberius should have wished the title *imperator/autokrator* to be used only by members of the army is consistent with the Republican usage, denoting his independent military authority as general (*imperator*) of all the legions (cf. McFayden 1920: 54).⁴⁰⁰ To use such a title in a non-military context might have smacked of military dictatorship.⁴⁰¹ Tiberius does seem to have avoided styling himself *imperator/αὐτοκράτωρ*, although there are examples of inscriptions where he is styled in this way (e.g. *EJ*² no. 93 = *IGRR* iv. 206; *EJ*² no. 102 = Oliver *GC* no. 15; *CIL* 3.8512, 3.10918; *AE* 1975, 861; cf. Holtzhausser 1918: 26-7): a reminder of the less than total control an emperor had over his nomenclature outside Rome. For the use of *Imperator* as a term of address, see Dickey 2002: 99-103, especially 102-3.

τοῦ πατρὸς τῆς πατρίδος: Tiberius was offered the title *pater patriae* several times during his reign and each time 'passed it by'. Tacitus records two definite instances where the title was offered, once in A.D. 15 (*Ann.* 1.72.1),⁴⁰² and again in 19 (*Ann.* 2.87.2). Neither of these occasions is mentioned by Dio, in the latter case perhaps owing to excision by Xiphilinus.⁴⁰³ It seems more likely however, that Dio omitted reference to the proposal of A.D. 19, just as he did not record that of A.D. 15 under

⁴⁰⁰ However, McFayden is incorrect when he asserts that all examples where Tiberius is styled *Imperator* date to early in his reign: *CIL* 3.8512 may be dated to A.D. 26/27.

⁴⁰¹ Augustus too seems to have moved away from identifying himself as *Imperator* as his reign progressed, perhaps due to its unwanted connections with the triumviral period (Grant 1946: 440-2).

⁴⁰² Tacitus suggests that this was not the first time Tiberius had been offered this title by the people: *nomen patris patriae Tiberius, a populo saepius ingestum, repudiavit*.

⁴⁰³ We are dependent principally on Xiphilinus for Dio's narrative following 57.17.8 until the resumption of the M at 58.7.2.

the events for that year. Here Dio's use of the aorist (**διέωσατο**) suggests that Dio has in mind a specific (initial) refusal of the title (perhaps that in A.D. 15), but the summary nature of the passage suggests a certain degree of timelessness (as indicated by the succession of imperfects). Dio's aim in this passage is to illustrate Tiberius' general conduct with respect to honorific titles general, and as such he probably intended to account for the several occasions where Tiberius was offered the title in the period covered by Book 57. Dio records one further occasion following the fall of Sejanus in A.D. 31 (58.12.8).⁴⁰⁴ Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 26.2, 67.2-4.

There are a few examples where the title *pater patriae* appears on Tiberian inscriptions, but these are clearly the rare exceptions and are perhaps best thought of as the results of enthusiastic provincial administrators or communities (*EJ*² no. 102, line 9 = *AE* 1929: 99 = Oliver *GC* no. 15; cf. Levick 1976: 248; Holtzhausser 1918: 37; Marsh 1931: 50 n.1; Lindsay 1995: 115).⁴⁰⁵ That this should happen is not surprising: Augustus was styled *pater/parens patriae* in literary and non-literary sources long before his final acceptance of the honour in 2 B.C., as Dio correctly recognized (55.10.10 [Xiph.]). For examples see Weinstock 1971: 204 n. 1.

Dio certainly saw Tiberius' rejection of the title *pater patriae* as being indicative of Tiberius' display of moderation (as indeed was the case with any emperor's rejection or at least reluctance to accept any honorific title). Tiberius' continual refusal may have also struck Dio as being somewhat unusual as it was a title accepted by most

⁴⁰⁴ *pace* Stevenson (2009: 107 n. 26) who seems to infer that Dio's statement at 58.22.1 refers to another rejection of the title *pater patriae*. The title *might* have been among the suite of honours proposed for Tiberius, but Dio is not explicit.

⁴⁰⁵ Note also the rare appearance attributions on the coinage, Carthage: *RPC* 1.1 nos. 754-757 (Carthage); cf. (if genuine) Cohen 1880: 1.193 (Tibère no. 42).

subsequent emperors, although usually after a lapse of time (e.g. 59.3.2, 60.3.2, etc.; cf. App. *BC* 2.7.[25]; Plin. *Pan.* 21, HA *Had.* 6.4).⁴⁰⁶ At 53.18.3 Dio provides two explanations for the significance of the title *pater*. The first explanation is that it symbolized the authority of the emperor over his subjects, just as a father once exercised power over his household. The second explanation is more nuanced but more positive. Dio suggests that the title was symbolic, at least originally, of a contract between emperor and subject: that an emperor should care for his subjects as father would for his children, while the children should show devotion to their father (cf. 43.17.5-6). This later interpretation perhaps owes something to the Senecan tradition (e.g. Sen. *Ben.* 1.4.3, 3.36.1-2; *Clem.* 1.14.2; cf. Ando 2000: 404); but the idea is well rooted in Greek thought as well, e.g. Hom. *Od.* 2.47; cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.9-11 (speaking of Romulus). Nevertheless, it is clear that the title *pater patriae* had otherwise positive connotations, and is suggestive of an ideal of rulership that would have been appealing to many in the Roman world (e.g. Dio. Chry. *Or.* 1.22, 40; Poll. 1.40; Tert. *Apol.* 34.2; *Epit. de Caes.* 18.6). For further on this point, see Stevenson 1992; cf. Weinstock 1971: 200-5; Ando 2000: 398-405; Barton 2001: 174-5; Stevenson 2009: 98-9.

To gain an appreciation of why Tiberius should refuse such a positive title, we need contextualise it in terms of Tiberius' relationship to the Augustan Principate. As with Tiberius' rejection of the *praenomen Imperatoris*, his rejection of the title *pater patriae* made sound political sense. Both these names had been of such central importance for Augustus for significant periods of his political career, and Augustus' formal acceptance of the title *pater patriae* in 2 B.C. was portrayed as a climactic

⁴⁰⁶ According to the author of the *Historia Augusta*, Pertinax was the first emperor to accept the title *pater patriae* on his accession (*Pert.* 5-6).

moment in his career (*RGDA* 35.1; cf. Cooley 2009: 275; Stevenson 2009). Tiberius' refusal could be interpreted, on the one hand, as evidence of Tiberius' genuine (or projected) moderation and respect for his adoptive father (see below 57.8.4).⁴⁰⁷ On the other hand, it allowed Tiberius to create a degree of distance between himself and Augustus. Stevenson (2009: 106-7) perhaps goes too far when he suggests that Tiberius' refusal of the title was in great part due to the negative connotations the term *pater patriae* attracted in connection with Augustus' management of his daughter's disgrace and banishment. More likely, we may read in Tiberius' actions an attempt to fashion an identity for himself, which was sufficiently distinct from that of Augustus (cf. Cowan 2009: 476-7).

8.1-2 τοῦ Αὐγούστου ... προσενέγραφε: 'Similarly did not adopt that of Augustus (for he did not allow it to be even voted to him), but allowed it if he heard it in speech or if it read it in writing, and frequently he used it himself in letters to various kings'. Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 26.2: *ac ne Augusti quidem nomen, quanquam hereditarium, ullis nisi ad reges ac dynastas epistulis addidit*. Given that the title 'Augustus' is virtually ubiquitous on Tiberius' coinage and on inscriptions,⁴⁰⁸ including the final 'autographed' section of the *SCPP* (l. 174; Lott 2012: 311), Dio's statement is the more accurate of the two, but still is problematic. Yet there was a difference in the way Tiberius and Augustus used the *cognomen* Augustus in their official styles. As noted by Grant (1950: 42) in the late coinage of Augustus, the name Augustus appears in the gentile position (e.g. CAESAR AUGUSTUS DIVI F PATER PATRIAE), whereas in the case of Tiberius it appears in the cognominal position (e.g. TI.

⁴⁰⁷ Indeed, *pater* appears on the various commemorative 'diuus Augustus' issues from Tiberius' reign, e.g. *RIC*² 1 (Tiberius) nos. 70-83.

⁴⁰⁸ E.g. Coinage: *RIC*² 1 p.92-101, *passim*.

CAESAR AUGUSTVS), hence placing less emphasis on the name ‘Augustus’. It was this change, according to Grant, that led to the assertion in the sources that Tiberius rejected the name Augustus. Although it is perhaps significant that the *cognomen* is not used all the time in the lapidary consular *fasti*. For example, Tiberius is entered in the *fasti Ostienses* for his consulships of A.D. 18 and 21 as, Ti. Caesar III and Ti. Caesar IV, respectively (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1 pp. 185, 187. But, for his consulship of 31, he appears as Ti. Caesar Augustus V (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1 p. 187). Alternatively, it has been suggested that Dio and Suetonius’ claim referred only to ‘Tiberius’ more private communications’ (Barrett 2002: 152). For further, see Scott 1932: 42-50; Cowan 2009: 476-7.

τοῦ Αὐγούστου: Dio always uses the transliteration of the Latin *Augustus*. Only once does he use the Greek equivalent, Σεβαστός when he explains the derivation of the word (53.16.8; cf. Rich 1990: 149). Although Dio was clearly concerned with maintaining a certain purity of style, his decision to transliterate Augustus throughout his work was appropriate for his persona (or at least one aspect of his persona) as a Roman Senator and imperial ‘insider’ (cf. below 57.8.4, and *Introduction, Chapter 1: The Roman Historian at Work*). Dio’s use of Αὐγουστος is consonant also with the observable trend in Greek epigraphic sources from the second and third centuries which saw the transliteration Αὐγουστος replace translation Σεβαστός as the Greek equivalent of *Augustus* (Rougé 1969: 89-91; Rich 1990: 20). For the significance of the title Augustus (and connotations) see summary of Cooley 2009: 261-2.

οὐδὲ γὰρ ψηφισθῆναι ποτε εἴασε: ‘Similarly he did not allow it to be voted to him on any occasion’. Cf. 57.2.1. A slightly discordant note? Refusing honours was one

thing, but not permitting honours to be voted in the first place perhaps suggests an infringement of senatorial *libertas*. As noted by Ando (2000: 33): '[Tiberius'] refusal of the name Augustus by itself left contemporaries without a form of address that advertised his uniqueness and justified their obsequence'. But we should note that for Dio at least, honours voted to the politically dominant contained the suggestion that they were brought about by coercion and brought little glory to the honorand (37.23.2). εἶασε (as with διεώσατο, above) Dio's use of the aorist would suggest a specific instance where Tiberius did not allow the senators to vote him the title, probably one of the meetings of the Senate in September A.D. 14.

8.2 **Καῖσαρ**: From his third century perspective, Dio regarded 'Caesar' as an imperial title (43.44.3) and not without reason, as it had been carried by all of the emperors up to his day. For the early Julio-Claudian emperors (Tiberius and Gaius) it appears in the position of the *nomen gentilicium* denoting membership to the *domus Caesaris*, and was not a title *per se* (cf. Hammond 1957: 22). Nevertheless Dio is correct in identifying it as a name by which Tiberius was addressed by contemporaries (e.g. Val. Max. *praef.* 1; cf. Dickey 2002: 100-1).

Γερμανικὸς ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ πραχθέντων: a dubious claim as it stands. There is insufficient evidence to indicate whether Tiberius ever used Germanicus as part of his official nomenclature.⁴⁰⁹ It became common practice for emperors to acquire honorific *cognomina* through the exploits of their lieutenants (e.g. 60.22.1-2). Perhaps Dio here is guilty of simply extrapolating from his evidence, basing his views on this later practice, from the fact that Germanicus celebrated a

⁴⁰⁹ *CIL* 10.1987 might refer to either the emperor Tiberius or Claudius, but the latter is more likely.

triumph for his victories in Germany (cf. 57.18.1 [Xiph.]). Tiberius did, after all, gain his eighth salutation as *imperator* from the deeds of Germanicus in A.D. 16 (Tac. *Ann.* 2.18.2).⁴¹⁰ Alternatively Dio might have found a reference to a ‘Caesar Germanicus’ in his sources and assumed it was referring to Tiberius, but this seems unlikely. Either way, the source of Dio’s claim is obscure. For the use of Germanicus (i.e. the vocative *Germanice*) as a term of address, see Dickey 2002: 103-4.

πρόξενός τε τῆς γερουσίας: = *princeps senatus*. Talbert (1984: 164) doubts the veracity of Dio’s unique claim here. Nowhere in the surviving documents of his reign do we find Tiberius explicitly styled thus. This, however, does not preclude the accuracy of Dio’s statement. That we should find no reference elsewhere to Tiberius as *princeps senatus* is not surprising; aside from one reference to the position in the *Res Gestae* (7.2), it is only with the accession of Pertinax that we first see *princeps senatus* in the epigraphic record as a formal imperial title,⁴¹¹ as recognized correctly by Dio (74(73).5.1 [Xiph.]). Hence, if genuine, it is perhaps better to think of *princeps senatus* not as an official title (hence something that would appear on inscriptions) but as a designation of Tiberius’ position within the Senate, that is, at the top of the senatorial *album*, which he presumably held on account of his seniority. Suolahti (1972: 210) suggests that Tiberius assumed to the position of *princeps senatus* by virtue of his (putative) censorial powers. If we follow Suolahti’s argument, it is possible that Tiberius held the position of *princeps senatus* as a result of the census of A.D. 13/14, but this does not seem likely. More plausibly, Tiberius assumed the rank of *princeps senatus* (i.e. the first name on the senatorial album) in A.D. 15 as a result

⁴¹⁰ For the defence of Tacitus’ dating for this salutation, see Gesche 1972; cf. Syme 1979: 322.

⁴¹¹ E.g. *AE* 1904. 65; *AE* 1969/70. 618; *CIL* 3. 14149, 35.

of the annual revision of the album (55.3.3).

Be this as it may, the idea of an emperor being *princeps senatus* was one that was ideologically appealing to Dio. Not only did Pertinax, a man whom Dio admired greatly, adopt it, but also Dio (53.1.3) thought that the designation was one that was appropriately ‘republican’ (δημοτικώς), and thus appropriate to the *ciuilis princeps*. Moreover, it signified the idea that an emperor should be selected from qualified members of the *amplissimus ordo*.

κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον: A stock phrase used by Dio, perhaps inspired by Thuc. 2.16.2. Dio’s usage always refers back to Republican procedure (tellingly Dio first uses the expression during his account of Caesar’s dictatorship at 43.23.4 and 43.44.2) and seems to be used as a mark of approval, an acknowledgement that *mos maiorum* was being upheld or restored. Here it signifies yet another feature of Tiberius’ republican-style conduct. Dio knew the republican tradition behind the designation *princeps senatus*. Zonaras’ antiquarian note (7.19 [= Dindorf 2.145]) is almost certainly derived from Dio, albeit in somewhat truncated form, where he notes that the *princeps senatus* excelled the other members of the Senate by virtue of the dignity (sc. ἀξίωμα) of his position, although without possessing formal powers (καὶ προέφερε τῶν ἄλλων τῷ ἀξιώματι, οὐ μὴν καὶ δυνάμει ἐχρητό τι).

Dio refers to at least one *princeps senatus* in his surviving Republican narrative (46.20.5) with reference to the grandfather of P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura, P. Cornelius Lentulus (*RE* 4, cols. 1374-5 = Cornelius 202 (Münzer); cf. Ryan 1998: 187-8), and possibly a second, Q. Lutatius Catulus, whom he describes with the unique expression τὰ πρῶτα τῆς βουλῆς (36.30.4; cf. Ryan 1998: 197-8). It was

traditionally the right of the *princeps senatus* to speak first in Senatorial debates, but this practice evidently fell into abeyance during the late Republic (Gell. 14.7.9, 4.10.2-5). It is possible that this tradition was revived in the imperial period, but unfortunately our evidence for this is unreliable (*HA Tac.* 4.3, cf. *Gord.* 9.7). Nevertheless, as we have seen, Tiberius did evidently opt to speak first (see note above 57.7.4), which might have been by virtue of his position as *princeps senatus*.

“**δεσπότης ... πρόκριτός εἰμι.**”: another strikingly Republican apothegm from Tiberius, consonant with those Dio includes at 57.2.3, 57.6.1 and 57.7.4. Ideologically, it conveyed a powerful message, similar to that presented by Ovid in his contrast between Romulus and Augustus (*Fasti* 2.142: *tu domini nomen, principis ille tenet*). **δεσπότης μὲν τῶν δούλων**: a positive statement that the emperor would behave as a master towards his slaves only (and not towards free men) as was befitting a δημοτικός. It is an also a tacit assertion of the emperor’s desire to ensure the proper order of things – it was a mark of a bad emperor to become ‘enslaved’ by political inferiors, such as slaves or women (cf. 60.2.4 [Xiph.]). **πρόκριτός**: Here it seems clear that Dio is thinking generally of the informal designation ‘*princeps*’ rather than *princeps senatus* (cf. Brunt and Moore 1973: 49; *pace* Pelham 1911: 51-2, 55; Rowe 2013: 13-4), given the addition of the universalizing qualification ‘of the rest’ (τῶν ... λοιπῶν). But Pelham certainly was correct in his general assertion that ‘*princeps*’ was not simply an abbreviation of the *princeps senatus* (Pelham 1911: 49-60; cf. Brunt and Moore 1973: 49; *contra* Rice Holmes 1928: 263-5).

8.3. **εὐχέτο τε, ὡς ἂν τι τοιοῦτο παρὰ πέσοι, τοσοῦτον καὶ ζῆσαι καὶ ἄρξαι χρόνον ὅσον ἂν τῷ δημοσίῳ συμφέροι**: again, a quasi-republican sentiment from

Tiberius. We may compare Tiberius' words with the formulaic prayer offered by Pliny at the end of the *Panegyricus* (94.5): *si bene rem publicam, si ex utilitate omnium regit, primum ut illum nepotibus nostris ac pronepotibus serves* [...]. These ideas had their roots in Republican thoughts, which may be seen at the end of the *pro Marcello*, where Cicero (*Marc.* 25-26) gently chides Caesar for reputedly saying, 'I have lived long enough either for nature or for glory' (*satis diu uel naturae uixi uel gloriae*), by reminding Caesar of his duty to the commonwealth. These ideas clearly appealed to Dio. Ideally, good leaders were expected to put the common good above their own desires. This applied as much to republican statesmen as it did to emperors: note Dio's criticism of Cicero whom he portrays as acting contrary to the public good by indulging in a personal vendetta against Q. Fufius Calenus (46.29.1).

δημοτικός: As has been noted well in previous scholarship, Dio uses the adjectives δημοκρατικός and δημοτικός to denote a quality of particular emperors cognate with the Latin *ciuilis*.⁴¹² It is appropriate at this juncture to explore what Dio might actually mean by the terms δημοκρατικός and δημοτικός,⁴¹³ for this present passage (sc. 57.7-13) contains perhaps Dio's most elaborate discussion and articulation of this concept applied to an emperor. As noted correctly by Wallace-Hadrill, δημοτικός is not a term that appears generally in Greek kingship literature, so we cannot look there for assistance.⁴¹⁴ Dio only uses the adjectives δημοτικός and δημοκρατικός and the cognate adverbs sparingly throughout his work, although when they describe a

⁴¹² E.g. Flach 1973: 140; Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 44; Rich 1990: 222.

⁴¹³ Freyburger-Galland 1997, treats these terms separately as representing different concepts. For reasons that will become apparent, there seems to be good reason to suppose that in many (if not all) circumstances the terms are interchangeable. That δημοκρατικός and δημοτικός could be interchangeable, note *LSJ*⁹ s.v. δημοκρατικός II.

⁴¹⁴ E.g. it does not appear in any of the kingship orations of Dio Chrysostom, ps.-Aelius Aristides, or in the handbooks such as that ascribed to Menander Rhetor, or even in the list of adjectives used to describe kings in Pollux's *Onomasticon*.

particular quality possessed by certain individuals the use is not confined to emperors.⁴¹⁵ Indeed, Dio uses δημοτικός in connection with three quintessentially Republican figures. The first of these is the exemplary M. Valerius Publicola (F 13.2 [ES]).⁴¹⁶ The second is the equally exemplary Younger Cato, whom Dio styles δημοτικώτατος primarily for his unflinching willingness to put the interests of the state above his own (43.11.6). The third, Lucius Mummius (F 76.1 [EVV]), who presents a less straightforward exemplum than either Publicola or Cato, is nevertheless a man whom Dio seems to have regarded positively in terms of his mildness in his public transactions.

When considering Dio's emperors, it is worth noting in the two instances where Dio's contemporary, the elder Philostratus (*GRSRE* no. 832), uses the term δημοτικός in the *Vita Sophistarum* it is in respect to Marcus Aurelius. In the first of these passages, Philostratus says that Marcus' nature was 'quite *demotikos*' (τῇ τε φύσει τοῦ βασιλέως δημοτικωτέρα) (Philostr. *VS* 560). The second example presents Marcus giving a particular ruling in a legal matter on account of it being '*demotikon*' (ἐξέεστο ... δημοτικὸν γάρ) (Philostr. *VS* 583). In both cases we may note the sense *demotikos* is used almost to convey a sense of leniency, not dissimilar to Dio's usage on occasions.

A range of translations have been offered for δημοτικός. Wallace-Hadrill (1982: 44) recognized that the term in Dio's mind denoted behaviour 'as if under a republic' (cf.

⁴¹⁵ For other usages, see *LSJ*⁹ s.v. δημοτικός.

⁴¹⁶ Zonaras (7.12 = Dind. 2.121) notes that the *cognomen* Publicola was the Latin equivalent of δημοκρηδής or δημοτικώτατος, perhaps independently of Dio. The former of the two words does not appear elsewhere in Dio, but note Plut. *Pub.* 10.9 and Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.19.5.

de Blois 1999: 37). This is certainly true for Dio's usage when it comes to describing the qualities of particular emperors: yet, it perhaps misses a no less important underlying meaning that made it a term that could be applied to either a Publicola or a Pertinax, that is to say as a quality that transcended the Republic/Principate divide. Moreover, Dio (and indeed Philostratus) recognized, perhaps more than Wallace-Hadrill (1982: 44) was seemingly prepared to admit, that δημοτικός could refer to a personal quality rather than simply a pose. Swan (2004: 56 on 55.4.2), glosses δημοκρατικός as 'unmonarchic, popular, unassuming.' For the former he notes well Dio's antithetical contrast between Caligula's δημοκρατικώτατος and μοναρχικώτατος behaviour (59.3.1-2) (Swan 2004: 56; Freyburger-Galland 1997: 139). Rich's suggestion (1989: 102-3), 'democratic', is not without its appeal either, as it carries a sense close to Swan's 'unmonarchic', as well as reflecting an idiomatic English sense of 'democratic'.

Typically, examples of imperial behaviour that Dio regards as being especially δημοτικός are things like the rejection of titles and honours (human or divine), as indicated in the commentary below at 57.9.1 and 57.15.1. We get the sense that δημοτικός denotes a conspicuous quality. Hence during the context of the settlement of 27 B.C., Dio says that the man who would shortly become Augustus wanted to appear δημοτικός by dividing the provinces in the way he did – sharing responsibility between himself and the Senate and People. Similarly Pertinax's adoption of the title *princeps senatus* is considered by Dio a way Pertinax was able to advertise and promote the δημοτικός character of his rule (74(73).5.1 [Xiph.]; cf. 74(73).3.4 [Xiph.]).

In light of the above examples, it is perhaps best to state that the δημοτικός defies a single definition, and to acknowledge the broad semantic range of term.

ὥστε οὔτε ἐν τοῖς γενεθλίοις αὐτοῦ γίγνεσθαι τι παρὰ τὸ καθεστηκὸς ἐπέτρεπεν: A deviation from Augustan policy. Augustus' birthday had been formally celebrated in his lifetime with festivals and sacrifices (51.19.2, 56.25.3; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 57). For Dio, the precedent for this was the enforced celebration of Julius Caesar's birthday as instituted by the triumvirs (47.18.4; cf. Weinstock 1971: 206-12). It appears that the formal celebration of Tiberius' birthday occurred only after his death following a senatorial decree in A.D. 40 (59.24.7), although note Suetonius (*Tib.* 26.1): *natalem suum plebeis incurrentem circensibus uix unius bigae adiectione honorari passus est*. Epigraphic evidence indicates that Tiberius' birthday was celebrated by at least certain Italian communities during his lifetime, as indicated by an inscription from Forum Clodii (mod. Bracciano), dated to A.D. 18 (*EJ²* 101 = *CIL* 11, 3303 = *AE* 2008, 522). Tiberius' professed wish not to have his birthday celebrated in such a manner must have struck Dio as particularly noteworthy, given that the commemoration of imperial birthdays was not only increasingly commonplace under the Principate, but also was the focus of specific religious observances (e.g. 59.7.2-3, 59.24.7; cf. *ILS* 108 (*Feriale Cumanum*); Plin. *Ep.* 10.17a; *Pan Lat.* 11 (3); etc.). The surviving acts of the Arval Brethren suggest that the emperor's birthday was an occasion for sacrifices to an emperor's *genius* (Gradel 2002: 162). This last detail might indicate Dio's train of thought in this sentence, as the following part of the sentence deals with the swearing of oaths by Tiberius' *genius*/τύχη (next note).

τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τύχην συνεχώρει: Dio was particularly concerned over the encroachment of (what we may loosely term) the imperial cult on what he perceived as the traditional forms of religious observance (see also 57.9.1 below). Dio notes how it was permitted for oaths to be sworn by the *τύχη* (sc. *genius*) of Julius Caesar (during his lifetime) as one of the measures passed in his honour in 44 B.C. (44.6.1, 44.50.1; cf. Weinstock 1971: 212-4; Fishwick *ICLW* 2.1.377; Pelling 2011: 346-7). Later, Xiphilinus notes that later in Tiberius' reign, oaths were sworn by not only by Tiberius' *genius* but also by Sejanus' (58.2.8 [Xiph.]).⁴¹⁷ Dio seems to be making a deliberate yet tacit distinction here between an oath sworn by Tiberius' *genius* and one by his name, the latter being apparently less problematic in Dio's mind (e.g. 58.12.6; cf. *EJ*² 117 = *P.Oxy.* 2.240).

By the time Dio was writing, swearing an oath by an emperor's *genius* seems to have become increasingly commonplace for many communities in the Roman Empire (Millar 1972: 146-7; cf. *CAH*² 10.840 (Price)). A result of this practice was the emergence of a conflict between (non-Christian) administrators and Christians during Dio's lifetime, as illustrated amply by the various *Martyr acta*: e.g. see Musurillo *ACM* 1.9 (*Martyrdom of Polycarp*); 6.3, 6.5 (*Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs*); 7.3 (*Martyrdom of Apollonius*). Dio's emphasis on these points show that it was perhaps not only Christians who found this practice of swearing by an emperor's *genius* objectionable.

ἐπωροχητός: 'perjury', according to Classical usage, which of course involved the breaking of a sacred oath (e.g. [Dem.] 59.10; Lycur. 1.76; Dinar. 1.47). Cf. 54.14.7,

⁴¹⁷ *pace* Weinstock (1971: 213) who says that these proposals were rejected: while it is possible that they were, there is nothing in Xiphilinus' text to support this.

59.8.3, 73(72).11.4 [Xiph., EVV]. Dio's main point is that Tiberius rejected any claims for personal divinity (see below 57.9.3). But Dio is almost certainly drawing a contrast between Tiberius' conduct in this matter, and that of subsequent emperors (including those of his own age). Ulpian (*Dig.* 12.2.13.6) preserves the ruling of a contemporary emperor, probably Caracalla,⁴¹⁸ who punished a man convicted of having sworn falsely by the emperor's *genius*, by having him whipped with rods and attaching a note to the miscreant stating "Do not swear rashly" (προπετῶς μὴ ὀμνῆ).

8.4 **συνελόντι τε εἰπεῖν ... γενόμενον**: an involved, yet fascinating sentence. Similar notes on Tiberius' refusal to allow an oath to be sworn confirming his acts are made by Suetonius (*Tib.* 26.2: *intercessit et quo minus in acta sua iuraretur*) and by Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.72: *neque in acta sua iurari quamquam censente senatu permisit*), but Dio transforms it into something very much of his own by way of his own explanatory note. The succession of present tense verbs (ποιούμεθα ... ἔχουσιν ... γίγνεται ... ζώντων) lends the passage a certain immediacy and emphasis of expression. Dio's insertion of his own experience of senatorial business builds on his persona as a senatorial 'insider', and in this passage his sense of corporate identity is especially pronounced (note the first person plural, ποιούμεθα). For comparison, note Dio's similar, but curiously more detached, comments at 47.18.3, where he notes the action of the triumvirs to bring about an oath to uphold the acts of Julius Caesar in 42 B.C.

⁴¹⁸ For the identification of the unnamed emperor quoted by Ulpian as Caracalla, see Honoré 2002: 163-2.

ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ ἔτους ἡμέρᾳ: The custom of swearing an oath to uphold the acts of the reigning *princeps* on the first day of the New Year seems to have begun in the 20s B.C.), although there was likely Caesarian precedent (44.6.1; 47.18.3; App. *BC* 2.106.[442]; cf. Goodyear 1981: 139-40; Reinhold 1988: 151-2). Dio records two instances during the reign of Augustus, one in 29 B.C. (51.20.1) and in 24 B.C. (53.23.1). Dio's interest in the development of this ceremony can be seen throughout his extant Julio-Claudian narrative (59.9.1, 59.13.1, 60.4.6, 60.10.1, 60.25.1-2). For a summary of the evidence, see Talbert 1984: 201-2.

ὧν γε καὶ λόγον τινὰ ποιούμεθα: Dio's use of the first person plural to express senatorial opinion is typical. Cf. Davenport (2012: 799), who notes that Dio often presents (sometimes tendentiously) his own views as being those of the Senate more generally.

ἐπὶ τε τοῖς ... ἐξ ἀνάγκης γίγνεται: The senatorial burden. As Dio's own career had amply demonstrated, it was inevitable that many senators were compelled to show support for the actions of emperors whom they did not respect. Failure to take such an oath could lead to dismissal from the Senate (Tac. *Ann.* 4.42.3, cf. *Ann.* 16.22.1). **ἔχουσιν:** Dio's use of the present plural is suggestive – it is tempting to think that he had in mind the joint rule of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, but it is equally likely that he statement was a general one.

τά γε πρώτα: It would seem from 59.9.1 that measures had been introduced to swear by Tiberius' acts later in his reign. When this was instituted is not preserved in the surviving portions of Dio's account, but it seems likely that it coincided with

Tiberius' withdrawal from Rome. Goodyear (1981: 139) suggests A.D. 32 for the date of the introduction of this measure, after the fall of Sejanus, but an earlier date could also be possible.

8.5 ἐκδηλότερον: Dio reminds us again of how important it was for an emperor to be *seen* to be acting in an appropriate manner. But could there be perhaps the implicit suggestion that Tiberius' actions drifted towards the ostentatious?

νουμηνίαν: literally, the first of the month, yet here Dio takes it to mean specifically the first of January (sc. ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ ἔτους ἡμέρᾳ (above)), as he does elsewhere, e.g. 55.8.1, 58.5.5 [Xiph.], and below 57.8.6 (below)

8.6 περὶ τε τὰς νέας ἀρχὰς καὶ περὶ τὴν ἐορτὴν ἔχοντα ... γίγνεσθαι: 'So it was both for this reason that he remained outside the city on the first day of the new year, but also in order that he might not interfere with the activities of the people, being otherwise occupied with the new magistrates and with the holiday, or so that he might not take money from them. For he most certainly did not praise Augustus' conduct in this respect: partly because it caused him much disgust but partly due to the expense in repaying such gifts.' As we have seen already (above 57.3.5) it was part of Dio's compositional strategy to provide multiple causes for Tiberius' actions. Unlike the parallel passage in Suetonius (*Tib.* 34.2), Dio ascribes to Tiberius a variety of motivations for his actions, and refrains (in this instance) from simplistic ethical categorization for Tiberius' behaviour.

τὰς νέας ἀρχὰς: From 153 B.C., the magistrates of Rome took office on the *kalends* of January (Livy *Per.* 47; Hdn. 1.16.3). Ovid (*Fasti* 1.75-88; cf. *Pont.* 4.9.17-38) provides a vivid description of the *processus consularis* which culminated in a sacrifice at the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. For discussion, see Scullard 1981: 52-4; Green 2004: 61-3. **περὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν:** Dio's phraseology suggests that he is referring not to the *processus consularis* but the popular New Year's Day festivities which took place concurrently. Much of our evidence for this festival is from later authorities. It is likely that the festival was part of the celebration of Janus (Hdn. 1.16.1), however, John the Lydian (*Mens.* 4.4) associated the festival held on the *kalends* of January with the goddess Strenia, and was one where gifts (*strenae*) were exchanged (see next note).⁴¹⁹ Either way, the historical origins of this festival are obscure: Symmachus (*Rel.* 15.1) traced its beginnings to the king Titus Tatius, but his coeval Macrobius traced it to Numa (*Sat.* 1.13.3). The vehemence with which Christian authors attacked the festival is perhaps a good indication of its popularity in Dio's own day and beyond for both Christian and non-Christian communities (e.g. Tert. *Idol.* 14; Asterius *Hom.* 4 = *PG* 40: cols. 215-225; August. *Serm.* 198.2 = *PL* 38: col. 1025; cf. *Lib. Or.* 9.4, [*Lib.*] *Progym.* 12.5.2). For discussion of this festival, see Harris 2011: 11-24.

ἢ καὶ ἀργύριον παρ' αὐτῶν λαμβάνη: The exchange of gifts was central to the New Year festival (e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 57.1, *Tib.* 34.2, *Cal.* 42; Hdn. 1.16.2; *Lib. Or.* 9.8, *Progym.* 12.5.5-10; Asterius *Hom.* 4). The practice of giving *strenae* to emperors continued long into the fourth century, as demonstrated by Symmachus' gift of gold objects to Valentinian II, which he made on behalf of his fellow magistrates,

⁴¹⁹ This confused aetiology has led some to assume that the new year's celebrations were not connected with any particular deity: *CAH*² 11. 986 (Liebeschuetz).

ostensibly as a mark of loyalty (*Rel.* 15.2). As with perhaps all acts of gift-giving, there was the tacit assumption that the exchange would be in some way reciprocated, hence Tiberius' reluctance to participate (sc. καὶ ἀνάλωσιν ἐκ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως γίγνεσθαι). **τὸν Αὐγουστον ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἐπήνει**: See 54.35.2-3 (with Rich 1990: 215) for Augustus' habit of accepting gifts and his generosity in repaying the giver. Suetonius (*Aug.* 57.1) describes Augustus receiving gifts on New Year's Day, which he would evidently use to pay for various public statues. Dio is able again to draw a point of subtle contrast between Augustus and Tiberius (and one not necessarily to Tiberius' disadvantage), which is not dependent on the appreciation of the earlier reference. Indeed, Dio's comment here anticipates a related anecdote at 57.17.1 (see *ad loc.*).

δυσχέρειαν: A particularly strong choice of word. That Tiberius should find being given money by social inferiors distasteful is consistent with the view of the aristocratic psychology of patronage found in Cicero's *De Officiis* (2.20.69). One senses that it is a view to which Dio would have subscribed as well: 'Maecenas' notes that any gift given to an emperor has the appearance of 'dishonesty' (κιβδηλία) (52.35.2). Interestingly, we may detect a fourth-century echo of this basic aristocratic mindset in the New Year's Day sermon of the bishop Asterius of Amasia (*Hom.* 4.4-5 = *PG* 40 cols. 217-220).

ἐκ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως: According to Suetonius (*Tib.* 34.2), it was Tiberius' habit to repay the giver of a gift with one four times as valuable. We may perhaps detect a faint note of criticism here, but it would be incorrect to make too much of it. On the whole, miserliness is not a feature of Dio's portrayal of Tiberius (see below 57.10.3).

9.1-2 ταῦτά ... “οὐκ ἐπιτρέψω”. Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 26.1: *Templa, flamines, sacerdotes decerni sibi prohibuit, etiam statuas atque imagines nisi permittente se poni; permisitque ea sola condicione, ne inter simulacra deorum set inter ornamenta aedium ponerentur*. Dio’s comments are stronger than those presented by Suetonius, leading Gradel (2002: 143, 278) to suggest that Dio’s account is a ‘garbled’ version of the same ruling described by Suetonius. But Gradel (2002: 144 n. 7) also concedes that Suetonius and Dio might be referring to two separate injunctions ruling against this suite of divine honours. A third solution may be posited: that Dio did refer to the same ruling as Suetonius but deliberately interpreted it for his purposes, that is, to exaggerate Tiberius’ ‘republican’ credentials. Whatever the case, Dio gives the *impression* that he is referring to a specific decree (note his use of the aorist ἀπηγόρευσε), from which he proceeds to quote the proviso (see note below 9.2) and appears to refer to it again at 58.8.4: τοῦτο [*sc.* the voting of (religious) honours]⁴²⁰ γὰρ ἀπηγορεύκει μὲν καὶ πρότερον, τότε δὲ διὰ τὸν Σεῖανὸν ἀνενέωσατο· οὐ γάρ που ὁ μηδὲν ἑαυτῷ τοιοῦτο γίνεσθαι ἐπιτρέπων ἄλλῳ γε ἐφίει.

Leaving aside questions of Dio’s historical accuracy, the passage in question conveys a strong ideological message. For Dio, the rejection of the trappings of personal divinity (i.e. consecrated statues and temples) was an appropriate action of a ‘republican’ emperor (*sc.* ταῦτά τε οὖν δημοτικῶς διώκει). Dio notes Augustus’ rejection of Agrippa’s proposal to have a temple (the Pantheon) with a conspicuously placed cult-statue dedicated to Augustus (53.27.3; cf. Rich 1990: 163). Dio takes this idea further in the Speech of Maecenas (52.35.3-5), where ‘Maecenas’ advises

⁴²⁰ Specifically, the passage is referring to sacrifices.

Augustus to forbid the manufacture of silver and gold statues of himself, along with the erection of temples; not only were these expensive to erect (so Maecenas argues), but they were no way to ensure a positive reputation (εὐκλεία). Dio illustrates this very point over the course of Books 57 and 58 where he charts the rise and fall of Sejanus by chronicling the erection and eventual destruction of his honorific statues (57.21.3 [Xiph.], 58.2.6 [Xiph.], 58.11.3). For comparison, note Petrus Patricius' comments on Didius Julianus' rejection of a golden statue (74(73).14.2^a), which are almost certainly derived from Dio.

Of course an emperor could not stop the proliferation of such images (and the same applies to temples), as Dio doubtless knew well (cf. Ando 2000: 228-239). But Dio's comments here set up a point of contrast between Tiberius and those emperors who *encouraged* the creation of such public images. In the context of the *Roman History*, Dio's comments on Tiberius look back to Augustus, who permitted such worship albeit in a limited way (51.20.7-8), but also look forwards to Caligula's desire to be worshipped (59.24.7). See also 57.10.1 (below) for Tiberius' conduct with reference to statues and shrines dedicated to Augustus. For discussion of Dio's attitudes to the worship of emperors with particular reference to the Maecenas passage, see Fishwick 1990a and Bowersock 1972: 202-6.

9.1 τεμένισμα: Not a classical word, but one which occurs with some frequency in Dio (e.g. 42.26.2, 53.1.3, 55.8.2, etc.). Of the extant authors before Dio, it appears

only in Josephus (*AJ.* 4.242, 18.19). How a **τεμένισμα** differed (if at all) from a **τείμενος** is not clear from Dio's usage.⁴²¹

τότε γε: Dio's qualifying remark here indicates that he was aware that permission was at least once granted for the creation of such a sacred precinct, although no direct reference survives in his extant narrative of the reign. It seems likely that Dio had in mind the decision to grant permission to the *koinon* of Asia to erect a temple to Tiberius, Livia and the Senate in A.D. 23 at Smyrna (*Tac. Ann.* 4.15; cf. Price 1984: 58, 258; Magie 1950: 501), to which Dio refers at 59.28.1.

εἰκόνα: Here used in a general sense of religious 'image', which could be applied to either statues or paintings (cf. Price 1984: 176-9). Although the later jurists Marcianus and Venuleius Saturninus make a distinction between consecrated and non-consecrated imperial images (e.g. *Dig.* 48.4.5.1, 48.4.6),⁴²² it has been argued that such a distinction did not apply to the Julio-Claudian Principate (Ando 2000: 236-7; cf. Cloud 1962: 222-23), which might account for the various stories of individuals being prosecuted for taking coins bearing images of emperors into brothels or lavatories. The placement of images of living individuals in temples or cult sites at Rome and in the provinces and was pre-Augustan in origin; Cicero (*ad Att.* 12.45.2 = SB 290) notes that an image to Julius Caesar had been set up in the temple of Quirinus, and at 41.61.4, Dio notes in passing the presence of another such image of

⁴²¹ Professor Purcell has suggested to me that **τεμένισμα** may refer to a *templum*. I thank him for the suggestion, but I do not think the evidence exists to allow for a firm opinion on the matter.

⁴²² Venuleius Saturninus wrote under the Antonines, whereas Marcianus wrote under the Severans.

Caesar in the temple of ‘Victory’ at Tralles (cf. Caes. *BC* 3.105; Plut. *Caes.* 47.1-2).

For further examples, see Weinstock 1971: 186-88.

9.2 προσέθηκε μὲν γὰρ τῇ ἀπορρήσει ὅτι “ἂν μὴ ἐγὼ ἐπιτρέψω”, προσεπέειπε δὲ ὅτι “οὐκ ἐπιτρέψω”: An appropriately vague and potentially ambiguous statement from Tiberius, and one which is not only consistent with Dio’s portrayal, but also with what we know of the emperor from his own decrees. Note, for example, Tiberius’ letter to the people of Gytheum concerning his rejection of divine/religious honours (*EJ*² no. 102 = Oliver *GC* no. 15).

ἀσέβειάν: Dio’s first use of the word ἀσέβεια, at least in the received text of the *Roman History*. It is conventional to understand Dio’s use of ἀσέβεια as a translation of the Latin *maiestas* (in the sense of the treason law), yet this is a point of contention and some discussion is necessary.⁴²³ Bauman (1974: 5) describes Dio’s use of the term as ‘confused and confusing’. The strength of this assertion is questionable. Bauman’s confusion arises from his reading of 60.3.6, where Dio notes that Claudius ‘put a stop to charges of impiety, not only in cases involving written matter, but also in cases involving actions’ (τό τε ἔγκλημα τῆς ἀσεβείας ὁμοίως οὐκ ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι μόνοις ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν ἔπαυσε). Bauman takes ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι μόνοις ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν to mean a distinction between verbal and ‘real *iniuriae*’. This is not the most natural reading of the passage (and if Dio wanted the passage to mean what Bauman says it does, we might wonder why he did

⁴²³ For the simple translation of *asebeia* as *maiestas*, see Mommsen *Strafr.* 539-40. The standard discussion of the terminology is Bauman 1974: 1-20, especially 2-10 for Dio’s use of *asebeia*, but note the objections of Brunt (1984b: 471-473) who puts forward the argument that Dio was using *asebeia* literally to denote a more specific charge of ‘impiety’ which applied to a range of offences more limited than *maiestas*. Brunt’s conclusions on this point have been challenged by Keaveney and Madden (1998), but not (in my opinion) conclusively.

not simply employ a simple λόγος/ἔργον distinction). I would posit that Dio is actually being quite literal, that Claudius did not prosecute those who wrote documents which were defamatory or those who committed acts which could be construed as being disrespectful to the emperor. For Dio, the latter category might well have encompassed those offences such as swearing falsely by the emperor's *genius* (see 57.9.3 below or above at 57.8.3) or something as trivial as selling a house which had a statue of an emperor (57.24.7; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.73) or accidentally hitting a statue of an emperor with a stone (cf. Marcianus in *Dig.* 48.4.5.1).

Dio's failure to provide a textbook definition of *asebeia* is not only indicative of the slippery (and ill-defined) nature of the accusation, but also of the fact (which has often been neglected in discussions of the *maiestas* law) that he was writing a history not a legal handbook. Here Dio loosely defines *asebeia* as covering 'insulting behaviour' and 'impious behaviour' (τό γε ὑβρίσθαι ... ἢ καὶ τὸ ἡσεβήσθαι...) directed towards Tiberius and Augustus, that is, towards a reigning emperor or a *diuus*.⁴²⁴ This is consistent with Dio's usage throughout the work. Dio's attitude towards charges of *asebeia* (however understood) is consonant with the views of Tacitus, Suetonius and Pliny regarding *maiestas*. Whether an emperor (re)introduced or suppressed accusations of *asebeia* was a mark of his quality as a ruler, e.g. Caligula: 59.4.3, Claudius: 60.3.6 [Xiph.], Titus: 66.19.1 [Xiph.], Nerva: 68.1.2 [Xiph.], Macrinus: 79(78).12.1.⁴²⁵ Such a judgment is consistent with the idea presented in the speech of Maecenas (52.31.5-8), where 'Maecenas' advises Augustus

⁴²⁴ Dio never uses *asebeia* for the crime of treason under the Republic, but note 37.27.2 for his transliteration of *perduellio*. For the Republican origins of the laws concerning *maiestas*, see generally Bauman 1970. For the putative Caesarian (rather than Augustan) origins of the *lex Iulia maiestatis*, see Allison and Cloud 1962.

⁴²⁵ As argued by Brunt (1984b) and Keaveney and Madden (1998), there was never any suspension of the *maiestas* law (*contra* Bauman 1974: 191-220).

not to prosecute those who vilify (ἐλοιδόρησε) or who say unseemly things (τι ἀνεπιτήδειον εἶπε) about him. But as Dio was aware, Augustus did not live up to this ideal, and punished individuals for publishing subversive materials, e.g. 55.27.1-3, 56.27.1-3.⁴²⁶

πολλὰς ἐσήγον: Dio's statement may be taken to confirm what Marsh (1931: 281) regarded as a typically exaggerated "loose general statement". This is not, however, grounds for serious censure, at least from a compositional perspective. It would have been inappropriate for Dio to have cluttered his narrative at this point with lists or examples of senatorial and equestrian nonentities who, after all, were *not* convicted or punished for 'impiety'. What matters for Dio is that such accusations were being made, and the manner in which they were addressed.

σεμνύνων: 'show reverence for'. Dio's sardonic tone is unmistakable. Cf. Pliny's pernicious observation that Tiberius deified Augustus so as to introduce the charge of *maiestas* (*Pan.* 11.1: *dicauit caelo Tiberius Augustum, sed ut maiestatis crimen induceret*). But Dio's negative comment here serves as a bridge to the following chapter which outlines the various positive ways that Tiberius honoured Augustus (see below 57.10.1). Note also Dio's word play in this passage ἡσεβήσθαι... ἀσέβειάν... σεμνύνων, punning on the common σεβ-/σεμ- root of all three words.

⁴²⁶ Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.72) notes the prosecution and banishment of Cassius Severus (*PIR*² C 522) which took place between A.D. 8 and 13 by Augustus under the *lex maiestatis*. The earlier of the dates is now generally favoured (e.g. Bauman 1974: 28-30; Syme 1978a: 213-14; Cohen 2008: 215; Pettinger 2012: 87), but there are exceptions who prefer the later date (e.g. Drogula 2011: 265). There is no explicit reference to the initial banishment of Cassius Severus, but Dio's general statement at 56.27.1-3, has been often read in connection with his exile. For further bibliography and discussion, see Pettinger 2012: 88-9 n. 62.

9.3 τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον ... προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ χρόνου: Again another proleptic observation, foreshadowing the descent from the lofty ‘republican’ beginnings of Tiberius’ rule. Dio introduces one of the central themes of the Tiberian tradition, and indeed imperial history, that is the proliferation of accusations against prominent men and women for acts of impiety/treason (cf. 57.19.1, 57.23.3).

τὴν τύχην αὐτοῦ: Only one example of such a charge exists in the literary sources, that of the equestrian Rubrius (Tac. *Ann.* 1.73; *PIR*² R 121), who was acquitted.

ἐθανάτωσε: Dio is referring to the prosecution of individuals who were accused of ‘impiety’ against Augustus generally, not just those who swore falsely by the fortune/*genius* of Augustus (*contra* Marsh 1931: 281). As with the other historians of Tiberius’ reign, Dio blamed the emperor for the executions of prominent men and women for *maiestas*/‘impiety’. While such a view glosses over the fact that such individuals were tried in both senatorial and non-senatorial courts at least until A.D. 15 (Tac. *Ann.* 1.72, Suet. *Tib.* 58; Richardson 1997: 511; cf. Jones 1955: 479),⁴²⁷ it is indicative of Dio’s view of the absolute nature of the monarchy at Rome that effectively all decisions could be seen as representing the will of the emperor.

10.1 ἡγάλλε: A characteristically neat transitional sentence. Note Dio’s word play ἡγάλλε [...] ἀγάλματα. Dio continues the theme of the ways in which Tiberius ‘honoured’ Augustus (see note above 57.9.3 (σεμνύνων)) but moves seamlessly into providing examples of Tiberius’ generosity and generally praiseworthy use and management of finances (57.10.2-5).

⁴²⁷ While it was usual for charges of *maiestas* to be heard in the senate, it is possible that some cases were heard in the *quaestio de maiestate*, such as the trial of Antistius Vetus (Tac. *Ann.* 3.38; *PIR*² A 767; cf. Marsh 1931: 121; Talbert 1984: 466; Richardson 1997: 511 n. 7).

τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπέγραφέ σφισι: Further exemplary conduct from Tiberius. This point is reiterated below at 57.10.2 with respect to buildings erected by private individuals (τοῦτο δὲ τὸ κατὰ τὰς ἐπιγραφάς ... ἐποίησε). For similar comments on other emperors, note Dio's comments on Augustus: 53.2.5; Claudius 60.6.8-9; Vespasian: 65(66).10.1^a [Zonar.]. Note also Augustus' comments in the *Res Gestae* (20.1): *Capitolium et Pompeium theatrum utrumque opus impensa grandi refeci // sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei*. Although Dio's statements conform to standard commonplace (cf. HA *Hadr.* 19.9-10), there is also a tacit contrast being made between Tiberius' conduct and that of later emperors and in particular Septimius Severus, who notoriously inscribed his own name on buildings which he restored (77(76).16.3 [Xiph.]).⁴²⁸

τά ... ἀγάλματα: Generally statues or images of divinities (including deified emperors). How *agalmata* differed from *eikones* is not clear, but the traditional reading of *agalmata* being those statues which received cult, seems appropriate in the context (Price 1984: 176-9; cf. Hyper. 6. 21 with Herrman 2009: 89-90).

τὰ ἡρώα: The temples/shrines of *Diuus Augustus*. Dio frequently translates *diuus* as ἥρωας, although he occasionally uses ἡμίθεος (Mason *GT* 124-5). Dio's usage conforms to what we know of his adaptation of classical terminology, in this case τὸ ἡρώον ('hero shrine', e.g. Thuc. 2.17.1, 3.24.1) to denote a Roman innovation, that is a temple to a *diuus* (e.g. 47.18.4).

⁴²⁸ Similar behaviour was displayed by Commodus, who rededicated the Colossus to himself (73(72).22.3 [Xiph.]), and by Domitian (Suet. *Dom.* 5).

καὶ ὅσα οἱ δῆμοι καὶ ὅσα οἱ ἰδιῶται ἐποιοῦν: Dio continues to demonstrate his interest in commenting on the spread of the ruler-cult in the Roman world (as above 57.8.3, 57.9.1-2). Here, as elsewhere, Dio appreciated that the impetus for the erection of cult temples and statues came not exclusively from the emperors or the Senate, but from the initiative of the municipal communities and wealthy civic grandees throughout the empire. Dio's comment here, however, would seem to be restricted to communities and individuals in Italy (see next note). Cf. Dio's comment at 56.46.3 (with Swan 2004: 355) about the spread of such cult sites following Augustus' death.

τὰ μὲν αὐτὸς καθιέρου ... τῶν ποντιφίκων τινὶ προσέτασσε: It is known that Tiberius dedicated a temple to Augustus at Nola in A.D. 26 and the Capitolium at Capua (Tac. *Ann.* 4.57.1; Suet. *Tib.* 40), but the detail of Tiberius authorizing members of the pontifical college to do similar is unattested elsewhere in the literary sources.⁴²⁹ The jurisdiction of the Roman *pontifices* appears to have extended throughout Italy, but not to the provinces (cf. Plin. *Ep.* 10.68-9; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.321). For the college of pontiffs, see generally Beard 1990: 20-4. Dio appreciated well the emperor's role in matters sacred and religious, as revealed by his remarks at 53.17.8. For discussion of the symbolism of the emperor as chief priest and his patronage of the priestly colleges, see Gordon 1990: 206-19; and more generally, Millar 1977: 355-61; Cameron 2011: 132-41. **τῶν ποντιφίκων:** Dio regularly employs the Greek transliteration of the Latin *pontifex* rather than searching for a classical alternative (e.g. 37.46.1, 39.11.3, 53.1.5, etc.; cf. Dion. Hal. *Rom. Ant.* 1.38.3; Plut. *Numa* 9.1).

⁴²⁹ Tiberius assumed the position of *pontifex maximus* on 10 March A.D. 15 (*EJ*² p. 47).

10.2 **τοῦτο δὲ τὸ κατὰ τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς ... ἐποίησε**: Tiberius' conduct must have seemed unusual to Dio, given (what Veyne has described as) the imperial 'monopolisation' of building dedications in the city of Rome (Veyne 1990: 387-8 with caveat p. 469 n. 317; Eck 1984: 140-1). Dio (60.6.8) and Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.72) describe Tiberius' restoration of the Theatre of Pompey and the retention of Pompey's name (cf. Vell. Pat. 2.130.1). Beyond this, there is little evidence to indicate the extent of Tiberius' programme of restoration.⁴³⁰ According to Dio (53.2.4), Augustus had expected that the descendants of the original builders would pay for the restorations if they had the resources. It is unlikely that there was any change in policy under Tiberius.

Expenditure on public buildings (rather than buildings intended for private use) was central to the ideology of euergetism (Arist. *EN.* 4.2.11; Cic. *Off.* 2.16-17, Plut. *Prae. ger. reip.* 821f-822a) and became a commonplace of imperial panegyric (cf. Vell. Pat. 2.130.1; Pliny *Pan.* 50.1-3). Dio's own attitudes to imperial building programmes were conventional.⁴³¹ Certainly he believed that an emperor should spend money on such projects, but he was also critical of emperors who were extravagant (or selfish) in their spending on buildings (59.28.2 [Xiph.]; 60.6.8-9; 65(66).10.1^a-2 [Zonar., Xiph.]; 68.7.1-2 [Xiph.]; 78(77).9.6-7 [Xiph.]).

⁴³⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 2.49 lists several buildings (re)dedicated by Tiberius following restoration, but Tacitus maintains that the restoration had been instigated by Augustus.

⁴³¹ As noted by Newbold (1975: 603), Maecenas' comments at 52.30.1 (τὸ μὲν ἄστυ τοῦτο καὶ κατακόσμηι πάσῃ πολυτελείᾳ καὶ ἐπιλάμπρυνε παντὶ εἶδει πανηγύρεων) are unrepresentative of Dio's own general attitudes. The reason for this need not (*pace* Newbold) be because the speech was intended to please Caracalla. Rather, we should think about the comments being appropriate to the character of Maecenas in the context of the debate.

αὐτὸς γὰρ οὐδὲν ... κατεσκευάσατο: Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 47: *princeps neque opera ulla magnifica fecit, nam et quae sola suscepit, Augusti templum restitutionemque Pompeiani theatri, imperfecta post tot annos reliquit*. Dio does not censure Tiberius at all for his lack of building activity, something which Suetonius would see as being evidence of Tiberius' miserliness (cf. Suet. *Tib.* 46-48). Indeed, the image of Tiberius presented by Dio in this chapter (especially 57.10.3-5) portrays Tiberius as a generous emperor (as above 57.10.1 and note below at 57.10.3). **τοῦ Αὐγουστείου:** The Temple of Augustus, which was probably erected between the Capitoline and Palatine hills (Fishwick 1992: 245-55). At 56.46.3 Dio notes that the temple was voted by the Senate and was funded by Livia and Tiberius. It was not dedicated until early in the reign of Caligula (59.7.1-4; cf. Suet. *Cal.* 21.1, Tac. *Ann.* 6.45.1). For bibliography and discussion, see Swan 2004: 354-55; Fishwick 1992; Platner and Ashby 1929: 62-6; *LTUR* 1.145-6.

10.3 ἐλάχιστα γὰρ ἐς ἑαυτὸν ... ἐπικοσμῶν: Note Maecenas' advice to Augustus (52.29.3): *τίς γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ἰδὼν σε πρὸς μὲν τὰ οἰκεία φειδωλότατον πρὸς δὲ τὰ κοινὰ ἀφειδέστατον ὄντα, ἐθέλοντι συντελέσειέ τι, καὶ ἀσφάλειαν καὶ εὐπορίαν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ σὲ πλουτεῖν εἶναι νομίζων;* The idea that a good king should spend money not on himself but for the common good is a central tenet to several Greco-Roman expressions of ideal kingship, e.g. Theocr. *Id.* 17.95-120, cf. 14.63-64; *RGDA* 15-24, *App.* 1-4; [Aristid.] *Or.* 35. For the ideal of the Roman emperor as benefactor, see Veyne 1990: 347-96, especially 386-90; Wilkinson 2012: 150-3, 161-3; Griffin 2013: 61-86. For examples of this ideal in practice, see Millar 1977: 420-34.

πόλεις ... ιδιώταις: The extent to which Tiberius extended his beneficence to cities and private individuals is not known. Dio, unlike Suetonius and Tacitus, seems to play up Tiberius' euergetism, perhaps with a view to making his portrait of the emperor conform more to the ideal of the emperor as the great benefactor (as above). In terms of cities, Tiberius' assistance to the cities of Asia following the earthquake of A.D. 17 was well advertised in inscriptions and coins (Mitchell 1987: 345-6, 350; cf. 57.17.7 below). Tacitus (*Ann.* 4.13) indicates that Tiberius provided additional tax relief to cities in Asia and Greece following earthquakes in A.D. 23. It is possible that Dio's *patria* Nicaea too was the recipient of Tiberius' generosity if we are to accept Phlegon's (*FGrH* 257 F.16a.4) notice of an earthquake striking the city some time in the early 30s.⁴³² Nevertheless, it has been argued that Tiberius' contribution to provincial (re)building programmes was slight (e.g. Mitchell 1987: 350; Seager 2005: 145-6).

τῶν τε βουλευτῶν συχνούς ... ἐπλούτισεν: Dio's comments on Tiberius' decisions to subsidize impoverished yet deserving senators are different from other ancient authorities, as is the case for Dio's comments on Tiberius' generosity to cities and private individuals. Tacitus concedes the same point as Dio regarding Tiberius' efforts to subsidize certain senators, but insidiously undermines Tiberius' actions (*Ann.* 2.37-38; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 47). Dio's representation of Tiberius at this point conforms to the ideal established in the speech of Maecenas, where Maecenas advises Augustus to give money to senators who have fallen into penury (52.19.2). That an emperor should render financial assistance to senators so that they might meet the

⁴³² The date of this earthquake is not securely known. Phlegon's account of the earthquake was excerpted by Eusebius-Jerome and was associated with the crucifixion of Christ, c. A.D. 32-33 (i.e. in the fourth year of the 202nd Olympiad).

property qualification for the Senate, was an ideal followed by Augustus and later emperors (e.g. 53.2.1, 54.17.3, 55.13.6, 60.11.8; cf. *RGDA App.* 4; *HA Hadr.* 7.9-11; Nicolet 1984: 94-6).

μηκέτι μηδὲ βουλεύειν διὰ τοῦτ' ἐθέλοντας: An interesting, albeit unelaborated glimpse of the senatorial mindset. Presumably Dio has in mind the inability of some senators to meet the expenses of office and the shame this would bring upon them.⁴³³ Dio's use of **μηδέ** ('not even') is particularly expressive of the enormity of the senators' decision. Cf. *Tac. Ann.* 12.52: *laudati dehinc oratione principis* [sc. Claudius] *qui ob angustias familiaris ordine senatorio sponte cederent, motique qui remanendo impudentiam paupertati adicerent*. Dio's comments here are consistent with those at 54.26.4 where he notes the reluctance of individuals to join the senate on account of the newly introduced property qualifications (see note below 57.10.4 ὑπὸ πτωχείας). For the financial burdens of Senators, see Talbert 1984: 54-66; cf. Matthews 1975: 13, 384 (for discussion of fourth-century evidence). For Senators withdrawing voluntarily from the Senate, see Hopkins 1983: 166-71; Talbert 1984: 27-29.

10.4 οὐ μέντοι καὶ ἀκρίτως αὐτὸ ἐποίει: Revision of the senate list was undertaken on a yearly basis by Tiberius and his imperial successors. To purge the senate of the unworthy was seen as a way an emperor could honour the Senate

⁴³³ There were other reasons why Senators should want to leave the *ordo*. Some senators appear to have felt the call to the stage (or arena): an occupation that was forbidden to senators (48.43.3; 54.2.5; 51.22.4; cf. Talbert 1984: 46-7). The SC of A.D. 19 sought to punish those senators who sought demotion from the order in so as to act on the stage or engage in prostitution (*AE* 1978, 145; Levick 1983; cf. *Tac. Ann.* 2.85; Talbert 1984: 46, 439 n. 23, 450 n. 140).

(56.41.3; Suet. *Aug.* 35.1, Lendon 1997: 148; cf. Swan 2004: 336-7), and (in Dio's mind) was a necessary task for the emperor to perform (cf. 52.19.1-2).

ὑπ' ἀσελγείας: a broadly pejorative term in Dio's ethical vocabulary which could cover a multitude of sins, but in many instances denotes unrestrained sexual behaviour (e.g. F 87.2 [EVV]; 78(77).24.2 [EVV]; 80(79).16.7 [Zonar.]). **ὑπὸ πτωχείας**: Dio notes under the year 18 B.C. Augustus' decision to increase the minimum property qualification for the Senate from HS 400,000 to HS 1,000,000 (54.17.2, cf. 54.26.3; Nicolet 1984: 91-3; Rich 1990: 194).

πάν τε ὃ ἐδωρεῖτό τισιν, ... γίγνεσθαι: A unique footnote to the history of administrative corruption under Augustus. Once more Dio draws a point of contrast between Tiberius and his predecessor, and again to Tiberius' advantage. But Dio's statement looks forwards as well as back. Tiberius' close attention to preventing such petty acts of financial maladministration during the early phase of his reign is contrasted to his apparent laxity following his retirement to Capri where Sejanus came close to seizing the reins of government entirely. **οἱ δοτήρες**: An unusual word in Dio, used only here and at 66.25.5 [Xiph.]. The general sense of paymaster or teller is clear enough (cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.9), but it is possible that Dio used the term **δοτήρ** to denote a particular type of freedman who administered the *fiscus*.

10.5 **ἐκ τῶν νενομισμένων προσόδων**: 'from regular revenues'. Dio's point is that Tiberius did not introduce any new or extraordinary taxes, which was another sign of a good emperor (cf. [Aristid.] *Or.* 35.16; Plin. *Pan.* 41.2-4). Tiberius would, however, raise taxes later in his reign (58.16.2). Dio frequently used an emperor's attitude

towards taxation as a barometer of his reign: e.g. 55.25.5, 56.28.3-6, 65(66).14.5 [Xiph.], 78(77).9.1-5 [Xiph., *EVV*]. Moreover, Dio's interest seemed to have extended to the administrative aspects of taxation (i.e assessment and collection) as shown by his discussion of these points in the speech of Maecenas (52.28-29.2).

οὐτε γὰρ ἀπέκτεινε ... τι ἡργυρολόγησεν: That 'bad' emperors or tyrannical individuals killed prominent men and women for their wealth is an oft repeated *topos* in Dio (e.g. Sulla: F. 109.10 [*EVV*]; Caligula: 59.22.5; Nero: 62[63].17.2 [Xiph.]; Domitian: 67.14.3 [Xiph.]; Commodus: 73(72).5.3-4 [Xiph.], 73(72).7.3 [Xiph.]; cf. Pliny *Pan.* 27.4, 50; Lactant. 7.11-12). This was of course consonant with ancient political wisdom which understood tyrants as being naturally envious or suspicious of individuals who were conspicuous for their wealth or virtue (e.g. Hdt. 5.92; Arist. *Pol.* 1311a15-23; Livy 1.54.5-8; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4. 56.2-3; Zonar. 7.10 [Dindorf 2.113.24-114.1]). **τότε γε ἐδήμευσεν:** The practice of confiscating the properties of condemned men by the imperial fiscus had begun during the reign of Augustus. Dio notes that the senate proposed during the trial of C. Cornelius Gallus (*PIR*² C 1369) that all of Gallus' property be given to Augustus (53.23.7; cf. Millar 1977: 163-74; Rich 1990: 158). For the confiscation of estates later in Tiberius' reign, see 58.16.1 (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6.19, *passim*). **ἐξ ἐπιρρείας:** 'from oppressive measures'. Not a classical expression. But note Herodian's description of Severus Alexander's displeasure at the avaricious Julia Mamaea (6.1.8): αὐτοῦ ἄκοντός τε καὶ ἀσχάλλοντος οὐσίας τινῶν καὶ κληρονομίας ἐξ ἐπιρρείας ὑφαρπασάσης ἐκείνης.

Αἰμιλίῳ γοῦν Ῥήκτῳ: Dio is our sole authority for a Tiberian prefect named Aemilius Rectus. As a result, doubt has been expressed often as to whether this Aemilius Rectus actually governed Egypt during the reign of Tiberius. According to Schwartz, Dio somehow transposed the identity of the later prefect L. Aemilius Rectus onto an otherwise unknown recipient of Tiberius' directive (Schwartz 1982: 189; cf. Bastianini 1988: 504).⁴³⁴ Ultimately this explanation is unsatisfying and does not account for why Dio should supply Rectus' name to the anecdote. After all, Dio had no reason on narrative grounds for introducing a name into an anecdote, as he might have made his point by reporting the apothegm in the same way as Suetonius, that is as a general statement to his (anonymous) governors (see note below: κείρεσθαί ... βούλομαι).⁴³⁵

Part of the problem is the assumed date of Aemilius Rectus' prefecture. Dio's mention of Aemilius Rectus at this point in his narrative has led people to assume that his prefecture was in 14 or 15. The survival of inscriptions at Karnak which attest to M. Magius Maximus (*PIR*² M 89)⁴³⁶ still holding the post during the first year of Tiberius' reign (Wagner 1971: 21-25 = *AE* 1982, 912), makes the earlier of these dates most unlikely. Moreover, the likelihood that L. Seius Strabo's prefecture began in 15 (June/July?) has resulted in the further assumption that Aemilius Rectus' tenure was brief, squeezed between Magius Maximus' and Seius Strabo's, and that, as

⁴³⁴ The relationship between the two (?) Aemilii Recti is a further source of speculation (cf. Demougin 1992: 180-1). It has been suggested that they are father and son, or that they were possible one and the same, presenting us with an unusual case of an iterated prefecture (*P.Oxy.* 3807 = Rea 1988: 187).

⁴³⁵ For Suetonius' habit of replacing proper names with 'vague descriptions or generic plurals', see Townend 1959: 288-9.

⁴³⁶ Bastianini (1975: 269) and Rea (1988: 186 = *P.Oxy.* 3807) name him Q. Magius Maximus. It is now generally taken that his praenomen was in fact Marcus (see, Brunt 1975: 143; Bureth 1988: 476; Bastianini 1988: 504, *PIR*² M 89)

opined by Brunt (1975: 138), he was dismissed for his overzealous collection of taxes. Here Brunt stretches the evidence too far. If Rectus were dismissed for his over-enthusiastic collection of taxes, then it would seem incredible that such a detail did not find its way into the present anecdote or the historical tradition. Kavanagh (2001: 383) and Bennett (1971: 49) note correctly that Dio's comments appear outside the annalistic narrative (as the **πότε** makes clear), and therefore Rectus' prefecture need not have occurred in 14 (or 15) as many have supposed (*pace* Demougin 1992: 180). But Kavanagh's suggestion that Rectus' tenure ran between 12 and 15 (Kavanagh 2001: 383) must be ruled out on the grounds of the aforementioned inscriptions of Magius Maximus.

The problem of the succession to the prefecture of Egypt following the tenure of Magius Maximus remains. Why Magius Maximus should have been replaced by Rectus only to be replaced by Seius Strabo in the space of one year defies ready explanation. If a successor to the Augustan candidate Magius Maximus was needed then why Tiberius should look to someone beyond the father of Sejanus is not clear. After all, Seius Strabo was a safe choice for prefect,⁴³⁷ and Tiberius' motivation to install a man who he could trust to the prefecture of Egypt is easy enough to comprehend. A possible solution to this problem would be to place Aemilius Rectus' tenure *after* that of Seius Strabo, that is sometime c. 17-22.⁴³⁸ This would fit with the available documentary evidence which places the next known prefect, C. Galerius, in

⁴³⁷ Doubt has been expressed as to whether Seius Strabo was prefect (e.g. Schwartz 1982: 192; Gambetti 2009: 275 n. 14). But the scepticism seems unjustified, based on the cumulative evidence of Dio (57.19.5) and Pliny (*HN* 36.197). Cf. Rea 1988: 184 = *P.Oxy.* 3807; Syme 1986: 303.

⁴³⁸ The duration of Seius Strabo's tenure is unknown. It is usually assumed to have been brief (Brunt 1975: 143; Bastianini 1975: 270). Rea (1988: 186 = *P.Oxy.* 3807) suggests the possibility of a longer tenure of six or seven years.

Egypt in 23 or possibly 22 (for evidence see Bastianini 1975: 270; Bureth 1988: 476).⁴³⁹

τὸ τεταγμένον: '[in excess of] the usual amount'. We need not take τὸ τεταγμένον in a technical sense of what had been 'assessed' or 'prescribed' (*pace* Brunt 1975: 139 n. 64), but simply as 'usual'. For the prefect's role in the collection of taxes, see Wallace 1938: 31-3, 292-6 368 n.3; Brunt 1975: 136-41; Sharp 1999: 230-3; Jördens 2012: 57. Cf. Philo *Flacc.* 4, with van der Horst's commentary (2004: 93-4). For taxation in Egypt more generally, note the summary of Jördens 2012: 59-61; and Wallace 1938.

κείρεσθαί μου τὰ πρόβατα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποξύρεσθαι βούλομαι: Suet. *Tib.* 32.2: *praesidibus onerandas tributo prouincias suadentibus rescripsit boni pastoris esse tondere pecus, non deglubere*; cf. Oros. 7.4. More wry humour from Tiberius. The pun is somewhat lost in Greek, as ἀποξύρεσθαι does not carry the same double meaning as the Latin *deglubere* 'to fleece' (cf. Muse 2009: 310-11), providing a strong indication that Dio extracted the anecdote from a Latin text.⁴⁴⁰ Tiberius' comments are a reworking of a familiar fable (Babrius 51; cf. Champlin, 2008: 416-7 n. 28), which in turn plays on the widespread idea of the good king as shepherd of his people. For discussion of the image of the good shepherd, see Brock 2013: 43-52; cf. Dvornik 1966: 1.266-8, *passim*. That an emperor should (like Tiberius) control

⁴³⁹ The belief that C. Galerius governed Egypt from 16-31 is based on the tenuous identification of Galerius as the unnamed Prefect of Egypt mentioned in Sen. *Consol. ad Helv.* 19.6, who (if we are to trust the text) ruled for 16 years. Such an extraordinary tenure is anomalous and Seneca's statement here has been rightly challenged (Kavanagh 2001).

⁴⁴⁰ There is no need to posit Dio's use of a Greek intermediary source in this instance.

rapacious governors is a recurring theme in imperial panegyric (e.g. Vell. Pat. 2.126.4; Men. Rhet. 2.375.18-24; cf. Charlesworth 1937: 111, 116).

11.1 **εὐπρόσδοος καὶ εὐπροσήγορος**: ‘approachable and easy to address’. Not necessarily qualities that are immediately associated with Tiberius. But it is perhaps worth remembering that Dio is using these terms primarily to describe Tiberius’ conduct as a ruler, not his personal qualities. Tiberius’ accessibility in terms of the administration of justice and public business has been introduced earlier in the narrative (above 57.7.2). Dio now uses these ideas of approachability and affability as a frame in which he presents Tiberius’ social interactions with the Roman elite (next note, and 57.11.3 below), provincial populations (57.11.2), and the Roman people (57.11.4-6), and with his friends (57.11.7). Dio’s comments here concerning Tiberius’ general accessibility (and especially to Senators), are setting up the another point of contrast with the latter part of his reign following Tiberius’ withdrawal to Capri where he would become difficult to access, and take on other trappings of tyrannical behaviour.

Dio portrays Tiberius in terms of the commonplace that a king should be approachable and affable. These ideas appear sporadically in discussions of ideal kingship (e.g. Xen. *Ages.* 9.2; Pliny *Pan.* 47.4-48.5; [Aristid.] *Or.* 35.23; Poll. 1.41; Men. Rhet. 2.375.10; Pelling 2011: 473-4 on Plut. *Caes.* 64-5), and were important to Dio’s ideal of a δημοτικός (56.43.1; 69.6.3 [Xiph.]; 74(73).3.4 [Xiph., EVV]; cf. 44.19.3; Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 35).⁴⁴¹ Moreover, being accessible and easy to address was commonly thought to be indicative of an individual’s ἐπιείκεια (hence below

⁴⁴¹ Neither word is particularly frequent in Dio. εὐπροσήγορος: 44.39.3, 57.11.1, 74(73).3.4 [EVV, Xiph.]; εὐπρόσδοος 44.19.3, 44.19.3, 56.43.1, 57.11.1.

57.11.2; cf. [Aristid.] *Or.* 35.23.), or in Latin terms, his *comitas* (cf. Davenport 2014: 107). The importance of accessibility was something not just for kings: note Dio on Lucullus' failure to win over his troops – he was difficult to access and was not able to persuade or win men over through kindness (ἐπιείκεια) (36.16.2). It is tempting to think that Dio's views on these positive characteristics were not so much shaped but reinforced by his own negative experiences at Nicomedia in the winter of 214/15, where Dio and other 'foremost men' were kept waiting by Caracalla (78(77).17-18 [Xiph.]; cf. Millar 1964: 21; Davenport 2012: 802-3).⁴⁴²

τοὺς γοῦν βουλευτὰς ... μὴ ὥστίζονται: It was customary for some senators to greet their emperors as part of the morning *salutatio*, a situation that was familiar to Dio (e.g. 73(72).17.3 [Xiph.], 75(74).13.2 [Xiph.], 77(76).17.1 [Xiph.]). Dio records that in the last years of Augustus' reign, the emperor had discontinued the practice of receiving senators at his home in the morning (56.26.2-3). The apparent revival of this practice under Tiberius no doubt contributed to his reputation for accessibility (see note above). But as behooved a 'republican' emperor, Tiberius showed appropriate concern for the *dignitas* of his Senators, sparing them both the discomfort of being jostled, as well as their time (cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 40). Yet the Senators' lot would become decidedly unhappier later in Tiberius' reign, when their attentions would have to be divided between Tiberius and the ascendant Sejanus (57.24.4). Moreover, our evidence for the performance of *salutatio* indicates that it was unusual for an emperor to see all of the senators at once. For the performance of *salutatio* by Senators, see Talbert 1984: 68-70; Lendon 1997: 135-6; Paterson 2007: 146-9.

⁴⁴² It might be added that Dio's presentation of that winter in Nicomedia was almost certainly shaped by his belief that an emperor should be accessible to senators and other men of importance.

11.2 **ἐπείκειαν**: See note above 57.1.1 **ἐπεικῆς**.

οἱ Ῥοδίων ... ἀπέπεμψε: The story of Tiberius' treatment of the Rhodian ambassadors is found in Suetonius (Suet. *Tib.* 32.2) where it appears as an illustration of the emperor's *moderatio*. Dio's rendering of the anecdote successfully illustrates Tiberius' 'mildness' (in so far as Tiberius was in a position to behave more harshly towards the Rhodians). But it also dovetails with Dio's opening sketch of Tiberius (especially 57.1.1): Tiberius summons the ambassadors, as though he were going to inflict some punishment (sc. **μετεπέμψατο ... κακόν τι δράσων**) – a detail not found in Suetonius' version. But contrary to their expectations, the ambassadors suffer nothing of the kind. The result is that Tiberius emerges as a slightly ambiguous *exemplum* of imperial mildness. On the one hand he did not have the ambassadors punished physically, but on the other hand his behaviour was a source of morbid anxiety for the ambassadors.

εὐχὰς αὐτῷ: It is uncertain what exactly Dio had in mind here. It is possible that it is a reference to the customary prayers for the emperor's health (*pro salute imperatoris*) that were made annually on 3 January (cf. Plut. *Cic.* 2.1 with Lintott 2013: 132). But Dio's indication that he was referring to a subscription in a letter (sc. **ὑπέγραψαν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ**) does not accord easily with this interpretation. Presumably those annual prayers for the health of the emperor appeared in the body-text of the missive, not in a subscription (cf. Plin. *Ep.* 10.35). Hence, Dio might have imagined a different type of document, such as a petition (Levick 1976: 126). Even so, from our imperfect

evidence of extant petitions, there seems little to indicate the systematic attachment of prayers to all such documents.

11.3 τούς τε ἀεὶ ἄρχοντας ὥς ἐν δημοκρατία ἐτίμα: A point of particular importance to Dio's senatorial heart. That a *ciuilis princeps* should show appropriate respect to the magistrates (and especially the consuls) was the cornerstone of the ideal (e.g. Plin. *Pan.* 64.2, 71.1-2; Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 37-8; cf. Alföldi 1952: 125-7). Although we may regard Tiberius' actions here conforming to a particular ideal, we must not lose sight of the fact that in the context of the early years of Tiberius' rule, such deferential behaviour was a marked change from the last years of Augustus' reign which saw his gradual withdrawal from public life. **ὥς ἐν δημοκρατία:** 'as though in a republic'. See comments above at 57.9.1, and below at 57.15.9.

τοῖς ὑπάτοις καὶ ὑπανίστατο: Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 31.2: *nec mirum, cum palam esset, ipsum quoque eisdem* [sc. the consuls] *et assurgere et decedere uia*. A respectful (yet ostentatious) gesture that seems to have become conventionalized, at least in the first and second centuries: cf. 60.6.1; Pliny *Pan.* 64.2, 71.2. By contrast, Julius Caesar became notorious for his failure to stand up for a senatorial delegation (44.8.1-3; App. *BC* 2.107.[445-6]; Plut. *Caes.* 60.4; Suet. *Iul.* 78.1; etc.), and Dio was scandalized by stories of the adolescent emperor Elagabalus greeting senators while reclining in bed (80(79).14.4 [Xiph.]). See too below (sc. εἴ τέ ποτε ἐπὶ τοῦ δίφρου ... εἶα).

δειπνίζου: Dio switches from Tiberius' conduct from the public to the (semi-) private

sphere.⁴⁴³ How an emperor treated his guests at dinner parties, how he behaved, and who was invited, are recurring themes in the imperial books of the *Roman History* (e.g. 59.14.7; 60.2.7 [Xiph.]; 61.4.3 [Xiph.]; 64(65).3.2-3 [Xiph.]; 64(65).4.3 [Xiph., EVV], 64(65).7.3 [EVV]; 67.9.1-5 [Xiph.]; 74(73).3.4 [Xiph.]; 78(77).17.4 [Xiph.]; 78(77).18.4 [Xiph.]). Tiberius' behaviour hosting dinner parties shows him very much as the model of hospitality, acting as would any generous private individual (see below 57.11.7 (sc. ἐν ἰδιωτείᾳ); cf. Plin. *Pan.* 49.4-8). In general, to be invited to a dinner held by the emperor was a mark of honour and imperial favour (Lendon 1997: 133; cf. Paterson 2007: 149-50).⁴⁴⁴ For further on imperial dinner parties, see Roller 2001: 135-73, and also 57.12.5 (below).

εἴ τέ ποτε ἐπὶ τοῦ δίφρου ... εἶα: (cf. above note τοῖς ὑπάτοις καὶ ὑπανίστατο). Note also Suetonius' anecdote (*Tib.* 30): *numquam curiam nisi solus intrauit; lectica quondam intro latus aeger comites a se remouit*. **ἰπτεᾶ τῶν πρώτων:** A typically status-conscious comment from Dio (cf. 52.25.6-7), which reveals much of Dio's senatorial perception of the stratification of the Roman orders of society during the imperial period. Presumably Tiberius' courteous actions did not apply to those equestrians who had risen from obscure origins to achieve their position in the *ordo equester*, but those who held administrative or other public offices. Perhaps significantly, Dio did not feel the need to elaborate. For the *ordo equester* during the Principate, see generally, Alföldy 1985: 122-6; Brunt 1983; *BNP* 'Equites Romani' (Lintott).

⁴⁴³ Although as this passage demonstrates, there was little distinction between the two when it came to scrutinizing the behaviour of emperors.

⁴⁴⁴ It is for this reason that we find Dio portraying himself as an attendee of several imperial dinner parties, e.g. Pertinax: 74(73).3.4 [Xiph.]; Septimius Severus 77(76).1.2 [Xiph.]; Caracalla: 79(78).8.4. Caligula infamously subverted this accepted system of honour by inviting his horse to dinners (59.14.7).

11.4-5. *Tiberius at the festivals and games*. As has been noted by numerous studies, public shows offered one of the few spaces in which the emperor could interact with the urban population of Rome. Hence arenas, theatres and other performance ‘stages’ were politicized spaces. They provided the physical contexts in which an emperor could address and receive the support of his people (cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 38). At the same time, they were places where the people from all echelons of Roman society could voice their pleasure or displeasure with the emperor in the safety of (relative) anonymity. The presence of the emperor was certainly part of the spectacle and there was an expectation (from at least some quarters) that the emperor should attend such events. Pliny (*Pan.* 51.4-5), for example, praises Trajan for his visibility at the games. Augustus notes in his *Res Gestae* that he had built a ‘private box’ (*puluinar*) in the Circus Maximus, presumably to contribute to his public visibility (*RGDA* 19.1, App. 2; cf. Cooley 2009: 187-8; Edmondson 2002: 52-4). Yet the visibility of an emperor meant that his conduct in the theatre was always subject to scrutiny. For the standard discussions of the political nature of the public shows, and on which this paragraph is based, see Yavetz 1969: 99-101, 107, 108-9; Cameron 1976: 156-92; Millar 1977: 369-75; Gunderson 1996: 126-33.

The view expressed above (and in the modern sources just cited) is heavily influenced by the descriptions of the public spectacles that appear in the emperor-centric narratives of Tacitus, Pliny, Suetonius, and Cassius Dio. Newbold (1975) has shown how Dio’s interest was in the games as a ‘political institution’, and that an emperor’s conduct at the games was indicator of the quality of his rulership. The material gathered by Dio concerning Tiberius’ public conduct in these arenas is, as we would

expect from these chapters, positive. In this, we see a marked contrast with the negative presentations of Tiberius' conduct at the games presented in Suetonius and Tacitus (see below 57.11.5 sc. οὐ γὰρ οὔτε ἐσπούδασέ ... οὐδέν).

11.4 **ἐσπέρας ... ἐνταῦθα τὰς νύκτας ἐνηυλίζετο**: Yavetz (1969: 108-9, with 109 n. 1) sees this as one of Tiberius' failed attempts to engage with the people. Such an appraisal is tendentious, and no doubt exaggerates the extent of Tiberius' alleged unpopularity, at least at this early stage of his reign. Yavetz's comment does serve to highlight an obvious (yet important) feature of Dio's narrative at this point: namely, that he is interested almost exclusively in how Tiberius behaved, not how this behaviour was interpreted by others.

τῶν Καισαρείων: A term almost unique to Dio (Weaver 2005: 251 n. 58).⁴⁴⁵ It is strange that Dio does not appear to have explained this particular meaning of the term earlier in the history. In the narrative up to (but not including) 52.24.4, οἱ Καισάρειοι denotes members of the Caesarian faction during the civil wars, which he does explain (41.39.4, cf. 41.60.3, 42.35.2, 49.3.5, etc.), but afterwards it changes meaning to denote another class, probably of imperial attendants (slave or freedman) (56.32.1 (Xiph.), 60.14.1, etc; Weaver 2005: 249-50; De Blois 1997b: 3409-10; cf. Mason *GT* 58). This at least would account for the apparent distinction made by Dio between the Καισάρειοι here and the ἀπελευθέροι below (57.11.5). Although elsewhere Dio seems to use the terms interchangeably (cf. 60.14.1, 60.17.8; cf. Weaver 2005: 250), and so his choice of words here might simply have been for stylistic (rather than

⁴⁴⁵ Καισάρειοι appears in a papyrus document of the reign of Hadrian (*P. Oxy.* 477, line 5) seemingly denoting a group of (imperial?) officials at Alexandria. Nothing further is known about this group, but it is worth noting that Dio styles Hiberius, the temporary successor to the prefect Vitrasius Pollio (*PIR* V 523), a Καισάρειος (58.19.6).

technical) reasons.

ἐνυλίζετο: A rare word in Dio's vocabulary, used only here and at 50.12.8. The register is almost martial (cf. 50.12.8; Hdt. 1.181, 9.15; Thuc. 4.54.4, etc), as though Tiberius were bivouacking on campaign. Perhaps there is the suggestion that by staying with servile attendants, Tiberius was 'roughing it' (cf. Soph. *Phil.* 33).

It is worth noting as well that Dio does not seem to attach any criticism to Tiberius' decision to stay at the homes of his social inferiors (here and note also 57.11.5: ἐξ οἰκίας καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν ἀπελευθέρων τινός). Although Dio was generally critical of emperors who prioritized their freedmen, he apparently did not see Tiberius' actions here being inimical to the proper order of things. Indeed, from a legal perspective freedmen were obligated to provide such services to their former masters (Buckland 1963: 87-9; Wallace-Hadrill 1990: 76-7). Although Dio's main point is that Tiberius made himself accessible to petitioners, he would have also been aware of (and approving of) actions that spared senators the expense of housing and entertaining him for the night.

ἐξ ἐτοιμοτάτου καὶ ἀπονωτάτου ... γίγνοιτο: Josephus (*AJ* 19.24-26) notes the custom at Rome where petitioners would make their cases to the emperor at the games. Tiberius presumably stayed near the grounds so as to maximize the time he could devote to petitioners. For Tiberius' accessibility (εὐπρόσδοος) see note above at 57.11.1. Interestingly, Suetonius provides a contradictory version (*Tib.* 47), where he says that Tiberius rarely attended the shows so as to avoid having to deal with requests from the people (*ne quid exposceretur*). For comments about the importance

of an emperor being accessible to petitioners at the games, see Cameron 1976: 164-5; Millar 1977: 368-75.

11.5 ἵππων ἀγῶνας: presumably ‘chariot races’ (cf. [Lib.] *Progym.* 8.1.15), rather than ‘horse races’, but Dio’s terminology could easily refer to either or both.

ἐξ οἰκίας καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν ἀπελευθέρων τινὸς πολλάκις ἐώρα: cf. Suet. *Aug.* 45.1: [sc. Augustus] *ipse circenses ex amicorum fere libertorumque cenaculis spectabat.*

συνεχέστατα γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰς θεάς ... δοκεῖν: A notable division in the Dionian and Suetonian/Tacitean traditions. Dio portrays Tiberius as a frequent attendee of the games, whereas Suetonius emphasises his absences (*Tib.* 47). Tacitus too seems intent upon drawing attention to Tiberius’ absence from such events, but illustrates his point with a single example – Tiberius’ decision not to attend the gladiatorial contests organized by Drusus (*Ann.* 1.76; cf. 57.14.5 below). Of course there is no way of determining which of the two traditions better represents how frequently Tiberius attended such shows, but we may suspect Dio’s account is closer to the mark, at least before Tiberius’ withdrawal from the city. In the cases of all three authors, their decision to portray Tiberius these ways was shaped by overarching narrative concerns. In the case of Dio, it was to emphasize Tiberius’ *comitas*, whereas for Suetonius and Tacitus, it serves to illustrate (amongst other things) Tiberius’ remoteness and disconnectedness. τιμῆς: Dio continues the theme of honour, this time concerning how Tiberius’ attendance at the games was a way of honouring the presiding magistrates of the games.

τῆς ... εὐκοσμίας: The only appearance of εὐκοσμία in the extant books of the *Roman History*. Interestingly it is a word more congenial to Xiphilinus, who introduces it into his *Epitome* in two places where we know Dio used other words or expressions (Xiph. 93.26 = 54.16.3; Xiph. 175.7 = 60.6.6-7).

τοῦ τε συνεορτάζειν σφίσι δοκεῖν ... ἔσχεν: A feeling that is doubtless familiar to many a politician or monarch who has been compelled by the expectations of their office to attend sporting contests. As Dio recognized, it was important for an emperor to be seen to be paying attention to the games. Indeed, emperors who showed their lack of interest in such events or avoided the games were left open to popular criticism (e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 45.1; HA *Marc.* 14.1; Zos. 3.11.4-5; cf. Edmondson 1996: 102-4). Yet Dio does not criticize Tiberius on account of his lack of interest in the games (sc. οὔτε δόξαν τινὰ ὡς καὶ συσπεύδων τινὶ ἔσχεν). Indeed for some senatorial writers this sort of detachment was expected (e.g. Pliny *Pan.* 33.2; cf. Cameron 1976: 180), and it is for this reason that Dio is critical of those emperors who showed excessive partisanship at games (e.g. Caligula: 59.5.4, 59.13.6; Vitellius: 64(65).5.1-2 [Xiph.]; cf. Newbold 1975: 590-1, 597).

11.6 οὕτω τε ἐς πάντα ... λαβεῖν: Again we can see Dio's approval of Tiberius' conduct, and he was almost certainly aware of a contemporary parallel. According to Dio's coeval, the jurist Modestinus (*Dig.* 40.9.17) Marcus Aurelius had forbidden the manumission of slaves *ex adclamatione populi*. This is consistent with an anecdote preserved by Xiphilinus and the *EVV* about Marcus refusing to manumit an animal trainer at the games, despite the wishes of the crowd (72(71).29.4 [Xiph.]). We do not know how common such manumissions were, but we do have Republican evidence

of this practice (Cic. *Att.* 4.15.6 = SB 90), and the practice continued into the fourth century (cf. Amm. Marc. 22.7.2). For ownership of slave-actors by the Roman elite, see Csapo 2010: 179-85; cf. Pliny *Ep.* 7.24.5-8 (the freedmen actors of Ummidia Quadratilla (*PIR* V 606)).

ὁρχηστήν τινα: ‘a certain pantomime dancer’ (cf. 54.17.4, 56.47.2; 57.13.10, etc.). Suetonius supplies a name for this actor, Actius, and styles him a ‘comic’ actor. The two accounts are by no means mutually exclusive. We may infer that Actius was almost certainly a dancer of the Italian style of pantomime, which developed out of the ‘comic style’, according to Athenaeus (1.20D). For the various terms applied to pantomime, see Vesterinen 2005: 200-4.

τὴν τιμὴν λαβεῖν: The price of manumission was paid by Tiberius (Csapo 2010: 184; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 47). The cost of manumitting a slave-actor could be expensive: Pliny records that it was not unusual for sums of over HS 700,000 to be paid for the freeing of an actor during his own day (*HN* 7.39.128).

11.7 **τοῖς τε ἐταίροις:** A compact, interesting passage.⁴⁴⁶ Dio introduces two ideas fundamental to his exploration of autocracy through Tiberius’ treatment of his friends (cf. Suet. *Tib.* 55-56). The first is the idea that the *ciuilis princeps*/δημοτικὸς αὐτοκράτωρ was one who essentially behaved as though a private citizen (sc. ἐν ἰδιωτείᾳ). The second is the idea of how the assumption of the imperial power changed individuals. Both of these were commonplaces of the genre of imperial biography and panegyric (e.g. Plin. *Pan.* 23.6, 49.4-8, 85; HA *Ant. Pius* 7.6). It also

⁴⁴⁶ Which is replicated, in truncated form, by John of Antioch F 110 (Mariev).

represents, at first glance, the first significant strain on Dio's opening sketch of Tiberius' nature. There, Dio was keen to illustrate how Tiberius' dissimulation resulted occasionally in the shabby treatment of his friends (see above 57.1.2: καὶ τῷ φιλάτῳ ὥς ἀλλοτριωτάτῳ προσεφέρετο). But the two passages are not contradictory. First, the earlier passage is concerned with Tiberius' manner rather than his actions. Second, neither passage claims to portray how Tiberius behaved at all times.

Additionally, the passage presents a glimpse of the sorts of social behaviour that Dio thought were important to friendship. To be sure, at least two of these are conventional *topoi* in friendship literature, but this does not make the fact that Dio should choose to stress these points any less significant. In fact, it suggests that Dio was attempting to situate Tiberius' actions in an interpretative framework that was instantly recognizable to his audience.

δικαζομένοις σφίσι συνηγωνίζετο: Dio perhaps has in mind Tiberius' decision to appear in support of Urgulania (*PIR* V 684) in 16 (Tac. *Ann.* 2.34). Our evidence precludes us from determining on how many occasions Tiberius supported his friends in such cases. Dio's use of the imperfect (συνηγωνίζετο) suggests that it was more than once, but Dio might well be basing his general observation on inference. That friends should support each other in legal disputes was a commonplace of friendship literature (Lucian *Tox.* 34; Plut. *De Am. Mult.* 6 [= *Mor.* 95C-D]) and was then incorporated into discussions of imperial behaviour (54.3.1; Suet. *Aug.* 56; etc.). However, such well-meaning imperial interventions would have been inimical to the fairness of the courts (as noted above at 57.7.6).

θύουσι συνεώρταξε: An intimate detail and one not usually found in discussions of friendship. Unfortunately Dio does not provide any further evidence for the occasion of these sacrifices. It seems likely from the context of the passage that Dio has in mind Tiberius' participation in acts of private sacrifice, for example those which aristocrats (and others) performed before harvests (cf. Fronto *ad M. Caes.* 4.6 = VdH² pp. 62-3). For general comments on the communal aspects of performing sacrifices, see Rüpke 2007: 102-3.

νοσοῦντάς τε ἐπεσκέπτετο: Although the visiting of sick friends was (and surely remains) a mark of friendship (Sen. *Ep.* 1.9.1-8; Plut. *De Am. Mult.* 6 [= *Mor.* 95D]; Lucian *Tox.* 18), it appears infrequently in Dio, the only other example being the exemplary conduct of Marcus Aurelius (72(71).35.4 [Xiph.]).

ἐνί ...τὸν ἐπιτάφιον αὐτὸς εἶπε: Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 32.1: *quorundam illustrium exsequias usque ad rogum frequentavit*. The identity of the individual (or individuals: sc. ἐνί γέ) honoured by this funeral oration is obscure. Likely candidates must be Tiberius' loyal companion, Lucilius Longus, who received a public funeral in 23 (Tac. *Ann.* 4.15; *PIR*² 389), or P. Sulpicius Quirinius (Tac. *Ann.* 3.48; *PIR*² S 1018).

12.1 **τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζηλώσεως ἔνεκα:** The idea of the emperor being an *exemplum* for others to follow is a familiar *topos* in Greco-Roman political thought: Men. *Rhet.* 2.376.8-9; [Arist.] *Or.* 35.26; cf. *SCPP* (ll. 132-3): *item senatum laudare magnopere Iuliae Aug[ustae] | Drusi[ue] Caesaris moderationem imitantium principis nostri iustitiam*. Dio adds a degree of originality in his presentation of this commonplace as

he depicts Tiberius as attempting to cultivate his own exemplary status (see also below 57.13.5). In what particular areas of conduct Tiberius hoped Livia would emulate him is left ambiguous (sc. ὅσα πρόποντα αὐτῇ τῶν τοιούτων ποιεῖν ἦν). Certainly the immediate context would suggest Tiberius' conduct with respect to honours (see above 57.8). But there may also be the sense that Dio is referring to his characteristic dissimulation. In other words, that Livia should endeavour to mask her great extra-constitutional power and influence (cf. 57.12.2).

ἵνα μὴ ὑπερᾶνχῃ: A very Dionian word (sc. ὑπερᾶνχέω) and idea. Aside from in Dio (and in his epitomators) and lexical works, the verb ὑπερᾶνχέω appears only in Thucydides (4.19.4) and in the spurious letters of Phalaris (*Ep.* 122.2).

Dio's use of ὑπερᾶνχέω throughout the work reveals an important nexus of ideas that is tied closely to his understanding of *hybris*.⁴⁴⁷ Hence, Dio uses the verb in connection with the Romans' arrogance in their treatment of the Samnites, which resulted in disaster for the Romans (F 36.10 [ES]). Elsewhere Dio uses it in conjunction with the granting and refusal of honours. Hence Caesar was perceived to have become arrogant due to his acceptance of too many extraordinary honours and as a result became odious to the senators (44.8.3-4; cf. Pelling 2011: 425-7 on Plut. *Caes.* 57.2-3). Finally, as with the case of Tiberius' motivations here, Dio notes how Septimius Severus was praised for not allowing extraordinary honours to be voted to imperial freedmen which could have made them behave (towards senators?) in an overbearing manner (77(76).6.2 [Xiph.]).

⁴⁴⁷ In other words, to behave in a manner that could be described as ὑπέρανχος was certainly one manifestation of individual (or corporate) *hybris*.

12.2 πάνυ γὰρ μέγα καὶ ὑπὲρ πάσας τὰς πρόσθεν γυναῖκας ὥγκωτο: A fact recognised by contemporaries: Vell. Pat. 2.75.5: *Livia [...] genere, probitate, forma Romanarum eminentissima [...]*; and 2.130.5: *eminentissima et per omnia deis quam hominibus similior femina*; Philo (*Leg.* 320):⁴⁴⁸ ἢ [sc. Livia] δέ γε καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅλον τὸ γένος κἂν τούτῳ [sc. mental capacity] διήνεγκεν [...]; etc. But Dio's statement has an edge to it. His choice of verb (ὥγκωτο) may be read in a pejorative sense ('puffed up'; cf. below at 57.12.5 ὑπέρογκον) or suggest something more neutral ('exulted'). Unlike Philo and Velleius, Dio is clearly thinking in terms of the extraordinary honours Livia accumulated during her lifetime, which he took apparent care to record over the course of the narrative.⁴⁴⁹ It is this feature that separated Livia from those earlier great women of Roman history (πρόσθεν), but was not (we may suspect) that different from the empresses to follow. Indeed, Livia, as the first 'Augusta', may be seen to set the pattern for the empresses and dowagers to follow in terms of her honours and public profile (cf. 61(60).33.12 [Zonar.]). For discussion of these honours, see; Purcell 1986: 85-7, 89-90; Flory 1993; Barrett 2002: 37, 137-8, 156-64.

ὥστε καὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοὺς ἐθέλοντας οἴκαδε ἀσπασομένους αἰεὶ ποτε ἐσδέχεσθαι: Note the similar statement regarding Agrippina, which also (according to Dio) was noted in the public records (61(60).33.1 [EVV]). *Pace* Baldwin

⁴⁴⁸ The passage is purportedly a quotation of (Herod) Agrippa's petition to Gaius (Philo *Leg.* 276-329), but is likely to be a free composition: cf. Smallwood 1961: 292.

⁴⁴⁹ Statues: 49.38.1; 55.5.5. Other honours: 49.38.1 (freedom from tutelage, tribunician inviolability); 55.5.5 (*ius trium liberorum*); 56.46.2 (right to be accompanied by a lictor while serving as a priestess). Buildings: 55.8.2 (Precinct of Livia), 56.27.5 (Stoa of Livia, cf. Swan 2004: 291-93). Extraordinary posthumous honours: 58.2.2-3, 6.

(1979: 196) I see no reason to suspect one of the two statements to be dubious. For discussion of Livia receiving people for *salutatio*, see Barrett 2002: 164-5.

τὰ δημόσια ὑπομνήματα: ‘the public records’. The first of three (or possibly four) references to these documents in Book 57: see also note below at 57.16.2 τῶν δημοσίων γραμμάτων; cf. 57.21.5, 57.23.2. Dio probably has in mind the *acta publica* that are noted sporadically in Latin sources (cf. Plin. *Ep.* 5.13.8; 7.33.3; Tac. *Ann.* 12.24; Suet. *Cal.* 8.2; *RE* 1 cols. 290-295 = Acta 5 (Kubitscheck)). These are likely to be the same as the so-called *acta diurna* (Baldwin 1979: 197-98; cf. White 1997: 80 n. 24; Sherwin-White 1966: 342; *BNP* ‘Acta’ 3 (Gizewski)), *contra* Syme (1958: 120 n. 2), who suggests that *acta publica* and *acta diurna* are distinct records. For discussion of Dio’s possible use of these sources, see Introduction, *Chapter 1: The Roman Historian at Work*.

αἱ τε ἐπιστολαὶ ... ὁμοίως: Marsh (1931: 279) is certainly correct in stating that the Gytheum inscriptions preserving the correspondence between Tiberius and the Gytheates (and where the Gytheates seem to have addressed both Tiberius and Livia) do not substantiate Dio’s claim. However, as noted by Barrett (2002: 155) it does not preclude the veracity of it either. After all Dio is referring to what must have been only a fraction of the total correspondence sent and received by Tiberius (sc. χρόνον τινά). Dio may have also been struck by a contemporary parallel in so far as it was the practice of Caracalla to including Julia Domna’s name alongside his on letters to the Senate (78(77).18.2 [Xiph.]).

12.3 οὐτε ἐς τὸ συνέδριον ... ἐσελθεῖν: Dio's comment has a somewhat period feel, and perhaps goes back to an Augustan or Julio-Claudian source favourable to Livia. Note the similar words of praise offered by the poet of the *Consolatio ad Liviam* (49-50 with Schoonhoven 1992: 100-1): *Nec uires errasse tuas campoue foroue | Quamquam licet citra constituisset domum.*⁴⁵⁰ Barrett (2002: 155) says that Dio's statement 'seems to undercut Dio's own thesis' that Livia sought to exercise autocratic power on account of these three spaces being 'the very places where power could be exercised'. While Barrett's claim might well have applied to the Republic, it misses the internal logic of Dio's narrative. Dio's point (and indeed that of pseudo-Ovid) emphasizes the fact that Livia *could* exert political power and influence without physically transgressing the traditionally masculine spaces of the army camp, senate chamber, and assembly. After all, Dio believed that the Augustan monarchy saw the centre of political power shift from the senate and assembly to the emperor's private quarters, at least in terms of decision making (cf. 53.19.2-3).

ἐς τὸ συνέδριον: Perhaps the ultimate act of symbolic transgression into the (masculine) political sphere, at least from a senatorial perspective (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 14.11). Outside the context of trials, there is scant pre-Severan evidence for women attending meetings of the Senate, and even then that evidence is poor. The pseudonymous biographer of the *Vita Heliogabali* (4.2, cf. 18.3) asserts that Julia Soaemias would attend Senate meetings during the reign of her son, but we may be justifiably suspicious of this claim. Xiphilinus notes one occasion where Soaemias and Julia Maesa attended a meeting of the senate (concerning the adoption of Alexander), but he adds that they were brought there by the emperor (80(79).17.2

⁴⁵⁰ The intention of the passage is supposed to be flattering to Livia, emphasising her restraint: Jenkins 2009: 9; *pace* Purcell (1986: 96), who detects the 'latent hostility' of the poet.

[Xiph.]), and we may take it to have been exceptional. For further comments, see Talbert 1984: 161-2.

ἐς τὰ στρατόπεδα: If Dio's material did derive from an Augustan or Julio-Claudian encomiastic source, then it is tempting to detect a not-so-veiled reference to the actions of Fulvia, whose virago-like escapades during the late 40s attracted criticism and concern from hostile witnesses (Cic. *Phil.* 3.4, 5.22, 13.18; cf. 45.13.2; 48.10.4). However, in Dio's third century context, the comment must have seemed somewhat quaint. As the actions of the elder Agrippina and Plancina amply demonstrate, it was becoming increasingly common for the wives of commanders to accompany their husbands into the legionary camps even during the reign of Tiberius (cf. Foubert 2011).⁴⁵¹ We may assume that this was also the case for the later Roman empresses accompanying their husbands on campaign. Furthermore, the title *mater castrorum*, first held by the younger Faustina (72(71).10.5 [Xiph.]; HA *Marc.* 26.8) suggests that several of the empresses of Dio's day had close associations with the military. For comments, see Levick 2014: 78-9 (on Faustina), and Levick 2007: 44, 136 (on Julia Domna).

ἐς τὰς ἐκκλησίας: Again traditional Republican political units not associated with women. Hence, Dio-Zonaras' vivid description of the transgressive behaviour of the women of Rome invading the assembly during the vote to the repeal the *lex Oppia* (Zonar. 9.17; cf. Livy 34.1-8.3, with Milnor 2005: 154-80).

⁴⁵¹ It is possible that Dio is drawing a point of contrast between Livia and the Agrippina (cf. 57.5.6), but if so, the comparison is a muted one.

ἐπὶ τε γὰρ τοῦ Αὐγούστου μέγιστον ἡδυνήθη: Dio will return to the idea of Livia's influence over Augustus in his obituary of the Augusta (58.2.5 [Xiph.]). Livia's great influence was by no means a negative force. Although, Dio supports the assumption that Livia was instrumental in persuading Augustus to adopt Tiberius as his successor (see note above 57.3.3), it is to be remembered that Dio's portrayal of Livia was that generally of the good advisor, and that it was Livia who was largely responsible for him becoming more merciful as a ruler (55.22.1-2; cf. *ind.* 55).

τὸν Τιβέριον αὐτὴ αὐτοκράτορα πεποιηκέναι ἔλεγε: Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.57: *cum dominationem ipsam donum eius accepisset. [...] idque Augusta exprobrabat, reposcebat.* A point Dio first made at 57.3.3 (see note above ἐπειδὴ ἡ Λιουία [...] ἐλέγετο). Livia's comments here mirror those of the younger Agrippina to Nero (61.7.3 [Xiph.]; cf. 62(61).13.2 [Xiph.]; 62(61).14.1 [Xiph.]), who would remind her son that it was she who made him emperor (“ἐγὼ σε αὐτοκράτορα ἀπέδειξα”).

καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐχ ὅσον ἐξ ἴσου οἱ ἄρχειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρεσβεύειν αὐτοῦ ἤθελεν: cf. 56.47.1. It has been suggested that Dio's claim that Livia sought preference over her son was influenced by either accounts of Agrippina the Younger (Goodyear 1972: 190; cf. 61(61).33.12 [Zonar.]: ἡ [sc. Agrippina] δὲ καὶ ἰσοκρατῆς τῷ Κλαυδίῳ ἄντικρυς ὀνομάζεσθαι ἤθελε) or by his experiences of the Severan Juliae (Barrett 2002: 238, cf. 155). Both of these suggestions, I suggest, miss the mark. In the case of the Severan Juliae, it is notable that Dio, in the extant narrative, does not portray them as attempting to subordinate their sons to their own political ambitions.⁴⁵² As suggested in the previous note, there is a close parallel with Agrippina, but this is not

⁴⁵² In the case of Julia Domna, it was only after the murder of Caracalla that she attempted to instigate a coup to replace Macrinus (79(78).23.2-3).

in itself strong evidence of direct influence. Rather, Dio's comment here feeds into a key observation about the psychology of power, and has little to do with the gender of the protagonists. Dio's point seems to be that those who give (absolute) power to another feel the right to take precedence over those who receive it. Moreover, Dio appears to have subscribed to the (sub-Thucydidean) belief that it was difficult for individuals (or states) to share power with equals (e.g. F 7.3 [ES]).

12.4 ὅθεν ἄλλα τε ἔξω τοῦ νενομισμένου ἐσεφέρετο: These proposals were seemingly made at the meeting of the Senate on 17 September 14 (see discussion above § II Senatorial Business). ὅθεν: Dio appears to suggest that these proposals were in response to, or recognition of, Livia's existing power and influence.

πολλοὶ μὲν μητέρα αὐτὴν τῆς πατρίδος πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ γονέα: cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.14: *alii parentem, alii matrem patriae appellandam [...] censebat.* Suet. *Tib.* 50.3: *quare non 'parentem patriae' appellari [...].* All three sources seem to be derived from a common source, with the similarity between Dio and Tacitus' comments being particularly close (cf. Jaeger 1910: 32-3). μητέρα αὐτὴν τῆς πατρίδος: Tiberius would again refuse to sanction this title for his mother following her death (58.2.3). However, as we have seen with some of the titles refused by Tiberius (see above 57.8.1), the title *mater patriae* does seem to have been used unofficially during her lifetime, as indicated by a copper coin type produced at Lepcis Magna (*RPC* 1.1 no. 849; cf. Grant 1950: 127). Tiberius' decision to veto the proposal to style his mother *mater patriae* must have had a degree of contemporary relevance to Dio, as the first

woman to be officially styled *mater patriae* was Julia Domna, who received the title sometime late in the first decade of the third century.⁴⁵³

καὶ τὸν Τιβέριον ἀπ’ αὐτῆς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.1: [...] *plerique ut nomini Caesaris adscriberetur ‘Iuliae filius’ censebant*; Suet. *Tib.* 50.2: *tulit etiam perindigne actum in senatu, ut titulis suis quasi ‘Augusti’, ita et ‘Liviae filius’ adiceretur*. Such a proposal could easily have been construed as being offensive to Tiberius, not only on account of it being a deviation from Roman onomastic conventions (Koestermann 1963: 114; Goodyear 1972: 190), but also because it might have suggested weakness or effeminacy (cf. Anacr. F 388 = Page *LGS* no. 318). The only parallel for use of the metronymic for an emperor is Alexander Severus. Yet even then it was never an official style but was used (presumably) in a pejorative sense in response to Mamaea’s domination over her son.⁴⁵⁴ However, it is likely that the proposal in A.D. 14 was supposed to be flattering to both Livia and Tiberius (Barrett 2002: 157-8; cf. Dixon 1988: 77).⁴⁵⁵ Dio’s suggestion that Tiberius was to be known as ‘Iuliae filius’ but not as the ‘Augusti filius’ (which is surely the sense of ὅπως ὥστε οἱ Ἕλληνες πατρόθεν) is almost certainly a misinterpretation of his source material.⁴⁵⁶ Suetonius’ statement must represent something closer to the original proposal, although ‘Liviae filius’ is surely a mistake for ‘Iuliae filius’. The addition of the metronymic would have resolved the problem (if problem there was)

⁴⁵³ It is not known when Julia Domna assumed the title *mater patriae*, but it has been suggested by Rowan (2012: 254) that the appearance of *mater patriae* on Domna’s coinage post-dates the fall of Plautianus in 205 but ceases after the destruction of Geta in 211.

⁴⁵⁴ The earliest surviving literary example of the style Alexander ‘son of Mamaea’ is from the late fourth-century biography of the emperor (HA *Alex. Sev.* 3.1), however, it without doubt originated in the third century, perhaps as a part of the propaganda of Maximinus Thrax.

⁴⁵⁵ Although, note Levick (1976: 153): ‘it may have been meant to hurt’. Cf. Goodyear 1972: 190 n. 1.

⁴⁵⁶ But hardly unforgivable. Indeed, it could be argued that this is the natural reading of Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.1.

caused by Augustus' adoption of Livia, which had left her in the peculiar position of being Tiberius' sister. Moreover, the assumption of both patronymic and metronymic would have served to emphasize Tiberius' noble lineage.⁴⁵⁷

12.5 ἀγανακτῶν οὖν ἐπὶ τούτοις οὔτε τὰ ψηφιζόμενα αὐτῇ πλὴν ἐλαχίστων ἐπεκύρου, οὔτ' ἄλλο τι ὑπέρογκον ποιεῖν ἐπέτρεπεν: Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.2: *ille moderandos feminarum honores dictitans eademque se temperantia usurum in iis quae sibi tribueretur, ceterum anxius inuidi et muliebre fastigium in deminutionem sui accipiens ne lictorem quidem ei decerni passus est aramque adoptionis et alia huiusce modi prohibuit.* Unlike Tacitus, Dio does not probe Tiberius' psyche and provide a reason (or reasons) for Tiberius' vexation and we the readers are left to supply the causes ourselves.

πλὴν ἐλαχίστων ἐπεκύρου: For the honours voted to Livia, see 56.46.1-2.

ὑπέρογκον: cf. above 57.12.2: πάνυ γὰρ μέγα ... ᾧγκωτο.

εἰκόνα γοῦν ποτε αὐτῆς οἴκοι τῷ Αὐγούστῳ ὀσιωσάσης: *pace* Barrett (2002: 162) and Donahue (2004: 79), *et al.*, there is no good reason to assume (based on its position in Dio's text) that this dedication occurred in A.D. 14.

⁴⁵⁷ This has been asserted recently by Depauw (2010: 137-8) as the reason behind the recording of the names of both parents for the priests of Apollo at Didyma during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Similarly, note the *Cynegeticus* (1.1-5) where the poet emphasises Caracalla's nobility based on his descent from Septimius Severus and Julia Domna.

πρὶν τὴν γερουσίαν ψηφίσασθαι: A curious detail – whether genuine or not. That a vote should be taken in order to consecrate a statue in a private house (sc. οἶκοι) seems extraordinary, and perhaps seemed so to Dio as well, which explains its inclusion here. Purcell (1986: 90) suggests that there might be some connection between this and the three-day private festival organised by Livia for her household in commemoration of Augustus at 56.46.5. Such an interpretation is not without its difficulties. According to Dio, that particular festival was celebrated by successive emperors down to his own day, presumably on an annual basis.⁴⁵⁸ In contrast, the event described here seems to be a one off event, marking the consecration of the statue, just as the public dinners described at 55.2.4 and 55.8.2 marked Tiberius' triumph and the dedication of the temple of Concordia respectively.

Yet it is also possible that Dio's report here is corrupted or misleading, with respect to the claim that the statue was in Livia's house (οἶκοι). It must be conceded that we do not know where this house that Dio is referring to actually was, and it would be unwise to assume that he was referring to the apartments on the Palatine, commonly ascribed to Livia. Nevertheless, the two key elements (i.e. dedication of statues and the organization of a public dinner) seem more suited to a public event, rather than one confined to the home. It is tempting to speculate, along with Reimar (2.857), that Dio's note here is in fact referring to the dedication of the statue to Augustus 'near the Theatre of Marcellus' noted by Tacitus and the *Fasti Praenestini* which occurred on 23 April A.D. 22 (Tac. *Ann.* 3.64; *Inscr. Ital.* XIII.2 p. 131 = *EJ*² p. 48).

⁴⁵⁸ Swan (2004: 357-8) identifies the festival with the *ludi Palatini*, which was celebrated seemingly from 17 to 19 January.

οὔτε τότε τοὺς ἄνδρας δειπνίσαι, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς μὲν τούτοις ἐκείνη δὲ ταῖς γυναιξὶν εἰστίασε: Tiberius’ actions seem to have maintained the status quo, and need not represent (*pace* Purcell 1986: 90) ‘a withdrawal towards the conservative tradition from the innovative and independent practice of Augustus’. Dio records that under Augustus, Livia (once with the elder Julia) gave public banquets *for women* on at least two separate occasions (cf. 55.2.4 and 55.8.2; cf. Rich 1990: 220, 226; Swan 2004: 48-9, 74-5). But there is no indication that Livia entertained (senatorial or equestrian) men at such public events. For public banquets in general during the imperial period, see Donahue 2004: 78-80. **ταῖς γυναιξὶν εἰστίασε:** ἐστίω + dat. Evidently a typically attic construction cf. Schol. on Arist. *Thesm.* 941/2.

12.6 καὶ τέλος τῶν μὲν δημοσίων παντάπασιν ... ἐπαχθὲς ἦν: There is a tinge of irony in Dio’s comments here. Livia’s meddlesomeness, in so far as she used her influence to represent the interests of numerous men and women, was perhaps her greatest virtue in the eyes of contemporaries and of Dio himself (e.g. 58.2.3 [Xiph.]; *SCPP* II. 115-17).

ὥστε καὶ ἐς τὴν Καπρίαν δι’ ἐκείνην οὐχ ἥκιστα μεταστήναι: The belief that Livia was the cause of Tiberius’ retirement to Capri has found adherents, ancient and modern (e.g. Suet. *Tib.* 51.1: *ut quidam putent* [...]; Tac. *Ann.* 4.57: *traditur etiam* [...]); Bauman 1992: 137; etc.). Whatever the truth in the matter, it seems as though such a rumour was an important component of the anti-Livia/Tiberius tradition which sought to emphasise the discord between Livia and her son (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.72.4; 3.64.1).

13.1 **ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς Λιουίας παραδέδοται ... μετεχειρίζετο**: Dio's transition from Livia back to Tiberius is jolting. **ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς Λιουίας παραδέδοται**: The statement suggests that the material in the preceding chapter was something of a pastiche drawn from a variety of different sources concerning Livia (Jaeger 1910: 32). But Dio may be aiming for a subtle juxtaposition of ideas: the estrangement of Tiberius and Livia introduces Dio's comment about Tiberius' harsh treatment of miscreants (sc. **τραχύτερον τοὺς αἰτιαζομένους τι μετεχειρίζετο**), the force of which relies, again, on the reader's knowledge of Dio's earlier portrayal of Livia as a moderating force (cf. note above at 57.12.3 **ἐπὶ τε γὰρ τοῦ Αὐγούστου μέγιστον ἡδυνήθη**). Otherwise, the **δέ** clause is something of a non sequitur. **ὁ δὲ δὴ Τιβέριος αὐτὸς μὲν τραχύτερον τοὺς αἰτιαζομένους τι μετεχειρίζετο**: 'He would treat those guilty of any offence quite harshly'.⁴⁵⁹ Tiberius' severity was a constant part of the historiographical tradition. Dio, however, suppresses any overt criticism of Tiberius, and likewise any suggestion at this point that Tiberius' severity might be indicative of some innate cruelty.

τῷ δὲ δὴ Δρούσῳ ... πολλάκις: cf. Suet. *Tib.* 52.1: *nam Drusus fluxioris remissiorisque uitae erat*; Tac. *Ann.* 1.76. It is difficult not to read this comment with relation to the later second century, where Dio was critical of those emperors (and especially Septimius Severus) who did not adequately chastise their sons. But Dio's main point is that Tiberius was consistent when it came to punishing vicious behaviour, irrespective of kinship ties (hence the force of the **δέ δὴ**, 'and *even* in the case of Drusus'). **ἀσελγεστάτῳ καὶ ὠμοτάτῳ**: Drusus' alleged vices are noted frequently in the sources: for which, see Rogers 1943: 148-52; Levick 1976: 273 n.

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. 57.19.1^b = Petrus Patricius: ὅτι Τιβέριος τοὺς κατηγορουμένους ἐπὶ τινι πικρῶς ἐκόλαζεν.

54; and below 57.14.9-10. Dio's choice of words presents Drusus as the ethical antithesis of Tiberius (sc. σωφρονέστατα, below 57.13.3). Note also, the sequence of ἀσελγ- and σωφρον- words in 57.13.1-3: ἀσελγεστάτῳ ... σωφρονέστατα ... ἀσελγαίνειν ... σωφρονίζειν.

Δρουσιανὰ: A curious detail, and one preserved only here. Given the Latinate form of the word, we may divine a Latin source behind this triviality.

13.2 “ζῶντος μὲν ... τελευτήσαντος”: A typically obscure apothegm from Tiberius. Cary translates (7.142): ‘While I am alive you shall commit no deed of violence or insolence; and if you dare try not after I am dead, either.’ Chris Pelling suggests to me that the sense could be closer to ‘just try it while I’m alive, and you won’t even have a chance even when I’m dead’ – that is that Tiberius would stop Drusus’ misbehaviour once and for all.

13.3 **σωφρονέστατα:** High praise indeed for Tiberius. Dio describes Tiberius’ personal conduct using the vocabulary of imperial panegyric. The somewhat hyperbolic statement serves to heighten not only the contrast between Tiberius’ chaste lifestyle and the debauched lifestyle of his son (as noted above at 57.13.1), but also Tiberius’ own reputed descent into orgiastic excesses that became apparent later in his reign (cf. 58.22.1-3).

καὶ οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων οὐδενὶ ἀσελγαίνειν ... ἐκόλαξε: cf. 57.23.4, where Dio notes how Tiberius appointed a guardian for a loose-living (sc. ἀσελγῶς) senator.

τῶν βουλευτῶν ποτε ... τάξας: Following Jaeger (1910: 37-38), Gelzer (*RE* 10.1, col. 530 = Iulius 154) and Seager (1972: 141 n. 3 = 2005: 261 n.71), we may safely date this discussion in the Senate to A.D. 22, which was instigated by C. Calpurnius Bibulus (Tac. *Ann.* 3.52.2; *PIR*² C 254), given the close parallels between Dio (57.13.3-4) and Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.52-54).⁴⁶⁰ **κατὰ τῶν ἀσώτως ζώντων:** Dio's language is suitably unspecific, given the context of the passage. According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.52), the discussion surrounded a tightening up of the existing sumptuary laws, and especially those covering what Woodman and Martin term 'gastronomic luxury' (cf. Woodman and Martin 1996: 376-8, 381).

καὶ προσεπειπὼν ὅτι: If we are to believe Tacitus (and there does not seem to be a good reason why we should not) Tiberius communicated his opinions to the senate by way of a letter, which Tacitus quotes in *oratio recta*. While it is possible that both Dio and Tacitus had access to an original copy of the missive, or to a source that did, it is likely that Dio's was a free composition.⁴⁶¹

ἄμεινόν ἐστιν ἰδίᾳ τρόπον ... κοινήν σφισι τιμωρίαν ἐπιθεῖναι: [he said that] 'it was a better method to punish transgressors in some other way in private rather than to impose a public punishment on them'. However, the sense of the **ἰδίᾳ ... κοινήν** contrast could be closer to 'to punish them individually rather than by way of common punishment'. Dio's choice of words seems to recall the passage just a few lines above (57.13.1) describing how Tiberius berated his son for his misdemeanors 'both in private and in public' (ἐπετίμα καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ πολλάκις). Although

⁴⁶⁰ Woodman and Martin's (1996: 384) caution is misplaced, as it is based on the erroneous assumption that the passage in Dio occurred in A.D. 14.

⁴⁶¹ The same is likely for Tacitus *Ann.* 3.53-55 as well: Adams 1973: 137-8; followed by Woodman and Martin 1996: 384.

here Dio's focus is clearly on Tiberius' treatment of individuals outside of the *domus Caesaris*, and perhaps there is the recognition that an emperor ideally needed to handle members of the non-imperial elite differently from the way he dealt with members of his own family.

Jaeger (1910: 37) identified this passage as being an amalgam of Tac. *Ann.* 3.52 (*num coercitio plus damni in rem publicam ferret ... uel retentum ignominiam et infamiam uirorum inlustrium posceret*) and *Ann.* 3.54 (*reliquis intra animum medendum est: nos pudor ... in melius mutet*). Certainly the parallel between the two accounts is close.

13.4: **νῦν μὲν γὰρ ... προτιμήσειν**: 'For at present at least some would behave moderately out of their fear of the disgrace, so that they would endeavour to evade detection; but once the law was transgressed by human nature, no-one would obey it.' A fascinating little passage that requires some further discussion. Dio phrases Tiberius' response in terms of a familiar *physis-nomos* dichotomy.⁴⁶² Tiberius' statement conforms largely to Dio's own predominantly bleak conception of human nature: that is of a force which drives men to violate the laws of society (cf. Reinhold 1988: 215-7). This in turn informed Dio's belief that harsh punishments (prescribed by laws) were not an effective means of deterring individuals from transgressive acts (F 17.7 [ES]; F 36.1-2 [ES]; 52.34.1; 55.16.2; etc.).

τῷ φόβῳ τῆς αἰσχύνης ... λαθεῖν ἐπιχειρήσαι: Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.54: *nam si uelis quod nondum uetitum est, timeas ne uetere*. Note also the distinct echoes in the

⁴⁶² For the Classical origins of which in Greek thought, see Guthrie 1969: 55-134.

Speech of Maecenas (52.34.7-8). These views, while central to Dio's understanding of motivation, are ultimately derived from philosophical commonplaces, that is, that would-be wrongdoers refrain from transgressing the laws or conventions of society due to fear of the shame their punishment would bring upon themselves. E.g. Antiphon the Sophist (F. 44a II. 3-10 [ed. Pendrick]: τὰ οὖν νόμιμα παραβαίνων ἐὰν λάθῃ τοὺς ὁμολογήσαντας καὶ αἰσχύνῃς καὶ ζημίας ἀπήλλακται· μὴ λαθὼν δ' οὐ·); Thuc. 2.37.3; Plat. *Leg.* 8.841a-c; etc). **αἰσχύνῃς**: Perhaps best understood in general terms, as 'disgrace' or 'shame'. But Dio's comment is consistent with the philosophical definition of αἰσχύνῃ as the 'fear of just censure' (Gell. 19.6.3: *ita enim philosophi definiunt: αἰσχύνῃ ἐστὶν φόβος δικαίου ψόγου*). For the broad semantic range of αἰσχύνῃ, see Dover 1974: 70-1; cf. Lendon 1997: 50-1 (for brief comments on the Roman context); and now Kaster 2005 (esp. Ch. 2).

13.5 **ἐσθῆτι ἀλουργεῖ ... ἀπαγορευθὲν πρότερον**: It is impossible to determine when this ordinance was issued. Nowhere in his extant narrative of either Augustus or Tiberius does Dio refer specifically to a prohibition of purple clothing. For sumptuary legislation under Tiberius (enacted in A.D. 15), see below 57.15.1. **φαιὰν μανδύην**: *Prima facie*, like Augustus (Suet. *Aug.* 73), Tiberius' choice of drab clothing seems calculated to indicate his frugality. However, it is interesting to note that Augustus legislated against the wearing of dark cloaks (*pullati* - deemed to be a foreign influence) in the theatre or in the forum (Suet. *Aug.* 40.5, 44.3). Be this as it may, Tiberius' austerity met with Dio's approval. As we would expect from the traditionally-minded Dio, he regarded how an individual dressed as a maker of their character, e.g. Marcus Aurelius: 72(71).35.4 [Xiph.], Nero: 63.13.3 [Xiph.], Claudius: 60.6.9, Elagabalus: 80(79).11.2 [Xiph. *EVV*], etc. For further comments, see

Edmondson 2008: 35-7.

13.6 **ταῦθ' ... μέχρι γε καὶ Γερμανικὸς ἔζη ἐποίει**: At last, Dio closes the ring (cf. above 57.7.1: ἐφ' ὅσον ὁ Γερμανικὸς ἔζη, διήγαγεν). Yet, as we have seen, some of the anecdotes used by Dio occurred after Germanicus' death, and we should not take Dio's statement literally.

μετὰ γὰρ τοῦτο συχνὰ αὐτῶν μετέβαλεν: Dio is wise not to couch Tiberius' change in absolute terms at this point (sc. **συχνὰ**), which at least allows him to praise individual aspects of Tiberius' conduct in his post-Germanicus narrative (e.g. 57.22.2-4 [Xiph.], 57.23.4-5 [Xiph.]).

εἴτ' οὖν φρονῶν ... ἐστερήθη: Dio concludes his discussion of Tiberius' conduct as emperor with a comment on Tiberius' nature. As such it recalls the opening section of the book (57.1). It also picks up on the *physis-nomos* theme raised at 57.13.4 (above). Dio's reluctance to offer a firm opinion is surprising. Yet, his agnosticism is appropriate for appraising the enigmatic Tiberius. The result incorporates (and perhaps responds to?) features of both the Suetonian and Tacitean conclusions on the matter. For Suetonius, the fundamentally vicious Tiberius was only slowly unmasked (cf. *Tib.* 33.1: *paulatim principem exseruit*). As always, the Tacitean verdict is less clear-cut than it may first seem, but his conclusion superficially at least resembles that of Suetonius (*Ann.* 6.51, but cf. *Ann.* 6.48). The comments of all three writers tap into an important question of ancient philosophy (and biography) – that is whether it was possible for someone to experience a change of nature. For further discussion, see Introduction, *Chapter 2: Dio on Tiberius*.

ἐξοκείλας: A very Dionian word. Dio typically uses it in terms of a ‘drift’ into moral turpitude of some description (e.g. F 62.1 (Antiochus III) [EVV]; F 83.1 [EVV], cf. F 85.1 (on Tiberius Gracchus) [EVV]; 80(79).3.3: [sc. Elagabalus] ἐς δὲ δὴ τὰλλα πάντα καὶ αἰσχρουργότατα καὶ παρανομώτατα καὶ μαιφονώτατα ἐξοκείλας).

τοῦ ἀνταγωνιστοῦ ἐστερήθη: The notion of the *metus hostilis* was an important one for Dio, just as it was for Sallust. It can be seen in Dio’s assessment of the behaviour of states as well as for individuals. For references, see Kuhn-Chen 2002: 174.

14.1 **λέξω δὲ ... ἄξιό ἐστιν**: ‘But now I shall describe at the appropriate time how each event happened (at least as much as is worth remembering)’. A recurring transitional sentence used by Dio (and Xiphilinus), with occasional deviations in the formulation, marking, in the case of Dio’s work, the transition into annalistic material (53.22.1, 69.8.1 [Xiph.], etc.). But this transition is relatively minor. It does not amount to a profound change in Dio’s historiographical (and biographical) focus, which remains predominantly on Tiberius and the workings of the imperial government. **τοὺς καιρούς**: Presumably denoting the ‘appropriate’ place in the annalistic narrative as well as the appropriate time in history (in a chronological sense).

57.14.1-10 *The Events of A.D. 15*. The following table presents a comparison of Dio and Tacitus’ accounts of the year. Items in bold represent items which occur in both Dio and Tacitus.

Dio	Tacitus <i>Ann.</i> 1.55-81
57.14.1-2 Consuls named. Distribution of Augustus' bequest to the people of Rome.	1.55.1 Consuls named. Germanicus voted a triumph by the Senate.
57.14.3 Games given by Drusus and Germanicus. Tiberius's absence from the games. Prohibition of an equestrian to fight as a gladiator.	1.55-71 The German campaign of 15.
57.14.4 Games held in honour of Augustus. Administrative arrangements upon the death of the governor of Crete.	1.72 Triumphal honours decreed for Germanicus' legates. Tiberius' refusal of honours.
57.14.5 New rules governing the time at which governors took up their provincial appointments.	1.73 Attempted prosecution of two equestrians, Falanius and Rubrius, for <i>maiestas</i> .
57.14.6 Death of Tiberius' grandson Drusus.	1.74 Attempted prosecution of Granius Marcellus for <i>maiestas</i> .
57.14.7-8 Tiber floods, and response.	1.75 Tiberius' conduct in the non-senatorial courts. Trial of Aurelius Pius. Attempt of Propertius Celer to be excused from the Senate on grounds of poverty.
57.14.9-10. Drusus' behaviour as consul, and other anecdotes concerning Drusus' temperament.	1.76. Tiber floods. Attempt by Asinius Gallus to consult the Sibylline oracles. Lucius Arruntius and Ateius Capito given charge of supervising flood mitigation procedures. Tax relief for Achaia and Macedonia. Games given by Drusus and Germanicus. Tiberius' absence from the games.
57.14.10 Pantomime riots.	1.77. Pantomime riots. Senatorial response to the riots.
	1.78. Tarracines ask permission to build a temple to <i>diuus Augustus</i> . Protests against the one per cent. tax.
	1.79 Discussion in the Senate concerning flood mitigation.
	1.80 The tenure of Poppaeus Sabinus' governorship.
	1.81 Consular elections.

Unlike Tacitus' more traditionally annalistic presentation of material that records both *res externae* and *res internae*,⁴⁶³ Dio's historical focus barely deviates from *res*

⁴⁶³ Although note Tacitus' decision to eschew the Livian formula of *res internae* – *res externae* – *res internae*. For Tacitus' annalistic arrangement of material for A.D. 15, see Ginsburg 1981: 67-72.

internae. Where he does note the occurrence of an event outside of Rome, it is in response to his concern for noting administrative developments (see below 57.14.4).

The absence of the German wars is the obvious difference between the two historians' presentation of the year. According to Syme, Dio's omission was due principally to the presentation of events found in Dio's main source, whom Syme identified as Aufidius Bassus (Syme 1981a: 365 = *RP* 3.1423).⁴⁶⁴ But Dio's decision to omit (or delay)⁴⁶⁵ his account of the campaigns of Germanicus and his legates in Germany makes sense also on narrative grounds and reflects his desire to keep his focus squarely on the actions of Tiberius and the working of the imperial government at Rome. Where there is correlation between items included by Dio and Tacitus (see bold items in table above), the sequence in which they are presented is notably different.

Although many of the inclusions in Dio's account of 15 may appear to be mere trivialities (Syme 1981a: 366 = *RP* 3.1424), the selection is typically Dionian and functions, in part, to reaffirm the pattern of imperial behaviour (viz. Tiberius and Drusus) outlined in the preceding chapters. Apart from this, Dio does not seem to have fashioned his material so as to create a sense of historical unity from this collection of anecdotes, although it is worth noting how the theme of death pervades the material in 57.14.1-6. For example: the anecdote of the funeral and the jokester (57.14.1-2); the death of the equestrian in the arena (57.14.3); the slaying of animals in the games in honour of Augustus (57.14.3); the death of the governor of Crete (57.14.4); and the death of Drusus' son (57.14.6).

⁴⁶⁴ For discussion of the sources see Introduction, *Chapter 1: The Roman Historian at Work*.

⁴⁶⁵ It is likely that Dio included a narrative of Germanicus' campaigns at 57.18.1, which survives only in Xiphilinus' *Epitome* as a short sentence. As discussed briefly in *Notes on the Text of Book 57* (above), Xiphilinus generally omits Dio's campaign narratives, unless they contained particularly memorable anecdotal details: Mallan: 2013: 632; Brunt 1980: 491.

14.1 **Γαίου τε Νωρβανού**: C. Norbanus Flaccus, the (likely) brother of the eccentric, trumpet-playing consul of A.D. 19. For the consul of 15, see *PIR*² N 168; Syme 1981b: 190 = *RP* 3.1351.

τὰ καταλειφθέντα: ‘the bequest’. For Augustus’ bequest to the *populus*, see 56.32.2 [Xiph.]; Suet. *Aug.* 101.2; Tac. *Ann.* 1.8, and the full discussion by Swan 2004: 312-3; Goodyear 1972: 144-5; Wardle 2014: 561-2.

προσκύψας ἐπιθύρισε: Two rare words, both appearing only here in the *Roman History*. It is unusual to find a verb of ‘whispering’ (sc. ἐπιθύρισε) after προσκύπτω, though in other texts it is generally implied (e.g. Pl. *Euth.* 279e; cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. προσκύπτω), but note Theophr. *Char.* 2.10: λέγων πρὸς τὸ οὗς προσκύπτων διαψιθυρίζειν.

14.2 **ἐκείνον μὲν γὰρ αὐτίκα ἀπέκτεινεν, ἵνα αὐτάγγελος αὐτῷ, ὥς που καὶ ἐπισκόπων εἶπε, γένηται**: A nice touch of gallows humour from Tiberius. The anecdote appears, with slight changes, in Suetonius, but with the addition of a pun (sc. *debitum*), which does not appear in Dio’s version (*Tib.* 57.2: *scurram, qui praetereunte funere clare mortuo mandarāt, ut nuntiaret Augusto nondum reddi legata quae plebei reliquisset, adtractum ad se recipere debitum ducique ad supplicium imperavit et patri suo uerum referre*). Turner (1943: 261) drew the parallel with the story told in *Aeneid* 2.535-50, especially 2.547-50, and recently Power (2012) has argued persuasively that Suetonius’ version (but not Dio’s) is modelled consciously on Vergil. But the meaning of the anecdote is not dependent on

any particular intertextual reference, and the form of the anecdote conforms to a folkloric *topos* (cf. Champlin 2008: 410).

As noted by Plass (1988: 69) the joke's sinister edge reminds the reader of the emperor's ultimate power of life and death, which fits the context of Dio's narrative well. As such, it qualifies much of the image presented in the preceding chapters of the *demotikos autokrator*: at once recalling the pre-accession Tiberius, the man who coolly had Agrippa Postumus executed, and anticipating the similarly ruthless Tiberius of the post-Germanicus narrative.

πέντε καὶ ἑξήκοντα δραχμαῖς: sixty-five drachmas or HS 260 was evidently paid to the each member of the citizen body at Rome (sc. 57.14.1 τῷ δήμῳ), or at least those who were eligible for the corn dole (Wardle 2014: 561).

14.3 καὶ τοῦτο μὲν τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτει γενέσθαι τινὲς λέγουσι: Dio's concern to record an apparent discrepancy in his sources is surprising at this point. Taken at face value, it suggests that Dio had consulted several sources in the composition of his narrative for the year. **τοῦτο**: presumably the payment of Augustus' bequest (see notes above). As it is, Dio is the only extant source to place Tiberius' distribution of Augustus' bequest specifically in A.D. 15. That he should have delayed in making the distribution is believable in itself: the unexpected additional monies that were paid to the soldiers in A.D. 14 had undoubtedly placed a strain on the imperial treasury, and there was perhaps a desire to make a proper audit of finances before paying the largess to the people of Rome (cf. Levick 1976: 122).

τότε δὲ ἱππέων τινῶν ... μονομαχήσαι ἐθελήσαντων: Late in Augustus' reign (A.D. 11), existing regulations (presumably from 22 B.C.) prohibiting members of the *ordo equester* from fighting as gladiators appear to have been relaxed (56.25.7; cf. 54.3.5 with Rich 1990: 174; Suet. *Aug.* 43.3 with Wardle 2014: 327-8), although there seems to have been a move by the Senate to forbid younger members of the *ordo* from appearing as gladiators in that same year (*Tab. Lar.* ll. 17-21; with Levick 1983: 104-5, 107).⁴⁶⁶ Tiberius may have been following Augustus' precedent in allowing these equestrians to perform as gladiators (Levick 1983: 107), but the fact that they sought permission from the princeps (or from Drusus?) to fight, might suggest that these two knights were under the age prescribed by the SC of A.D. 11 (i.e. under 25).

ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ... διέθηξε: cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.76.3. Whereas Tacitus uses the games to make a comment on Drusus' bloodlust, Dio's interests are directed towards the game's programme of events. **ὁ Δροῦσος ὑπὲρ τε ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ:** there were certainly dynastic motivations behind the decision to have games given in the names of his two sons, although it was Drusus who presided, owing to Germanicus' absence from Rome.

τὸν μὲν ἀγῶνα αὐτῶν οὐκ εἶδε: cf. above note at 57.11.5 (συνεχέστατα γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰς θεάς ... δοκεῖν). Dio's brief note on these equestrians in the arena is indicative of his fondness for such stories: e.g. 59.8.3, 59.10.2, 59.10.4, 67.14.3 [Xiph.]. In part this was almost certainly due to the scandalous element in these sorts of anecdotes: of elite men (and occasionally women) transgressing the expected behaviour of their social classes (cf. Newbold 1975: 595; Swan 2004: 284). While this is undeniable,

⁴⁶⁶ The relationship between these two actions is not known: Swan 2004: 284.

there is perhaps a deeper current of thought behind these sorts of notices. Dio uses the theatre or the arena as spaces where symbolic interactions between the emperor and members of the other orders could be played out. How an emperor prohibited or punished members of the elite for appearing in the arena, or conversely, how they encouraged or forced individuals to appear in such contexts all contributed to Dio's broader discussion of imperial conduct and of contemporary social *mores* (cf. Wiedemann 1992: 130-1). For discussion of the range of possible motivations of elite performers in the arena, see Wiedemann 1992: 108-11; Edmondson 1996: 107-9; Gunderson 1996: 140-2; Edmondson 2002: 58-60.

14.4 τῶν τοῦ Αὐγούστου γενεσίων: The birthday of Augustus (23 September) had been celebrated annually since 30 B.C. (51.19.2) and from 20 B.C. with the addition of circus events, which too became a fixed part of the celebrations from 8 B.C. (54.8.5, 55.6.6; Weinstock 1971: 209). **τῶν ... γενεσίων:** the form is almost always plural (sc. τὰ γενέσια) when denoting the celebration of the birthday of a deceased individual (*LSJ*⁹ s.v. γενέσιος III), but note the testimony of the grammarian Ammonius (*De adfin. voc. diff.* 116 [ed. Nickau p. 29]) who states that the γενέσια was a commemoration on the anniversary of an individual's death. However, in Dio, γενέσια refers to the anniversary of a deceased individual's birth (47.18.5-6).

καί τινα καὶ θηρία ἐσφάγη: the brief note about the addition of an event (in this case a *uenatio*) is typically Dionian (cf. Newbold 1975: 596-7). Dio's appetite for this sort of *recherché* detail is patent, and especially in his desire to trace the origins of institutions, or in this case events at games (sc. καὶ τοῦτο ... ἐποιήθη).

μὲν καὶ ... τότε δὲ: A particularly harsh anacoluthon, even for Dio. A lacuna may be suspected.

ἡ Κρήτη τοῦ ἄρχοντος: More precisely the governor of Crete and Cyrenaica (53.12.4; cf. Strabo 17.3.25 [840]), but it is not unusual for sources to identify this geographically divided province simply as Crete (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.38).⁴⁶⁷ The identity of this praetorian governor is not known, although Baldwin's (1983: 139-40) suggestion that it might be the *nouus homo*, P. Octavius (*PIR*² O 19), who is known to have held the post early in the reign of Tiberius, is tantalizing. However, the governor, as with his quaestor and legate must remain *anonymi*.

τῷ τε ταμίᾳ: = 'quaestor' (Mason *GT* 91). See also note below, 57.16.1.

τῷ παρέδρῳ: As noted above at 57.7.6, παρέδρος was Dio's unique term for a governor's *legatus*. The governor of Crete and Cyrenaica, a man of praetorian rank, was permitted one legate (cf. 53.14.7). *Legati* were usually chosen by the proconsul from men of praetorian rank, although there are instances of *legati* having previously held only more junior posts (Birley 1981: 15).

τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον προσετάχθη: The precedent for a legate and quaestor to take charge of a province upon the death of a governor had been set in A.D. 6 in the province of Achaia (55.27.6). It has been suggested that as with the arrangements of A.D. 6 where the province of Achaia was divided between quaestor and the legate, so

⁴⁶⁷ Certainly due to the fact that the provincial capital was at Gortyn.

too was the province of Crete and Cyrenaica divided, with the legate taking Crete and the quaestor Cyrenaica (Baldwin 1983: 138-9).

14.5 ἐπειδὴ τε συχνοὶ ... ὥστε τοὺς προάρχοντας αὐτῶν παρὰ τὸ καθεστηκὸς χρονίζειν: That governors under Tiberius served long stints in the provinces was a characteristic of the reign (cf. Seager 1972: 173-4 = 2005: 147; Talbert 1984: 505). For Tacitus, this was a simple matter of Tiberius' habit (sc. *morum*), of keeping the same individual in place for a long period of time (*Ann.* 1.80; cf. *Ann.* 4.6). Dio too notes this elsewhere (58.23.5). Here however Dio, perhaps through inference based on the new law (see next note), recognized that there was more to these unusually long governorships than just Tiberius' wish to keep men that he could trust in the same positions. That would-be governors should be unenthusiastic about their appointments and wish not to leave Rome (sc. ἐπὶ πολὺ ἔν τε τῇ Ῥώμῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ λοιπῇ Ἰταλίᾳ ἐνδιέτριβον) is a sentiment found repeatedly in some of Cicero's less equanimous letters concerning his appointment to the governorship of Cilicia (e.g. Cic. *ad fam.* 3.2.1 = SB 65; Cic. *ad Att.* 5.10.3 = SB 103; *ad Att.* 5.11.1 = SB 104).

ἐπειδὴ ... ἀφορμᾶσθαι: This is perhaps the most important piece of evidence to indicate that the proconsular year commenced on the 1st of July (Mommsen *Staatsr.*³ 2.255-6). How long this rule was in place is not known, as it is likely that by Dio's day, governors were expected to have assumed their posts by April (Barnes 1986; Davenport and Manley 2014: 119; cf. Talbert 1984: 497-8). If Dio noted when this change occurred (and it is almost certain that he did) then it did not catch the eye of his epitomators. **ἐνδιέτριβον:** The tendency for governors to loiter in Rome before assuming their commands seems to have been a recurring problem. Dio records under

the year A.D. 43 a new measure to compel governors of non-imperial provinces to leave the city for their commands before the end of April (60.17.3).

14.6 τοῦ ἐγγόνου: This putative child of Drusus is omitted from Stein's stemma of the Julio-Claudian family in *Pauly-Wissowa* (*RE* 10.1 = Iulius), and is not acknowledged by Gardthausen (*RE* 10.1 col. 433 = Iulius 136), or by many of the standard works on Tiberius.⁴⁶⁸ He is, however, recognised by Eck (*BNP* Drusus II.1), Gelzer (*RE* 10.1, col. 501 = Iulius 154) and tentatively in *PIR* (*PIR*² I 219: Anno consulatus filius eius [sc. Drusus'] paulo ante ut uidetur natus mortuus est). The omission by Tacitus could be attributed to the annalist's lapse,⁴⁶⁹ but Velleius' testimony⁴⁷⁰ is suggestive when he notes that Tiberius felt the loss of his two sons and one grandson (sc. *nepotem*) (Vell. Pat. 2.130.3), which given the date of composition, must be a reference to Ti. Germanicus Iulius Caesar (Woodman 1977: 273; Elefante 1997: 541; *pace* Rogers 1943: 95). Should we therefore be suspicious of the existence of this third son of Drusus, and is the individual referred to here in fact the twin brother of Ti. Iulius Caesar Nero (Gemellus) (*PIR*² I 226), that is to say Ti. Germanicus Iulius Caesar (*PIR*² I 224), who died in A.D. 23 (Tac. *Ann.* 4.15.1)? In short, no. Independent support for Dio's identification of this grandson of Tiberius may be gleaned from Ovid (*Pont.* 2.2.73-4: *adde nurum nepemque pias natosque nepotum | ceteraque Augustae membra ualere domus*) who attests to sons of both Germanicus and Drusus (cf. Rogers 1943: 95-6). If we accept that Book 2 of the

⁴⁶⁸ Marsh (1931) Levick (1976) and Seager (1972 and 2005) all do not acknowledge the existence of this son.

⁴⁶⁹ Although it may be said that Tacitus is usually punctilious in his recording of imperial deaths and marriages.

⁴⁷⁰ If the text of Velleius is correct.

Epistulae ex Ponto was composed in A.D. 12-13,⁴⁷¹ then we may presume that Drusus' son was at very least two years old when he died, and perhaps older. Given A.D. 15 was a year in which the Tiber flooded (below 57.14.7), it is possible that that this young son of Drusus died as a result of contracting one of the diseases which always accompanied such flooding.

οὐδὲν ὅ τι τῶν συνήθων οὐκ ἔπραξε ... προίεσθαι: Tiberius' stiff upper lip would be again on show when he was confronted by the death of Drusus in A.D. 23 (57.22.3 [Xiph.]; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.8). As we have seen above, Dio presents Tiberius as being aware of his own exemplary status (cf. 57.12.1). Stories of parents bearing the loss of their children (or grandchildren) with equanimity and fortitude were, of course, a mainstay of the Roman *exempla* tradition (e.g. Val. Max. 5.10, Sen. *Con. Marc.* 14.3; Tac. *Agr.* 29.1; HA *Marc.* 21.3-5). For further comments, note Woodman and Kraus 2014: 232-3 (with reference to Tac. *Agr.* 29.1) and Davenport and Manley 2014: 193-5.

14.7 τοῦ τε ποταμοῦ τοῦ Τιβέριδος πολλὰ τῆς πόλεως κατασχόντος ὥστε πλευσθῆναι: The flooding of the Tiber in 15 is attested by Tacitus as well (*Ann.* 1.76). For a convenient tabulation of the evidence for the Tiber floods recorded in the literary sources for the period 750 B.C. – A.D. 398, see Lonardi 2013: 12-3; and Aldrete 2007: 242-6, who covers the period 414 B.C. to A.D. 2000. From evidence of recorded floods from modern times, it is likely that the floods of A.D. 15 occurred between January and March or (less likely) between October and December.

ὥστε πλευσθῆναι: A detail which accompanies many of Dio's notices concerning

⁴⁷¹ For dating, see Syme 1978a: 37-42.

the flooding of the Tiber, and perhaps reflects a conventional method of describing the extent of a flood (e.g. 53.20.1, 53.33.5, 54.25.2, 58.26.5).

14.7-8 **οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ἐν τέρατος ... ἐλάμβανον, ἐκεῖνος δὲ δὴ νομίσας ἐκ πολυπληθείας ναμάτων**: Note 39.61.1-3 where Dio also contrasts what we would call a ‘divine’ explanation of the Tiber floods with a ‘scientific’ explanation. As noted by Aldrete (2007: 223-224), the accounts of Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.76.1) and Dio are similar, in so far as both authors present a juxtaposition of divine and rational explanations for the flooding, with the latter explanation championed by Tiberius.

14.7 **ἐν τέρατος λόγῳ**: For the flooding of the Tiber as a portent, see Pliny *HN* 3.5.55; Goodyear 1981: 171.

ὥσπερ που τό τε μέγεθος ... ἐξετάκη: The grouping of this sort of material is indicative of not only of Dio’s use of an annalistic source, but also of his willingness to conform to the annalistic genre. However, what these omens signified for Dio is less clear. With the exception of the death of Drusus’ son, there is little in Dio’s narrative at this time that could be regarded as being worthy of a portent, with the exception of the flooding of the Tiber itself. If Dio is right in placing these extraordinary events in this year, then we may perhaps add some further context to Asinius Gallus’ request to consult the Sibylline Books (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.76.1). **τῶν σεισμῶν**: The absence of the earthquakes in the other accounts has led to the suspicion that Dio invented these earthquakes so as to parallel his account of the Tiber floods of A.D. 5 (55.22.3) (cf. Waldherr 1997: 197). This is unlikely. Dio’s brief account of the disasters of A.D. 5 bears virtually no similarity with this present

passage,⁴⁷² and so we can rule out the possibility of Dio simply following a template for his account of these disasters. More likely is the suggestion that Dio is following a different annalistic source from Tacitus (Waldherr 1997: 197), or even that they were following the same source, but chose to excerpt different material. For further discussion of the putative earthquakes of 15, see Waldherr 1997: 196-7. For earthquakes as portents, see e.g. 41.14.3. **τῶν κεραυνῶν**: For lightning bolts as portents, see e.g. 37.25.1-2; 39.15.1; cf. Plin. *HN* 2.55.143-4.

14.8 **πέντε ἀεὶ βουλευτὰς κληρωτοὺς ἐπιμελίσθαι τοῦ ποταμοῦ προσέταξεν**: i.e. the *curatores riparum et alvei Tiberis*. Suetonius (*Aug.* 37) notes the creation of the position of *curator alvei Tiberis* by Augustus, which, if not an error, must have been superseded by the new board of five (Aldrete 2007: 199; cf. Wardle 2014: 289). I do not see any sensible reason why we should assume that the board was created in A.D. 16 (*pace* Syme 1981a: 369 = *RP* 3.1428; reiterated in Syme 1982: 78 = *RP* 4.215-6), a view based purely on the fact that Tacitus fails to mention its creation. The precise relationship between the board of five and the two man commission headed by Ateius Capito and L. Arruntius is not known, but it seems reasonable to assume the board arose as a result of the findings of Capito and Arruntius (*Tac. Ann.* 1.76.1; cf. Goodyear 1981: 171-2). Again, it is worth noting the contrast between Dio and Tacitus. Dio succinctly notes the creation of a board, which continued (with some minor changes) up to his own day and beyond, whereas the Latin annalist preferred to describe the failure of a temporary commission. As Chris Pelling suggests to me,

⁴⁷² Cf. 55.22.3: σεισμοὶ τε ἐξαίσιοι συνέβησαν, καὶ ὁ Τίβερις τὴν τε γέφυραν κατέσυρε καὶ πλωτὴν τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἐποίησε, τοῦ τε ἡλίου τι ἐκλιπὲς ἐγένετο, καὶ λιμὸς συνηνέχθη.

there is a general feeling of *nil mutandum*, or at least nothing changed *much*, about Tac. *Ann.* 1.72-81.

14.9 ὥσπερ τις ιδιώτης διετέλεσε: ‘conducted himself as though a private individual’. Given that Drusus was consul, Dio is clearly thinking about Drusus’ behaviour as a member of the imperial household (and as Tiberius’ potential heir apparent), and as such the possessor of an extra-constitutional position within the state.

ὁργή οὕτω χάλεπῃ: Dio continues his predominantly pejorative characterization of Drusus (see above 57.13.1-2). It is interesting that Tacitus chooses to develop a similar characterization of Drusus in his account of this year as well, but does this through his description of Drusus’ behaviour at the games (as mentioned above at 57.14.3, ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ... διέθηκε).

ἵππεϊ ἐπιφανεῖ: Presumably none other than the Praetorian Prefect, L. Aelius Sejanus (Scott 1930: 155-7; Champlin 2011: 93 n. 59; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.3.2). Scott (1930) suggests that Dio did not identify Sejanus here so as to make clear the joke about Drusus’ nickname (see note below). But we may also take Dio’s decision to withhold Sejanus’ name at this point as a way of building up to Sejanus’ more extensive introduction to the narrative proper later in the book. These two suggestions are not mutually exclusive. Xiphilinus will repeat the anecdote with a minor change after he has introduced Sejanus later in the book (57.22.2 [Xiph.]).

Κάστωρ παρωνύμιον λαβεῖν: How Drusus' nickname came about is not immediately clear. The suggestion of Boissevain (2.572), followed by Cary (7.148 n. 1), that he was named after a (supposed) gladiator named Castor mentioned by Horace (*Ep.* 1.18.19, with Pseudacron. *ad loc.* [ed. Keller 2.267]) is not compelling and should be dismissed. Had Dio intended this connection be made, then we should expect him to explain it, just as he did with the case of Caracalla's nickname 'Tarautus' (79(78).9.3), who was a famous gladiator. Stein (1918: 219-20) and Scott's (1930: 157; cf. Poulsen 1991: 128) suggestion is more likely, in so far as the Dioscuri were the patron deities of the *ordo equester*.⁴⁷³ But I think the name rests on two more simple associations. On the one hand, the nickname relies on the standard epithet of Castor as ἵππόδαμος 'horse tamer' (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 3.237; Hom. *Od.* 11.300; Hom. *Hymn Dios.* 3), and thus plays on the fact that Drusus struck (or 'tamed') an equestrian (sc. ἵππῃ). On the other hand, the Drusus' nickname is ironic: Pollux was the boxer, not Castor. **παρωνύμιον:** a very unusual word for Dio, appearing only here and at 79(78).5.2. Perhaps Dio is wanting to distinguish an informal and 'formal' *cognomen* (sc. ἐπίκλησις).

14.10 **τῇ τε μέθῃ κατακορής:** Drusus' fondness for wine seems to have been so well known as to be almost commonplace (e.g. Plut. *Quaest. Con.* 1.6.4 [= *Mor.* 624C]; cf. Athen. 2.52C; Plin. *HN* 14.28.145). We may also note Dio's continued interest in contrasting the behaviour of Tiberius with that of his son.

ἐμπρησθεισί τισιν: literally 'some things that were set on fire', but perhaps 'some things that were on fire' or just 'a fire'. How the fire started is not made clear, nor the

⁴⁷³ For which see Helbig 1905 and Wissowa 1912: 269.

extent of the fire. Such particulars appear to have been irrelevant to Dio's purpose. For Dio the main thing is that Drusus was present at a fire, which provided the context for his apophthegm (see next note).

θερμόν σφισιν ἐγγέαι κελεύσαι: 'He ordered them to pour it out hot'. The request to 'pour it out hot' does not, it seems, appear elsewhere in Greek literary sources. It was perhaps a request more familiar to the tavern rather than the symposium, which explains its absence in sympotic literature, where one might have expected to find such an expression.

τοῖς τε ὀρχησταῖς οὕτω προσέκειτο: More worrying behaviour from Drusus. Generally, association with pantomimes (as with gladiators) was not a good character reference in Dio's eyes (e.g. 59.5.2). However, Dio's attitudes were not entirely inflexible, as shown by his comments on Trajan's enthusiasm for pantomimes (68.10.2 [Xiph.])

ὥστε καὶ στασιάζειν αὐτοὺς ... καθίστασθαι: 'so that when they fell into disorder, they could not be brought to order by the laws which Tiberius had brought in to deal with them.' Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.77.⁴⁷⁴ Dio's link between Drusus' attachment to pantomime dancers and the failure of Tiberius' 'laws' (τῶν νόμων) has been taken for granted by some. The fact that the banishment of pantomime dancers and claque leaders came in A.D. 23, the year of Drusus' death, provides some evidence of a link, providing of course it was the ban was introduced after his demise (57.21.3; Tac. *Ann.* 4.14.3). **στασιάζειν:** probably just 'fell into disorder' or 'rioted', but the verb carries

⁴⁷⁴ Slater (1994: 125 with his n. 32) is misleading: the references to Zosimus (1.6.1), Velleius (2.126.2), Suetonius (*Tib.* 34.1), are not specific to the riots of 15.

the sense of ‘forming a faction’, with reference to the supporters of various performers (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.77.1: *dissensionem uulgi*).

ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων ... ἐσενηνόχει: It is generally assumed that these laws were introduced in 15 (e.g. Jory 1984: 60-1; Slater 1994: 125-6) and that they are the same as the measures decreed by the Senate described by Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.77). But the pluperfect (sc. ἐσενηνόχει) might indicate hitherto unknown measures introduced in October A.D. 14 in response to the riots at the *ludi Augustales* (cf. 56.47.2). If not, and Dio is referring to the laws of 15, then two interpretations present themselves for **μηδ’... καθίστασθαι**. (i) We may assume (with Jory 1984: 62) that there was a second outbreak of rioting after the one described by Tacitus in 15. Alternatively, (ii) Dio’s comment on the failure of the laws in suppressing the disorder may refer to the general ineffectiveness of the laws and that the pantomime actors (and their followers) remained a problem until they were banished in A.D. 23.

There is another, less historical, reading of this passage. It is worth recalling Dio’s comments above at 57.13.4: ἂν δ’ ἅπαξ ὁ νόμος ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως ἐκνικηθῇ, μηδένα αὐτοῦ προτιμήσειν. Might Dio’s comments on the ineffectiveness of the laws to curb actions of the rioters be an illustration of this very idea? In other words, just as Drusus exhibited behaviour unrestrained by convention, so too was the rioting pantomime devotees not restrained by the laws.

57.15-16 *The Events of A.D. 16*. Unlike Tacitus, Dio eschews any notice of ‘external affairs’, and as a result his material for 16 is entirely drawn from ‘urban affairs’ and

miscellaneous ‘end chapter’ material.⁴⁷⁵ For brief comments on Dio’s and Tacitus’ treatment of this year, see Syme 1981a: 365-6 = *RP* 3.1422-5; Ginsburg 1981: 81-2. The following table provides a comparative summary of material included by Dio and Tacitus under A.D. 16. Items printed in bold denote items in common.

Dio on A.D. 16	Tacitus on A.D. 16
15.1 Consuls named. Legislation banning the use of gold objects and silk clothing, except in religious rites.	2.1 Consuls named.
2. Tiberius does not allow the Greek word <i>emblema</i> to be used in a senatorial decree.	2.1-4 Vonones and the unrest in Parthia, Armenia and Eastern Provinces
3. Tiberius does not allow a centurion who wished to give evidence in Greek in the Senate, although this had been permitted by Tiberius on earlier occasions.	2.5 Tiberius’ desire to send Germanicus to the East. Germanicus’ development as a commander.
4. Tiberius’ behaviour during the trial of Drusus Libo.	2.6-26 Germanicus’ operations in Germany. Germanicus recalled to Rome.
5. Trial of Drusus Libo continued after his death. Commemorations.	2.27. Drusus Libo
6. 3 rd example of Tiberius’ inconsistency. Tiberius’ reaction to the pretensions of Vibius Rufus.	2.28. Drusus Libo before the trial. Tiberius could punish earlier, but decided to delay.
7. Tiberius does not prosecute Vibius Rufus. Rufus given the consulship. Tiberius and Thrasyllus. Anecdote of Tiberius’ dream.	2.29. Drusus Libo arrives in the Senate for his trial.
8. Tiberius’ banishment of astrologers.	2.30. Details of the trial of Drusus Libo.
9. Illustration of ‘democratic’ form of	2.31. Suicide of Drusus Libo, trial

⁴⁷⁵ Tacitus’ account of the same year which commences with an account of the troubles beyond the eastern frontier of the empire (*Ann.* 2.1-4), followed by a description of Germanicus’ campaigns across the Rhine (*Ann.* 2.6-25). The terminology is that of Ginsburg 1981: 32; cf. Swan 1997: 2527.

government, pertaining to the banishment of astrologers.	continues.
16.1. Miscellaneous public business: shortage of quaestors.	2.32. Outcome of the trial. Commemoration. Expulsion of Astrologers.
2. Miscellaneous public business: copying of public records undertaken by elected group of three senators. Assistance of victims of fires given by Livia and Tiberius.	2.34. L. Piso (retirement and quarrel with Urgulania)
3. Conspiracy of Clemens.	2.35. Suspension of Public Business debated between Asinius Gallus and Cn. Piso.
4. Capture of Clemens. Anecdote involving Tiberius and Clemens.	2.36 Gallus v. Tiberius on the issue of praetorian appointments.
	2.37 Speech of M'. Hortalius (on imperial subsidy for impoverished senators).
	2.38 Opposition from Tiberius, speech of Tiberius.
	2.39. Conspiracy of Clemens.
	2.40. Capture of Clemens. Anecdote of Tiberius and Clemens.
	2.41. Miscellaneous public business dedication of temples.

15.1. **Στατίλιου δὲ Ταύρου μετὰ Λουζίου Λίβωνος:** The consuls for A.D. 16 were Sisenna Statilius Taurus (*PIR*² S 851; Syme 1986: 376),⁴⁷⁶ perhaps the brother of the consul of A.D. 11, T. Statilius Taurus (*PIR*² S 855), and L. Scribonius Libo (*PIR*² S 266). Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.1. Although both scions of distinguished families, the careers of both the consuls of 16 are obscure beyond the holding of the consulship (Syme 1981b: 190 = *RP* 3.1351-2).

⁴⁷⁶ In the *fasti* affixed to the index of Book 57, this consul is given the praenomen T. This seems to be in error. For the adoption of a traditional *cognomen* (in this case Sisenna) as a *praenomen*, see Salomies 1987: 329; cf. Salway 1994: 130.

ὁ Τιβέριος ... ἀπείπε δὲ καὶ χρυσῷ σκεύει μηδένα: We know from Tacitus that the sumptuary legislation referred to here was proposed by Q. Haterius (*PIR*² H 24) and supported by a praetor, Octavius Fronto (*PIR*² O 34) and passed by the Senate (Tac. *Ann.* 2.33.1; cf. Koestermann 1963: 309; Goodyear 1981: 287). Dio's tendency to ascribe laws to the emperor, rather than to individual senators is typical of his style in the imperial books (cf. Brunt 1977: 95 n. 4). For discussion of Roman sumptuary legislation and elite consumption, see Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 315-55; Edmondson 2008: 32-7; Holleran 2012: 238-41 cf. Newbold 1974: 130-5. For the use of luxury items in religious ceremonies, see Cobb 2013: 143-5. According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.33.1) this motion was put forward at the next meeting of the Senate (*proximo senatus die*) following the condemnation of the alleged conspirator Drusus Libo, so may be dated to late September or early October (see below 15.4).

σηρικῇ: This adjective is not found in Greek literary texts before the 1st century A.D. Dio considered it a sufficiently exotic term for it to elicit the following definition of silk (43.24.2):

τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ὕφασμα χλιδῆς βαρβάρου ἔργον ἐστί, καὶ παρ' ἐκείνων καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐς τρυφὴν τῶν πάνυ γυναικῶν περιττὴν ἐσπεφοίτηκεν.

Dio's comments are indicative of the degree to which silk was seen as synonymous with vice (*luxuria/truphe*) (cf. Goodyear 1981: 288), which Dio often associates with the trappings of tyrants (e.g. 59.17.3; 73(72)17.3 [Xiph.]). Cf. Plin. *HN* 11.27.77-8.

15.2. ἔμβλημα: A word used here in the technical sense, denoting the inlaying of gold into silver. The term is rarely if ever found in literary Greek texts, but is more

common as a Greek loan word in Latin sources, e.g. Cic. Verr. 4.17.37; Quint. *Inst. Orat.* 2.4.27. It is possible that the word (in this technical sense) entered the vernacular spoken by the Greek-speaking merchants in the ports of the Mediterranean and was thence assimilated into Latin. ἐμβληθῆναι: ‘but he forbade the word ‘insert’ *to be inserted* into the decree’. An irresistible punning opportunity – and one not missed by our historian.

15.3 ἐκατοντάρχου: a centurion (cf. Mason *GT* 41; Freyburger-Galland 1997: 195). It has been suggested that this centurion’s evidence was in some way connected to the trial of Drusus Libo (Levick 1976: 152). This seems unlikely. Aside from both incidents occurring in the same year, there is no good cause to link the two. For Dio, the case of the Greek-speaking centurion was worthy of mention for its thematic suitability: that is, as an illustration of Tiberius’ inconsistency, and on account of its connection to the preceding anecdote (i.e. the use of Greek in the Senate). Interestingly, the order of these two anecdotes in Dio corresponds to that found in Suetonius (*Tib.* 71), and may reflect the order of presentation in their (common) source.

The anecdote of the centurion who was more fluent in Greek than he was in Latin, provides a piece of anecdotal evidence for evolution of the recruiting practices of the Roman army, concerning the absorption of (presumably) eastern provincials into the army. This was a process which had its genesis in the civil wars of the late Republic, and would continue throughout the imperial period. For the changes in recruitment practices during the early imperial period, see Keppie 1997: 97-8.

καίπερ πολλὰς μὲν δίκας ... ἐπερωτῶν: Whether Tiberius heard many cases in Greek in the Senate is neither contradicted nor confirmed by specific examples, although it would seem to be the case that he did, if we admit Valerius Maximus' shrill comments as evidence (Val. Max. 2.2.3). Dio's vagueness is to be expected, and serves to emphasise the inconsistency with respect to Tiberius' attitude towards the centurion (see next note). For the linguistic conservatism of Tiberius, see Kaimio 1979: 106-7. For the use of Greek in the Senate, see Kaimio 1979: 103-10; Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 60-3.

15.4 οὐχ ὁμολογούμενον ἔπραξε: The material in this chapter focuses on incidents where Dio deemed Tiberius' actions to be inconsistent (cf. Baar 1990: 95). The method of arrangement is almost Suetonian, where ostensibly anecdotal material is arranged under a particular rubric, with the important difference that Dio appears to have confined himself to material which he believed occurred during the same year.

Λούκιον Σκριβόνιον Λίβωνα: A mistake: the identity of the individual is M. Scribonius Drusus Libo (*PIR*² S 268).⁴⁷⁷ Suetonius (*Tib.* 25.1) commits the same error, and it may well be that the corruption stems from a common (annalistic?) source used by Suetonius and Dio. L. Scribonius Libo, the brother of Drusus Libo, was consul *ordinarius* for 16 (as above at 57.15.1). However, it does not seem to be the case that Dio conflated the identities of the brothers (*pace* Pettinger 2012: 196 n. 3, 219). It is possible that the error originated with the copyist and not Dio. If this were so, then the possibility of the source connection between Dio and Suetonius dissolves.

⁴⁷⁷ For the correct order of his *cognomina*, see Pettinger 2012: 219-20; cf. Sumner 1970: 275 n. 113; Woodman 1977: 272; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.129.2; Sen. *Ep. Mor.* 70.10.1.

Our knowledge of Drusus Libo's career is nebulous. He was born probably around 15 B.C. (Pettinger 2012: 232). According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.28.2), Drusus Libo was honoured with a praetorship (sc. *ornat praetura*) by Tiberius, although the year is not revealed. The date of his magistracy has thus been the subject of less than fruitful debate. There are three options: i) that Drusus Libo held the praetorship in 16 (*BNP* 'Scribonius' II.6 (Eck); Syme 1958: 399; Scheid 1976: 363); ii) that he was nominated praetor designate in 16, and was to hold office in 17 (Goodyear 1981: 270-1);⁴⁷⁸ iii) that he held office in 15 (Seager 1972: 90; Levick 1976: 150, 270 n.14; Pettinger 2012: 196-7). A position of agnosticism is perhaps preferable to unprofitable speculation. Pettinger has argued that Dio's silence regarding Drusus Libo's praetorship is evidence for his not possessing it in 16, as the prosecution of a serving magistrate would have interested Dio (Pettinger 2012: 197). This is certainly a valid point, but is not argued consistently by Pettinger.⁴⁷⁹ Aside from his praetorship, an anecdote in Suetonius attests to Drusus Libo a member of the pontifical college (Suet. *Tib.* 25.3 with Lindsay 1995: 112; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.124.4).

νεανίσκον: Given that Drusus Libo was in his early thirties, it may be thought that Dio's designation of Drusus Libo as a νεανίσκος, as with Seneca's use of *adulescens* (*Epist.* 70.10: *Adulescens tam stolidus quam nobilis* [...]), exaggerates Drusus Libo's youth. Although, note Plutarch's designation of Dolabella (a man probably in his 30s, like Libo) as νέος ἀνὴρ (Plut. *Ant.* 9.1; cf. Pelling 1988: 136). As noted by Laes and

⁴⁷⁸ Syme (1986: 256 n.7) concedes the possibility of Goodyear's suggestion.

⁴⁷⁹ Pettinger argues elsewhere (2012: 196 n. 3, 219) that Dio had conflated the identities of Drusus Libo and his consular brother, L. Scribonius Libo, and if this were so it would still be the case that Dio had reported on the prosecution of a serving magistrate (and a consul no less) without drawing comment.

Strubbe (2014: 23-30), the division of the life cycle in the ancient world was never standard and a νεανίσκος could apply to a man in his 20s. However, it was perhaps not for precision that Dio styled Drusus Libo a νεανίσκος. That young men are given to revolutionary designs is a common *topos* in literature (ancient and modern) for which see Laes and Strubbe 2014: 42-8. Dio does exaggerate ages for effect: the son of the emperor Pertinax is styled a ‘a little boy’ (παιδίον) at the time of his father’s accession in 193 (74(73).7.2 [Xiph.]) and is a probably exaggeration, since it is likely that the younger Pertinax attained the suffect consulship in A.D. 212 (cf. *PIR*² H 74).⁴⁸⁰

εὐπατρίδην: Here used in the non-technical sense of ‘noble’ rather than ‘patrician’ (cf. above 57.1.1 Τιβέριος δὲ εὐπατρίδης μὲν ἦν). Born circa 15 B.C., Drusus Libo was an aristocrat of distinguished plebeian lineage, who through marriage, adoption, and birth had connections with the dynasts and senatorial grandees of the late Republic. The connections of Drusus Libo and his kinsmen have been extensively explored elsewhere, so a bare outline will suffice here. Drusus Libo was the son of Pompeia Magna, the daughter of L. Cornelius Cinna (*pr.* 44 B.C.) (and thus granddaughter of Pompey the Great) and the otherwise unattested L. Scribonius Libo (*PIR*² S 266), the putative son of L. Scribonius Libo (*cos.* 34 B.C.; *PIR*² S 264). Drusus Libo was adopted by M. Livius Drusus (*cos.* 15 B.C.; *PIR*² L 295), who in turn was the adopted son of M. Livius Drusus Claudianus, the father of Livia. For fuller discussion of Drusus Libo’s family, see Pettinger 2012: 219-34; cf. Weinrib 1968a; Syme 1986: 255-60).

⁴⁸⁰ I owe this observation to Caillan Davenport.

δόξαντά τι νεωτερίζειν: Dio's interest in the alleged conspiracy of Drusus Libo and the subsequent trial is almost totally confined to what it revealed about Tiberius' character. According to the official version of events preserved in the *Fasti Amiternini*, Libo's criminal plan (*nefaria consilia*) was to assassinate leading members of the state, including Tiberius and his sons (*Inscr. Ital.* XIII.2, p. 193. = *EJ*²: 52). Our knowledge of the conspiracy and trial is almost entirely dependent upon Tacitus' description of the affair (*Ann.* 2.27-32). For discussion of the trial, see Rogers 1935: 12-21; Shotter 1972; Goodyear 1981: 263-86; Pettinger 2012: 9-27.

τέως μὲν ἔρρωτο, οὐκ ἔκρινε, νοσήσαντα δὲ ... ἐς τὴν γερούσιαν ἐσεκόμισε: Dio is at odds with the other accounts with respect to the timing of Libo's illness. Tacitus (2.29) thought Libo's illness (feigned or genuine), came about as a result of the trial, whereas Dio believed that Libo was only brought to trial on account of his illness. Shotter (1972: 90 n. 11) suggests that Dio's account is a distortion of the (true) version reported by Tacitus. Shotter (1972: 91) argues that this statement represents Dio's attempt to reconcile the apparent inconsistencies in Suetonius' dating of the conspiracy. According to Suetonius (*Tib.* 25.1, 25.3), Tiberius was aware of the conspiracy from as early as August/September A.D. 14, but did not act until A.D. 16. Yet given that Dio does not mention Drusus Libo with connection to the events of Tiberius' accession (cf. below at 57.3.4), it is odd that he should feel the need to 'reconcile' the source(s) at this point. Indeed, contrary to Shotter's suggestion, it seems unlikely that Dio is using Suetonius, and it is better to propose a common source (Townend 1961: 228-9; cf. Introduction, *Chapter 1: The Roman Historian at Work*). The discrepancy between Tacitus and Dio with respect to Drusus Libo's illness provides the key to understanding his treatment of the affair. Dio's description

of the trial of Drusus Libo functions as a self-contained anecdote, designed to reveal something of the inconsistent conduct of Tiberius in legal matters and little more. Dio's point is that Tiberius could have (or should have?) taken action against Drusus Libo while he was in good health. In Dio's mind to delay a trial against someone plotting revolution, and then carry on the trial after the death of the defendant was pointless. Cf. Gärtner 2010: 416, who suggests Dio portrays Tiberius waiting for such a time as Drusus Libo would become a 'leichtes Opfer'.

ἐπιθάνατον: 'to the point of death' or 'at death's door'. A rare word, used only here by Dio (if Bekker's emendation of the MS ἐπὶ θάνατον is accepted), although it is found in the Attic canon and was considered appropriate by the grammarians of the imperial period (cf. [Dem.] 50.60; Pollux 3.106 [*s.v.* περὶ νόσου]).

σκιμποδίῳ καταστέγῳ: a small covered litter or hammock (*RE* 3 A1 cols. 527-9 (Rodenwaldt)). Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.29, who simply describes the device as a 'sedan chair' (*lectica*). Dio always uses the diminutive σκιμπόδιον, never the more common σκίμπους, and seems to have a specific sort of covered invalid carriage in mind (see below 57.17.6; cf. 77.(76).13.4 [Xiph.]). Gellius (19.10.1) thought of such carriages as being typically Greek. Dio here and elsewhere (e.g. 60.2.3 [Xiph.]) associated *scimpodia* with the traditional sedan chairs used by women (cf. Suet. *Otho* 6.3).

15.5. **ἑαυτὸν προαπεχρήσατο**: 'he slew himself in anticipation [sc. of the end of the trial]'. An uncommon phrase, although one found elsewhere in Dio (F 36.8 [LGR]; F 66.3 [EVV]). The προ- conveys the nature of Libo's anticipatory action.

εὔθυνη: we should probably expect for the aorist the augmented form **ἡὔθυνε** (cf. 37.44.1: **κλοπῆς τε γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡὔθυνε**, ...), and an emendation would seem reasonable. However, the unaugmented aorist form of verbs beginning in **εὖ-** is a common vulgarism, even among keen Atticists like Maximus of Tyre (Trapp 1997: 1694). For examples in Maximus of Tyre, see Dürr 1899: 12.

τά τε χρήματα αὐτοῦ τοῖς κατηγοροῖς διέδωκε: The distribution of Drusus Libo's property is noted by Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.32.1: *Bona inter accusatores diuiduntur*). The accusers in the trial, as known to Tacitus, were L. Fulcinus Trio, Firmius Catus, Fonteius Agrippa and C. Vibius Serenus. (For their identities, see Rogers 1935: 13, Goodyear 1981: 272, 274). As Goodyear (1981: 280) notes, if Libo's financial situation was as dire as noted by Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.27.2), we are left to wonder the extent to which Libo's accusers would have gained from his prosecution. However, it should be remembered that landed wealth did not always convert into disposable income, and the division of Libo's lands may have been worth a considerable amount. As noted by Ulpian (*Dig.* 48.4.11; cf. Rogers 1935: 18-19; Shotter 1972: 97), the death of a defendant accused under the Julian law concerning *maiestas* for plotting against the state or the emperor was not released from the punishment of having his property confiscated. For Dio's comments on *delatores* under Tiberius, see 57.19.2 [Xiph.], 58.4.8 [EVV.].

θυσίας ... ψηφισθῆναι ἐποίησε: As with the other material presented in this section, the actions of individual Senators or the decisions of the Senate are presented as those of Tiberius (see above 57.15.1 **ὁ Τιβέριος ... ἀπείπε δὲ καὶ χρυσῶ σκεύει μηδένα**). According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.32.2), sacrifices to Jupiter, Mars, and Concord

were decreed by L. <Piso>,⁴⁸¹ C. Asinius Gallus, M. Papius Mutilus and L. Apronius. **ἐπ’ αὐτῷ**: ‘with respect to the same’, i.e. the death and conviction of Drusus Libo. **οὐχ ἑαυτοῦ μόνον ἔνεκα ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Αὐγούστου ... Ἰουλίου**: ‘[sc. sacrifices] made not only on his own behalf but also on behalf of Augustus and Augustus’ father Julius.’ A detail often omitted from discussions of the aftermath of the trial of Drusus Libo. Ostensibly this detail sits awkwardly with Tacitus’ account of the offer of sacrifices, but the two accounts need not be regarded as being mutually exclusive. If we combine the accounts of Dio and Tacitus we may conclude that sacrifices were offered to Jupiter, Mars, and Concord on behalf of Tiberius, Augustus, and Julius Caesar. Although there is nothing unusual in sacrifices being offered *to* particular gods *on behalf of* an emperor (Price 1980: 30-3, *passim*; Fishwick 1990b), it is unusual to find examples of sacrifices offered on behalf of *diui* as well (as seems to be the case here with Augustus and Julius Caesar). However, such a practice is not unattested: Fishwick (*ICLW* 2.1: 565) adduces a Hadrianic inscription (*SEG* 2, 718) and (more tantalizingly) the Gytheum inscription from early in the reign of Tiberius (Oliver *GC* no. 15, ll. 28-9; *EJ*² no. 102).⁴⁸² The incident may have revealed for Dio a further point of inconsistency on Tiberius’ part, given his general reluctance to have his name or genius evoked (see commentary above 57.8.3 τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τύχην συνεχώρει). **καθάπερ ποτὲ ἐδέδοκτο**: ‘as had been thought appropriate on earlier occasions.’ Dio probably has in mind here the voting of sacrifices following the suppression of a conspiracy. The decree of a festival and sacrifices to commemorate the fall of Catiline and his followers in 63 B.C. was according to Dio the first time

⁴⁸¹ The identity of this individual is a matter of speculation, owing to several missing letters in the MS of Tacitus. The emendation dates back to Gronovius. Cf. Syme 1956: 18-19 = Syme 1970: 52; Goodyear 1981: 283.

⁴⁸² θυέτωσαν οἱ ἔφοροι ταύ[ρ]ον ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἡγεμόνων καὶ θεῶν σωτηρίας... Fishwick *ICLW* 2.1: 565 takes the θεῶν to denote the *diui*, which given the date of the inscription, must refer to Augustus and Julius Caesar.

such a measure was enacted in those circumstances (37.36.3). As with the example of 63 B.C., we know from the *fasti Amiternini* that the Senate decreed a holiday to accompany the sacrifices (*EJ*² p. 52)

15.6 Οὐβίῳ Ῥούφῳ: C. Vibius Rufus (*PIR* V 396). Not the extraordinary creation ‘L. Vibius Rufus Rufinus’ as maintained by Auburger (1995: 141). For this man’s identity, see Syme 1981a: 366-71 = *RP* 3.1424-1431, and below 15.7. Οὐβίῳ is Bekker’s emendation of the hopelessly corrupt M (οὐειουίωι) and Xiphilinus’ οὐίω.

δίφρα: i.e. Caesar’s *sella curulis*. These chairs were usually made of ivory (cf. Polyb. 6.53.9), although Caesar was granted a special curule chair, which was covered in gold (44.11.2; App. *BC* 2.106.[442]; cf. Weinstock 1971: 281-4). Yet Dio does not seem to be thinking of this particular chair, as he notes at 44.17.3 that it was carried out of the Theatre of Pompey before Caesar’s arrival on the Ides of March. For Dio, the symbolic act of sitting in such a chair was tantamount to the expression of imperial aspirations. Dio notes that one of Septimius Severus’ *omina imperii* was his sitting (unwittingly) on the imperial throne (75(74).3.3 [Xiph.]).

τῇ τοῦ Κικέρωνος γυναικὶ συνῶζει: Dio is referring to Cicero’s second wife, Publilia. Cicero’s first wife, Terentia, can be ruled out on chronological grounds. Although famed for her long life – she evidently lived to be 103 (Val. Max. 8.13.6; Pliny *HN* 7.158) – she would, nevertheless, have died around A.D. 8. Publilia, who was born around 60 B.C., would have been around twenty years Rufus’ senior (Syme 1978b: 294). The suggestion that Rufus married the wife of Cicero’s son, but pretended that she was the wife of Cicero himself is pure fantasy (*pace* Rowland

1968: 134 n. 16). For comments on Vibius Rufus' marriage to Publilia, see Syme 1978a: 84; Syme 1978b: 293-4 = *RP* 3.1086-8; Syme 1981a: 367 = *RP* 3.1425-6; Treggiari 2007: 151. Dio's silence with respect to the identity of Rufus' wife is hardly surprising: Dio does not mention her by name in his republican narrative (cf. 46.18.3-4), and for the anecdote to work the only pertinent detail is her relationship to Cicero.

ῥήτωρ: Whatever the veracity of Dio's waspish comments on the strength of Vibius Rufus' rhetorical abilities, it is worth noting that he is cited several times by the Elder Seneca in the *Controversiae* (1.1.12; etc.).

15.7. **ὑπάτευσε**: Vibius Rufus appears in the *Fasti Ostienses* as *consul suffectus* in 16 with C. Pomponius Graecinus (*PIR*² P 717), although Vibius Rufus is erroneously styled 'Rufinus' (*Inscr. Ital.* XIII.1 p. 185). A similar error occurs in the *Fasti Antiates minores* where Rufus appears as 'C. Vibius Libo' (*Inscr. Ital.* XIII.1 p. 303). For discussion and correction, see Syme 1981a: 371-2 = *RP* 3.1430-1; cf. Rogers 1931: 204. See also, below 15.8.

It is difficult to reconstruct Dio's intention for including this anecdote. Dio intended it to be a companion piece to the anecdote concerning Drusus Libo, although the connection is not clear. Certainly, Dio's intention is to illustrate instances of Tiberius' inconsistency, but it is not obvious as to why Rufus should have warranted punishment. Is Dio hinting that Rufus had revolutionary designs, like Libo? Or is he saying that Rufus' use of Caesar's chair was an act of impiety (Bauman 1974: 77)? Perhaps more likely, Dio is indicating that Vibius Rufus affected the sort of openly arrogant behaviour (sc. σεμνυνόμενος) that signalled imperial aspirations, and thus

would usually attract the ire of a king or tyrant, but that it went unpunished by Tiberius. Moreover, there the symbolism of sitting in a chair as a portent of future imperial authority (cf. 75(74).3.3 [Xiph.];).

15.7. **Θρασύλλω:** Ti. Claudius Thrasyllus (*PIR*² T 190), possibly from Alexandria, *amicus principis*, and a figure not without historical interest in his own right. Dio includes two other anecdotes involving Thrasyllus (55.11.1 = Zonar. 10.36; 58.27.1-3) where he appears portrayed as an astrologer. Thrasyllus had been a companion of Tiberius since the latter's stay on Rhodes between 6 B.C. and 2 B.C. (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6.21). There is no evidence that he held any sort of formal position at court (*pace* Hayes 1959: 2, who styles Thrasyllus as the 'official court astrologer'). Thrasyllus' accomplishments apparently extended well beyond astrology, as indicated by the potted *curriculum vitae* provided by the Scholiast on Juvenal (*Schol.* 6.576 [ed. Wessner p.111]). Diogenes Laertius credits Thrasyllus with having organised the Platonic corpus into tetralogies (Diog. Laer. 3.56-61), in addition to the works of Democritus (Diog. Laer. 9.45-48). For discussion of Thrasyllus' career and his accomplishments, see Tarrant 1993: 1-30, 215-47 (testimonia). For Thrasyllus' family, with particular emphasis on the (disputed) identification of his children, Ennia Thrasylla (*PIR*² E 65) and Ti. Claudius Balbillus (*PIR*² C 813), see Cichorius 1927: 102-5; MacMullen 1967: 140-1; Pflaum 1960-1: 1.34-41; Ripat 2011: 122.

αὐτός τε ἀκριβῶν οὕτω τὸ πρᾶγμα: Tiberius' knowledge of astrology and divination appears elsewhere in Dio's portrayal of Tiberius (55.11.1 [Zonar.]); and was an established part of the historiographical tradition. E.g. Tac. *Ann.* 6.20; Suet. *Tib.* 69.

ὄναρ: ‘in a dream’, used here as an adverbial accusative (Freyburger-Galland 1999: 534; *LSJ*⁹ s.v. ὄναρ II). Like many of his contemporaries (e.g. Galen, Maximus of Tyre, Artemidorus, Septimius Severus), Dio was particularly interested in dreams – his first work was a booklet of the dreams and portents’ which prefigured Septimius Severus’ coup in 193 (73(72).23.1 [Xiph.]), and dream narratives abound in his history. Indeed, Dio claims to have received constant encouragement from his guardian spirit (in this case the goddess Tyche and the *daimonion*) through dreams (73(72).23.4 [Xiph.]; 79(78).10.1-2; 80(80).5.3 [Xiph.]). For a discussion of dreams in Dio, see Freyburger-Galland 1999: 533-45; Kuhn-Chen 2002: 213-17. For dream narratives in Roman historiography, see Pelling 1997b; Harris 2003: 18-34.

δαίμων τις: that *daimones* contacted individuals in dreams was a commonly held belief: e.g. Plat. *Symp.* 202d-203a; Apul. *DDS* 156. See further, Kidd 1988: 430-1; Harrison 2013: 164; cf. Dodds 1965: 38-45.

15.8. **τούς τε ἀστρολόγους καὶ τοὺς γόητας**: Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.3; Suet. *Tib.* 36. Astrologers and magicians were periodically the targets of expulsion from the city of Rome, with between nine and eleven possible expulsions between 139 B.C. and A.D. 175, with the bulk of these falling between 33 B.C. and the reign of Domitian (Cramer 1954: 232-48; MacMullen 1967: 132-3; Ripat 2011: 115 n. 2). The word γόης was frequently used in a pejorative sense by Dio, as with other authors of his age (e.g. 46.4.1; 78(77).18.4 [Xiph.]; Philostr. *VA* 1.2.1-3; 7.17.1; cf. MacMullen 1967: 128; Ogden 2007: 462-6). For astrologers (and their periodic expulsions from Rome) see Ripat 2011; cf. Cramer 1951; Cramer 1954; Rives 2011: 683.

τοὺς μὲν ξένους ἐθανάτωσε, τοὺς δὲ πολίτας ... ὑπερώρισε: The dating of this edict is a well-known crux. Dio, like Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.32.3) places the expulsion of the astrologers and seers under the year A.D. 16. However, a fragment of Ulpian (*De off. Proc.* 7 = *Coll. Mos. et Rom. leg.* 15.2) attributes what appears to be the same legislation to the consulship of ‘Pomponius and Rufus’ (*exstat senatus consultum Pomponio et Rufo cons.*), which has been taken to refer to the consuls of A.D. 17 (see below 57.17.1). In an attempt to reconcile the problem, Koestermann (1963: 1.309) posited the existence of two similar decrees (based on Dio’s phrase μετὰ τὸ πρότερον δόγμα – discussed below), the first in A.D. 16 and the second in A.D. 17 (cf. Furneaux 1896: 322). Rogers (1931: 203-4; cf. Rogers 1935: 20-1) has argued that as the suffect consuls for A.D. 16 were C. Pomponius Graecinus and C. Vibius Rufus (see above 15.7), Ulpian’s decree belongs to A.D. 16 after all. This argument has not received the acceptance it deserved (*pro* Cramer 1951: 13; Frakes 2012: 301; *contra* Goodyear 1981: 285; Ripat 2011: 119-20; Pettinger 2012: 19.⁴⁸³ Most recently Pettinger (2012: 19 n.58) has argued for A.D. 17 based on the (false) assumption that the identity of the suffect consul of A.D. 16 was C. Vibius Rufinus (*PIR*¹ V 395). For the distinction between C. Vibius Rufus and C. Vibius Rufinus, see Syme 1981a: 371-6.

A further difficulty arises with respect to the punishments described by Dio (i.e. the banishment of convicted citizens and the execution of non-citizens). Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.32.3) provides the names of two individuals who were executed on account of the decree against astrologers and magicians, L. Pituanus and P. Marcius. According to

⁴⁸³ Both Ripat and Pettinger have followed Goodyear, apparently in ignorance of Syme 1981a (which does not appear in either of their bibliographies).

Tacitus, Pituanus was thrown from the Tarpeian Rock, while Marcius was executed outside the Esquiline Gates accompanied by the sounding of trumpets. It has been suggested from the divergent methods of execution, that Pituanus was an alien, but Marcius was a citizen (Furneaux 1896: 322). The most straightforward solution would be to infer that both were aliens, and the differing methods of execution were due to the nature of their offences, which it has been generally assumed were connected with Libo's conspiracy (Koestermann 1963: 1.309; Goodyear 1981: 285).

A final question we must ask of this decree is whether it was connected to the Drusus Libo affair. Dio, like Suetonius (*Tib.* 36), divorces the expulsion of the astrologers and magicians from his brief comments on the trial of Drusus Libo. Tacitus, on the other hand, records the decree against the astrologers and magicians with the other *senatus consulta* brought about in response to the trial of Libo. It is possible that Tacitus was in error on this point, and that the legislation against the astrologers came *before* Libo's trial, and was thus the motivation for the trial in the first place (this would accord with the seeming importance Libo's association with astrologers played in the prosecution's case against him (Tac. *Ann.* 2.30; cf. Shotter 1972: 91-3)). However, I am inclined to accept Tacitus' attribution, given that the decree mentioned by Dio and Tacitus can be dated to the latter half of A.D. 16 (when C. Pomponius Graecinus and C. Vibius Rufus were suffect consuls, see above), and in the absence of conclusive evidence to the contrary.

μετὰ τὸ πρότερον δόγμα: This earlier decree is almost certainly that mentioned under A.D. 11 56.25.5; cf. Rogers 1935: 20-1; Swan 2004: 280). The alternative requires the invention of an otherwise unattested decree proposed earlier in A.D. 16.

Some, who have attributed the edict mentioned by Ulpian to A.D. 17, have assumed that Dio's πρότερον δόγμα refers to an earlier decree passed in A.D. 16 (cf. Cramer 1951: 27-8; Ripat 2011: 119-20). The existence of such a decree, however, is unnecessary for the reasons outlined above.

τοῖς γὰρ πειθαρχήσασιν αὐτῶν ἄδεια ἐδόθη: This amnesty presumably applied to those whom obeyed the former decree, that is the decree of A.D. 11 (see above). Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 36.

15.9 **ἐκώλυσεν:** Here used in the technical sense of a tribune's *intercessio* or *veto*. For identical usage, see Plut. *Tib. Gracc.* 10.4.

τὸ τῆς δημοκρατίας σχῆμα: 'the appearance of democratic government' not 'a demonstration of democratic government' (*pace* Cary, Loeb trans.). Perhaps analogous to Suetonius' comment about Tiberius *speciem libertatis ... induxit* (Suet. *Tib.* 30; cf. Syme 1986: 372). Dio was not so naïve (*pace* Rogers 1935: 21) to think that the tribune's *veto* in favour of Tiberius and Drusus was uninfluenced by their wishes. For Dio's use of σχῆμα as denoting the appearance (as opposed to the reality, note 59.20.4: τὸ μὲν σχῆμα τῆς δημοκρατίας ἐσώζετο, ἔργον δ' οὐδὲν αὐτῆς ἐγίγνετο; cf. 52.7.4; etc.

ὅτι ἡ βουλή: The apparent senatorial opposition to the proposed punishment of Roman citizens who were believed to have practised astrology or divination is otherwise unattested in the sources. However, there is no reason to question the accuracy of Dio's report (Rapke 1982: 63-4; *pace* Marsh 1931: 281), which seems to

have been taken from a detailed account, derived ultimately from the *acta senatus*. Two details are suggestive of authenticity: 1) that Dio provides the name of the senator who opposed the motion (Cn. Calpurnius Piso); and 2) that Dio should name Drusus in addition to Tiberius as two senators who supported the motion.

συνέπαινος: united with (+ dative) against. An unusual adjective, used only here by Dio, although one which occurs in Herodotus and elsewhere (e.g. Hdt. 3.119, 5.32; Arist. *Eud.* 1221a26), albeit with a different construction.

Γναίῳ Καλπουρνίῳ Πίσωνι: Cn. Calpurnius Piso (*PIR*² C 287). Piso's opposition to this decree against the astrologers is preserved only in Dio's account. For Piso's career, see Shotter 1974; Syme 1986: 369-75; Note now, Drogula 2015 who argues against the idea that Cn. Calpurnius Piso was a supporter and friend of Tiberius.

This seems to mark the formal introduction of Piso into Dio's narrative.⁴⁸⁴ Here Dio provides Piso's *tria nomina*, as he had done in the case of Libo (see above, 57.15.4), and calls for brief comment. There are twenty-two individuals named in Book 57 (excluding members of the Imperial house), five of whom are introduced by their *tria nomina*: 'L'. Scribonius Libo' (57.15.4); Cn. Calpurnius Piso (57.15.9); L. Aelius Sejanus (57.19.5); M. Gabius Apicius (57.19.5); C. 'Lutorius' Priscus (57.20.3). Why Dio should single out these individuals for such precise identification is unclear. With the exception of Sejanus, the remainder appear only fleetingly in the narrative. Townend (1961: 228-9) argued that Dio simply copied out the name as he found it in his source material, and that the cases where individuals are introduced for a second

⁴⁸⁴ Piso had been duly noted as one of the consuls of 7 B.C. (55.8.1, 3).

time (i.e. where Dio provides more than just a single name) are indicative of Dio's change of source. Such an argument is appealing. The 'procedural' nature of the anecdote, suggests that Dio had extracted it from a source using the *acta senatus* (or the *acta* directly), where such details would have been provided and necessary to distinguish Piso from his brother, L. Calpurnius Piso (*PIR*² C 290), who had also played a conspicuous role in the senatorial proceedings of A.D. 16 (*Tac. Ann.* 2.34).

However, there are possible literary-historiographical reasons why Dio should provide Piso's name in full at this point. Piso's role in the death of Germanicus was almost certainly provided in greater detail than what currently survives in the epitomes of Xiphilinus and Zonaras, given that Dio considered the death of Germanicus to have been a turning point in the reign (57.13.6; 57.18.9-10). Hence, we may infer that Dio's precise identification of Piso at this point was intended to signal to the reader the importance of Piso's role in the ensuing narrative. Such a reading is supported by the fact that Piso appears in the anecdote as the principal antagonist of Tiberius and Drusus, thus perhaps foreshadowing the conflict played out between Piso and Tiberius during Piso's trial for the murder of Germanicus.

If we return to the list of individuals who are introduced by *tria nomina*, a pattern does emerge. The presence of the *tria nomina* makes these individuals conspicuous. If Dio does not appear to develop them as characters, consider what they represent. Libo was the author of a conspiracy against Tiberius (the first one against Tiberius). Piso was the (alleged) murderer of Germanicus. Apicius, according to Dio: 'surpassed all mankind in profligacy', and the death of Priscus caused a new law to be introduced allowing for a delay between the conviction in a capital trial and execution. Therefore,

perhaps Dio's decision to record these individuals' names in full was not a peculiarity of his method, blindly following the source in front of him, but a decision which served a distinct historiographical function.

Unfortunately, no comprehensive study has yet been produced on Dio's naming conventions. For general observations on the presentation of Roman names in Greek literary texts, see Dickey 1996: 56-61.

16.1 **ταῦτά τε οὖν οὕτως ἐπράχθη**: the three items mentioned in 16.1-2 amount to a brief miscellany of items which caught Dio's eye from his source(s). The arrangement is indicative of 'end chapter' material gathered by annalists. The corresponding section of Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.41) contains no shared items.

οἱ τότε ταμιεύοντες ἐλάττους αὐτῶν ἦσαν: It was usual procedure for ten of the twenty annually elected quaestors to be appointed to a senatorial province by lot. Why there should be a shortage of eligible candidates in A.D. 16 is unknown. For discussion of the appointment and function of quaestors under the empire, see Birley 1981: 12-14. For Dio's terminology for the quaestorship, see Freyburger-Galland 1997: 161-2; cf. Mason *GT* 91.

16.2. **τῶν δημοσίων γραμμάτων**: How (if at all) these differed from the κοινὰ ὑπομνήματα (57.23.2) or the δημόσια γραμμάτα described at 57.12.2 (see note *ad loc.*) is not clear.⁴⁸⁵ White (1997: 81) suggests that the *acta* as a general term might also encompass material such as '*tabulae publicae, publica monumenta*, and even

⁴⁸⁵ Reimarus (2.862, cf. 2.856) believed that they were the same.

fasti'. Dio's usage here might be intended to cover several types of document. Whatever the precise set of records Dio had in mind, his terminology stylistically is consonant with the δημόσια γράμματα described in the Attic orators (e.g. Dem. *De. cor.* 55; Aeschin. *De falsa leg.* 32).

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ Λιουία: The public role of Livia during the early years of Tiberius' reign certainly interested Dio, as we have already seen (cf. 57.12). According to Suetonius' account of what appears to have been the same fire, Livia appears to have played an active role by giving encouragement to the 'people and soldiers' who were fighting the fire (Suet. *Tib.* 50.3; cf. Barrett 2002: 164).

16.3 Κλήμης τις: The story of Clemens is reported also by Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.39.1-40.3) and Suetonius (*Tib.* 25.1, 3). Velleius passes over the episode without comment, either through discretion or ignorance. Suetonius lists Clemens' insurrection as one of the three causes for Tiberius' *cunctatio* in 14 (Suet. *Tib.* 25.1). The early dating has been generally rejected (e.g. Shotter 1972: 91; Sage 1982/3: 299; Lindsay 1995: 110; etc.). This episode, as with the murder of Agrippa Postumus, has attracted much scholarly attention, yet with few profitable conclusions. Some have mooted the possibility that Clemens was none other than Agrippa himself (Bellemore 2000: 113, *passim*). Others have attempted to link the conspiracy of Clemens the pseudo-Agrippa with that of Drusus Libo (e.g. Rogers 1943: 22-3; Levick 1975b: 128-9; Levick 1976: 150-2; Pettinger 2012: 207-15), but there is no positive evidence to support such a connection (see above 57.15.4-5).

ἐς τὴν Γαλατίαν ἐλθὼν ... ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ὥρμησεν: Clemens' itinerary described by Dio stretches the bounds of believability in what is already an unlikely tale, and these details might well be Dio's own embellishments (cf. Koestermann 1963: 324). Similarly, the size of Clemens' entourage appears exaggerated: πολλοὺς [s.c. ἐν τῇ Γαλατίᾳ] ... πολλοὺς [s.c. ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ] ... προσεποιήσατο, although Suetonius mentions the size of Clemens' band, albeit in similarly vague terms (Suet. *Tib.* 25.1). Tacitus' version confines Clemens' operations to Italy (Tac. *Ann.* 2.39.4-40.1).

παππῶαν: The adjective occurs only here in the surviving narrative of Dio. It is used in Isaeus (as here) in the context of inheritance left by a grandfather (cf. Isae. 3.50; 8.34).

16.4: **διὰ τινων:** In the Tacitean version of the story it was Sallustius Crispus who orchestrated the capture of Clemens (*Ann.* 2.40.2). The veracity of Tacitus' description of Sallustius Crispus' role in the affair is subject to doubt. If Dio knew about Crispus' alleged involvement, there are sound historiographical reasons why he should choose not to include him at this point. By eschewing the temptation of introducing Crispus as another character into the already compressed story (keeping in mind that Crispus does not figure anywhere in the *Roman History*), Dio keeps the reader's attention on the two key players, Tiberius and Clemens.

“πῶς Ἀγρίππας ἐγένου;” ... “οὕτως ὡς καὶ σὺ Καῖσαρ.”: The Tiberius-Clemens exchange appears in almost identical form in Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.40.3: *percunctanti Tiberio quo modo Agrippa factus esset, respondisse fertur quo modo tu Caesar*), and

is suggestive of a common source (Matthews 2010: 59). Later in the *Roman History*, Dio replicates the scene (*mutatis mutandis*), in the exchange between the praetorian prefect Papinian and the outlaw Bulla Felix (77(76).10.7 [Xiph.]). The formulaic nature of this exchange, and the parallels with the story of ‘Alexander and the Pirate’ (e.g. Cic. *Rep.* 3.24),⁴⁸⁶ have been well noted in the scholarship (Wölfflin 1870: 744; Schmidt 2000: 32-4; Champlin 2008: 410-11; Gleason 2011: 58-60). Schmidt (2000: 25 n. 29, *passim*) notes that the story of Clemens fits into an informal series of similar stories (so-styled *Räubergeschichte*) recounted by Dio and Xiphilinus (but found elsewhere), where a socially marginal figure rebukes an authoritarian figure.

Questions remain as to the function of the anecdote. Koestermann (1963: 326) regarded the anecdote as referring to Tacitus’ earlier comments about Tiberius’ adoption by Augustus: *senili adoptione inrepsisse* (Tac. *Ann.* 1.7). Goodyear (1981: 311-12) following Seager (1972: 176 with n.2) was inclined to accept the story as anti-Tiberian slur preserved from the period, emphasising Tiberius’ usurpation of the throne, not specifically about Tiberius’ adoption. If this interpretation is correct, what is interesting about Dio’s version of the anecdote is how poorly it fits with the preceding narrative, at least with Dio’s own historical interpretation. On the whole, Dio is not interested in questioning Tiberius’ legitimacy *per se*, which is the apparent function of Clemens’ pithy reply. Alternatively, what the story may bring out is the nature of the imperial system. Haynes (2003: 9-11), has suggested that the story is intended,

‘to illustrate that the emperor can be seen to have no clothes – people know that he is “made up” – and still wield political power ... The joke is that the

⁴⁸⁶ For the *Nachleben* of the story of Alexander and the Pirate in the Middle Ages, see Cary 1956: 95-8.

basis of society is the fiction that sustains both Tiberius and the imposter, but it can be articulated only as a joke, as the whole social network is implicated in it.'

Certainly such a reading is closer to Dio's own general views of the imperial system, with his keen sense of the difference between appearances and realities. Yet assuming that Dio included this anecdote for any reason other than it is memorable and 'good to think with', it would perhaps be unwise to assert that that Dio endorsed any one particular reading of the anecdote.

57.17.1-8 *The Events of A.D. 17*. Dio's account of the year 17 is truncated by the lacuna in M. Dio's selection of the annalistic material for this year in the surviving text is something of a medley of events and anecdotes. There is a degree of symmetry between Dio's account of 16 and 17, in so far as both begin with Tiberian legislation, Tiberius' concern over the use of Greek words, and feature a truncated trial narrative. Only two items are shared with Tacitus – the trial of Archelaus of Cappadocia and Tiberius' response to the earthquakes in Asia Minor. This may be accounted for by either Dio's use of a different source to that used by Tacitus, or simply by Dio's different selection from a range of texts, which might have included those used by Tacitus.

17.1 **Γάιος τε Καικίλιος**: An elusive individual. The index to Book 57 styles this consul Γ. Καικίλιος Γ. υἱ Νέπωϛ ἢ Ροῦφοϛ. Cassiodorus (allegedly working from Aufidius Bassus)⁴⁸⁷ is in accord with the Dionian material, and identifies the consul as C. Caecilius (*Chron.* 618/17 [= *Chron. Min.* 2. p. 136]), which is supported

⁴⁸⁷ For general comments on the relationship between Cassiodorus and Aufidius Bassus, see *FRHist* 3.604-5 (Levick), and above, Introduction, *Chapter 1: The Roman Historian at Work*.

epigraphically by the *Fasti Lunenses* (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1 p. 310). However, the consul is identified as C. Caelius by Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.41), the *Fasti Ostienses* (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1 p. 185), and the *Fasti Antiates minores* (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1 p. 303). The divergence in the tradition is not easy to account for, as it cannot be put down to simple error on the part of either Dio or Tacitus' source(s) as it occurs in both literary and lapidary consular lists. A possible solution is that the man is in fact a *polyonymus*: that is, a putative Caecilius Metellus Nepos (a descendant of the consul of 57 B.C.?) who was adopted by a Caelius Rufus (cf. *PIR*² C 141).⁴⁸⁸ If this is correct, then we perhaps can add a further footnote to the history of the eclipse of the Caecilii Metelli.

Λούκιος Φλάκκος: L. Pomponius Flaccus (*PIR*² P 715; cf. Syme 1981b: 192 = *RP* 3.1353; Syme 1981c: 129-30 = *RP* 3.1379-81). Flaccus was the brother of the suffect consul of 16, C. Pomponius Graecinus (cf. note above 57.15.7).

τὴν νοუმηνίαν: sc. 'New Year's Day'. For discussion, see above notes at 57.8.6.

οὔτε ἐδέξατο: Tiberius' ordinance presumably related to the giving of gifts after New Year's Day (sc. μετὰ τὴν νοუმηνίαν): cf. Suet. *Tib.* 34.2.

17.2 **ἐνθυμηθεῖς οὖν νυκτὸς ... ῥήμασι δὲ οὔ:** The anecdote of the interchange between Tiberius, Ateius Capito and Porcellus appears in almost identical form in Suetonius' sketch of Porcellus (*Gram.* 22.2, see also notes below), yet in a different

⁴⁸⁸ This Caelius Rufus may well be the suffect consul of 4 B.C. attested in the *Fasti magistrorum uici* (*Inscr. It.* XIII.1 p. 284). Cf. Syme (1981b: 190 = *RP* 3.1351) who asserts that this suffect consul of 4 was the father of the consul of 17. That the consul of 17 carried the *cognomen* 'Rufus' is partially confirmed by the entry in the so-called *Consularia Constantinopolitana* [ed. Burgess p. 226] where the consuls are named 'Crasso et Rufo'.

context (in Suetonius, the occasion is a speech delivered by Tiberius). It may be that either Dio or Suetonius (or both) took the basic anecdote and attached it to different occasions. Moreover, both Dio and Suetonius employ the anecdote for different purposes. The Latin biographer uses the anecdote to develop further his portrayal of Porcellus as *sermonis Latini exactor molestissimus* (Gram. 22.1). Dio employs the anecdote as an example where Tiberius acted in his customary manner of not punishing displays of *parrhesia* (cf. 57.17.3: κείνον μὲν οὖν οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τούτῳ κακόν, καίπερ ἀκρατῶς παρρησιασάμενον, ἔδρασε). But in doing so, the anecdote in Dio's narrative is not all about critiquing Tiberius' behaviour, as it is just as much an illustration of the two stereotypical courtiers: that is the flatterer and the advisor who offers frank advice.

Ἀτείου Καπίτωνος: C. Ateius Capito (*PIR*² A 1279), the noted jurist, interpreter of sacred texts, consul (*suffectus*), and toady. His fleeting appearance here in Dio conforms to his reputation for obsequiousness (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.70, 3.75; Syme 1958: 760-1).

“εἰ καὶ μηδεὶς ... καταριθμήσομεν”: Cf. Suet. Gram. 22.2: *adfirmante Ateio Capitone et esse illud Latinum et si non esset futurum certe iam inde [...].* **ἐς τὰ ἀρχαία:** ‘following the ancient usage’ or ‘classical usage’, cf. Lucian. *Lex.* 25: ὅτι ὑπεράττικος εἶναι ἀξιῶν καὶ τὴν φωνὴν εἰς τὸ ἀρχαιοτάτον ἀπηκριβωμένος τοιαῦτα ἔνια [...]. In Suetonius' version, the issue is more with the quality of diction (i.e. whether Tiberius used ‘good Latin’ in his speech); but for Dio, the problem seems more about classicism, and as such his rendering of the anecdote seems to have a certain Second Sophistic gloss to it.

Πόρκελλός τις: All modern editions have chosen to follow Xylander’s emendation and identify this individual as Μόρκελλος (e.g. Boissevain 2.574; Melber 3.279). This is likely to be incorrect (*pace* Auburger 1995: 141, *PIR*² P 735). The emendation was made on the basis a reference to the grammarian in Suetonius’ *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* 22.1, where his name is given as M. Pomponius Marcellus. However, Kaster has demonstrated convincingly that the text of Suetonius is corrupt (1992: 99-102), and has in turn emended Suet. *Gram.* 22.1 to read M. Pomponius Porcellus, so as to bring it in line with Dio and Seneca (*Suas.* 2.12-13; cf. Kaster 1995: 222-3). Kaster’s decision seems to have met with general agreement (e.g. Courtney 1996: 347; Laurence and Paterson 1999: 185). Hence, the reading of M and Xiphilinus, who both record the name as Πόρκελλος, should be retained in place of the long accepted emendation. According to Suetonius, Porcellus began life as a boxer, something his critics never let him forget, as illustrated by a malicious epigram attributed to Asinius Gallus (Suet. *Gram.* 22.3 with Kaster 1995: 227).

“σύ, Καίσαρ, ... ῥήμασι δὲ οὐ.”: cf. Suet. *Gram.* 22.3: “*Mentitur*”, *inquit*, “*Capito; tu enim, Caesar, ciuitatem dare potes hominibus, uerbo non potes.*” The almost exact parallel must be indicative of a source connection of some sort. As noted correctly by Laurence and Paterson (1999: 185), ‘Porcellus was demonstrably wrong ... in these matters ... the emperor was a trendsetter’, when it came to the coining of new vocabulary. But there is possibly a political edge to the witticism as well. Although Tiberius’ reputation does not include generosity in extending the franchise (Sherwin-White 1973: 237-8; cf. Box 1931: 202), grants of citizenship especially to individuals

in Greece and the Eastern provinces were not unknown (Alföldy 1965: 837-9).⁴⁸⁹ Might Marcellus' comment (if genuine) have come in the wake of some grants of Roman citizenship? If so, the subtext of Porcellus' comment would be along the lines of, "You may be able to make a Greek a Roman, but you cannot make a Greek word a Roman one". Furthermore, as Caillan Davenport has suggested to me, Marcellus' reply may carry the more timeless idea that even an emperor's power had its limitations.

17.3 τὸν δὲ δὴ Ἀρχέλαον τὸν τῆς Καππαδοκίας βασιλέα: Archelaus Philopatris (*PIR*² A 830), originally of Pontic origin, was installed in Cappadocia by Antony in 36 B.C. (49.32.3; Strabo 12.2.11 [540]; Reinhold 1988: 63). His position was confirmed by the future Augustus following the battle of Actium (51.2.1), where he had fought on the side of Antony and Cleopatra (Plut. *Ant.* 61.1). After this, he seems to have found favour with the *princeps*; he was granted extensions to his territory during the 20s, and his connections with other eastern royal families were encouraged. For discussion of the career and connections of this Anatolian potentate, see Sullivan 1980: 1149-61; Syme 1995: 144-52; Jacobson 2001.

δὲ ὀργῆς σχών: Further characteristic behaviour from Tiberius. As we have seen, Dio portrays Tiberius as tolerant of people who displayed *parrhesia*, but (less positively) as being wont to hold grudges (see above 57.2.7 ὅθενπερ καὶ πρότερον διὰ μίσους αὐτῷ ἦν). Tacitus too attributes Archelaus' summons to Rome as being

⁴⁸⁹ Anecdotal evidence from the reign of Augustus indicates that Tiberius had sought Roman citizenship for one of his Greek companions (Suet. *Aug.* 40.3), indicating as Wardle (2014: 306) points out, that 'Tiberius was active on behalf of clients from the Greek world from early in his career'. The Alexandrian, Ti. Julius Alexander (*PIR*² I 139) may also have been a high-profile recipient of a grant of citizenship by Tiberius perhaps in the 20s or 30s: cf. *RE* 10.1 col. 153 = Iulius 59 (Stein).

on account of Tiberius' anger (*Ann.* 2.42.2, and below 57.17.4), and it is likely that this aspect of their accounts stems from a common tradition. Modern scholars have been perhaps too ready to dismiss the personal motivation for Archelaus' trial as maintained by Dio and Tacitus. Yet personal animosity between kings is seldom a trivial matter. If there were existing antipathy between Tiberius and Archelaus, then it would have made sense for Tiberius to remove him from power (at least in terms of *Realpolitik*), lest Archelaus actually instigate a war.

πρότερόν οἱ ὑποπεπωκώς ὥστε καὶ συνηγόρω, ... χρήσασθαι: Evidence from Suetonius indicates that Tiberius' defence of Archelaus occurred early in Tiberius' career (*Suet. Tib.* 8). The date of the trial is unknown, although it is generally assumed that it occurred in the 20s (e.g. Romer 1985: 77-9; Levick 1971: 486, *passim*, argues for 26 B.C.). Note, however, Bowersock (1965: 157-9) who presents a cogent argument for the trial occurring between 19 and 16 B.C. **ὑποπεπωκώς:** The quasi-religious register emphasises Archelaus' grovelling attempt to gain Tiberius' help. Similarly, note also ἐθεράπευσε below at 57.17.4 in relation to Archelaus' behaviour towards Gaius. **ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων κατηγορήθη:** The grounds on which Archelaus was indicted by the Cappadocians is not known (Sullivan 1990: 184-5; Sullivan 1980: 1154; cf. Bowersock 1965: 159).

17.4 **μετὰ τοῦτο αὐτοῦ ... ἐθεράπευσε:** This incident may be placed fairly securely on Samos in 1 B.C., when we know that Tiberius also visited C. Caesar on the latter's progression to his eastern command (55.10.19 with Swan 2004: 116-7; *Suet. Tib.* 12.2; Romer 1985: 75-6, *passim*). **ἐθεράπευσε:** There is perhaps a sense of irony here, as according to Dio's account of the visit, Tiberius 'abased himself' (ἐταπείνου

... ἐαυτόν) when he paid court to his stepson C. Caesar (55.10.19 [Xiph., Zonar.]).

μετεπέμψατο ὥς καὶ νεωτερίζοντά τι: Dio's coeval, the elder Philostratus, citing a certain Maximus of Aegeae, includes a passing reference to a plot by Archelaus against Rome (VA 1.12.2 = *FGrH* 1066 (Maximus of Aegeae) T 2).⁴⁹⁰ Although Dio is sceptical of this allegation, it is possible that there were some grounds for this, especially given the troubled situation in Armenia at the time (Rogers 1935: 25-7; Romer 1985: 98-9; cf. Sullivan 1980: 1160-1; Braund 1984: 97).

καὶ τῇ τῆς γερουσίας ψήφῳ παρέδωκεν: When Archelaus was brought before the Senate to face trial is another vexed issue, even though both Dio and Tacitus place it in A.D. 17. The problems stem from the ambiguities of Tac. *Ann.* 2.42.2-3, which have been discussed adequately by Goodyear (1981: 319). A summary of the problem will suffice here. Tacitus notes two points: i) at the time of the trial Archelaus had ruled Cappadocia for fifty years (*rex Archelaus quinquagesimum annum Cappadocia potiebatur*), and ii) that the trial came soon after Tiberius had taken command of the empire (*ut ... imperium adeptus est*). If Tacitus is correct in calculating Archelaus' regnal years, and if Dio is correct in placing Archelaus' accession in 36 B.C., then we should expect the trial to have taken place in 14 (Gwatkin 1930: 8; Magie 1950: 1349 n. 1).⁴⁹¹ Koestermann's suggestion (1963: 329) that Tacitus is referring to the year in which the future Augustus reaffirmed Archelaus' position following the battle of Actium is closer to Tacitus' '50th year', but our surviving authorities preclude a satisfactory resolution to the problem. In all events, late 14 seems too early for the

⁴⁹⁰ NB Radicke 1999: 169-70, who suggests that Philostratus may have inserted the reference to Archelaus into his summary of Maximus' account.

⁴⁹¹ In this reckoning, Archelaus' 'fiftieth year' might still include a part of the year 15 as well, assuming that the anniversary of his accession was mid-year.

trial. Any time between 15 and 17 is more reasonable. See further below 57.17.7.

δεινῶς ποδαγρῶντα: A curious triviality, although it does contribute nicely to Dio's characterisation of the frail potentate. Yet Dio seems particularly alert to the sufferings of individuals from gout: e.g. Narcissus (61(60).34.4 [Xiph.]); Vespasian (66.17.1 [Xiph.]); Faustina minor (72(71).29.1 [Xiph.]), Septimius Severus (77(76)16.1 [Xiph.]). Perhaps it was because Dio himself was afflicted by it (80(80).5.2 [Xiph.]).

17.5: **ἔπαθε μὲν γὰρ ποτε ... λαβεῖν**: Jones (1971: 181) places the appointment of the procurator in the latter part of Augustus' reign, on account of Archelaus' infirmities. But **τοῦτο** presumably refers to Archelaus' 'insanity' (παράφρονεῖν), rather than to his gout (δεινῶς ποδαγρῶντα) (cf. Romer 1985: 80 n. 10). Romer (1985: 79-80) believes the appointment of the procurator coincided with the time of Archelaus' trial before Augustus in the 20s, with the procurator left in charge of the kingdom while Archelaus was away. Yet if this was the case, then we might wonder why we do not hear about a similar arrangement for the period of Archelaus' absence during his second trial? Moreover, it is difficult to find a time when such an arrangement was likely to have been made. After all, Archelaus' kingdom had been extended by Augustus in 20 B.C. (54.9.2), and Archelaus had accompanied Tiberius to Armenia not long after (Joseph. *AJ* 15.105). Nor do the following decades show him to be out of imperial favour, or as an unstable liability. Therefore, we should place the appointment of the procurator before, rather than after, his first trial, perhaps in the immediate aftermath of Actium, where Archelaus' 'insanity' (real or feigned) might have been given as the excuse for his decision to side with Antony and

Cleopatra. **ἐπίτροπον**: = procurator (Mason *GT* 142-3).

17.5-7: **οὐ μέντοι καὶ τότε ἔτι παρελήρει ... τότε μὲν οὕτως ὁ Ἀρχέλαος ἐσώθη**: Dio's account of Archelaus' trial is complicated if one is trying to tease out the various facets of the case against Archelaus. To appreciate fully what Dio is trying to do one has to step back from the historical questions and look at it on the narrative level. When we do so, Dio's love of the paradoxical, and especially of the "unexpected outcome", comes to the fore in his presentation of the trial. The progression of ideas may be summarised thus: i) Archelaus is accused of treasonous behaviour (ὥς καὶ νεωτερίζοντά τι, above 57.17.4); ii) he decides to feign insanity during the trial to secure an acquittal (ἐπλάσσετο, εἴ πως ἔκ γε τούτου σωθείη); iii) his hopes for an acquittal do not look good until the prosecution reports a comment of his that is genuinely treasonous (ἐπειδὴν οἴκαδε ἐπανέλθω, δείξω αὐτῷ οἷα νεῦρα ἔχω); iv) while such a statement should have been more than sufficient to condemn him, it results in his salvation (τότε μὲν οὕτως ὁ Ἀρχέλαος ἐσώθη), presumably because only an insane man would make such a boast about his 'muscles' (νεῦρα) given Archelaus' obvious physical infirmities (διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον μὴ ὅτι στήναι ἀλλὰ μηδὲ καθίζεσθαι δύνασθαι).

17.5 **οὐκέτ' αὐτὸν ὁ Τιβέριος ἀπέκτεινεν**: 'Tiberius no longer attempted to put him to death'. Note the use of the conative imperfect (sc. ἀπέκτεινεν). Gwatkin (1930: 8; cf. Goodyear 1981: 320) has indicated that this cannot be taken to mean that Archelaus was acquitted. But Braund's assumption (1984: 166) that Archelaus' death 'ended proceedings' cannot be supported by the available evidence. Rogers (1935: 25) is (wisely) agnostic.

17.6 ἐν σκιμποδίῳ καταστέγω ... προκύψας: Within the space of a few dozen lines, Dio tells a second anecdote involving *scimpodia* (see note above 57.15.4 σκιμποδίῳ καταστέγω). Here Dio's rather breathless digression on *scimpodia* (sc. νομιζόμενον γάρ ... ἐποίησε) points clearly to his keen interest in these sorts of high-status, senatorial objects; both in terms of recording the instances of their use and the semiotics of such usage. καὶ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Τιβερίος ποτε ἐποίησε: 'as even Tiberius did on occasion'. Cf. 60.2.3; Suet. *Tib.* 30.

17.7 ἄλλως δ' οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον ἀπέθανε: cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.42.3: *finem uitae sponte an fato impleuit*. Dio's greater awareness of the passing of time may be important (sc. οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον ἀπέθανε), and one which may lend weight to the thesis that Archelaus was brought before the Senate prior to A.D. 17 (see above 57.17.4). Yet Dio's statement might suggest anything from the passing of a matter of months to that of a few years, and offers nothing conclusive.

ἡ Καππαδοκία τῶν τε Ῥωμαίων ἐγένετο: cf. Strabo 12.1.4 [534]; Vell. Pat. 2.39.3; Tac. *Ann.* 2.42.4; Suet. *Tib.* 37.4; Vict. *Caes.* 2.3; [Vict.] *Epit.* 2.8; Eutr. 7.11.2. For later authors, the annexation of Cappadocia was recognized as one of the few major historical developments of Tiberius' reign, appearing in not only the Byzantine tradition (e.g. Malalas 10.10 [p. 178 ed. Thurn]), but even in the Ethiopian history of John of Nikiu (69.1). For the strategic and material value of Cappadocia, see Magie 1950: 491-3.

ἵππῃ ἐπετροάπη: The newly formed province was under the command of equestrian

procurators until the Flavian period, when it was combined with the province of Galatia and given to a senatorial governor (cf. Mitford 1980: 1173-4, 1182-3). Little is known about these early equestrian praesidial procurators. It has been suggested that the Julio-Claudian praesidial procurators of Cappadocia were subordinate to the governors of Syria (Brunt 1983: 56; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 12.49), although the evidence is slender. Why it was decided that Cappadocia be given to an equestrian is not immediately clear. Magie (1950: 495) thought that it indicated that the province was treated as though it was a private estate of the emperor, with the result that revenues went straight to the military treasury. This view, which goes back to Mommsen's theory concerning the creation of the new equestrian prefectures and procuratorships (*Staatsr.* 2.2³: 859), has been overturned by Brunt (1983: 57-8). In fact, the allocation of the newly formed province to an equestrian made sense on a very basic level, given what we know about provincial administration during Tiberius' reign. First, there was precedent for the appointment of an equestrian in such a post. Second, and more importantly, by choosing an equestrian it would not add additional strain on the senatorial order to supply a (willing) proconsul or *legatus Augusti pro praetore* (and quaestor) for the province: an important consideration given the persistent shortage of governors and quaestors during Tiberius' reign (see above 57.16.1, and 58.23.5).

ταῖς τε ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ πόλεσι ταῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ σεισμοῦ κακωθείσαις: Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.47.1), Pliny (*HN* 2.86.200), and Seneca (*QN* 6.1.12) mention twelve cities that were affected by the earthquake, a number which is confirmed by local inscriptions from Asia Minor (*ILS* 8785 = *OGIS* 471; *CIL* 3.7096; *IK* 5 (Kyme) 20, 21).⁴⁹² Thirteen cities are named by Eusebius-Jerome (*Chron.* p. 172 ed. Halm), a list which was to

⁴⁹² The two inscriptions from Kyme are heavily reconstructed.

become canonical in the Greek chronographic tradition, e.g. George the Monk (*Chron.* p. 311 ed. De Boor); Syncellus (*Chron.* p. 386-7 ed. Mosshammer). A copy⁴⁹³ of a statue base found in Puteoli and which may be dated to A.D. 30 names 14 cities (*CIL* 10.1624 = *ILS* 156). Eusebius-Jerome and the Puteoli inscription include the names of cities that suffered from earthquakes during the 20s (Ephesus c. A.D. 29 and Cibyra in 23 (*Tac. Ann.* 4.13.1)). The list of thirteen cities found in the Eusebian tradition includes Ephesus but not Cibyra, due, no doubt, to the fame of Ephesus.

ἀνὴρ ἐστρατηγηκὼς σὺν πέντε ῥαβδούχοις: Again Dio's taste for administrative niceties comes to the fore. Although apparently not interested in the number of cities effected by the earthquake (see above note), he does provide the number of lictors that accompanied the praetor, who is identified by Tacitus as M. Ateius (*Tac. Ann.* 2.47.4; *PIR*² A 1278). For discussion of the evidence of imperial envoys accompanied by five lictors, see Cotton (2000: 219-29), who suggests that these so-called *quinquefascales* occupied positions of special authority, but whose authority was subordinate to that of the serving provincial governor. **ῥαβδούχος:** = lictor (Mason *GT* 82).

καὶ χρήματα πολλὰ ... ἐδόθη: According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.47) Tiberius promised the cities a sum of ten million HS and tax relief for a period of five years. Cf. Oros. 7.4.18; Vell. Pat. 2.126.2; Suet. *Tib.* 48.2.

17.8 **τῶν γὰρ ἀλλοτρίων ... ἀπει****:** 'For he vigorously <refrained> from the property of others (so long that is as he cultivated the other forms of virtue'. A

⁴⁹³ The original was in Rome, at the base of a colossal statue of Tiberius erected next to the temple of Venus in the Forum to celebrate Tiberius' contributions to the rebuilding of the cities (*FGrH* 257 (Phlegon) F 36.13).

reiteration of a key feature of Dio's portrayal of Tiberius, introduced above 57.10.5.

ἀπε****: Here the text of M breaks off. The word supplied by Xiphilinus is

ἀπεχόμενος.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note on Abbreviations. All abbreviations of journal titles follow those of *L'Année Philologique*.

J.N. Adams, 'The Vocabulary of the Speeches in Tacitus' Historical Works', *BICS* 20 (1973), 124-144.

E. Adler, 'Cassius Dio's Livia and the Conspiracy of Cinna Magnus', *GRBS* 51 (2011), 133-54.

E. Adler, 'Cassius Dio's Agrippa-Maecenas Debate: An Operational Code Analysis', *AJPh* 133.3 (2012), 477-520.

G.S. Aldrete, *Floods of the Tiber in Ancient Rome* (Baltimore 2007).

A. Alföldi, (trans. H. Mattingly), *A Conflict of Ideas in the Late Roman Empire: The Clash Between the Senate and Valentinian I* (Oxford 1952).

A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor 1963).

G. Alföldy, 'La politique provinciale de Tibère', *Latomus* 24 (1965), 824-844.

G. Alföldy, (trans. D. Braund, F. Pollock), *The Social History of Rome* (London 1985).

W. Allen, 'The Death of Agrippa Postumus', *TAPA* 78 (1947), 131-139.

J.E. Allison and J.D. Cloud, 'The Lex Julia Maiestatis' *Latomus* 21 (1962), 711-731.

R. Alston, 'Roman Army Pay from Caesar to Diocletian', *JRS* 84 (1994), 113-123.

W. Ameling, 'Griechische Intellektuelle und das Imperium Romanum: das Beispiel Cassius Dio', *ANRW* 2.34.3 (1997), 2472-2496.

J.G.C. Anderson, 'The Eastern Frontiers under Augustus', in S.A. Cook, et al. (edd.), *The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume X, The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C. - A.D. 70* (Cambridge 1934), 239-283.

C. Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 2000).

F. de. Angelis, 'The Emperor's Justice and its Spaces in Rome and Italy', in F. de Angelis (ed.), *Spaces of Justice in the Roman World* (Leiden and Boston, 2010), 127-159.

R. Ash, *Ordering Anarchy: Armies and Leaders in Tacitus' Histories* (London 1999).

- R. Ash, 'Standing in the Shadows: Plutarch and the Emperors in the Lives and the Moralia', in A.G. Nikolaidis (ed.), *The Unity of Plutarch's Work. 'Moralia' Themes in the 'Lives', Features of the 'Lives' in the 'Moralia'* (Berlin and New York 2008), 557-575.
- A.E. Astin, 'Augustus and "Censoria Potestas"', *Latomus* 22 (1963), 226-235.
- J. Auberger, *Dion Cassius, Historie Romaine, livres 57-59 (Tibère-Caligula)* (Paris 1995).
- G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim 1956).
- M. Baar, *Das Bild des Kaisers Tiberius bei Tacitus, Sueton und Cassius Dio* (Stuttgart 1990).
- L. Bablitz, *Actors and Audience in the Roman Courtroom* (London 2007).
- L. Bablitz, 'The Platform in Roman Art, 30BC – AD180', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XIV* (2008 Brussels), 235-275.
- L. Bablitz, 'Three Passages on Tiberius and the Courts', *MAAR* 54 (2009), 121-133.
- B. Baldwin, 'The acta diurna', *Chiron* 9 (1979), 189-203.
- B. Baldwin, *Suetonius* (Amsterdam 1983).
- B. Baldwin, 'Historiography in the Second Century: The Precursors of Cassius Dio', *Klio* 68.2 (1986), 479-486.
- M.A.W. Baldwin, *Fasti Cretae et Cyrenarum: Imperial Magistrates of Crete and Cyrenaica During the Julio-Claudian Period* (Ann Arbor 1983) [PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan].
- J.P.V.D. Balsdon, 'The Principates of Tiberius and Gaius', *ANRW* 2.2 (1975), 86-94.
- T.M. Banchich and E.N. Lane (trans. and comm.), *The History of Zonaras: From Alexander Severus to the Death of Theodosius the Great* (London 2009).
- E. Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium: From Justinian to the Last Palaeologus* (Oxford 1957).
- B.C. Barmann, 'The Mount Athos Epitome of Cassius Dio's Roman History', *Phoenix* 25.1 (1971), 58-67.
- T.D. Barnes, 'The Victories of Augustus', *JRS* 64 (1974), 21-26.
- T.D. Barnes, 'The Composition of Cassius Dio's "Roman History"', *Phoenix* 38.3 (1984), 240-255.

- T.D. Barnes, 'Proconsuls of Asia under Caracalla', *Phoenix* 40.2 (1986), 202-205.
- A.A. Barrett, *Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome* (New Haven 2002).
- W.S. Barrett, *Euripides. Hippolytus* (Oxford 1964).
- C.A. Barton, *Roman Honour. The Fire in the Bones* (Berkeley 2001).
- G. Bastianini, 'Lista dei prefetti d'Egitto dal 30^a al 299^b', *ZPE* 17 (1975), 263-328.
- G. Bastianini, 'Il préfet d' Egitto (30 a.C. – 297 d.C.): Addenda (1973-1985)', *ANRW* 10.1 (1988), 503-517.
- R.A. Bauman, *The Crimen Maiestatis in the Roman Republic and Augustan Principate* (Johannesburg 1970).
- R.A. Bauman, *Impietas in Principem: A Study of Treason Against the Roman Emperor with Special Reference to the First Century A.D.* (Munich 1974).
- R.A. Bauman, 'Tanaquil-Livia and the Death of Augustus', *Historia* 43.2 (1994), 177-188.
- M. Beard, 'Priesthoods in the Roman Republic', in M. Beard and J. North (edd.), *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World* (London 1990), 19-48.
- M. Beard, J. North and S.R.F. Price, *Religions of Rome. Volume I: A History* (Cambridge 1998).
- R.E. Bennett, *The Prefects of Roman Egypt: 30 B.C. to 69 A.D.* (Ann Arbor 1971) [PhD Dissertation Yale 1970].
- J. Bellemore, 'The Death of Agrippa Postumus and the Escape of Clemens', *Eranos* 98 (2000), 93-114.
- J. Bellemore, 'Cassius Dio and the Chronology of A.D. 21', *CQ* 53.1 (2003), 268-285.
- J. Béranger, 'Le refus du pouvoir: recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat', *MH* 5.3 (1948), 178-196.
- J. Béranger, *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat* (Basel 1953)
- J. Bergmans, *Die Quellen der Vita Tiberii (Buch 57 der Historia Romana) des Cassius Dio* (Amsterdam 1903) [Dissertation, Heidelberg]
- R. Bett, *Pyrrho, His Antecedents, and His Legacy* (Oxford 2000)
- S. Bingham, *The Praetorian Guard: A History of Rome's Elite Special Forces* (London 2013).

- A.R. Birley, *The Fasti of Roman Britain* (Oxford 1981).
- A.R. Birley, 'Sejanus: his fall', in N. Sekunda (ed.), *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald* (Gdansk 2007), 121-150.
- L. De Blois, 'The Εἰς Βασιλέα of Ps.- Aelius Aristides', *GRBS* 27.3 (1986), 279-288.
- L. De Blois, 'Volk und Soldaten bei Cassius Dio', *ANRW* 2.34.3 (1997a.), 2650-2676.
- L. De Blois, 'Emperor and Empire in the Works of Greek Authors of the Third Century A.D.', *ANRW* 2.34.4 (1997b), 3391-3443.
- L. De Blois, 'Dio's Vocabulary', *Classical Review* 49.1 (1999), 36-37.
- J. Bodel, 'Chronology and Succession 2: Notes on Some Consular Lists on Stone', *ZPE* 105 (1995), 279-296.
- R.J. Bonner, 'The Book Divisions of Thucydides', *CPh* 15.1 (1920), 73-82.
- A.B. Bosworth, 'Arrian's Literary Development', *CQ* 22.1 (1972a), 163-185.
- A.B. Bosworth, 'Asinius Pollio and Augustus', *Historia* 21.3 (1972b), 441-473.
- A.B. Bosworth, 'Tacitus and Asinius Gallus', *AJAH* 2.2 (1977), 173-192.
- P. Boudreaux, (ed.), *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum, Codicum Parisinorum partem tertiam*, (Brussels 1912).
- P. Boudreaux, F. Cumont (edd.), *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum, Codicum Parisinorum partem quartam*, (Brussels 1922).
- G.W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford 1965).
- G.W. Bowersock, 'Greek Intellectuals and the Imperial Cult', in W. den Boer and E. Bickerman (edd.), *Le culte des souverains dans l'Empire Romain*, (Geneva 1972), 177-212.
- A.K. Bowman, 'Papyri and Roman Imperial History, 1960-75', *JRS* 66 (1976), 153-73.
- H. Box, 'Roman Citizenship in Laconia, Part I', *JRS* 21 (1931), 200-214.
- G. Boys-Stones, 'Physiognomy and Ancient Psychological Theory', in S. Swain (ed.), *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam* (Oxford 2007).
- D.C. Braund, *Rome and the Friendly King: The Character of the Client Kingship* (London 1984).

- S. Braund, *Seneca, De Clementia. Edited with a Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford 2009).
- J. Briscoe, 'The Grandson of Hortensius', *ZPE* 95 (1993), 249-250.
- R. Brock, *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle* (London 2013).
- S. Brunet, 'The Date of the First Balbillea at Ephesos', *ZPE* 117 (1997), 137-138.
- P.A. Brunt, 'Roman Constitutional Problems', *CR* 12.1 (1962), 70-73.
- P.A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower: 225 B.C. to A.D. 14* (Oxford 1971).
- P.A. Brunt, 'C. Fabricius Tuscus and an Augustan Dilectus', *ZPE* 13 (1974a), 161-185.
- P.A. Brunt, 'Conscription and Volunteering in the Roman Imperial Army', *SCI* 1 (1974b), 90-115.
- P.A. Brunt, 'The Administrators of Roman Egypt', *JRS* 65 (1975), 124-147.
- P.A. Brunt, 'Lex de Imperio Vespasiani', *JRS* 67 (1977), 95-116.
- P.A. Brunt, 'On Historical Fragments and Epitomes', *CQ* 30.2 (1980), 477-494.
- P.A. Brunt, 'Nobilitas and Novitas', *JRS* 72 (1982), 1-17.
- P.A. Brunt, 'Princeps and Equites', *JRS* 73 (1983), 42-75.
- P.A. Brunt, 'The Senate in the Augustan Regime', *CQ* 34.2 (1984a), 423-444.
- P.A. Brunt, 'Did Emperors Ever Suspend the Law of "Maiestas"?', in A. Guarino and V. Giuffrè (edd.), *Sodalitas : scritti in onore di Antonio Guarino* (Napoli 1984b), 478-489.
- P.A. Brunt and J.M. Moore, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus* (Oxford 1973).
- C. Bruun, 'Roman Emperors in Popular Jargon: Searching for Contemporary Nicknames', in De Blois, L., et al. (edd.), *The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power. Proceedings of the Third Workshop of the International Network, Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 B.C. – A.D. 476)* (Amsterdam 2003), 69-98.
- W.W. Buckland (rev. P. Stein), *A Text-Book of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian* (3rd Edn., Cambridge 1963).
- G. Bureth, 'Le préfet d'Égypte (30 a.C – 297 d.C): État présent de la documentation en 1973', *ANRW* 10.1 (1988), 472-502

- A. Cameron, *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Roman and Byzantium* (Oxford 1976).
- A. Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford 2011).
- J.B. Campbell, *The Emperor and the Roman Army: 31 BC – AD 235* (Oxford 1984).
- H.V. Canter, 'Personal Appearance in Biographies of Roman Emperors', *Studies in Philology* 25.3 (1928), 385-399.
- G. Cary, *The Medieval Alexander* (Cambridge 1956).
- E. Champlin, 'The Testament of Augustus', *RhM* (1989), 154-165.
- E. Champlin, 'Tiberius the Wise', *Historia* 57.4 (2008), 408-425.
- E. Champlin, 'Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins', *JRS* 101 (2011), 73-99.
- E. Champlin, 'Seianus Augustus', *Chiron* 42 (2012), 361-387.
- M.P. Charlesworth, 'Livia and Tanaquil', *CR* 41.2 (1927), 55-57.
- M.P. Charlesworth, 'The Virtues of a Roman Emperor: Propaganda and the Creation of Belief', *PBA* 23 (1937), 105-133.
- C. Cichorius, 'Der Astrologe Claudius Balbillus, Sohn des Thrasyllus', *RhMus.* 76 (1927), 102-5.
- J.D. Cloud, 'The Text of Digest XLVIII.4: Ad Legem Iuliam Maiestatis', *ZRG* 80 (1962), 206-232.
- M.A. Cobb, 'The Reception and Consumption of Eastern Goods in Roman Society', *G&R* 60.1 (2013), 136-152.
- H. Cohen (ed.), *Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'Empire Romain communément appelées, médailles impériales* (2nd Edn., Paris 1880).
- S.T. Cohen, 'Augustus, Julia and the Development of the Exile "Ad Insulam"', *CQ* 58.1 (2008), 206-17.
- S. Connolly, 'Disticha Catonis Uticensis', *CPh* 107.2 (2012), 119-130.
- A.E. Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Cambridge 2009).
- M. Corbier, 'Divorce and Adoption as Roman Familial Strategies', in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford 1991), 47-78.

- T.J. Cornell, 'The Historical Tradition of Early Rome', in I.S. Moxon, J.D. Smart and A.J. Woodman (edd.), *Past Perspectives. Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing* (Cambridge 1986), 67-86.
- H.M. Cotton, 'Cassius Dio, Mommsen and the quinquefascales', *Chiron* 30 (2000), 217-234.
- H.M. Cotton and A. Yakobson, 'Arcanum Imperii: The Powers of Augustus', in G. Clark and T. Rajak (eds.), *Philosophy and Power in the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Miriam Griffin* (Oxford 2002), 193-209
- E. Courtney, 'Literacy, Learning, and Ruling', *Classical Journal* 91.3 (1996), 346-347.
- E. Cowan, 'Tiberius and Augustus in Tiberian Sources', *Historia* 58.4 (2009), 468-485.
- F.H. Cramer, 'Expulsion of Astrologers from Ancient Rome', *C&M* 12 (1951), 9-50.
- F.H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (Philadelphia 1954).
- M.H. Crawford, *The Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge 1974).
- J.A. Crook, *Consilium Principis: Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian* (Cambridge 1955).
- E. Csapo, *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theatre* (Chichester and Malden, MA 2010).
- C. Davenport, 'Cassius Dio and Caracalla', *CQ* 69.2 (2012), 796-815.
- C. Davenport, 'The Conduct of Vitellius in Cassius Dio's Roman History', *Historia* 63.1 (2014), 96-116.
- C. Davenport and C.T. Mallan, 'Hadrian's Adoption Speech in Cassius Dio's *Roman History* and the Problems of the Imperial Succession', *AJPh* 135.4 (2014), 637-668.
- C. Davenport and J. Manley (trans. and comm.), *Fronto. Selected Letters* (London 2014).
- S. Demougin, *Prosopographie des chevaliers romains julio-claudiens: (43 av. J.-C.-70 ap. J.-C.)* (Rome 1992).
- J.D. Denniston (rev. K.J. Dover), *The Greek Particles* (2nd Edn., Oxford 1954).
- M. Depauw, 'Do Mothers Matter?', in T.V. Evans and D. Obbink (edd.), *The Language of the Papyri* (Oxford 2010), 120-139.

- W. Desmond, 'Lessons of Fear: A Reading of Thucydides', *CPh* 101.4 (2006), 359-79.
- E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address. From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford 1996).
- E. Dickey, *Latin Forms of Address. From Plautus to Apuleius* (Oxford 2002).
- J. Diggle (ed. trans. and comm.), *Theophrastus. Characters* (Cambridge 2004).
- A. Diller, 'Notes on Greek Codices of the Tenth Century', *TAPA* 78 (1947), 184-188
- A. Diller, 'The Age of Some Early Greek Classical Manuscripts', in J.L. Heller and J.K. Newman (edd.), *Serta Turyniana. Studies in Greek Literature and Palaeography in Honor of Alexander Turyn* (Urbana 1974), 514-524.
- S. Dixon, *The Roman Mother* (London and Sydney 1988).
- E.R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety: Some Aspects of Religious Experience from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine* (Cambridge 1965).
- J.F. Donahue, *The Roman Community at Table During the Principate* (Ann Arbor 2004).
- K.J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford 1974).
- M.B. Dowling, *Clemency and Cruelty in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor 2006).
- G. Downey, 'Tiberiana', *ANRW* 2.2 (1975) 95-130.
- F.K. Drogula, 'Controlling Travel: Deportation, Islands and the Regulations of Senatorial Mobility in the Augustan Principate', *CQ* 61.1 (2011), 230-266.
- F.K. Drogula, 'Who was Watching Whom?: A Reassessment of the Conflict Between Germanicus and Piso', *AJPh* 136.1 (2015), 121-153.
- A. Drummond, 'M. Tullius Tiro', in T.J. Cornell, *et al.* (edd.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (Oxford 2013), 402-3.
- T. Duff, *Plutarch: Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford 1999).
- T. Duff, 'Models of Education in Plutarch', *JHS* 128 (2008), 1-26.
- T. Duff, 'The Structure of the Plutarchan Book', *Classical Antiquity* 30.2 (2011), 213-278.
- P. Dufraigne, *Aurelius Victor: Livre des Césars. Texte établi et traduit* (Paris 1975).
- K. Dürr, 'Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Dialexeis des Maximus von Tyrus', *Philologus* Supp. 8 (1899), 1-156.

- F. Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy* (Washington 1966).
- W. Eck, 'Senatorial Self-Representation: Developments in the Augustan Period', in F.G.B. Millar and E. Segal (edd.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford 1984), 129-167.
- W. Eck, 'Marcius Hortalus, nobilis iuvenis, und seine Söhne', *ZPE* 95 (1993), 251-260.
- W. Eck, 'The Emperor and His Advisors', in A.K Bowman, *et al.* (edd.), *Cambridge Ancient History XI: The High Empire A.D. 70-192*, (Cambridge 2000), 195-213.
- W. Eck, 'Drusus II.1', *BNP* (Brill Online 2006).
- W. Eck, 'Scribonius II.6', *BNP* (Brill Online 2006).
- J. Edmondson, *Dio: The Julio-Claudians. Selections from Books 58-63 of the Roman History of Cassius Dio*. LACTOR 15 (London 1992).
- J. Edmondson, 'Dynamic Arenas: Gladiatorial Presentations in the City of Rome and the Construction of Roman Society during the Early Empire', in W.J. Slater (ed.), *Roman Theatre and Society: E. Togo Salmon Papers I* (Ann Arbor 1996), 69-112.
- J. Edmondson, 'Public Spectacles and Roman Social Relations', in *Ludi Romani: espectáculos en Hispania Romana* (Mérida 2002), 43-63.
- J. Edmondson, 'Public Dress and Social Control at Rome', in J. Edmondson and A. Keith (edd.), *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture. Phoenix Supplementary Vol. 46* (Toronto 2008), 21-46.
- V. Ehrenburg and A.H.M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (2nd Edn., Oxford 1955).
- M. Elefante, (ed. and comm.) *Velleius Paterculus ad M. Vinicium consulem libri duo* (Hildesheim 1997).
- R.C.K. Ensor, *England: 1870-1914* (Oxford 1937).
- J.J. Farber, 'The Cyropaedia and Hellenistic Kingship', *AJPh* 100.4 (1979), 497-514.
- J-L. Ferrary, (trans. J. Edmondson), 'The Powers of Augustus', in J. Edmondsdson (ed.), *Augustus* (Edinburgh 2009), 90-136.
- D. Fishwick, *The Roman Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire* (Leiden 1987)
- D. Fishwick, 'Dio and Maecenas: The Emperor and the Ruler Cult', *Phoenix* 44.3 (1990a), 267-275.

- D. Fishwick, 'Votive Offerings to the Emperor?', *ZPE* 80 (1990b), 121-130.
- D. Fishwick, 'On the Temple of Divus "Augustus"', *Phoenix* 46.3 (1992), 232-55.
- D. Flach, 'Dios Platz in der kaiserzeitlichen Geschichtsschreibung', *A&A* 18 (1973), 130-43.
- M.B. Flory, 'Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome', *TAPA* 123 (1993), 287-308.
- H.I. Flower, 'Piso in Chicago', *AJPh* 120.1 (1999), 98-115.
- L. Foubert, 'The Impact of Women's Travels on Military Imagery in the Julio-Claudian Period', in O. Hekster and T. Kaiser (edd.), *Frontiers in the Roman World. Proceedings of the Ninth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Durham, 16-19 April 2009)* (Leiden 2011), 349-361.
- R.M. Frakes, *Compiling the Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum in Late Antiquity* (Oxford 2012).
- M-L. Freyburger-Galland, *Aspects du vocabulaire politique et institutionnel de Dion Cassius* (Paris 1997).
- M-L. Freyburger-Galland, 'Les rêves chez Dion Cassius', *REA* 101.3-4 (1999), 533-545.
- M-L. Freyburger-Galland, 'L'établissement du texte des livres 41 & 42', in M.-L. Freyburger-Galland, et al. (edd. and trans) *Dion Cassius Histoire Romaine Livres 41 & 42* (Paris, 2002).
- M-L. Freyburger-Galland, 'Dion Cassius et Suétone', in Dubuisson, M. and Poignault, R. (edd.), *Présence de Suétone : actes du colloque tenu à Clermont-Ferrand, 25-27 novembre 2004 : à Michel Dubuisson in memoriam* (Tours 2009), 147-162.
- L. Fulkerson, *No Regrets: Remorse in Classical antiquity* (Oxford 2013).
- H. Furneaux (ed. and comm.), *P. Cornelii Taciti Annalium ab excess divi Augusti libri. The Annals of Tacitus, Volume 1, Books I-VI* (2nd Edn., Oxford 1896).
- E. Gabba, 'The Historians and Augustus', in F.G.B. Millar and E. Segal (edd.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford 1984), 61-88.
- H. Galsterer, 'The Administration of Justice', in A.K. Bowman, et al. (edd.) *The Cambridge Ancient History X: The Augustan Empire, 43 BC – AD 69* (Cambridge 1996), 397-413.
- S. Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots of 38 CE and the Persecution of the Jews: a Historical Reconstruction* (Leiden 2009).

- T. Gärtner, 'Libo als Exempel für einen wohlüberlegten Selbstmord', *Klio* 92.2 (2010), 411-420.
- M. Gelzer, 'Iulius 154', *RE* 10.1 (1917), cols. 478-536.
- B. Gentili and G. Cerri, *History and Biography in Ancient Thought* (Amsterdam 1988).
- H. Gesche, 'Die Datierung der 8. imperatorischen Akklamation des Tiberius', *Chiron* 2 (1972), 339-348.
- C. Gill, 'The Question of Character Development: Plutarch and Tacitus', *CQ* N.S. 33.2 (1983), 468-487.
- C. Gill, *The Structured Self in Hellenistic and Roman Thought* (Oxford 2006).
- J. Ginsburg, *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus* (Salem 1981).
- C. Gizewski, 'Acta', *BNP* (Brill Online 2006).
- B. Gladhill, 'The Emperor's No Clothes: Suetonius and the Dynamics of Corporeal Ecphrasis', *Classical Antiquity* 31.2 (2012), 315-348.
- M. Gleason, 'Identity Theft: Doubles and Masquerades in Dio's Contemporary History', *ClAnt* 30.1 (2011), 33-86.
- A.W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, Volume 2* (Oxford 1956).
- F.R.D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus Books 1-6, Volume I: Annals 1-1.54* (Cambridge 1972).
- F.R.D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus Books 1-6, Volume II: Annals 1.55-81 and Annals 2* (Cambridge 1981).
- R. Gordon, 'The Veil of Power: Emperors, sacrificers and benefactors', in M. Beard and J. North (edd.), *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World* (London 1990), 201-234.
- A.M. Gowing, 'Dio's Name', *CPh* 85.1 (1990), 49-54.
- I. Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion* (Oxford 2002).
- A.J. Graham, 'The Limitations of Prosopography in Roman Imperial History (with Special Reference to the Severan Period)', *ANRW* 2.1 (1974), 136-157.
- M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas: A Historical Study of the Aes Coinage in the Roman Empire 49 B.C. – A.D. 14* (Cambridge 1946).

- M. Grant, *Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius: Historical Comments on the Colonial Coinage Issued Outside Spain* (New York 1950).
- E.W. Gray, 'The Imperium of Marcus Agrippa', *ZPE* 6 (1970), 227-238.
- S.J. Green, *Ovid, Fasti I: A Commentary* (Leiden 2004).
- M.T. Griffin, *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford 1976).
- M.T. Griffin 'Philosophy, Politics, and Politicians at Rome', in M. Griffin and J. Barnes, *Philosophia Togata* (Oxford 1989), 1-37.
- M.T. Griffin, *Seneca on Society: A Guide to De Beneficiis* (Oxford 2013).
- E.S. Gruen, 'Augustus and the Making of the Principate', in K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* (Cambridge 2005), 33-51.
- E. Gunderson, 'The Ideology of the Arena', *ClAnt* 15.1 (1996), 113-151.
- W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy, Volume III The Fifth Century Enlightenment* (Cambridge 1969).
- W.E. Gwatkin, *Cappadocia as a Roman Procuratorial Province* (Columbia 1930).
- S. Halliwell, 'Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character', in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), *Characterisation and Individuality in Greek Literature* (Oxford 1990), 32-59.
- M. Hammond, 'Imperial Elements in the Formula of the Roman Emperors during the First Two and a Half Centuries of the Empire', *MAAR* 25 (1957), 19-64.
- N. Hanel, 'Military Camps, Canabae, and Vici. The Archaeological Evidence', in P. Erdkamp, *A Companion to the Roman Army* (Malden, MA 2007), 395-416.
- E.G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, (London 1906).
- E.G. Hardy, 'Lectio Senatus and Census under Augustus', *CQ* 13.1 (1919), 43-49.
- J.D. Harrington, *Cassius Dio: A Re-examination* (Ann Arbor 1971) [PhD Thesis, University of Kentucky].
- M. Harris, *Sacred Folly: A New History of the Feast of Fools* (Ithaca 2011).
- W.V. Harris, 'Roman Opinions about the Truthfulness of Dreams', *JRS* 93 (2003), 18-34.
- J. Harrison, *Dreams and Dreaming in the Roman Empire* (London 2013).
- W.M. Hayes, 'Tiberius and the Future', *CJ* 55.1 (1959), 2-8.
- H. Haynes, *The History of Make Believe. Tacitus on Imperial Rome* (Berkeley 2003)

- C. Head, 'Physical Descriptions of the Emperors in Byzantine Historical Writing', *Byzantion* 50 (1980), 226-240.
- J. Heinrichs, 'Ubier im *Oppidum Ubiorum*', *Kölner Jahrbuch* 43 (2010), 315-331.
- W. Helbig, 'Die Castores, als Schutzgötter des römischen Equitatus', *Hermes* 40.1 (1905), 101-115.
- G. Herbert-Brown, 'C. Asinius Gallus, Ti. Claudius Nero and a Posthumous Agrippa in Ephesus (ILS 8897)', *Syllecta Classica* 15 (2004), 131-151.
- J. Herrman, *Hyperides. Funeral Oration* (New York and Oxford, 2009).
- P. Herz, 'Finances and Costs of the Roman Army', in P. Erdkamp (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Army* (Malden, MA 2007), 306-322.
- E. Hohl, 'Wann hat Tiberius das Prinzipat übernommen?', *Hermes* 68.1 (1933), 106-115.
- C. Holleran, *Shopping in Ancient Rome: The Retail Trade in the Late Republic and the Principate* (Oxford 2012).
- C.A. Holtzhauser, *An Epigraphic Commentary on Suetonius' Life of Tiberius* (Philadelphia 1918) [PhD Dissertation, Pennsylvania].
- T. Honoré, *Emperors and Lawyers* (2nd Edn., Oxford 1994).
- T. Honoré, *Ulpian: Pioneer of Human Rights* (2nd Edn., Oxford 2002).
- K. Hopkins, *Death and Renewal* (Cambridge 1983).
- S. Hornblower, 'Narratology and Narrative Techniques in Thucydides', in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford 1994), 131-166.
- S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides, Volume 3* (Oxford 2008).
- N. Horsfall, 'Doctus Sermones Utriusque Linguae?', *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical News and Views* 23.3 (1979), 79-95.
- P.M. van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus: The First Pogrom. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Leiden 2003).
- M. Hose, (trans. M. Beck), 'Cassius Dio: A Senator and Historian in the Age of Anxiety', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden, MA 2007), 2.461-467.
- E.D. Huntsman, 'Livia Before Octavian', *AncSoc* 39 (2009), 121-169.

- D.W. Hurley, 'Gaius Caligula and the Germanicus Tradition', *AJPh* 110.2 (1989), 316-338.
- D.W. Hurley, 'Suetonius' Rubric Sandwich', in T. Power and R. Gibson (edd.), *Suetonius the Biographer: Studies in Roman Lives* (Oxford 2014), 21-37.
- J. Irigoin, 'Centres de copie et bibliothèques', in *Byzantine Books and Bookmen. A Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium* (Washington, 1975), 17-27
- A. Jacobson and H.M. Cotton, 'Caligula's *recusatio imperii*', *Historia* 34.4 (1985), 497-503.
- D.M. Jacobson, 'Three Roman Client Kings: Herod of Judaea, Archelaus of Cappadocia and Juba of Mauretania', *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 133 (2001), 22-38.
- H. Jaeger, *De Cassii Dionis librorum 57. et 58. fontibus* (Berlin 1910) [Dissertation Berlin].
- T.E. Jenkins, 'Livia the Princeps: Gender and Ideology in the *Consolatio ad Liviam*', *Helios* 36.1 (2009), 1-25.
- W.A. Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities* (Oxford 2010).
- A.H.M. Jones, 'The Imperium of Augustus', *JRS* 41 (1951), 112-119.
- A.H.M. Jones, 'Imperial and Senatorial Jurisdiction in the Early Principate', *Historia* 3.4 (1955), 464-488.
- A.H.M. Jones, *Studies in Roman Government and Law* (Oxford 1960).
- A.H.M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Empire* (2nd Edn., Oxford 1971).
- C.P. Jones, 'Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works', *JHS* 56 (1966), 61-74
- C.P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford 1971).
- C.P. Jones, 'Aelius Aristides, ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ', *JRS* 62 (1972), 134-152.
- A. Jördens, 'Government, Taxation, and Law', in C. Riggs (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2012), 56-67.
- E.J. Jory, 'The Early Pantomime Riots', in A. Moffatt (ed.), *Maistor. Classical, Byzantine and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning* (Canberra 1984), 57-66.
- J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Helsinki 1979).

- G. Kampff, 'Three Senate Meetings in the Early Principate', *Phoenix* 17 (1963), 25-58.
- R. Kannicht and B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. 2 (Göttingen 1981).
- R.A. Kaster, *Studies on the Text of Suetonius De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* (Atlanta 1992).
- R.A. Kaster (ed.), *C. Suetonius Tranquillus. De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* (Oxford 1995).
- R.A. Kaster, *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome* (Oxford 2005).
- B.J. Kavanagh, 'The Conspirator Aemilius Regulus and Seneca's Aunt's Family', *Historia* 50.3 (2001), 379-384.
- R. Kearsley, 'Triumviral Politics, The Oath of 32 B.C. and The Veterans', *CQ* 63.2 (2013), 828-834.
- A. Keaveney and J.A. Madden, 'The Crimen Maiestatis under Caligula: The Evidence of Dio Cassius', *CQ* 48.1 (1998), 316-320.
- A.M. Kemezis, 'Commemoration of the Antonine Aristocracy in Cassius Dio and the Historia Augusta', *CQ* 69.1 (2012), 387-414.
- A.M. Kemezis, *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus, and Herodian* (Cambridge 2014).
- L. Keppie, *The Making of the Roman Army: from Republic to Empire* (London 1984).
- L. Keppie, 'The Praetorian Guard Before Sejanus', *Athenaeum* 84 (1996), 101-124.
- L. Keppie, 'The Changing Face of the Roman Legions (49 B.C. – A.D. 69)', *PBSR* 65 (1997), 89-102.
- L. Keppie, *Legions and Veterans: Roman Army Papers 1971-2000* (Stuttgart 2000).
- L. Keppie, "'Having Been a Soldier": The Commemoration of Military Service on Funerary Monuments of the Early Roman Empire', in J.J. Wilkes (ed.), *Documenting the Roman Army: Essays in Honour of Margaret Roxan*, *BICS Supplement* 81 (London 2003).
- G. Kessler, *Die Tradition über Germanicus* (Berlin 1905) [Dissertation Leipzig].
- I.G. Kidd, *Posidonius. Volume II. The Commentary: (i) Testimonia and Fragments 1-149* (Cambridge 1988).
- M. Kiernan (ed.), *Sir Francis Bacon. The essayes or counsels, civill and morall* (Oxford 2000).

- L. Koenen, 'Die "laudatio funebris" des Augustus für Agrippa', *ZPE* 5 (1970), 217-283.
- E. Koestermann, 'Die Majestätsprozesse unter Tiberius', *Historia* 4.1 (1955), 72-106.
- E. Koestermann, *Tacitus Annalen: Band I, Buch 1-3* (Heidelberg 1963).
- D. Konstan, 'Clemency as a Virtue', *CPh.* 100.4 (2005), 337-346.
- D. Konstan, 'The Two faces of Parrhêsia: Free Speech and Self-Expression in Ancient Greece', *Antichthon* 46 (2012), 1-13.
- E. Kornemann, *Tiberius* (Stuttgart 1960).
- B. Kuhn-Chen, *Geschichtskonzeptionen griechischer Historiker im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.: Untersuchungen zu den Werken von Appian, Cassius Dio und Herodian* (Frankfurt 2002).
- W.K. Lacey, 'Summi Fastigii Vocabulum: The Story of a Title', *JRS* 69 (1979), 28-34.
- W.K. Lacey, *Augustus and the Principate* (Leeds 1996).
- C. Laes and J.H.M. Strubbe, *Youth in the Roman Empire: The Young and Restless Years* (Cambridge 2014).
- A. Lang, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kaisers Tiberius* (Jena 1911) [Dissertation Jena].
- D.M. Lang, 'Iran, Armenia and Georgia', in E. Yarshater (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran, Volume 3.1 The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods* (Cambridge 1983), 505-536.
- R. Langlands, *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge 2006).
- R. Laurence and J. Paterson, 'Power and Laughter: Imperial Dicta', *PBSR* 67 (1999), 183-197.
- M. Lavan, 'Florus and Dio on the Enslavement of the Provinces', *CCJ* 59 (2013), 125-151.
- W.D. Lebek, 'Augustalspiele und Landestruer (Tab. Siar. Frg. II Col. A 11-14)', *ZPE* 75 (1988), 59-71.
- P. Lemerle (trans. H. Lindsay and A. Moffatt), *Byzantine Humanism: The First Phase. Notes and Remarks on Education and Culture in Byzantium from its Origins to the 10th Century* (Canberra 1986).

- J.E. Lendon, *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Roman World* (Oxford 1997).
- P.M. Leunissen, *Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander (180 – 235 n. Chr.): Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Elite im römischen Kaiserreich* (Amsterdam 1989).
- D.S. Levene, 'Pity, Fear and the Historical Audience: Tacitus on the Fall of Vitellius', in S.M. Braund and C. Gill (edd.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature* (Cambridge 1997), 128-149.
- B.M. Levick, 'Drusus Caesar and the Adoptions of A.D. 4', *Latomus* 25 (1966), 227-244.
- B.M. Levick, 'The Beginning of Tiberius' Career', *CQ* 21.2 (1971), 478-486.
- B.M. Levick, 'Tiberius' Retirement to Rhodes in 6 B.C.', *Latomus* 31 (1972), 779-813.
- B.M. Levick, 'Julians and Claudians', *G&R* 22.1 (1975a), 29-38.
- B.M. Levick, 'Mercy and Moderation on the Coinage of Tiberius', in B.M. Levick (ed.), *The Ancient Historian and His Materials: Essays in honour of C.E. Stevens on his seventieth birthday* (Farnborough 1975b), 123-137.
- B.M. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician* (London 1976 [Revised Edn. 1999]).
- B.M. Levick, 'The Senatus Consultum from Larinum', *JRS* 73 (1983), 97-115.
- B.M. Levick, *Julia Domna: Syrian Empress* (London 2007).
- B.M. Levick, 'Aufidius Bassus', in T.J. Cornell, *et al.* (edd.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (Oxford 2013), 1.518-521.
- B.M. Levick, *Faustina I and II: Imperial Women of the Golden Age* (Oxford 2014).
- B.M. Levick and T.J. Cornell, 'Marius Maximus', in T.J. Cornell, *et al.* (edd.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (Oxford 2013), 1.602-611.
- J.D. Lewis, 'Primum Facinus Novi Principatus?', in B.F. Harris (ed.), *Auckland Classical Essays: Essays Presented to E.M. Blaiklock* (Auckland 1970).
- J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, 'The Settlement of 27 B.C.', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IV* (Brussels 1986), 345-365.
- J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, 'Religion', in A.K. Bowman, *et al.* (edd.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*². Volume XI, *The High Empire AD 70-192* (Cambridge 2000), 984-1008.
- H. Lindsay, (ed. and comm.), *Suetonius: Tiberius* (London 1995).

- A. Lintott, (trans. and comm.) *Plutarch: Demosthenes and Cicero* (Oxford 2013).
- A. Lintott, 'Equites Romani', *BNP* (Brill Online 2006).
- J.A. Lobur, *Consensus, Concordia, and the Formation of Roman Imperial Ideology* (London 2008).
- A. Lonardi, *La cura riparum et alvei Tiberis. Storiografia, prosopografia e fonti epigrafiche*. BAR International Series 2464 (Oxford 2013).
- A.A. Long, 'Timon of Phlius: Pyrrhonist and Satirist', *PCPS* N.S. 24 (1978), 68-91.
- J. Lott, *Death and Dynasty in Early Imperial Rome: Key Sources, with Text, Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge 2012).
- D. McFayden, *The History of the Title Imperator* (Chicago 1920) [PhD Dissertation, University of Chicago]
- R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1967).
- D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950).
- C.T. Mallan, 'The Style, Method, and Programme of Xiphilinus' *Epitome* of Cassius Dio's *Roman History*', *GRBS* 53.3 (2013), 610-644.
- C.T. Mallan, 'The Rape of Lucretia in Cassius Dio's *Roman History*', *CQ* 64.2 (2014), 758-771.
- S.J.V. Malloch, 'The End of the Rhine Mutiny in Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio', *CQ* 54.1 (2004), 198-210.
- B. Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus* (Wiesbaden 1979).
- G. Marañón, *Tiberius Caesar: A Study in Resentment* (London 1956).
- S. Mariev, *Ioannis Antiocheni fragmenta quae supersunt omnia* (Berlin and New York 2008).
- J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge 1997).
- F.B. Marsh, 'Tacitus and the Aristocratic Tradition', *CPh.* 21.4 (1926), 289-310.
- F.B. Marsh, *The Reign of Tiberius* (Oxford 1931).
- R.H. Martin, *Tacitus* (London 1981).
- R.H. Martin, *Tacitus Annals V & VI* (Warminster 2001).
- F.A. Marx, 'Aufidius Bassus', *Klio* 29 (1936), 94-101.

- H.J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: a lexicon and analysis* (Toronto 1974).
- J.F. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, A.D. 364-425* (Oxford 1975).
- J.F. Matthews, *Roman Perspectives. Studies in the social, political and cultural history of the First to Fifth Centuries* (Swansea 2010).
- C.M. Mazzucchi, 'Alcune vicende della tradizione di Cassio Dione in epoca bizantina', *Aevum* 53.1 (1979), 94-139.
- M. Meckler, 'Caracalla's Sense of Humor and Cassius Dio's Latinity', in G. Bonamente and M. Mayer, *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Barcinonense* (Bari 2005), 221-231.
- F.G.B. Millar, 'The Early Principate', *CR* 13.3 (1963), 327-329.
- F.G.B. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford 1964).
- F.G.B. Millar, 'The Imperial Cult and the Persecutions', in W. den Boer and E. Bickerman (edd.), *Le culte des souverains dans l'Empire Romain*, (Geneva 1972), 143-175.
- F.G.B. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London 1977).
- F.G.B. Millar, 'Senatorial Provinces: An Institutionalized Ghost', *Anc.W* 20 (1989), 93-97.
- F.G.B. Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Roman Republic* (Ann Arbor, 1998).
- K. Milnor, *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing the Private Life* (Oxford 2005).
- E. Mioni and M. Formentin (edd.), *I codici greci in minuscola: dei sec. IX e X della Biblioteca nazionale marciana* (Padua 1975)
- S. Mitchell, 'Imperial Buildings in the Eastern Roman Provinces', *HSCP* 91 (1987), 333-365.
- T.B. Mitford, 'A Cypriot Oath of Allegiance to Tiberius', *JRS* 50 (1960), 75-79.
- T.B. Mitford, 'Cappadocia and Armenia Minor', *ANRW* 2.7.2 (1980), 1169-1228.
- M. Molin, 'Préfets et préfecture du prétoire dans l'Histoire romaine de Dion Cassius', *CCG* 18.1 (2007), 199-216.
- A. Momigliano, 'Review: Benjamin Farrington, Science and Politics in the Ancient World', *JRS* 31 (1941), 149-157.

- T. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* (3rd Edn., Leipzig 1887).
- T. Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht* (Leipzig 1899).
- O. Montevecchi, 'Problem di datazione: Tiberio', *YCS* 28 (1985), 267-272.
- L. Morgan, 'The Autopsy of C. Asinius Pollio', *JRS* 90 (2000), 51-69.
- T. Morgan, *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge 2007).
- M.J. Moscovich, 'Historical Compression in Cassius Dio's Account of the Second Century B.C.', *AW* 8.3-4 (1983), 137-143.
- A. Móscy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia* (London 1974).
- F. Münzer, 'Claudius' *RE* 3 (1899), cols. 2662-2667.
- F. Münzer, 'Cornelius 202', *RE* 4 (1901), cols. 1374-5.
- C.L. Murison, *Rebellion and Reconstruction: Galba to Domitian. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 64-67 (A.D. 68-96)*, (Atlanta 1999).
- K. Muse, 'Fleecing Remus' Magnanimous Playboys: Wordplay in Catullus 58.5', *Hermes* 137.3 (2009), 302-313.
- W.L. Newman, *The Politics of Aristotle*, (Oxford 1887-1902).
- R.F. Newbold, 'Social Tension at Rome in the Early Years of Tiberius' Reign', *Athenaeum* 52 (1974), 110-143.
- R.F. Newbold, 'Cassius Dio and the Games', *L'antiquité classique* 45 (1975), 589-604.
- C. Nicolet, 'Augustus, Government, and the Propertied Classes', in F.G.B. Millar and E. Segal (edd.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford 1984), 89-128.
- B.G. Niebuhr, (trans. H.M. Chepmell and F. Demmler), *Niebuhr's Lectures on Roman History* (London 1875).
- C.E.V. Nixon and B.S. Rogers, *In Praise of the Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini* (Berkeley 1994).
- C.F. Noreña, *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power* (Cambridge 2011).
- J. Ober, 'Tiberius and the Political Testament of Augustus', *Historia* 31.2 (1982), 306-328.

- D. Ogden, 'Magic in the Severan Period', in S. Swain, S. Harrison, and J. Elsner (eds.), *Severan Culture* (Cambridge 2007), 458-469.
- J.H. Oliver, *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri* (Philadelphia 1989).
- W. Orth, 'Zur Fabricius-Tusculum-Inschrift aus Alexandria/Troas', *ZPE* 28 (1978), 57-60.
- H.D.M. Parker, *The Roman Legions* (Cambridge 1958).
- P.J. Parsons and H. Lloyd-Jones, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin 1983).
- J. Paterson, 'Friends in High Places: The Creation of the Court of the Roman Emperor', in A.J.S. Spawforth (ed.), *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies* (Cambridge 2007), 121-156.
- H.F. Pelham, *Essays on Roman History* (Oxford 1911).
- C.B.R. Pelling, 'Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives', *JHS* 99 (1979), 74-96.
- C.B.R. Pelling, 'Cassius Dio', *CR* 32.2 (1982), 146-148.
- C.B.R. Pelling, 'Manuwald, Cassius Dio und Augustus', *Gnomon* 55.3 (1983), 221-226.
- C.B.R. Pelling, *Plutarch: Life of Antony* (Cambridge 1988).
- C.B.R. Pelling, 'Plutarch: Roman Heroes and Greek Culture', in M. Griffin and J. Barnes, *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society* (Oxford 1989), 199-232.
- C.B.R. Pelling, 'Plutarch and Roman Politics', in B. Scardigli (ed.) *Essays on Plutarch's Lives* (Oxford 1995), 319-356 [= C.B.R. Pelling, 'Plutarch and Roman Politics', in I.S. Moxon, et al. (eds), *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing* (Cambridge 1986), 159-187].
- C.B.R. Pelling, 'Tacitus and Germanicus' in T.J. Luce and A.J. Woodman (eds.), *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition* (Princeton 1993), 59-85.
- C. Pelling, 'Biographical History? Cassius Dio on the Early Principate', in M.J. Edwards and S. Swain (edd.), *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1997a), 117-144.
- C. Pelling, 'Tragical Dreamer: Some Dreams in the Roman Historians', *G&R* 44.2 (1997b), 197-213.
- C. Pelling, *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* (Swansea 2002).

- C. Pelling, 'Breaking the Bounds: Writing about Julius Caesar', in B. McGing and J. Mossman (edd.), *The Limits of Ancient Biography* (Swansea 2006).
- C. Pelling, 'The Spur of Fame: Annals 4.37-8', in C.S. Kraus, J. Marincola, and C. Pelling (edd.), *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A.J. Woodman* (Oxford 2010), 364-385.
- C. Pelling, *Plutarch. Caesar. Translated with an Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford 2011).
- A. Pettinger, *The Republic in Danger. Drusus Libo and the Succession of Tiberius* (Oxford 2012).
- R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968).
- H.G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* (Paris 1960-1).
- P. Plass, *Wit and the Writing of History* (Madison 1988).
- M. Platnauer, *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris* (Oxford 1938).
- S.B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Oxford 1929).
- B. Poulsen, 'The Dioscuri and Ruler Ideology', *SO* 66 (1991), 119-146.
- T.J. Power, 'Claudius' Homeric Quotation', *Latomus* 70.3 (2011), 727-731.
- T. Power, 'Pyrrhus, Priam in Suetonius' *Tiberius*', *CQ* 62.1 (2012), 430-33.
- T. Power, 'Introduction: The Originality of Suetonius', in T. Power and R. Gibson (edd.), *Suetonius the Biographer: Studies in Roman Lives* (Oxford 2014), 1-18.
- S.R.F. Price, 'Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult', *JRS* 70 (1980), 28-43.
- S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984).
- S.R.F. Price, 'The Place of Religion: Rome in the Early Empire', in A.K. Bowman, et al. (edd.), *The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume X, The Augustan Empire 43 BC – AD 69* (Cambridge 1996), 812-847.
- N. Purcell, 'Livia and the Womanhood of Rome', *PCPS* N.S. 32 (1986), 78-105.
- C. Questa 'Tecnica biografica e tecnica annalistica nei libri LIII-LXIII di Cassio Dione,' *Studi Urbinati* 31.1-2 (1957), 37-53.

- J. Radicke, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Continued. IV A: Biography Fascicle 7 Imperial and Undated Authors* (Leiden 1999).
- A.M. Ramsay, 'The Speed of the Roman Imperial Post', *JRS* 15 (1925), 60-74.
- T.T. Rapke, 'Tiberius, Piso, and Germanicus', *AClass* 25 (1982), 61-69.
- J. Rea, 'Business Letter', in J. Rea (ed.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LV* (London 1988), 177-187.
- W.J. Rees, *Cassius Dio, human nature and the late Roman Republic* (2011) [DPhil Dissertation, Oxford].
- M. Reinhold, *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 49-52 (36-29 BC)* (Atlanta 1988).
- P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981).
- T. Rice Holmes, *The Architect of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1928).
- J.W. Rich, 'Dio and Augustus', in A. Cameron (ed.), *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History* (London 1989), 86-110.
- J.W. Rich, *Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement (Roman History 53-55.9)*, (Warminster 1990).
- J.W. Rich, 'Deception, Lies, and Economy with the Truth: Augustus and the Establishment of the Principate,' in A. Turner, K.O. Chong-Gossard, and F. Vervaeke (edd.), *Private and Public Lies: The Discourse of Despotism and Deceit in the Graeco-Roman World* (Leiden 2010), 167-191.
- J.W. Rich, 'Cornelius Valerianus', in T.J. Cornell, et al. (edd.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (Oxford 2013), 1.637-638.
- J.W. Rich and J.H.C. Williams, 'Leges et Iura P.R. Restituit: A New Aureus of Octavian and the Settlement of 28-27 B.C.', *NC* 159 (1999), 169-213.
- J.S. Richardson, 'The Senate, the Courts, and the SC de Cn. Pisone Patre', *CQ* 47.2 (1997), 510-518.
- P. Ripat, 'Expelling Misconceptions: Astrologers at Rome', *CPh* 102.2 (2011), 115-154.
- J.B. Rives, 'Magicians and Astrologers', in M. Peachin (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Roman Social Relations* (Oxford 2011), 679-692.
- U. Roberto, *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia Chronica* (Berlin 2005).
- U. Roberto, 'Byzantine Collections of Late Antique Authors: Some Remarks on the Excerpta historica Constantiniana', in M. Wallraff and L. Mecella (edd.),

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur: Die Kestoi des Julius Africanus und ihre Überlieferung (Berlin 2009), 71-84.

G. Rodenwaldt, 'Skimpous' *RE* 3 A1 (1927), cols. 527-529.

R.S. Rogers, 'The Date of the Banishment of the Astrologers', *CPh* 26.2 (1931), 203-204.

R.S. Rogers, *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius* (Middletown, Connecticut 1935).

R.S. Rogers, *Studies in the Reign of Tiberius: Some Imperial Virtues of Tiberius and Drusus Julius Caesar* (Baltimore 1943).

D.S. Rohrbacher, 'Physiognomics in Imperial Latin Biography', *ClAnt* 29.1 (2010), 92-116.

M. Roller, *Constructing Autocracy: Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome* (Princeton 2001).

F.E. Romer, 'A Case of Client Kingship', *AJPh* 106.1 (1985), 75-100.

T. Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford 1997).

P.A. Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature* (Cambridge 2001).

D.O. Ross, 'The Tacitean Germanicus', *YCS* 23 (1973), 209-227.

J. Rougé, Ο ΘΕΙΟΤΑΤΟΣ ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΟΣ, *RPh*. 43.1 (1969), 83-92.

C. Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices: Divine Ideology and the Visualisation of Imperial Power in the Severan Period* (Cambridge 2012).

G. Rowe, *Princes and Political Cultures: The New Tiberian Senatorial Decrees* (Ann Arbor 2002).

G. Rowe, 'Reconsidering the Auctoritas of Augustus', *JRS* 103 (2013), 1-15.

R.J. Rowland, 'Sallust's Wife', *CW* 62.4 (1968), 134.

M. Roxan and W. Eck, 'A Military Diploma of AD 85 for the Rome Cohorts' *ZPE* 96 (1993), 67-74.

J. Rüpke, (trans. and ed. R. Gordon) *Religion of the Romans* (Cambridge and Malden, MA 2007).

L.W. Rutland, 'The Tacitean Germanicus: Suggestions for a Re-Evaluation', *RhM* 130.2 (1987), 153-164.

- S.H. Rutledge, 'Tiberius' Philhellenism', *CW* 101.4 (2008) 453-467.
- F.X. Ryan, *Rank and Participation in the Republican Senate* (Stuttgart 1998).
- M.M. Sage, 'Tacitus and the Accession of Tiberius', *AncSoc* 13/14 (1982/3), 293-321.
- M.M. Sage, 'Tacitus' Historical Works: A Survey and Appraisal', *ANRW* 33.2 (1990), 851-1030.
- R. Saller, 'Anecdotes as Historical Evidence for the Principate', *G&R* 27.1 (1980), 69-83.
- O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namengebung* (Helsinki 1987).
- O. Salomies, 'Polyonymous Nomenclature in Consular Dating', *Arctos* 39 (2005), 103-135, at 108-9.
- B. Salway, 'What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700', *JRS* 84 (1994), 124-145.
- J. Scheid, 'Scribonia Caesaris et les Julio-Claudiens. Problèmes de vocabulaire de parenté', *MEFRA* 87.1 (1975), 349-375.
- M.T. Schettino, 'Perdono e "clementia principis" nello stoicismo del II secolo', in M. Sordi (ed.), *Responsabilità, perdono e vendetta nel mondo antico* (Milan 1998) 209-238.
- W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern: von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus* (Stuttgart 1887-97).
- M.G. Schmidt, 'Anekdotisches in Cassius Dios Zeitgeschichte', *MH* 57.1 (2000), 20-35.
- H.H. Schmitt, 'Der pannonische Augstand des Jahres 14 n. Chr. und der Regierungsantritt des Tiberius', *Historia* 7.3 (1958) 378-383.
- H. Schoonhoven (ed. and comm.), *The Pseudo-Ovidian Ad Liviam de Morte Drusi (Consolatio ad Liviam, Epicedium Drusi). A Critical Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Groningen 1992).
- P. Schrömbges, 'Zu den angeblichen Reichsteilungsplänen des Tiberius (Dio 57,2,4 F.)', *RhM* 135 (1992), 298-307.
- D.J. Schove, *Chronology of Eclipses and Comets AD 1-1000* (Woodbridge: 1984).
- E. Schwartz, 'Cassius 40', *RE* 3 (1899), 1684-1722.
- J. Schwartz, 'Préfets d'Egypte sous Tibère et Caligula', *ZPE* 48 (1982), 189-192.

- K. Scott, 'Drusus, nicknamed "Castor"', *CPh* 25.2 (1930), 155-161.
- K. Scott, 'Tiberius' Refusal of the Title "Augustus"', *Classical Philology* 27.1 (1932) 43-50.
- H.H. Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic* (London 1981).
- R. Seager, *Tiberius* (London 1972).
- R. Seager, *Tiberius* (2nd Edn., Malden and Oxford 2005).
- B. Severy, 'Family and State in the Early Imperial Monarchy: The Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre, Tabula Siarensis, and the Tabula Hebana', *CPh* 95.3 (2000), 318-337.
- M. Sharp, 'Shearing Sheep: Rome and the Collection of Taxes in Egypt, 30 BC – AD 200', in W. Eck and E. Müller-Luckner (edd.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1999), 213-241.
- A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford 1966).
- A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (2nd Edn., Oxford 1973).
- A.N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East, 168 B.C. to A.D. 1* (London 1984).
- D.C.A. Shotter, 'Tacitus, Tiberius and Germanicus', *Historia* 17.2 (1968), 194-214.
- D.C.A. Shotter, 'Tiberius and Asinius Gallus', *Historia* 20.4 (1971), 443-457.
- D.C.A. Shotter, 'The Trial of M. Scribonius Libo Drusus', *Historia* 21.1 (1972), 88-98.
- D.C.A. Shotter, 'Cnaeus Calpurnius Piso, Legate of Syria', *Historia* 23.2 (1974), 229-245.
- B. Simons, *Cassius Dio und die Römische Republik: Untersuchungen zum Bild des römischen Gemeinwesens in den Büchern 3-35 der Rhomaika* (Berlin 2009).
- W.J. Slater, 'Pantomime Riots', *Classical Antiquity* 13 (1994), 120-144.
- E.M. Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium: Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Leiden 1961).
- C.E. Smith, *Tiberius and the Roman Empire* (Baton Rouge 1942).
- R.E. Smith, *Service in the Post-Marian Roman Army* (Manchester 1958).

- W.F. Snyder, 'On Chronology in the Imperial Books of Cassius Dio's Roman History', *Klio* 33 (1940a), 39-56.
- W.F. Snyder, 'Public Anniversaries in the Roman Empire: The Epigraphical Evidence for their Observance During the First Three Centuries', *YCS* 7 (1940b), 225-317.
- M.A. Speidel, 'Roman Army Pay Scales', *JRS* 82 (1992), 87-106.
- P.A. Stadter, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles* (Chapel Hill 1989).
- P.A. Stadter, *Plutarch and his Roman Readers* (Oxford 2014a).
- P.A. Stadter, 'Plutarch's Compositional Technique: The Anecdote Collections and the *Parallel Lives*', *GRBS* 54.4 (2014b), 665-686.
- A. Stein, 'Drusus Castor', *Hermes* 53.2 (1918), 217-220.
- A. Stein, 'Iulius 59', *RE* 10.1 (1917) cols. 153-157.
- A.V. van Stekelenburg, 'Lucan and Cassius Dio as heirs to Livy: The Speech of Caesar at Placentia', *AClass.* 19 (1976), 43-57.
- S.A. Stertz, 'Pseudo-Aristides, ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ', *CQ* 29.1 (1979), 172-197.
- S.A. Stertz, 'Ammianus Marcellinus' Attitudes toward Earlier Emperors', in C. Deroux, *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II* (Brussels 1980), 487-514.
- T.R. Stevenson, 'The Ideal Benefactor and Father Analogy in Greek and Roman Thought', *CQ* 42.2 (1992), 421-436.
- T.R. Stevenson, 'Acceptance of the Title Pater Patriae in 2 BC', *Antichthon* 43 (2009), 97-108.
- T.R. Stevenson, 'The Succession Planning of Augustus', *Antichthon* 47 (2013), 118-139.
- D.R. Stuart, 'The Attitude of Dio Cassius toward Epigraphic Sources', in H.A. Sanders (ed.), *Roman Historical Sources and Institutions, University of Michigan Studies Humanistic Series Vol. 1* (New York and London 1904), 101-147.
- G.V. Sumner, 'The Truth About Velleius Paterculus: Prolegomena', *HSCP* 74 (1970), 257-297.
- R.D. Sullivan, 'The Dynasty of Cappadocia', *ANRW* 2.7.2 (1980), 1125-1168.
- R.D. Sullivan, *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome, 100-30BC* (Toronto 1990).

- J. Suolahti, 'Princeps Senatus', *Arctos* 7 (1972), 207-208.
- C.H.V. Sutherland, *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy: 31 BC – AD 68* (London 1951).
- S. Swain, 'Character Change in Plutarch', *Phoenix* 43.1 (1989), 62-68.
- S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World A.D. 50 – 250* (Oxford 1996).
- P.M. Swan, 'A Consular Epicurean under the Early Principate', *Phoenix* 30.1 (1976), 54-60.
- P.M. Swan, 'Cassius Dio on Augustus: A Poverty of Annalistic Sources?', *Phoenix* 41.3 (1987), 272-291.
- P.M. Swan, 'How Cassius Dio Composed his Augustan Books: Four Studies', *ANRW* 2.34.3 (1997), 2524-2557.
- P.M. Swan, *The Augustan Succession: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 55-56 (9 B.C. – A.D. 14)* (Oxford and New York 2004).
- R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939).
- R. Syme, 'Some Pisones in Tacitus', *JRS* 46 (1956), 17-21.
- R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958a).
- R. Syme, 'Imperator Caesar: A Study in Nomenclature', *Historia* 7.2 (1958b) 172-188.
- R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1968).
- R. Syme, *Ten Studies in Tacitus* (Oxford 1970).
- R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1971).
- R. Syme, 'How Tacitus Wrote Annals I-III', in W. Peremans (ed.), *Historiographia Antiqua. Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* (Leuven 1977), 231-263.
- R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford 1978a).
- R. Syme, 'Sallust's Wife', *CQ* N.S. 28.2 (1978b), 292-295.
- R. Syme, 'Some Imperial Salutations', *Phoenix* 33.4 (1979), 308-329.
- R. Syme, 'Biographers of the Caesars', *MH* 37.2 (1980), 104-128.

- R. Syme, 'Vibius Rufus and Vibius Rufinus', *ZPE* 43 (1981a), 365-376.
- R. Syme, 'The Early Tiberian Consuls', *Historia* 30.2 (1981b), 189-202.
- R. Syme, 'Governors Dying in Syria', *ZPE* 41 (1981c), 125-144.
- R. Syme, 'Tacitus: Some Sources of His Information', *JRS* 72 (1982), 68-82.
- R. Syme, 'The Year 33 in Tacitus and Dio', *Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 3-23.
- R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford 1986).
- R. Syme (ed. A.R. Birley), *Anatolica: Studies in Strabo* (Oxford 1995).
- R.J.A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton 1984).
- R.J.A. Talbert, 'Commodus as Diplomat in and Extract of the Acta Senatus', *ZPE* 71 (1988), 137-147.
- H. Tarrant, *Thrasyllan Platonism* (Ithica 1993).
- J.C. Tarver, *Tiberius the Tyrant* (Westminster 1902).
- J.H. Thiel, *Kaiser Tiberius: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis seiner Persönlichkeit* (Darmstadt 1970).
- D. Timpe, *Untersuchungen zur Kontinuität des frühen Prinzipats*. *Historia Einzelschriften* 5 (Wiesbaden 1962).
- L. du Toit, 'A Note on Tacitus, Annals 1.13.2-3', *AClass* 23 (1980), 128-129.
- L. du Toit, 'The Senatorial Debate on 17th September A.D. 14 and Drusus' Journey to Pannonia', *AClass* 23 (1980b), 130-133.
- E. Tóth, 'The Occupation of Pannonia', in Z. Visy (ed.) *The Roman Army in Pannonia* (Budapest 2003), 19-24.
- G.B. Townend, 'The Date of Composition of Suetonius' Caesares', *CQ* 9.2 (1959), 285-293.
- G.B. Townend, 'Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny', *Hermes* 89.2 (1961), 227-248.
- G.B. Townend, 'The Trial of Aemilia Lepida', *Latomus* 21.3 (1962), 484-493.
- M.B. Trapp, 'The 'Dialexis' of Maximus of Tyre', *ANRW* 2.34.3 (1997), 1945-1976.
- H.W. Traub, 'Tacitus' use of *ferocia*', *TAPA* 84 (1953), 250-261.
- W. Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians* (Basingstoke 2007).

- S. Treggiari, *Terentia, Tullia, and Publilia: The Women of Cicero's Family* (London 2007).
- H.R. Trevor-Roper, *The Last Days of Hitler* (London 1962).
- A. Turner, 'A Vergilian Anecdote in Suetonius and Dio', *CPh* 38.4 (1943), 261.
- F. Vervaet, 'Arrogating Despotic Power through Deceit: The Pompeian Model for Augustan *Dissimulatio*', in A. Turner, K.O. Chong-Gossard, and F. Vervaet (edd.), *Private and Public Lies: The Discourse of Despotism and Deceit in the Graeco-Roman World* (Leiden 2010), 133-166.
- M. Vesterinen, 'Some Notes on the Greek Terminology for Pantomime Dancers and on Athenaeus 1, 20d-e', *Arctos* 39 (2005), 199-206.
- P. Veyne, (trans. B. Pearce), *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism* (Harmondsworth 1990).
- G. Wagner, 'Inscriptions grecques du temple de Karnak (I)', *BIAO* 70 (1971), 1-38.
- B. Walker, *The Annals of Tacitus: A Study in the Writing of History* (Manchester 1952)
- F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford 1957-1979)
- G.H. Waldherr, *Erdbeben das aussergewöhnliche Normale* (Stuttgart 1997).
- S. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Princeton 1938).
- A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Civilis Princeps: Between Citizen and King', *JRS* 72 (1982), 32-48.
- A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Patronage in Roman Society' in A. Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London 1990), 63-87.
- A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius* (2nd Edn., London 1995).
- A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome's Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge 2008).
- D. Wardle, *Suetonius' Life of Caligula: A Commentary* (Bruxelles 1994)
- D. Wardle, 'The Heroism and Heroisation of Tiberius', in P. Defosse (ed.), *Hommages à Carl Deroux, II – Prose et linguistique, Médecine* (Bruxelles 2002), 433-440.
- D. Wardle (trans. and comm.), *Suetonius. Life of Augustus* (Oxford 2014).
- G.R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier* (London 1969).

- G.R. Watson, 'Conscription and Voluntary Enlistment in the Roman Army', *PACA* 16 (1982), 46-50.
- P. Weaver, 'Phaon, Freedman of Nero', *ZPE* 151 (2005), 243-252.
- E.J. Weinrib, 'The Family Connections of M. Livius Drusus Libo', *HSCP* 72 (1968a) 247-278.
- E.J. Weinrib, 'The Prosecution of Roman Magistrates', *Phoenix* 22.1 (1968b), 32-56.
- S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971).
- K. Wellesley, 'The Dies Imperii of Tiberius', *JRS* 57 (1967), 23-30.
- C.M. Wells, *The German Policy of Augustus* (Oxford 1972).
- P. Wessner, *Scholia in Iuvenalem Vetustiora* (Leipzig 1931).
- M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique: Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts* (Leipzig 1973).
- P. White, 'Julius Caesar and the Publication of Acta in the Late Roman Republic', *Chiron* 27 (1997) 73-84
- C.R. Whittaker (ed. and trans.), *Herodian* (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1969-70),
- T.E.J. Wiedemann, *Emperors and Gladiators* (London 1992).
- T.E.J. Wiedemann, 'Tiberius to Nero', in A.K. Bowman, et al. (edd.), *The Cambridge Ancient History X: The Augustan Empire, 43 BC – AD 69* (Cambridge 1996), 198-255.
- J.J. Wilkes, 'A Note on the Mutiny of the Pannonian Legions in A.D. 14', *CQ* 13.2 (1963), 268-271.
- J.J. Wilkes, 'The Julio-Claudian Historians', *CW* 65.6 (1972), 177-203.
- J.J. Wilkes, 'The legions in the Principate: Updating Ritterling', *JRA* 15 (2002), 528-535.
- S. Wilkinson, *Republicanism During the Early Roman Empire* (London 2012).
- N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983).
- N.G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek studies in the Italian Renaissance* (London 1992).
- N.G. Wilson, *Aristophanea: Studies in the Text of Aristophanes* (Oxford 2007).

- C. Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Ideal at Rome During the Late Republic and the Early Principate* (Cambridge 1950).
- T.P. Wiseman *Clio's Cosmetics* (Leicester 1979).
- G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (2nd Edn., Munich 1912).
- E. Wölfflin, 'Zu Tacitus Annalen', *Philologus* 30 (1870), 744.
- A.J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus 2.94-131: The Tiberian Narrative* (Cambridge 1977).
- A.J. Woodman, 'Tacitus' Obituary of Tiberius', *CQ* 39 (1989), 197-205.
- A.J. Woodman, 'A Death in the First Act: Tacitus, Annals 1.6', *Proceedings of the International Leeds Latin Seminar* 8 (1995), 257-73.
- A.J. Woodman, *Tacitus Reviewed* (Oxford 1998).
- A.J. Woodman, 'Not a Funeral Note: Tacitus, Annals 1.8.5-6', *CQ* 52.2 (2002), 629-632.
- A.J. Woodman and R.H. Martin (ed. and comm.), *The Annals of Tacitus. Book 3*. (Cambridge 1996).
- A.J. Woodman, 'Mutiny and Madness: Tacitus Annals 1.16-49', *Arethusa* 39.2 (2006), 303-329.
- A.J. Woodman and C.S. Kraus (ed. and comm.), *Tacitus. Agricola* (Cambridge 2014).
- M. Woods, *Eudemian Ethics, Books I, II, and VIII* (2nd Edn., Oxford 1992).
- Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (Oxford 1969).