

**OCPD AND THE ENIGMATIC PERSONALITY
OF EMPEROR TIBERIUS**

**OBSESSIVE-COMPULSIVE PERSONALITY DISORDER AND
THE ENIGMATIC PERSONALITY OF EMPEROR TIBERIUS**

By

STEPHANIE ROMKEY, B.Sc, B.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University

©Copyright by Stephanie Romkey, August 2006

MASTER OF ARTS (2006)

McMaster University

(Classics)

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder and the Enigmatic Personality of
Emperor Tiberius

AUTHOR: Stephanie Romkey, B.Sc. (Acadia University), B.A. Hon. (Acadia
University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor E. Haley

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 149

Abstract

Numerous studies have been conducted on the principate of Emperor Tiberius, but only one study conducted by G. Maranon in 1956, has examined his personality. The methods that were used in this study are no longer applicable to modern psychiatry and the details of Tiberius' personality begged for a reexamination. A thorough examination of the ancient sources was made and all of Tiberius' personality traits were considered and a complete diagnosis using the five modern psychiatric axes was made. The findings of this careful study found that Tiberius suffered from a premorbid Axis II Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder, with a later onset of Axis I, Major Depressive Disorder, Substance Abuse (Alcohol), and Event-caused Persecutory Delusional Disorder, and Axis III Myocardial Infarction (Heart-Attack). This updated diagnosis is particularly favourable since it strengthens the arguments which have previously been made by modern scholarship, about his political and economic policies, as well as his administrative skills. These findings also account for a variety of anomalies which modern scholarship has chosen to reject without good reason such as his sexual conduct, and actions at Rhodes. Finally, as a means of verifying this study, all conclusions and findings have been verified by a practicing psychiatrist to ensure that the data herein was properly analyzed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who have been supportive over the past year. First, I would like to thank my committee members for their patience, comments, and suggestions. Second, I would like to thank Dr. Haley, my thesis supervisor, for labouring with me and permitting me to study such a unique, and fascinating, aspect of Tiberius' reign. Third, I would to thank Dr. Valerie Taylor of St. Joseph's Mental Health – Mountain Site, for her mentorship and for verifying the extensive data, and interpretations, contained herein. Last, I would like to offer my heartfelt thanks to my fiancé Tom, since without his love and support this thesis would never have been completed.

MASTER OF ARTS (2006)

McMaster University

(Classics)

Hamilton, Ontario

Title: Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder and the Enigmatic Personality
of Emperor Tiberius

Author: Stephanie Romkey, B.Sc. (Bio/Clas., Acadia University), B.A. (Hons.
Clas., Acadia University)

Supervisor: Professor E. Haley

Number of Pages: v, 149

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
I. <i>Characterization of Tiberius as found in the Primary Sources</i>	1
II. <i>Psychiatric Diagnosis and OCPD</i>	10
Chapter 2: Tiberius' Ancestry and the Influence of Augustus	21
Chapter 3: Tiberius' Early Career and Retirement to Rhodes	34
Chapter 4: Tiberius' Career Between AD 4 and 14	46
I. <i>Patrons and Friends</i>	46
II. <i>Tiberius' Military career AD 4-14</i>	57
Chapter 5: Tiberius' Early Career	68
I. <i>Tiberius' Accession</i>	68
II. <i>Tiberius, Germanicus, and Piso</i>	76
Chapter 6: An Agenda of Perfection	87
I. <i>Tiberius and the Senate</i>	87
II. <i>Tiberius and the Provinces</i>	102
Chapter 7: Tiberius, Asinius Gallus, and Agrippina	110
Chapter 8: Tiberius on Capreae	120
I. <i>Tiberius, Sejanus and Delusional Admiration</i>	120
II. <i>Tiberius' Alcoholism and Sexual Deviance</i>	131
III. <i>Tiberius' Death</i>	135
Conclusion	138
Appendix A	142
Bibliography	144

Chapter 1: Introduction

I. *Characterization of Tiberius as found in the Primary Sources*

In order to fully understand the historical portrayal of the emperor Tiberius, one must first understand the varying approaches to the components of character and characterization within a given work, such as fiction or biography. A character, when considered from the fictional standpoint, is a creation of the author writing the work, and is defined as, “persons, or people, depicted in writing.”¹ These are the people whom the author creates through the process of characterization, which is defined as, “The depicting, in writing, of clear images of a person, his actions and manners of thought and life. A man’s nature, environment, habits, emotions, desires instincts: all of these make people what they are and the skillful writer makes his important people clear to us through a portrayal of these elements.”² The author strategically places pieces of information about the character, throughout the work, which the reader then reads and interprets as elements of traits. The reader will then begin to assemble the various traits gleaned from the work into a recognizable personality. The perception of the character, and what they represent, is heavily debated among the different schools of literary scholars.

According to the structuralists, the character cannot be known beyond what is presented in the work. The example provided by Toolan is that of an iceberg in the water.

¹ S. Chatman, Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978) pg. 108.

² Chatman, pg. 107.

The tip, which is seen by the naked eye, is all that is perceived to exist of the iceberg to a passerby.³ The same applies to the analysis of a character. Structuralists argue that only the information provided by the author exists, and no greater, psychological meaning, or understanding, may be gained from the work.⁴ To the structuralist, there is no greater depth of character, and that psychology should never be applied to something that was the fictional creation of an author. However, this theory has been challenged by another literary critic, namely Chatman, who feels that a more open approach to the character, and to characterization, is applicable.

In the ‘open approach’, as described by Chatman, a set of traits, which are grouped into behaviours, create a ‘real’ person, or character.⁵ In this particular view of the character, psychology, and other social sciences, may be applied as a means of gaining a further understanding of the role the character plays in relation to the story and society. For instance, the character may reflect a negative aspect of society, or may reflect the author’s own views.⁶ The perception of the true personality of the character is based upon habits which become symptoms for traits, which are determined from the descriptions provided by the author. Therefore, the experiences of the author will affect not only the types of characters portrayed, but how they are portrayed. For instance, if an author describes a character as ‘paranoid’, ‘excessively clean’, and ‘a hand-washer’, one

³ M.J. Toolan, Narrative: A critical Linguistic Introduction (New York: Routledge, 1988) pg. 91. This is similar to what cognitive behavioural therapists teach their clients. It is impossible to know the reasons for the behaviours observed of those around you. Mary-Lou Doxtator, “Personal Interview,” St. Joseph’s Mental Health – Mountain Site, Hamilton, March 3rd, 2006.

⁴ Chatman, pg. 110.

⁵ Chatman, pg. 120; see also R Fowler, Linguistics and the Novel (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1977) pg. 35.

⁶ S. Rimmon-Kenan, Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics (London: Routledge, 1983) pg. 38.

may assign the trait ‘compulsive’ to that character.⁷ The author, too, in describing this character will have a preconceived notion of what it means to be compulsive. Therefore the resulting recognition of this trait, by the reader, through the habits described by the author, is based upon previously accepted habits that denote ‘compulsion’.⁸

The open approach also considers the duration of the traits. For instance, if a trait does not persist throughout the majority of a work, then it is not considered to be a trait, but a momentary reaction.⁹ Therefore, traits typically do not encompass emotions, thoughts, or feelings, as these tend to be more temporary, and not a good basis for determining the personality of a particular character. It is only if these feelings are consistent throughout the work, that they may be considered a trait of the character’s personality.¹⁰ Depending upon the type of character with which one is dealing, the personality may be quite complex.

Flat characters refer to those characters who have a single trait, or a set of very few traits.¹¹ These characters tend to be the ones that are remembered the best in a novel. Round characters are those characters which are open-ended, and provide an element of surprise.¹² In the case of the round characters, the traits may seem to actually contradict each other as the author provides a deeper glimpse into the mind of the character.¹³

⁷ Chatman, pg. 122.

⁸ Chatman, pg. 119.

⁹ Chatman, pg. 130.

¹⁰ Chatman, pg. 131.

¹¹ Chatman pg. 132.

¹² Chatman, pg. 132.

¹³ Chatman, pg. 133. These characters are slowly revealed to the reader over the course of the entire plot, such as Rodia, in Dostoyevski’s, Crime and Punishment. Throughout the work, one learns of his vices, the psychological aftermath of the murder, and, at the end of the novel, his ability to fall in love.

With round characters, the actions which may be taken by the character after the novel has ended may be used as a means to understand the personality of the character. The reader may anticipate how the character will continue to live their lives after the story is over.¹⁴ It is human nature to wish to see what becomes of the characters in whom one has invested some emotion, and this too contributes to the experience and the understanding of the character as whole, and the role that they played.¹⁵ Although the type of character and the interaction of the reader with the work are important means to learn more about a character, they are not the only ones employed by authors.

The physical description of a character can also play a large role in how a character is perceived by those reading the work. An author will choose a set of physical descriptions which have been widely accepted socially as denoting certain traits.¹⁶ For instance, one who is tall and thin may also reflect an introverted, or perhaps, stingy man. On the contrary, a character described as ‘jolly’ and ‘plump’ will denote a friendlier character.¹⁷

Physical appearance is not the only physical means of demonstrating a character’s traits. The physical surroundings can also lend valuable pieces of information in order to obtain a true sense of who the character is. For instance, if a character lives in a broken-down home, and wears tattered clothing, one may deduce that the character is poor.¹⁸ In the case of Rodia, his apartment, which was small and unkempt, may reflect his own

¹⁴ Chatman, pg. 133. For example, Rodia has found love, and learned from his suffering; therefore, it is unlikely that he will return to his murderous ways, but will wed and be merry for the remainder of his days.

¹⁵ Chatman, pg. 134.

¹⁶ Fowler, pg. 39.

¹⁷ G. Maranon, *Tiberius: A Study in Resentment* (London: Hollis & Carter, 1956) pg. 18.

¹⁸ Rimmon-Kenan, pg. 69.

unkempt psychological state, which resulted in his murdering his Landlady. The type of character, how he/she is portrayed, and through what means, greatly affects the gleaned traits of that character's personality.

In the case of the ancient historical writers, dealing with actual persons, the situation is different because neither the events, nor the person, nor appearance, is a complete fabrication of the author in question. However, the way in which the author chooses to examine the evidence and evaluate an historical figure, based on his own experience and bias, does have an impact on how he portrays the said character, and how the reader interprets the results.¹⁹ Ancient authors differ from modern historical authors in their often creative approach to history. A purpose of the ancient historian was to entertain his audience through a colourful description of events, enticing potential readers to read the work.²⁰ Therefore, the ancient historian would present his own entertaining version of a historical account, based on previous sources, or eye-witness accounts. It is possible that the surviving account of Emperor Tiberius was subject to creative interpretation as well.

Velleius Paterculus was an ancient historian who wrote during the reign of the emperor Tiberius. Velleius in his work, The History of Rome, portrayed Tiberius as a very capable administrator, who began his political career five years in advance of the average age.²¹ Velleius portrayed Tiberius as an excessively able soldier,²² frugal,²³

¹⁹ W.J. Harvey, Character & the Novel (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1965) pg. 50.

²⁰ A.J. Woodman, Tacitus Reviewed (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998) pg. 112.

²¹ Velleius, History of Rome, 2.94.3. He became quaestor at the age of 18, therefore his entire senatorial career was advanced by five years.

²² See Vell, 2.97.4 for discussion of the success of the German campaigns.

cautious,²⁴ and a diplomat.²⁵ If Tiberius could avoid a war through diplomacy, he appears to have done so. However, Tiberius is also described as a strict disciplinarian. He would punish great offenses, but would turn a blind eye to minor ones.²⁶ This was not the only way in which the author chose to demonstrate Tiberius' greatness.

Much like the authors of fictional works, Velleius also relied on a physical description to portray a certain trait of the character. This aspect of Velleius' literary art is interesting because it uses the portrayal of Drusus' character, and physical appearance, to promote Tiberius'. Velleius describes Drusus' character as being good, and noble.²⁷ Once he establishes this, he devotes a line to Drusus' physical appearance. The description that Velleius supplies regarding Drusus', and Tiberius', appearance is not very detailed; however, what is supplied demonstrates that Tiberius was very handsome, in comparison to his brother.²⁸

This optimistic view which Velleius adopted when writing about Tiberius may also be considered to be a result of his experiences, as it was for the authors of fiction.²⁹

Velleius was also a soldier, and therefore, the emperor's behaviour may have seemed

²³ Vell. 2.129.3; See also 2.114.2 for evidence that Tiberius supplied extensive provisions and medics for the soldiers (he hoarded medical supplies and used them only when absolutely necessary).

²⁴ Vell. 2.113.2; 2.111.4. Tiberius was excessively cautious in how he positioned the army during the Pannonian revolt, resulting in the success of the Romans.

²⁵ Vell. 2.129.3. Tiberius would err on the side of caution, and would use diplomacy before fighting, in settling a dispute.

²⁶ Vell. 2.126.3.

²⁷ Drusus appears to be a flat character for the purpose of establishing Tiberius' (round) character. Using other characters for a means of comparison is common, see Fowler, pg. 56.

²⁸ Vell. 2.97.3. By identifying Tiberius as more handsome than a previously established handsome and noble character, the reader may determine that Tiberius was also more noble than Drusus. See Chatman, pg. 135, for a description of the role of flat and round characters in relation to one another

²⁹ Velleius had benefited under the reign of Tiberius. He had actually worked alongside Tiberius in the army, and benefited from his caution, and was even permitted to march in a triumph with Tiberius (Vell. 2.121.3).

perfectly normal to him. Also, Velleius' experience as a soldier also may have inspired him to focus on Tiberius' military merits, as opposed to a more complete history.³⁰ His positive experience with Tiberius may have contributed to his exceptionally patriotic view of the emperor's reign. However, Velleius does still give criticism of Tiberius at the end of his reign, in relation to Sejanus.³¹ The role of Sejanus, as well as the complete general conduct of the emperor, would figure largely in the accounts provided by Tacitus and Suetonius.

Tacitus' work, The Annals, provides the greatest discussion of the reign of Tiberius of all of the surviving writers from antiquity. His account of the reign of Tiberius is significantly longer than the one supplied by Velleius.³² The account supplied by Tacitus is more in depth, as he provides a greater number of examples, making a personality analysis of Tiberius much easier. It is through this work that the complexity of Tiberius' character is revealed.

Suetonius' account of Tiberius in his Lives of the Twelve Caesars is very similar to Tacitus; however, there is less chronology in his work. His work is a biography and therefore includes more rumour than Tacitus' work. However, the value of this account cannot be overlooked as he also supplies very important character traits of Tiberius which complement the traits supplied by Tacitus.

³⁰ This may account for the lack of description of Tiberius' family, home life, and any detailed background imagery which would have influenced the reader's interpretation of the character of Tiberius.

³¹ Vell, 2.128.4. The presence of this criticism, however minor it may be, does indicate that Velleius may have recognized that Tiberius was trusting Sejanus with important affairs of the state when, perhaps, he should not have.

³² The first six books of the Annals are dedicated to the life and reign of Tiberius.

In the beginning of Book 1, Tacitus claims that his account of the emperors' reigns is impartial.³³ Suetonius' account makes no such claim, but a number of traits provided in the two works about Tiberius are incredibly identical. For instance, in both Tacitus' and Suetonius' accounts, Tiberius was portrayed as a brilliant administrator,³⁴ exceptionally frugal,³⁵ moderate,³⁶ and disciplined.³⁷ Although, the two works approach the study of Tiberius differently, they both provide discussions on Tiberius' behaviour that are similar in nature.

Tacitus, like Velleius, also used physical appearance to convey Tiberius' character type, but Tacitus also included details which were not so flattering to the emperor. He described Tiberius as being tall, slender, bald, and he also described a skin affliction that Tiberius had.³⁸ This description, coupled with the fact that it was presented in conjunction with Tiberius' departure to Capreae, would give the reader the impression that he was an unapproachable man. Suetonius' account appears to have had less of a purpose with regard to characterization within a narrative. Instead, it appears that it was provided for heightening reader interest, and the fact that his physical description of Tiberius matches that of Tacitus' indicates that it was fairly accurate.³⁹

It is important to note that both Tacitus and Suetonius wrote long after the reign of Tiberius; therefore, the list of behaviours and traits which Tacitus was likely trying to

³³ Tacitus, *The Annals*, 1.1.

³⁴ Tac, *Ann*, 2.87, and Suet. *Tib*. 30.

³⁵ Tac, *Ann*, 2.38. Tiberius refused to give Hortalus money when he became bankrupt. Suet. *Tib*. 7.

³⁶ Tac, *Ann*, 2.36; 2.59; 2.44; 3.12. His moderation was especially evident during the trial of Piso. Suet. *Tib*. 26.

³⁷ Tac, *Ann*, 3.55, and Suet. *Tib*. 19.

³⁸ Tac. *Ann*, 4.57.

³⁹ Suet. *Tib*. 68.

convey to his readers, was based upon his own interpretation of earlier texts and inscriptions.⁴⁰ Suetonius had access to the imperial archives and it is probable that the majority of his information came from there.⁴¹ Tacitus also appears to have a great dislike of the imperial system, in general, since he had watched many suffer under the reign of Domitian.⁴² As a result, he presents the facts in a manner that makes Tiberius seem especially enigmatic and cruel.

Scholars who have studied Tacitus have either agreed with his interpretations of Tiberius' motives with regard to events that occurred in his reign, or have acted as apologists for Tiberius, and explained the cruel portrayal as the result of Tacitus' bias.⁴³ Other scholars chose to ignore the personality aspect completely, and examine various aspects of Tiberius' reign, such as his economic policy,⁴⁴ or how he was as a politician.⁴⁵ One scholar has also focused on the archaeology of the island of Capreae.⁴⁶ However, it was the assessment of Tiberius, based on his appearance and motives, that prompted the most comprehensive psychological review of his personality, to date.

⁴⁰ M.P. Charlesworth, "Tiberius and the Death of Augustus," The American Journal of Philology 44.2 (1923), pg. 149.

⁴¹ J. Ober, "Tiberius and the Political Testament of Augustus", Historia 31 (1982), pg. 307.

⁴² Tacitus makes specific reference of those who suffered under Domitian in Agricola 44-45. Tacitus himself did not actually lose property during Domitian's reign, but the experience may have jaded his ideology. See R. Mellor, Tacitus (London: Routledge, 1993), pg. 8-9, and Charlesworth, pg. 148.

⁴³ D.C.A. Shotton, "Tiberius and Asinius Gallus," Historia 20 (1971), pg. 457.

⁴⁴ R.S. Rogers, Studies in the Reign of Tiberius: Some Imperial Virtues of Tiberius and Drusus Julius Caesar (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1972), pg. 25.

⁴⁵ B. Levick, Tiberius the Politician (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976), pg. 89-118.

⁴⁶ G.W. Houston, "Tiberius on Capreae," G and R 32.2 (1985), pg. 179-194.

II. *Psychiatric Diagnosis and OCPD*

Due to the especially enigmatic nature of the emperor, as presented by the ancient sources, modern scholars have made a variety of attempts to explain what the ancient sources were trying to portray. As described in the previous section, the varying biases of the author were also very important factors in the historical portrayal of an individual.

Many scholars who approach the study of Tiberius will either accept that his actions were impacted by an underlying mental illness, or they will avoid discussing it. Certain authors, such as Barbara Levick, avoid discussing his mental state, but when forced to confront the issue, deny its influence.⁴⁷ One scholar who decided to assess Tiberius based on his own interpretation of the ancient sources was Mommsen. Mommsen described Tiberius' personality as cruel and paranoid.⁴⁸ Mommsen's interpretations of Tiberius appear to have spurred research on his mental state, as he was closely adhered to in the resulting studies conducted in the 1930s, and in Maranon's later study.⁴⁹

The first really concise scientific approach to the question of Tiberius' personality, and the question of whether or not he had a mental condition, was that made by Gregorio Maranon in 1956. Indebted to the observations made by Mommsen, and the accounts

⁴⁷ Levick, (1976), pg. 37. Tiberius' peculiar, and very emotional, response to losing Vipsania was postulated to be no more than rumor. Levick claims that the marriage had been political, and that he was a free agent, acting as many Romans had before him.

⁴⁸ Mommsen was also the first to admit that Tiberius, though cruel, was a brilliant administrator. See T. Mommsen, *A History of Rome Under the Emperors* (London: Routledge, 1992), pg. 72.

⁴⁹ For instance, see: D. Henting, *Über den Caesarenwahnsinnen, die Krankheit des Kaisers Tiberius* (Munich, 1934) which discusses Tiberius' left-handedness and cruel behaviour in terms of schizophrenia. See also A. Esser, "Vision of the Emperor Tiberius," *Klinischen Monatsblatt der Augenheilkunde* 119.4 (1935), pg. 428-432, which discusses Tiberius' appearance in busts, comparing the findings to Mommsen's view of him.

supplied by Suetonius and Tacitus, Maranon used the newborn art of psychotherapy to diagnose Tiberius. Maranon's theory of resentment⁵⁰ proved to be problematic because the diagnosis was based upon psychiatric procedures and values which are no longer in practice today. In order to obtain an accurate diagnosis, it is necessary to consider what a psychiatrist does in cases when there are cultural differences between the individual being considered, and the psychiatrist.

In an endeavor to prevent superimposing western cultural values over those of other cultures, the DSM-IV stipulates that the psychiatrist should consult other family members of any culture that differs from their own, in order to get a sense of which behaviours are culturally influenced, and which are unique to that person.⁵¹ As a result, a fuller picture may be obtained, and the risk of misdiagnosis is reduced. However, Tiberius' case is unique for a number of reasons.

First of all, Tiberius is deceased; therefore, the ability to fully analyze his situation is greatly limited because there are no surviving accounts of his thoughts, and actions, in his own words. As a result, one has to rely on the accounts provided by the ancient authors who not only discussed his behaviours, but also suggested motives. The ancient authors themselves are problematic as it is possible that they were creative in their portrayals, and may not have been completely factual. In Maranon's approach the emotional interpretations of the sources were considered to be factual, and were not questioned, which resulted in a diagnosis based on the opinions of the ancient authors as

⁵⁰ The theory of resentment held that a man was resentful if he was timid, ugly, tall, thin, left-handed, and introverted. This opinion is based upon the belief that all people are born with certain inborn traits which may be determined by physical appearance. For a more detailed discussion, see Maranon, pgs. 9-50.

⁵¹ American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM IV. (Washington: American Psychiatric Association, 1994), pg. 898.

to what Tiberius' motives were.⁵² Therefore, it is necessary to consider the behaviours described, and absent from, the sources in order to determine how to diagnose Tiberius properly.

As shown above in the section on characterization, there are certain traits that appear to be key components of Tiberius' personality. He was described as frugal, a disciplinarian, a collector, rigid, emotionally numb, and moderate.⁵³ When presented with core traits, a psychiatrist must carefully examine the information provided, and through a process of elimination, determine the diagnosis.

Before one can properly analyze the conditions applicable to this thesis, it is necessary to understand the way in which a psychiatrist categorizes the various illnesses in a single psychiatric diagnosis. Psychiatrists do a complete analysis of patients using what is described as a multi-axial system. This system is comprised of five axes that when viewed together provide a comprehensive picture of the individual being assessed. The first of the five axes represents the major psychiatric conditions, or clinical syndromes.⁵⁴ Examples of diagnoses on Axis I are bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, and Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD). Axis II represents the personality disorders, which are loosely divided into three separate clusters as well as developmental disorders such as mental retardation.⁵⁵ Axis III encompasses general medical conditions which play a role in the development, continuance, or exacerbation of Axis I or II disorders.⁵⁶

⁵² This resulted in a diagnosis based around inborn traits.

⁵³ See above, pg. 5-7.

⁵⁴ D. J. Robinson, DSM-IV Personality Disorders Explained (Port Huron: Rapid Psychler Press, 2000), pg. 9.

⁵⁵ Robinson, pg. 7-9.

⁵⁶ Robinson, pg. 10.

Axis IV reflects psychosocial and environmental stressors such as divorce, or starting a new job.⁵⁷ Finally, Axis V reflects how well the psychiatrist thinks that the individual is functioning both at the present time, and the highest level of functioning in the previous year.⁵⁸

All conditions that are present in a patient are placed on the appropriate axis, and a complete diagnosis is made. For the purpose of this study, only Axis I, II and III will be examined because the ancient sources provide enough description of the behaviours that Tiberius exhibited in order for one to confer a plausible diagnosis. Axes IV and V will not be used because both are explicitly rooted in the ability to conduct an interview with the patient. There is no way of knowing for certain, and from Tiberius' own standpoint, how he felt about his own life experiences.⁵⁹ Axis V is unnecessary because Tiberius is deceased and ranking his ability to function in society is futile for this study. Now that the various axes have been described, the personality disorders can be examined in more detail.

In the case of Tiberius, after examining the literature describing the major psychiatric illnesses, the Axis I and II diagnoses most consistent with his presentation are major depressive disorder, substance abuse (alcohol), and event-caused delusional disorder of the persecutory type. The characteristics of Major Depressive episode are

⁵⁷ Robinson, pg. 10.

⁵⁸ This rating is conferred on a scale between 0 and 100, and helps to provide an understanding of how each of the previous four axes are affecting the individual (Robinson, pg. 9). The lower the score, the less capable the individual is of handling their affairs.

⁵⁹ However, it can be said with some certainty that the stress of becoming an emperor certainly aggravated his condition.

bouts of depression which may be recurrent and last for a duration of at least two weeks.⁶⁰ These depressive episodes are characterized by a loss of interest in work or leisure, fatigue, sadness, and oftentimes social withdrawal. Blaming oneself for failing to meet occupational expectations may contribute to the already depressed mood.⁶¹ Tiberius' removal to Rhodes in 6 BC, and to Capreae in AD 26, both meet the criteria for a major depressive disorder.⁶² Numerous conditions are often associated with depression, one of which is substance abuse.

The diagnostic criteria for substance abuse are recurrent use of a substance in potentially dangerous situations, or continued use of the substance even though numerous social difficulties have arisen as a result of its use.⁶³ Tiberius was noted for his heavy drinking, and he even chose various governmental positions during drinking bouts.⁶⁴ A diagnosis of substance dependence cannot be assigned because it is uncertain if withdrawal was present; therefore, the diagnosis of abuse is the only one that can be made given the information that survives.

Persecutory delusional disorder is characterized by a delusional spell that lasts longer than one month in duration. It is characterized by the belief that the individual is being harassed, harmed, poisoned, conspired against, or thwarted in their long term goals by another person or persons. Small slights may become exaggerated and become a part of the delusional system, which manifests itself in numerous appeals to the law for

⁶⁰ Hypomania or mania cannot be present or this would warrant the diagnosis of bipolar disorder (American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-IV-TR. Washington: American Psychiatric Association, 2000., pg. 427).

⁶¹ DSM-IV-TR, pg. 349.

⁶² See chapter 3, pg. 44, and chapter 7, pg. 154 respectively.

⁶³ DSM-IV-TR, pg. 198.

⁶⁴ Suet. Tib. 42.

justice. Finally, delusional individuals may also become violent toward those whom they view as an enemy.⁶⁵ The event-caused variety of this subtype of delusional disorder is caused by extreme psychosocial stressors, often accompanied by depression.⁶⁶ Tiberius had two known bouts of delusion which both accompanied depressive episodes on Rhodes and Capreae.⁶⁷ Although all of the Axis I conditions are very important to note, they were not premorbid, meaning that Tiberius did not have them consistently throughout his life. Tiberius had a premorbid axis II personality disorder prior to the development of his Axis I conditions.

The mental conditions that constitute the Axis II illnesses, specifically the personality disorders, have received little attention until the last decade. A personality disorder is defined as, “An enduring pattern of inner experience and behaviour that deviates markedly from the expectations of the individual’s culture, is pervasive and inflexible, has an onset in adolescence or early adulthood, is stable over time, and leads to distress or impairment.”⁶⁸ Therefore, the disturbances are problematic, and constitute a disorder if they are unchanging over time. The personality disorders are often harder to diagnose because they can mimic symptoms from the Axis I diagnoses.⁶⁹ Also, persons who suffer from the personality disorders will avoid, or shun, psychiatric treatment

⁶⁵ DSM-IV-TR, pg. 325-326.

⁶⁶ See DSM-IV, pg. 326. I am indebted to Dr. Taylor of St. Joseph’s Mental Health – Mountain Site, for her explanation of the medical texts.

⁶⁷ See Chapter 3, pg. 41 and Chapter 8, pg. 124.

⁶⁸ DSM-IV, pg. 629. Personality disorders are characterized by cognitive distortions which must be distinguished from characteristics of personality types. For instance, some people are more organized than others but that is not necessarily indicative of a personality disorder (L. Sperry, Diagnosis and Treatment of the DSM-IV-TR Personality Disorders (New York, Brunner – Routledge, 2003), pg. 176-178.

⁶⁹ Robinson, pg. 22.

because they do not feel anxious about their behaviour.⁷⁰ In fact, many patients do not even recognise their symptoms, and as a result, are disinterested in treatment. This is because they are often unaware of how their style of interaction is problematic for both themselves, and for others.⁷¹

The category relevant to this study will be the Cluster C personality disorders.⁷² A broad description of these disorders encompasses symptoms of social avoidance, low tolerance for anxiety, and stunted affect.⁷³ The personality disorders that are categorized as Cluster C are Avoidant Personality Disorder (APD), Dependent Personality Disorder (DPD), and Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder (OCPD).

The personality disorder that will be the focus of this study because it is the one most associable with Tiberius is Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder. The symptoms of this condition are as follows: "...preoccupation with details, rules, plans, and organization; emotionally restricted; reluctant to delegate tasks; frugal; excessively devoted to work; controls others; task completion is hampered by perfectionism; inflexible; overconscientious about morals, ethics, and values; not able to discard objects."⁷⁴ In order for a positive diagnosis of OCPD to be made, the individual in question must meet four of the ten criteria listed above.

OCPD should not be confused with the Axis I anxiety disorder OCD. An individual with OCPD is often characterized by an extreme need to analyse and

⁷⁰ DSM-IV, 1994, pg. 800.

⁷¹ Dr. V. Taylor, "Personal Interview," St. Joseph's Mental Health – Mountain Site, Hamilton, May 3rd, 2006.

⁷² They are the most relevant because they are the cluster with which Tiberius' traits match the best.

⁷³ Affect is the psychiatric term used when referring to one's emotional state. See Robinson, pg. 122.

⁷⁴ Robinson, pg. 116-117.

understand problems, and to have one's efforts acknowledged.⁷⁵ OCD differs from OCPD as it involves an obsession around which all behaviour is modified to deal with the obsession. This alteration in behaviour is called a compulsion.⁷⁶ For instance, if someone has an obsession with germs, then they will feel a compulsive need to constantly wash everything around them.⁷⁷

Tiberius appears to be a textbook example of OCPD as he meets all of the criteria for it. One of the more telling symptoms that an individual has an obsessive-compulsive type disorder is the hoarding of objects. In Tiberius' case, he had a vast collection of art, particularly sculpture. In some cases, Tiberius would go to great lengths to acquire art pieces.⁷⁸

This condition is further characterized by a lack of leisure activities. For these individuals, work is of the greatest importance. Individuals with this illness often feel that they can do any task better than anyone else, unless the task is being delegated to an individual who has earned the patient's admiration.⁷⁹ The criteria for the admiration may seem random as it is based on the individual's own taciturn, and rigid, nature. The nature of these patients is somewhat cold, and restricted. Humour is rarely spontaneous and tends to reflect the use of irony.⁸⁰ It is this emotional constitution of the patient that often

⁷⁵ Robinson, pg. 121.

⁷⁶ American Psychiatric Association. Quick reference to the Diagnostic criteria from DSM – IV, (Washington D.C., American Psychiatric Association, 1993), pg. 217.

⁷⁷ DSM-IV Quick Reference, 1993, pg. 217.

⁷⁸ A.F. Stewart, "To Entertain an Emperor: Sperlonga, Laokoon, and Tiberius at the Dinner-Table," JRS 67 (1967), pg. 84; See also, Pliny the Elder, Natural History, 34.62, for an example of Tiberius removing the Apoxyomenos (statue) from the baths of Agrippa, and then being forced to return it due to public outcry. Tiberius also hoarded money, see Tac. Ann. 2.37-38.

⁷⁹ Individuals who have proven themselves earn recognition (Dr. Taylor, "Personal Interview," St Joseph's Mental Health – Mountain Site, Hamilton, September 3rd, 2005).

⁸⁰ Robinson, pg. 118.

brings these individuals before the psychiatrist, wondering why someone so industrious and hard-working is not liked by his/her peers.⁸¹

Certain demographic traits have been linked to OCPD and it was discovered that the individuals who are most prone to this condition tend to be male, and the eldest child.⁸² In the case of emperor Tiberius, he was both male and the eldest child in his family.⁸³ The instance of this condition is also much more prevalent in occupations which require strict attention to detail, and a strict sense of duty.⁸⁴ None of these criteria can be met more definitely than a role in the Roman army, where Tiberius spent the great majority of his life.⁸⁵

Another important aspect about OCPD is the fact that children of exceptionally rigid parents are more prone to developing this condition than children of understanding parents.⁸⁶ Tiberius' family, the Claudians, were described as having a harsh and rigid nature.⁸⁷ Although the treatment of children in ancient Rome seems to be harsh in comparison to our own time, it is important to note that Tiberius' family was singled out for its especially harsh constitution.

Another important factor in the diagnosis of OCPD is the inability to see the 'larger picture' in any situation. The OCPD patient will be especially cautious and will

⁸¹ I am indebted to Dr Taylor at St. Joseph's Mental Health – Mountain Site, for this valuable insight.

⁸² Robinson, pg. 119.

⁸³ The occurrence of this condition in males is doubled in comparison to the number of females (Robinson, pg. 117).

⁸⁴ Robinson, pg. 119.

⁸⁵ Vell. 2.93.3.

⁸⁶ Robinson, pg. 118.

⁸⁷ Tac. Ann. 1.4.

pay attention to absolutely every detail.⁸⁸ This may prevent them from completely understanding the situation, or from being able to bring the project to its completion. Tiberius was noted for his extreme attention to detail, which may have impeded his ability to complete tasks.⁸⁹

A final aspect, which is most important to note in any study concerning OCPD and Tiberius, is the relation of OCPD to alcoholism. It has been shown that of all the personality disorders, OCPD exhibits the greatest number of alcoholic dependents. Approximately 10% of all alcoholic dependents have OCPD.⁹⁰ Furthermore, studies have shown that 30% of those who have received treatment for OCPD are also alcoholic.⁹¹

Now that OCPD and all of the related symptoms have been fleshed out, Tiberius' life may be analysed, beginning with his early life, then proceeding into his life as emperor. The behaviours he exhibited, as supplied by the ancient sources, shall be examined. It should be noted that this is not a political examination, and various political debates have not been considered that have been in many other studies conducted on Tiberius' reign. The modern interpretations of his behaviour will also be considered as a complete analysis is made based upon the findings of numerous case studies. Through this careful endeavour, evidence shall be supplied to demonstrate that Tiberius suffers from: Axis I depressive disorder, substance abuse (alcohol), and delusional disorder

⁸⁸ Robinson, pg. 121.

⁸⁹ Vell. 2. 113.2.

⁹⁰ E. Echeburua, et al. "Alcoholism and Personality Disorders: An Exploratory Study," Alcohol and Alcoholism 40.4 (2005), pg. 323. The findings of this study were based upon those who had been diagnosed with OCPD, and were patients of the Department of Psychiatry at Oxford University.

⁹¹ K. Suzuki, et al. "Co-occurrence of Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Traits in Young and Middle-Aged Japanese Alcohol-Dependent Men," Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research 26.8 (2002), pg. 1225. Forty-one males aged 20-30, and 34 males aged 40-59 years old who were hospitalized in the Kurihama National Hospital all of whom had been admitted for alcoholism, also had OCPD according to the DSM-IV diagnostic criteria.

(persecutory)⁹²; Axis II OCPD, premorbid; and Axis III Myocardial Infarction, prior to, and resulting in death.⁹³

⁹² Tiberius' drinking habits present a difficult conundrum since it cannot be said for certain whether Tiberius suffered from alcohol abuse or dependence. The difference between the diagnoses is minute according to the DSM-IV. Since the sources are silent about whether or not Tiberius suffered alcohol withdrawal, which is the primary symptom of alcohol dependence, Tiberius' drinking has been safely diagnosed as alcohol abuse. However, it should be noted that Tiberius may very well have been alcohol dependent. See DSM-IV Handbook, pg. 114 and 121.

⁹³ The term 'premorbid' is a psychiatric term referring to a medical condition which had the greatest duration in a patient's history. The complete diagnosis, terms, and discussion of the axes was verified by Dr. Taylor at St. Joseph's mental Health - Mountain Site, on September 3rd, 2005.

Chapter 2: Tiberius' Ancestry and the Influence of Augustus

In first considering one with OCPD, it is necessary to comb, very carefully, through his/her entire life for evidence of behaviours, and certain environmental factors, that may lead to a positive diagnosis. Tiberius' family, as well as his early career, must be considered in the examination to establish that there were, in fact, factors that could lead to the development of OCPD. Although Tiberius' early life is not as well documented as his career as emperor, there are still key pieces of evidence which need to be considered. In the following chapter, Tiberius' early life will be considered, and any key behaviours, or circumstances, will be raised. Tiberius' family will first be considered for behavioural traits which may lead to a conclusion of OCPD. The three branches which shall be considered for the purpose of this study are the Claudians, the Pulchri, and the Neronas.⁹⁴

The oldest line of the three is the patrician Claudians, which shall be considered first since Tiberius was a Claudian, by blood, on both sides. The Claudian line had a long and successful lineage. Their family tradition offered Suetonius examples of eccentricity, ambition and haughtiness, known as the Claudian *adrogantia*.⁹⁵ They also provided Tacitus with a means of explanation for the conduct, and manner, of Tiberius.⁹⁶

The quality of *adrogantia* is interesting, and worth further consideration in the context of this study. Tacitus uses this quality as a means of establishing Tiberius'

⁹⁴ The latter two families trace their ancestry from Claudius 'the brave', and Claudius 'the fair', sons of the censor Ap. Claudius Caecus. See Levick (1976) pg. 11.

⁹⁵ Suet. *Tib.* 3.4.

⁹⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 1.4. "...sed vetere atque insita Claudiae familiae superbia..."

character in his historical account. By establishing that Tiberius' family had bad temperament, then Tiberius' own nature could be no different from other members of his family. A similar approach is used in establishing any familial history of illness in psychology and psychiatry.

The fact that more than just Tacitus found the Claudian family to be rigid is clear if there were documented cases of it from annalists, from which Tacitus, and Suetonius obtained their information.⁹⁷ If there is a family history of very rigid behaviour, that appears to be unchanged over generations, then it is likely, too, that Tiberius would also be rigid.⁹⁸ Yet another thing to consider is that the Claudians were also very successful.⁹⁹ Success tends to come with hard work, and in the case of OCPD, anything less than perfect will not do. A seemingly stubborn political view, combined with success, and arrogance, were all excellent fodder for creating an environment which could lead to the development of OCPD.¹⁰⁰ According to E. Halloran, *et al.*, children mimic the behaviour to which they are exposed while growing up. Therefore, if a child is reared in an environment in which heavy emphasis is placed on success, rather than on general

⁹⁷ Both of these writers wrote long after the death of Tiberius, and relied on previous documents, including imperial records, and epigraphic evidence, to complete their analyses. For instance, see: W. Dennison, "The Epigraphic Sources of Suetonius," *AJA* 2.1/2 (1898): pg. 26-45; see also the interesting argument put forward by N. Reed ("Some Neglected Evidence on the Early Career of Tacitus," *CQ* 26.2 (1976): pg. 309-314) that Tacitus served as the librarian to Titus, and therefore, had access to many sources for his later writings. Rigid is used here, and throughout this thesis in the psychiatric sense of the word. In this context, it means that Tiberius' behaviour was unchanging.

⁹⁸ OCPD may run in families. See Robinson, pg. 120.

⁹⁹ The Claudian family boasts fine members such as Ap. Claudius the *Decemvir*, who aided in composing the Twelve Tables in 450 BC. See, Levick (1976) pg. 11.

¹⁰⁰ OCPD tends to develop in individuals who had families that were very strict about the need to succeed, and perfection in everything. Tiberius' successful family would set the stage for his own standards and expectations. See Robinson, pg 122-124.

happiness, the child will be conditioned to succeed at all other costs.¹⁰¹ Tiberius appears to have been raised in this sort of environment, and as Tacitus rightly stated, it did have an impact on his nature. Tacitus' discussion of Tiberius' nature, in relation to the Claudian family, will be considered next.

Tacitus discusses various aspects of Tiberius' nature throughout the Annals; however, a small section near the beginning of the work is worthy of discussion. In Book 1, Chapter 4 of the Annals, Tacitus states, "...sed vetere atque insita Claudiae familiae superbia, multaque indicia saevitiae, quamquam premanur, erumpere."¹⁰² Tacitus uses this as a means of establishing the nature of Tiberius, yet he also supplies some interesting descriptors which are key to a positive diagnosis of OCPD. The first clause of the quote establishes that Tiberius did come from a line of individuals who had exhibited strong personality traits of arrogance, which is indicative of OCPD; however, the next two clauses are particularly interesting. Tacitus continues to explain that the cruelties, or cruel temper, attributed to the Claudians, were often repressed, and would violently come out every so often. This description, although seemingly unimportant, is actually strongly indicative of OCPD. Patients with this condition are notoriously emotionally restrictive, and only express emotions in the form of violent outbursts of anger or frustration.¹⁰³ Therefore, Tiberius comes from a long line of arrogant, emotionally restrictive

¹⁰¹ Halloran, *et al.*, "The Relationship of Adolescent Personality and Family Environment to Psychiatric Diagnosis," Child Psychiatry and Human Development 32.3 (2002): pg. 201-205. This article emphasizes that environmental stressors during the formative years, have a large impact on the resulting personality in adolescence. If the environment is one that is severely imbalanced, a personality disorder will develop.

¹⁰² ...But he had the old haughtiness ingrained of the Claudian Family, and much evidence of savageries, although repressed, broke out.

¹⁰³ DSM-IV-TR pg. 726-727.

individuals, bent on success. The Pulchri and the Neronēs, also have their origins in the Claudian family tree, and will be considered for further evidence.

The Pulchri were the senior, and the most outstanding, individuals of the two lines until their line perished under the principate of Tiberius. It was into this family that Tiberius' mother Livia was born. The forwardness of the female members of this line was referenced by Suetonius in numerous examples, particularly those dealing with the domineering nature of Tiberius' mother.¹⁰⁴ These examples demonstrate that there was a dominant personality that ran in the family. The Pulchri were also achievers, and their women were very forward. This account was used to explain Livia's own nature because she came from a family of both arrogance, and over-achievement, on both sides of her family. This would, in turn, affect Tiberius' nature, since personality is influenced by the environment in which one is raised.¹⁰⁵ Although the Pulchri were serious achievers, the Neronēs would prove to be fairly obscure with regard to political successes.

The Neronēs, the family from which Tiberius' father, Tiberius Claudius Nero came were not nearly as successful as the Pulchri. This is demonstrated by Horace, who had his work cut out for him when he tried to celebrate the achievements of Tiberius and his family within his odes.¹⁰⁶ The only family member who was worthy of mention was C. Nero, who in 210 BC took over armies and destroyed Hasdrubal, which dealt a severe blow to Hannibal and his cause. However, after this, the family slipped into obscurity. In

¹⁰⁴ Suet. Tib. 22.1, and 50.2. Cicero, too, attempted to shame one of the more notorious female members, Clodia, by comparing her to her female ancestors (Cicero, *pro Cael.* 14 and 34).

¹⁰⁵ See Robinson, pg. 123.

¹⁰⁶ Horace, *Odes*, 4.4.37 ff.

fact, the family tree of the Neronos cannot be traced with any certainty.¹⁰⁷ The political alliances for this family are also unclear. It is possible that the Tiberius Nero who in 67 BC served as legate under Pompey, was Tiberius' grandfather, but even this is unknown.¹⁰⁸

Tiberius' father, Tiberius Nero, made his first appearance on the political stage in 54 BC, when he competed against C. Memmius to impeach A. Gabinius for extortion. In 48 BC, Tiberius Nero was acting as quaestor for the rebel Julius Caesar. Although he was rewarded under Caesar for his work, two years after Caesar's death, Nero thought that the killers should be rewarded.¹⁰⁹ After this, he soon allied himself with Marc Antony because his faction was more committed to the republic. However, after numerous failed attempts to raise Italy against Octavian at Perusia, Praeneste, and Campania, Nero, Livia, and their young son moved to Sicily.¹¹⁰ This area also proved to be unstable, and the family uprooted again to the east to join Antony. It was not until 39 BC that they were permitted to return to Italy.¹¹¹

Levick claims that Nero was also very flexible; however, based on the examples provided there is no evidence to support this. If anything, Nero showed incredible stubbornness in refusing to stop fighting the cause of the republic, regardless of the odds against Antony's faction. In fact, the evidence suggests that Nero had a much more rigid

¹⁰⁷ Levick (1976), pg. 13; see also, R. Syme, The Roman Revolution (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1939), pg. 19.

¹⁰⁸ See Sallust, Cat. 50.4., and; Levick (1976), pg. 13.

¹⁰⁹ Suet. Tib. 4.1; Vell. Pat., 2.75; Dio, 42.40.6.

¹¹⁰ For the political background of the time, and Tiberius Nero's movements, see M. Flory, "Abducta Neroni Uxor: The Historiographical Tradition on the Marriage of Octavian and Livia," APA 118 (1988): pg. 343-347.

¹¹¹ Suet., Tib. 4.2 and Vell. Pat. 2.75.

personality than Levick leads one to believe.¹¹² His ambition made him adhere to the particular party in power as is evidenced by the fact that he gave his wife to Octavian. It is possible that he was hoping to gain political advancement.¹¹³ Therefore, it appears that Nero, and the obscure militant family of the Neronese, may have had OCPD.

It was shortly after their return to Italy that Nero divorced his wife, and she married Octavian when she was six months pregnant with Nero's second son, Drusus.¹¹⁴ Nero presided over the wedding feast of the two, which may seem incredible, but as Levick states, it is likely that it was for political reasons.¹¹⁵ If Octavian married Livia, then he would be forced to divorce Scribonia, who was the sister of the father-in-law of Sextus Pompey.¹¹⁶ Whether Nero had political motivation or not, it appears that he did not benefit, politically, from the divorce.

Nero did not receive a consulship, and he did not accompany Antony to the east. His sons, who had been in his care until his death, were given to the tutorship of Octavian.¹¹⁷ Tiberius, who was nine years-old at the time, gave his father's funeral oration.¹¹⁸ Tiberius would have witnessed, and lived with the rigidity of his father, who

¹¹² See Levick (1976), pg. 15; also, a strong sense of principle, combined with ambition, and rigidity, are characteristic of OCPD. In keeping with the observations made by Halloran, *et al.*, above, Tiberius would be influenced by the behaviours observed in his home life. See also, R. Conger, *et al.* "Adjustment Problems and Emerging Personality Characteristics from Early to Late Adolescence," American Journal of Community Psychology 27.3 (1999): pg. 431-433.

¹¹³ Levick (1976), pg. 16.

¹¹⁴ PIR² C 857 and Dio. 48.44.

¹¹⁵ Levick (1976), pg. 15 and Appian, BC 5.53.

¹¹⁶ This would serve to sever the political tie between Augustus and Pompey.

¹¹⁷ Dio. 48.44.5.

¹¹⁸ Suet. Tib. 6.4. "...Novem natus annos defunctum patrem pro rostris laudavit." The oration focused around the naval, and military achievements of Nero, rather than his political career. See Levick (1976), pg. 15.

was ambitious, but tempered by a strong sense of principle, for the first nine years of his life. However, the influence that Augustus had on Tiberius cannot be ignored.

When the principate was in its early stages Augustus made numerous reforms in order to secure devotion to himself, and to the regime.¹¹⁹ Under the guise of restoring the republic, Augustus established what was, essentially, a monarchy of sorts with himself at the helm.¹²⁰ The various reforms that Augustus made are exhaustive, and have been the subject of many books and papers.¹²¹ However, for the purpose of this study, a general overview of the moral reforms which Augustus established will be examined as means of establishing the origins of Tiberius' own morality.

As was stated previously in the discussion on Tiberius' father, Tiberius' sense of morality was influenced by his parents. However, Augustus still had an impact on his life. Tiberius came under his guardianship in 33 BC, and spent his entire career under the guidance of Augustus. Augustus, who was also a man of principle and republican morals, particularly because of his municipal origins,¹²² had personality traits which could be viewed as having a great influence on cementing Tiberius' own moral system.

Augustus himself is described by the sources as being very austere, principled, frugal, emotional, straightforward, and strict. Augustus had a strict sense of republican

¹¹⁹ By making various moral reforms, Augustus appeared to the people of Rome as a champion of the qualities that Romans valued. He revived numerous religious practices which had been discontinued in the republic such as the *compitalia* at which his *genius* and *Lares* were worshipped, thus, securing devotion to himself from the Roman people. L. R. Taylor, The Divinity of the Roman Emperor, (Connecticut: Middletown, 1931), pgs. 178, 185-189.

¹²⁰ Syme (1939), pg. 320.

¹²¹ For example, Syme (1939), pgs. 349-458, Taylor (1931) pgs. 155-190, L. R. Taylor, "Tiberius' Refusal of Divine Honours," TAPA 40 (1929), pgs. 87-101; K. Galinsky, "Augustus' Legislation on Morals and Marriage," Philologus 125 (1981), pgs. 126-144; see also, S. Treggiari, Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1969), pgs. 160-169, for a discussion on the various colleges that were resurrected by Augustus, and the roles of the lower classes in them.

¹²² Syme (1939), pgs. 367, 452-453.

morality and was not fond of the way that the *nobiles* in Rome conducted themselves.¹²³ Throughout his reign, Augustus introduced new social and moral reforms, and both ancient colleges and religious rites were once again resurrected.¹²⁴ Tiberius was raised in Augustus' home with these strict observances of morality in place. It is certain that as a member of the imperial family he was expected to be an exemplary role model for the men of Rome. If Tiberius had begun to err, it is very likely that Augustus did give rough rebuke.¹²⁵ The treatment of his daughter, and anyone close to him who made errors, all received harsh treatment from his fierce temper.¹²⁶ Augustus was a man who was not fond of error. Livia, herself would have furthered this element of strictness.

Livia was an incredibly ambitious woman. She was constantly working behind the scenes, and out of the public eye, securing various posts for friends and intimates.¹²⁷ It is even said that she spared Tiberius from the shame of being called an exile by securing for him the title of legate. Augustus often took counsel with her on matters of state, and her influence did not go unnoticed by the senators of the time.¹²⁸ However, Livia was devoted to Augustus and his reforms.

She was incredibly modest and would not appear in public unless for religious ceremonies and escorted by other Roman matrons. She was very plain in appearance, and

¹²³ Syme (1939), pg. 453.

¹²⁴ Gallinsky, pg. 126-130.

¹²⁵ For Augustus' reaction to the departure to Rhodes, See Suet. *Tib.* 11-13. For examples of other cases when Augustus offered rebuke and had fits of anger, see Suet. *Aug.* 42, 54, 65.

¹²⁶ Suet. *Aug.* 65, see also Seneca *de Clementia* I.9.2-7, which described how Livia encouraged Augustus to extend more clemency toward those accused of conspiracy. The passage describes Augustus' temper as well.

¹²⁷ For example, Livia secured the rank of senator for her friend Urgulania's son, Otho (Suet. *Otho* 1.1).

¹²⁸ Suet. *Aug.* 12.1 for Tiberius' receipt of legateship at Rhodes.

emotionally reserved.¹²⁹ Augustus, when attempting to set an example for Julia, told her to be more like Livia which surely could not have been received well by the flamboyant Julia. Livia and Augustus attempted to keep moral depravity at a minimum. No secrets were permitted among the ladies under Livia's care within the imperial household.¹³⁰ Surely, a woman as devoted as Livia was to her husband's cause would ensure that her sons were as scrupulous about their moral image as she was. As a result, the entire family became absorbed into Augustus' cause, and Tiberius as the eldest would take the brunt of the moral conditioning.

The mechanisms that are in play here are identical in almost every case of OCPD. There is an authority, usually parents or guardians, in a child's life who introduce morals which must be adhered to strictly. This moral view is viewed as being the 'right' way to be, and is often an older moral view.¹³¹ Therefore, the views of the authority become an unspoken law, and in order to avoid punishment, the child must conform to their ways.¹³² In adulthood, if the parental control is the same, then the parental authority figures will still have an extreme hold over the individual.

The parents of OCPD children tend to have incredibly high expectations of performance, and tend to love what the individual for what they can do rather than who

¹²⁹ Syme (1939), 385, and A. Barrett, *Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome* (London: Yale University Press, 2002), pgs. 43, 49, Tac. *Ann.* 2.82, Plin. *NH* 7.84, Suet. *Tib.* 50.1.

¹³⁰ See Suet. *Aug.* 64 for the methods of discipline and education of Augustus' daughter and granddaughters.

¹³¹ Sperry, pg. 178.

¹³² T. Millon, *Disorders of the Personality* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1981), pg. 217-218; M. Kantor, *Diagnosis and Treatment of the Personality Disorders* (Tokyo: Ishiyaku EuroAmerica, Inc., 1992), pg. 223.

they are.¹³³ When one examines the fragments of letters in which Augustus praises Tiberius, it is for his skills as a soldier, not for his personality. In fact, various aspects about Tiberius, including his demeanor and speech were critiqued by Augustus.¹³⁴ The fact that Tiberius was the eldest child meant that he would receive the most scrupulous attention from Livia and Augustus.¹³⁵ This may also be a contributing factor to why Drusus was also very morally upstanding, but was not morose¹³⁶ because he was not the focus of attention. Also, males are most likely to develop this type of personality because society places greater expectations on them to succeed.¹³⁷ Roman society was no different, and Tiberius, being the eldest male in the imperial household, would have experienced this phenomenon to a much greater extent.

Certainly there were many other Romans who were also very republican in their behaviour; however, there were just as many senators who were not. The rising class of *novi homines* were vying for power, prestige and luxury, and conducting illicit affairs

¹³³ Robinson, pg. 117. Dr. V. Taylor, at St. Joseph's Mental Health – Mountain Site, also explained that the parental environment of those with OCPD is often very cold, and unfeeling.

¹³⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 21, 68, *Aug.* 86. Although Augustus does call Tiberius charming, it appears to have been common among family. If Tiberius actually was charming, Augustus would have had no need to criticize him. Tiberius exhibited physical traits of emotional restriction as well. He had a rigid way of moving, and would refuse to speak to anyone in his company (Kantor, pg. 216-218; Suet. *Tib.* 68). However, Tiberius was also described as being exceptionally polite which is also very common with OCPD as the individuals are conditioned to defer to authority (Maj, pg. 171; Sperry, pg. 180; Suet. *Tib.* 29). Tiberius' extreme distaste of flattery would further confuse those around him. When he became emperor, he refused titles for himself and his mother (Suet. *Tib.* 26, 51.2, 67); he checked the use of flattery within the senate (Tac. *Ann.* 4.37); he refused to allow anyone to approach his litter and would not permit himself to be kissed, also, if during speeches those speaking referred to him in too flattering of terms, he interrupted them and corrected their speech (Suet. *Tib.* 27). Individuals with OCPD loathe flattery because it conjures undesirable emotions, and because they feel unworthy of it. They have high expectations and often feel that they do not measure up. As a result they neither receive, nor give, flattery. All of this behaviour is reflective of the desperate need for control that these individuals have. In order to be 'perfect' citizens, they must keep all negative emotions, and situations under extreme control. Restricted affect is a result of this behaviour.

¹³⁵ Sperry, pg. 181. The eldest child receives more attention from caregivers, and as a result has a higher chance of developing OCPD.

¹³⁶ For example, see Vell. 2.97, and Suet. *Claud.* 1.1, for the character of Drusus.

¹³⁷ Robinson, pg. 121.

with freedwomen.¹³⁸ Augustus had to do something to promote proper family building, and ensure that a population of freedmen stock was not outnumbering citizens. Tiberius was raised during all of this, and it is no small wonder that it impacted him the way that it did.

The Obsessive-compulsive personality tends to take a moral system and practice it to the extreme.¹³⁹ Therefore it is not surprising that in the various accounts of Tiberius' reign that have survived, he is described as incredibly moral and principled. In fact, he was so much so that he became angry when he received flattery and shunned it. He was the pinnacle of justice when he sat in on various court cases, and instructed the senators as a means of ensuring that justice was observed.¹⁴⁰ In fact, in some cases he took justice and duty to a very large extreme by ignoring certain sacred duties and rights as a means of ensuring that justice was served.¹⁴¹ Everything that he had been exposed to while living in Augustus' house, and being a pawn in his political situation was taken to heart. Tiberius, in most cases, and like Agrippa,¹⁴² submitted to Augustus, and continued to practice all of the precedents that had been established. In fact, Tiberius' devotion seemed almost fanatical.

¹³⁸ R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pg. 9.

¹³⁹ When one examines the sources, numerous examples appear of men who had moderate temperament, were outspoken, flamboyant, and even incredibly cruel (Moderate temperament: L. Arruntius, Tac. *Ann.* 1.13; Outspoken: Messalinus Cotta, *Ann.* 6.5; Flamboyant: Agrippina, Suet. *Tib.* 53; Incredibly Cruel: Cn. Piso, *Ann.* 2.43) even though they were all living within the same social context.

¹⁴⁰ For example Suet. *Tib.* 58 (attitude toward justice) and 27 (attitude toward flattery).

¹⁴¹ Suet. *Tib.* 69; Tac. *Ann.* 3.60-63, 4.14 and 36.

¹⁴² Syme (1939), pg. 341, 343-345.

Tiberius became very angry when Augustus was insulted by various enemies.¹⁴³ After Augustus' death, Tiberius strictly adhered to Augustan precedent, and even devoted himself to the promotion of the cult of Augustus.¹⁴⁴ Tiberius would not allow himself to be worshipped, but did encourage the provinces to worship Augustus. However, Tiberius himself appears to have felt unworthy, and would only allow himself to be worshipped if a precedent had been established in a particular area by Augustus.¹⁴⁵ The many Augustan precedents that Tiberius followed would require an extensive restating of what has been established by prominent scholars.¹⁴⁶ However, the possible reasons for why Augustus himself was so important must be considered.

Oftentimes with a diagnosis of OCPD, certain figures are sometimes considered to be 'gurus', or those who are experts, and adequate. The ways of this source of admiration for their extreme adequacy, and therefore, perfection are regarded as law. This appears to have been the case with regard to Augustus, and case studies of OCPD patients who had a source of admiration verify this behaviour. Anything that this perfect individual said was viewed as right, and not subject to change.¹⁴⁷ This may explain why Tiberius took great pains to ensure that Augustus' name was not tarnished, that his worship was well

¹⁴³ Suet. *Tib.* 51.

¹⁴⁴ Livia was the first *flaminica*, and Germanicus, the first *flamen*, of Augustus established in AD 17 by Tiberius. See William Smith, *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (London: John Murray, 1875). pg 180; Ryberg, pg. 72; DCA Shotter, "Tiberius and the Spirit of Augustus," *G and R* 13.2 (1966), pg. 209.

¹⁴⁵ Smith, pg. 205; Tac. *Ann.* 3.37.

¹⁴⁶ For example, Shotter (1966), pg. 210, and Ober, pg. 237.

¹⁴⁷ Kantor, pg. 223, and Sperry, pgs. 181 and 183.

established, and that Tiberius himself was adhering to his established right way.¹⁴⁸ It may also explain why he strictly adhered to Augustan precedent the way that he did.

This phenomenon certainly explains the source of Tiberius' moral system. The ways of the object of perfection, soon become the ways of the OCPD patient. Patients will adhere to these regulations as a means of becoming perfect and receiving the recognition that they did not receive as children.¹⁴⁹ Augustan precedent became Tiberius' way of ensuring that he did not make any grave errors, and would therefore be perfect. However, in order for Tiberius to achieve moral perfection, and be viewed as the quintessential republican, Tiberius had to adhere to a rigid ethical system. However, prior to discussing Tiberius' ethical system, an exploration of the importance of Tiberius to Augustus' regime and his eventual retirement will be made.

¹⁴⁸ It is likely that Tiberius was referring to Augustus, too, when he told the senate that he prayed that they found him worthy of his ancestry (Tac. Ann. 4.38).

¹⁴⁹ Sperry, pg. 181.

Chapter 3: Tiberius' Early Career and Retirement to Rhodes

At the pinnacle of his career in 6 BC, Tiberius made a decision that almost proved fatal: he retired to Rhodes. The reasons for the retirement are debated among the ancient sources. The main reason given was that Tiberius was in need of a rest.¹⁵⁰ However, the official reason was never made clear by the ancient sources. Tacitus claims that Tiberius disliked Julia, and needed time away from her.¹⁵¹ Dio and Suetonius have contributed other reasons for his retirement.¹⁵² However, it is plausible that this early retirement, which occurred contrary to Augustus' wishes, was probably caused by a bout of depression, the cause of which was likely a combination of all of the reasons given. In this section, Tiberius' departure to Rhodes, and his activities while there will be considered.

Certainly Tiberius' elevation to power likely played some role in his depression. He had become an incredibly important pawn in Augustus' imperial plan. Since 23 BC when Tiberius became the *quaestor Ostiensis*, he successfully completed many important missions for Augustus. For instance, in 21 BC Augustus sent Tiberius to the east to regain standards that had been lost to the Parthians, to depose Artaxes, the Armenian king, and replace him with his younger brother Tigranes.¹⁵³ The standards were recovered in 20 BC, and in Armenia, the pro-Roman party, upon discovering that Parthia

¹⁵⁰ Dio, 55.9.5; Suetonius, *Tib.* 10.2; Velleius, 2.99.2.

¹⁵¹ Tac. *Ann.* 1.43.; See also, Dio, 55.9.7, and Suet. 10.1, 11.4.

¹⁵² See Dio, 55.9.5-8; Suetonius, *Tib.* 10. Both provide reasons which include marital discord and the desire to improve his political standing. Suetonius also claimed that Tiberius was tired, and that had been the first reason he had given, an excuse which Levick boldly called 'false of course', B. M. Levick, "Tiberius' Retirement to Rhodes," *Latomus* 31 (1972), pg. 780.

¹⁵³ L.R. Taylor, "M. Titius and the Syrian Command," *JRS* 26.2 (1936), pg. 161-165.

was weakened, killed Artaxes themselves.¹⁵⁴ Although the victory was handed to him, Tiberius would benefit from sharing in the glory achieved by Augustus.

Tiberius received the praetor's insignia, prior to holding the office, and sacrifices were offered in his honour.¹⁵⁵ He was now a very important figure in the Augustan regime. Shortly after the Armenian success, in 19 BC, Tiberius also married Vipsania, Agrippa's daughter.¹⁵⁶ It was also at this time that Drusus embarked on the same political path as his brother had before him. At the age of 19 he was given a quaestorship, and was permitted to stand for the praetorship and consulship five years before the legal age.¹⁵⁷

It should be noted, that although Tiberius was achieving great success, he was doing so under the guidance and watchful eyes of Augustus. In 16 BC, when Tiberius became the urban Praetor, the Germans had begun to infiltrate across the Rhine and into Gaul causing a great deal of unrest in that province.¹⁵⁸ The governor in the year of 17 BC was Marcus Lollius, who had suffered a minor defeat at the hands of the Sugambri, losing an eagle. Although the eagle was regained shortly after, morale in that province had dwindled, and the Gauls could no longer be trusted.¹⁵⁹ As a result, Augustus himself decided to intervene, and he took Tiberius with him.¹⁶⁰ In Gaul, Tiberius was

¹⁵⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 2.3.4; *RG* 27.2; Taylor (1936), pg. 163.

¹⁵⁵ Dio, 54.5.9, and Vell. Pat. 2.122.1.

¹⁵⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 7.2; Levick (1976), pg. 27.

¹⁵⁷ Dio. 54.10.4; Levick (1971), pg. 478-480.

¹⁵⁸ Dio, 54.2.2, and *PIR*² L 311 for date; See also R. Syme, "Some Notes on the Legions Under Augustus," *JRS* 23 (1933): pg. 16-17.

¹⁵⁹ Syme (1933), pg. 19.

¹⁶⁰ The duties of the Praetorship were left to Drusus, in Tiberius' absence (Vell. 2.97.1).

responsible for blocking German raids as well as subduing the quarrelling between key Gallic nobles.¹⁶¹

In 15 and 14 BC, Tiberius gained more military experience, this time, with Drusus. It was at this time that the tribes of Vindelicia and Raetia were conquered, which helped to ensure further control in the North, preventing the Germans from crossing the Rhine.¹⁶² Tiberius' ample military successes were in part due to his extreme caution and detailed manner. Augustus would likely not have been willing to attempt the conquest of Germany and the Alps, had Tiberius not been available.¹⁶³

It was also during the period of wars in Gaul, that Augustus made his dynastic plans more clear.¹⁶⁴ If two men shared power, then if one should die, the other would be able to maintain the state. Agrippa was married to Augustus' daughter Julia, and the union proved fruitful. It produced two sons, Gaius in 20 BC, and Lucius in 17 BC.¹⁶⁵ Once this system of succession was implemented, the empire truly was in place.

Tiberius was at the pinnacle of his career in 13 BC. He had become a consul that year with P. Quinctilius Varus and was responsible for instituting the law that permitted Agrippa to have power with Augustus.¹⁶⁶ It was also during this year that his first son, Drusus was born. However, in 12 BC, Agrippa was in Campania when he became ill and

¹⁶¹ C.M. Wells *The German Policy of Augustus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), pg. 59-61, and T.D. Barnes, "The Victories of Augustus," *JRS* 64 (1974): pg. 22.

¹⁶² Syme (1939), pg. 329 and 390.

¹⁶³ Levick (1976), pg. 28.

¹⁶⁴ Scholars debate the intended reason for the succession, but there is no reason to suspect that it was due to regency. For regency debate see R. Seager, *Tiberius* (London, Eyre Methuen, Ltd., 1972) pg. 18-38 and A. Boddington, "Sejanus. Whose Conspiracy?" *AJP* 84.1 (1963), pg. 1-16; For joint succession debate, see Levick (1976), pg. 19-67.

¹⁶⁵ Levick (1976), pg. 29, and *PIR*² I 316.

¹⁶⁶ A.H.M. Jones, "The Imperium of Augustus," *JRS* 41.1-2 (1951): pg. 112-115. See also, Levick (1976), pgs. 23 and 29.

died. Since Agrippa was Augustus' leading general, he had to be replaced promptly. For Tiberius, this meant divorcing his beloved Vipsania, in order to marry the free-spirited Julia. This surely could not have been a happy time as it appears that Tiberius was quite taken with Vipsania.

Suetonius describes the marriage between Tiberius and Vipsania, daughter of Marcus Agrippa, as very harmonious. When Tiberius was forced to divorce Vipsania, Suetonius claims that he did so reluctantly, and after he had divorced her, he regretted it.¹⁶⁷ In fact, Suetonius continues to explain that when Tiberius saw her after divorcing her, care was taken to ensure that he never saw her again because of his reaction.¹⁶⁸ Although this account may be a result of rumour, it does help to demonstrate an important aspect of OCPD, and the general sentiment appears to be in keeping with this diagnosis.

Individuals who have OCPD tend to have few friends, and resent change. This tends to be because there are few people who can function well with the rigid nature of the OCPD patient.¹⁶⁹ Vipsania had a very compromising nature about her that was very compatible with Tiberius' rigid one. Therefore, it is entirely possible, and still in keeping with the diagnosis, to suggest that Tiberius did become distraught when he was forced to divorce Vipsania. However, it was likely not for the loss of Vipsania herself that Tiberius was upset, but for the resulting change that divorcing her caused. He was in a situation in which he had no control, and control of every situation is key in OCPD.¹⁷⁰ Now Tiberius was raising children that were not his, and he was forced to marry Julia, who was

¹⁶⁷ For a full discussion of the divorce, and the proceeding events, see Suetonius, *Tib.* 7.2.

¹⁶⁸ Suet. *Tib.* 7.3.

¹⁶⁹ DSM-IV, pg. 728.

¹⁷⁰ DSM-IV, pg. 727.

indecent.¹⁷¹ This practice was very common in Rome, and the fact that Tiberius seemed to be very distraught by it, indicates one aspect of his resilience to change.¹⁷² Although this entire scenario may be rumour, it still applies to OCPD.

Tiberius' marriage to Julia was initially happy. Julia accompanied Tiberius on his campaign to the Balkans, and gave birth to their only son, who died, in 10 BC. The following year when Tiberius celebrated an ovation, Julia took part in the festivities,¹⁷³ however, it is likely when Tiberius became more established politically that Julia began to resent him. Tiberius was from an older school of thought who believed that women had no place in politics.¹⁷⁴ This, and the fact that Tiberius had less eminent ancestry may have been what spurred the letter that Julia sent to Augustus complaining about her husband's demeanor.¹⁷⁵ Julia's character was also a cause of dissension between the two.

Julia was very much a 'city girl', who was a woman of fashion and very licentious. Augustus did everything in his power to attempt to keep Julia under control, but to no avail.¹⁷⁶ She drank excessively, wore provocative clothing, and she was adulterous, and guilty of public perversion.¹⁷⁷ These were all traits that would have made

¹⁷¹ Suetonius, *Tib.* 7. Although in Roman Society this practice was common, an individual with OCPD would not adapt very well, regardless of what is normal for the culture (I am indebted to Dr. Taylor for this explanation). Also Julia's nature was very stubborn, and rigid as well which would not mix with Tiberius'.

¹⁷² When change is forced on an individual of OCPD, who does not welcome change, the result is often a violent outburst of emotion. If Tiberius reacted badly enough that Augustus had to prevent him from seeing her again, then it is likely that the outburst was extreme.

¹⁷³ Suet. *Tib.* 7.3, Dio 55.2.4.

¹⁷⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.3.

¹⁷⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 1.53.

¹⁷⁶ Suet. *Aug.* 64.

¹⁷⁷ Dio, 55.10.14; Sen. *De Ben.* 6.32.1; Plin. *NH.* 21.9.

Tiberius miss Vipsania that much more.¹⁷⁸ While all of this was occurring there were other factors at play which could have had an impact on Tiberius' mental state.

In 6 BC, the senate wished to make Gaius a consul.¹⁷⁹ Augustus did not refuse the honour but did postpone it. Other honours were heaped upon Gaius, and Augustus sought the consulship in 5 BC in order that he might accompany Gaius into the forum when he donned the *toga virilis*.¹⁸⁰ The offer of the consulship to Gaius may also have reflected a lack of confidence that the people had in Tiberius as a politician. It is unlikely that Augustus expected him to retire, but, when Tiberius starved himself out of spite, Augustus relented and allowed him to retire.¹⁸¹

Tiberius' reaction to Augustus when he refused to allow Tiberius to retire is very interesting for this study. Tiberius, essentially, did what any individual with OCPD would do: he reestablished control over the situation. By threatening to starve himself to death, Tiberius removed the control over the situation from Augustus to himself. Individuals who are in a position where they have no control may commit rebellious acts such as these as a means of regaining the control that they have lost.¹⁸² Tiberius was essentially an agent to Augustus which is evident in the account of his career and personal life, above. This was his way of indirectly rebelling, and removing full control of his life away from Augustus. Finally Augustus relented and Tiberius departed from Rome.

¹⁷⁸ Levick (1976), pg. 37, 41.

¹⁷⁹ Augustus postponed the consulship for the boy (Dio, 55.9.1-5).

¹⁸⁰ Dio 55.9.1-5 and Tacitus *Ann.* 1.3. For a list of the honours granted to Gaius and Lucius, see *PIR*² I 216 and 222.

¹⁸¹ Suet. *Tib.* 10.2.

¹⁸² Robinson, pg. 122.

Only a few individuals saw him off, and one senator accompanied him to Rhodes.¹⁸³ The fact that Tiberius did depart from Rome during the height of his career does indicate depression. It is likely that the stress from his marriage to Julia, and the stress from being placed in the background when he had been so important to Augustus all along, was enough to make him beg for retirement on account of his ‘fatigue’.¹⁸⁴ All of these explanations are very plausible and it is very possible that all were equally responsible for his depression. Tiberius had been forced to divorce Vipsania, and remarry the scandalous Julia. He had also been eclipsed by Gaius and Lucius, even though Augustus owed much of his success to Tiberius.¹⁸⁵ The theory that Tiberius was depressed fits well with his abrupt departure from Rome, and also supports the diagnosis of OCPD. Depression often accompanies the condition, and has an onset in later life.¹⁸⁶ Tiberius would have been 36 years old when he made his second retirement at Rhodes. His abrupt departure, conduct, and refusal to return to Rome, indicate depression. However, initially, Tiberius did partake in study while at Rhodes.

Although Tiberius was an austere Roman, he was also a philhellene. He enjoyed having debates with the Greek intellectuals, and even adopted their dress when he was a private citizen.¹⁸⁷ While he was at Rhodes, he adopted some of the cultural norms such as target practice and riding; however, he appeared to be most interested in the philosophical

¹⁸³ Suet. *Tib.* 10.2, and Tac. *Ann.* 4.15, who describes Lucilius Longus, the only senator to accompany Tiberius to Rhodes.

¹⁸⁴ This was the initial excuse that Tiberius provided to Augustus when he requested that he be allowed to retire (Suet. *Tib.* 10.1).

¹⁸⁵ Dio also claims that Tiberius left because he was angry that he had been given the tribunician power to annoy the young princes, Gaius and Lucius (55.9.4). See also, Levick (1972), pgs. 780-789.

¹⁸⁶ DSM-IV, pg. 728; Robinson, pg. 122; Dr. V. Taylor, “Personal Interview,” St. Joseph’s Mental Health, Mountain Site, Hamilton, September 3rd, 2005.

¹⁸⁷ Suet. *Tib.* 2.1.

side of Greek culture. The branch of philosophy, if any, that Tiberius followed, and how it impacted his career and conduct, is uncertain.¹⁸⁸

Regardless of his philosophical leanings, Tiberius loved to debate. In fact the only time that he actually used his tribunician power was during one such debate. Tiberius had chosen a side and was abused by one of the philosophers who was in attendance. Tiberius left the scene quietly and returned with his lectors to arrest the man.¹⁸⁹ This appeal to his authority was hardly very Stoic, which was the main philosophical school at Rhodes.¹⁹⁰ In this case, his OCPD caused him to react to an inferior with incredible contempt, and authority, which is typical of this condition when dealing with ‘inferiors’.¹⁹¹ Further support for the view that Tiberius suffered from OCPD was his use of astrology.

Tiberius’ interest in astrology, during his second retirement, is also considered to be further proof of his stoic ties. However, since it is uncertain which branch, if any, of philosophy that Tiberius followed closely, it is also possible that his interest in astrology was due to the unrest of the times.¹⁹² He kept an astrologer with him named Thrasyllus, to whom he gave Roman citizenship in AD 4.¹⁹³ Tiberius himself also became adept at the art and he kept Thrasyllus with him for the remainder of his days in order that he

¹⁸⁸ Suet. Tib., 74 and Pliny the Elder, NH, 34.62.

¹⁸⁹ Suet. Tib. 11.3.

¹⁹⁰ Tiberius is assumed to ‘act’ in a Stoic way, but this philosophy does not account for his personality very well (Levick (1976), pg. 18)

¹⁹¹ Stone, pg. 347, and Millon, pg. 225. Dr. V. Taylor, explains that these individuals may bark orders like a drill sergeant.

¹⁹² Suet. Tib. 62 and 69 and W. Allen, Jr., “The Political Atmosphere of the Reign of Tiberius,” TAPA 72 (1941): pg. 1-7.

¹⁹³ See PIR T 137.

might know his destiny.¹⁹⁴ Given the nature of astrology in Rome, this trend also fits very well with an OCPD diagnosis.

Although astrology does form a component of the Stoicism that was practiced in Rome at that time,¹⁹⁵ Tiberius' love of it goes far beyond basic consultation. Unlike Augustus, Tiberius practiced astrology himself and he was noted for being a master at this art. He even went through scrupulous, and severe, testing techniques to ensure that he found the perfect astrological advisor.¹⁹⁶ After all, Tiberius was a very particular man, and only the most adequate astrologer would do. Thrasyllus ended up being the man who successfully evaded death and became Tiberius' advisor and friend for the remainder of Tiberius' days.¹⁹⁷

Tiberius' relationship with astrology is interesting to note in the context of this diagnosis. Since OCPD tends to be preoccupied with the future, it would make perfect sense that Tiberius would seek out astrology. Any mechanism that would allow him to see the future and avoid major error would be most welcome. His keen attention to detail

¹⁹⁴ For evidence of Thrasyllus' citizenship, see CIL III, 7107; M. Manilius, Astronomica, 4.764-776.

¹⁹⁵ Brennan, The Stoic Life: Emotions Duties and Faith (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2005), pg. 33 and Levick (1976), pg. 18. The ideal behaviours of Stoicism do overlap with the symptoms of OCPD; however, Stoicism cannot account for Tiberius' behaviour since each individual who practiced it did so differently. All of the behaviours mentioned above, and throughout this thesis, do contradict with both Stoic and Epicurean principles, though it is certain that Tiberius did practice Stoicism. See Levick (1976), pg. 18 and W. M. Hayes, "Tiberius and the Future," CJ 55.1 (1959), pg 5; A. Wallace-Hadrill, "The Emperor and his Virtues," Historia 30 (1981), pgs. 303-304. Tiberius' imperial coinage contains virtues that are aspects of Stoicism such as Justice. However, Marcus Aurelius uses Tiberius as an example of a man who was plagued by vice and paranoia, two aspects that are certainly not Stoic (Marcus Aurelius, Meditations, 12.27). Based upon appearances, Tiberius appears to have practiced both of these philosophies simultaneously; however, his adherence to these two opposing philosophies was so rigid that it indicates a personality disorder. The aspects of each that Tiberius to which Tiberius does adhere are perfectly in keeping with OCPD, permitting the discussion of the philosophies to be omitted. See also, D. Konstan, Some Aspects of Epicurean Philosophy (Leiden, E. J Brill, 1973), pgs. 1-25.

¹⁹⁶ Tac. Ann. 6.20-21.

¹⁹⁷ Thrasyllus also attended formal dinners with Tiberius and Augustus, one of which was documented in (Suet. Aug. 98.3).

as well as cautious nature could easily account for his almost fanatical attitude toward this science as compared to Augustus.¹⁹⁸ It is also very likely that he used the knowledge that he acquired from Thrasyllus as a sort of checking mechanism.¹⁹⁹ Tiberius would make a prediction then ask Thrasyllus to check it.²⁰⁰ However, Tiberius' stay at Rhodes was not enjoyable for the entire duration.

Augustus did not forget the stress that Tiberius had caused him by his abrupt departure, and when Julia was disgraced in 2 BC, Augustus made this abundantly clear. He sent Tiberius a letter divorcing the latter from Julia.²⁰¹ Tiberius begged Augustus to not be so harsh on his daughter, and to allow him to return to Rome.²⁰² Augustus flatly refused him, and the following year when Tiberius' tribunician powers had expired they were not renewed. Livia intervened on her son's behalf and secured him the title of Legate to conceal his embarrassing exile.²⁰³ His mental state also appears to have deteriorated.

Tiberius stopped receiving officials who put in at Rhodes, fearing their homage, and he discontinued the military exercises which he had once enjoyed.²⁰⁴ Tiberius was in

¹⁹⁸ Augustus took the science of astrology very seriously and did publish his horoscope; however, based upon the accounts, astrology appears to have been much more important to Tiberius (Barton, pg. 44).

¹⁹⁹ Dio claims that Tiberius was very adept at astrology (Dio, 55.11.1, and Tac. Ann. 6.20).

²⁰⁰ There are other examples of Tiberius checking on various matters during his reign. His careful monitoring of the senate (Suet. Tib. 73) is one example. Tiberius' relationship with Thrasyllus also presents an interesting aspect of this study. Essentially, Tiberius accepted Thrasyllus as an omniscient astrologer, someone whose technique could not be questioned. With OCPD, certain people become highly regarded even though their backgrounds are less than reputable. It is uncertain whether Thrasyllus meets this category, but Tiberius' admiration of him is certainly reminiscent of his admiration for Sejanus. See Chapter 8, Section 1.

²⁰¹ She supposedly was involved in a faction that had the intention of killing Augustus. See Plin. NH, 7.149, and Levick (1972), pg. 795.

²⁰² Suet. Tib. 11.4.

²⁰³ Suet. Tib. 12.1.

²⁰⁴ Suet. Tib. 12.

a very precarious position. It was entirely plausible that he could lose his life on account of this monstrous political blunder. In one account, Tiberius became so fearful that he took up the Greek mode of dress,²⁰⁵ a detail which some scholars have chosen not to believe; however, given the severe psychosocial stresses that Tiberius was under during his time at Rhodes, it is entirely plausible that he did dress this way.

In event-caused delusional disorder of the persecutory type, in which the individual feels powerless, they may resort to disguises as a means of preventing those whom they fear from harming them. Tiberius' fears were very real, which further supports this type of delusion was present. The fact that he was no longer in favor is evidenced by the actions of the people of Nemausus who threw down his statues.²⁰⁶ Tiberius' fears were very real, and his life really was in danger. Augustus could order his death if he viewed it as necessary, which was likely the reason why Tiberius stopped talking to any soldiers and diplomats, he did not want to give the impression of treasonable acts.²⁰⁷ However, the isolation may have furthered his terror, causing him to feel the need to protect himself via a disguise. One case study provides the examples of a man who thought that the mafia was attempting to kill him, so he disguised himself and only left his house at night.²⁰⁸ This explanation is very plausible given that Tiberius was experiencing a depressive episode at the time, and event delusions tend to arise from those.

²⁰⁵ Dio, 55.10.9.

²⁰⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 13.1; Levick (1976), pg. 45.

²⁰⁷ Suet. *Tib.* 13.

²⁰⁸ DSM-IV-TR, pg. 322.

Finally after much hardship, Tiberius was permitted to return to Rome; however, Augustus made it abundantly clear that Tiberius' return was permitted by Gaius. Tiberius returned to Rome but was not active in politics. He moved from the home that he had on the Esquiline Hill, and relocated to the gardens of Maecenas where his presence would be less conspicuous. Certainly, Tiberius' personality was as puzzling to the ancient Romans as it is today. He was reclusive, moral, just, and austere, traits which were confusing to those around him. In the following section, Tiberius' philosophical and ethical system will be considered.

Chapter 4: Tiberius' Career Between AD 4 and 14

I. *Patrons and Friends*

The political situation during the last 10 years of Augustus' reign was difficult. Augustus lost both of his heirs, and was forced to reorganize his succession plans. Military emergencies also contributed to the upheaval of the times, and Tiberius spent the majority of the time between AD 4 and AD 14 on campaign. This portion of Augustus' reign is not as well documented as the previous years, and many scholars focus on the politics of the time.²⁰⁹ However, to consider all of the political events of this period would be exhausting, and not overly relevant to this study. This is because it is difficult to discern Tiberius' true political influence at the time. Therefore, the factions which have been demonstrated to have been present during this time will only be mentioned briefly, as well as the relevant political reforms made in response to them. The main focus will be the types of people whom Tiberius appears to have supported, his friends, and, finally, Tiberius' military career during this time. Tiberius' return to political prominence will be discussed first.

The Augustan succession was once again thrown into jeopardy when Lucius died in AD 2. It was at this time that Tiberius was permitted to return to Rome; however, it was not a warm welcome. In fact, Augustus made it very clear to Tiberius that it had been Gaius who had allowed him to return, and not him.²¹⁰ This is not surprising

²⁰⁹ Levick (1976), pg. 47-67; Syme (1939), pg. 419-439; Levick (1966), pg 227-230; Syme (1986), pg. 64-79.

²¹⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 3.48.

considering that Augustus' succession plans, and the fact that the stability of the empire had been thrown into complete jeopardy when Tiberius abruptly retired to Rhodes in 6 BC. As one source states, Augustus could handle the deaths of his relatives with more fortitude than their errors.²¹¹ By retiring, Tiberius committed a grave error, one that Livia and Augustus had attempted to stop, by turning his back on the regime, and on Augustus. Had Gaius survived, Tiberius may have remained in obscurity; however, fate determined that he would become emperor, and in AD 4 Gaius died from an illness at Limyra.²¹² The succession was, once again, in jeopardy. Augustus, at this time, finally chose to adopt Tiberius.

On the 26th of June AD 4, Augustus adopted Tiberius with Agrippa Postumus. However, Agrippa's situation was not as favorable as Tiberius'. He remained in favor until the following year, when Augustus disinherited him.²¹³ Tiberius, on the other hand, was made co-heir with Augustus, an agreement which was cemented by the offer of the tribunician power, and a command in Germany. However, regardless of the fact of Tiberius' refusal to conform to the role that he had been assigned in the Augustan regime before his retirement, in AD 4 he refused the tribunician power both privately and in the senate.²¹⁴ If Tiberius did in fact refuse the honours which Velleius claims that he did,²¹⁵ then this reflects yet another facet of OCPD.

²¹¹ Levick, (1976), pg. 46; Suet. Aug. 65.2.

²¹² PIR² I 216, pg. 128.

²¹³ The sources claim that Agrippa was disinherited because he was mentally unsound. However, Levick argues that it was more likely that Agrippa posed a threat to the regime because of his Julian supporters. See Levick (1966), pg. 267, and Syme (1986), pg. 64-69.

²¹⁴ Vell. Pat. 2.104.2; Tiberius received a 10 year grant of the tribunician power (Tac. Ann. 1.3.3).

²¹⁵ Levick states that principle and pride would dictate that Tiberius would reject the powers conferred, but that fear of what would happen to his position would cause him to accept it (Levick (1976), pg. 47-48).

People who suffer from OCPD are living contradictions because they aim to please their superiors by being perfect, but view themselves as imperfect and think themselves inadequate because of that.²¹⁶ Therefore, as is often the case, those with this condition that do succeed often come across as aloof and unappreciative.²¹⁷ Any thanks or honours conferred are often viewed as unnecessary because of feelings of inadequacy,²¹⁸ which may be why Tiberius refused the tribunician power. Tiberius, as a sufferer of OCPD, would view the honour as unnecessary, and far too lofty a title for him to accept given the recent familial discord. Augustus, and possibly Livia,²¹⁹ may have given Tiberius an ultimatum which would have swayed his decision to accept or risk remaining in his current situation. The pressure from someone in a position of authority would have been enough to convince Tiberius to accept it. After all, every individual with OCPD is deferential to those authority figures whom they view as being superior. Whatever the case, Tiberius was elevated back to his previous position of power and was sent on campaign in Germany. It was also during this time period that numerous political reforms were made.

In AD 4 the senate was purged, and a number of Tiberius' supporters were admitted. This, in essence, lessened the impact of Julia's faction on the senate. In AD 5 the *Lex Valeria Cornelia* was introduced. This law would ensure that the upper classes

²¹⁶ This behavioural observation is made based on case studies provided by Kantor, pg. 221-223.

²¹⁷ Therefore, the Tiberian pride that gave him the reputation of being haughty is more likely to be linked to OCPD. Robinson, pg. 122 explains that individuals with this condition often appear as being very aloof. See Levick (1976), pg. 47-55 for a discussion of Tiberius' pride, as well as Maranon, pg. 18-22.

²¹⁸ Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder patients can never accept compliments without adamantly mentioning flaws in their work (DSM-IV, pg 726).

²¹⁹ Livia had shown herself to be defensive of her son's career when she secured a legateship for Tiberius while at Rhodes (Suet. *Tib.* 12.1).

would have greater control over the outcome of consular and praetorian elections.²²⁰ This move is almost reminiscent of the elevation of the senate in the beginning of Tiberius' reign, and one that is reminiscent of a diagnosis of OCPD. Those who suffer from OCPD prefer to limit the control of those whom they view as inferior to themselves, and in some cases, may be incredibly harsh toward them.²²¹ These people were viewed as inadequate and more likely to make grave errors, than those in higher ranking offices. To the patient with OCPD, a hierarchy of command is very important. Although Tiberius had *imperium* equivalent to Augustus', much of Tiberius' time would have been spent dealing with the upheaval in Pannonia, Illyricum, and Germany. Augustus' own influence in the elevation of Tiberius' supporters, and the quashing of Julia's faction's power, cannot be clearly discerned. This is especially difficult when dealing with an individual who suffers from OCPD.

These individuals will regard certain authority figures as better than themselves. The rules that these authority figures establish may also become set in stone to the person who suffers from OCPD. Augustus was a figure of authority in Tiberius' life. In fact, Tiberius deferred to Augustus' wishes on numerous occasions, and regarded his policies as rigid rules, never to be broken.²²² Therefore, it is impossible to tell, given Augustus' old age and failing health, whether Tiberius assumed control and promoted policies of his own, and the people who supported him, or, whether Augustus gave Tiberius instructions, and Tiberius carried them out as he had done during the duration of his relationship with

²²⁰ Levick (1976), pg. 51.

²²¹ Kantor, pg. 223-224.

²²² For example, Tiberius divorced Vipsannia to marry Julia. Also, during Tiberius' reign, he refused to change any rule/law which had been laid out by Augustus. See Chapter 3, pg. 40.

Augustus prior to 6 BC. Both of these options are equally possible given a diagnosis of OCPD.²²³ However, given the fact that Augustus was alive, and that Tiberius had made some poor decisions in the past, it is highly unlikely that he would have initiated any policy that would have angered Augustus.²²⁴ Whatever the case, Tiberius' friends became more prominent, politically, during this time.

All of those individuals, who had shown themselves to be supporters of Tiberius, were also earning important positions in government. Scholarship has gone so far to claim that most of these individuals were 'friends' to Tiberius.²²⁵ However, this definition is problematic, because it does not differentiate between a political ally, and a companion, which is important to this study. Individuals who suffer from OCPD have very few friends due to the rigid nature of their personality. If one considers the word friend, the way that modern sources are using it, as a political ally, it appears that Tiberius was popular. In working relationships, individuals with OCPD often are popular because they often work the hardest.²²⁶ Tiberius would have been popular among his political allies, and military comrades for his hard work, but this does not mean that all of the individuals were true friends. Therefore, it is important to be sure that the Roman definition of friend is considered so that modern bias is not applied, leading to a false diagnosis.

²²³ Both deferral to authority, and assuming control have been observed with OCPD (Millon, pg 226). I am also indebted to Dr Taylor for pointing out this example of the contradictory nature of OCPD.

²²⁴ Augustus probably had the final decision on any policy that Tiberius may have wanted to introduce. Changing the policy of the consular elections would have further reduced the control that the common people had, thus reducing the power that Julia's Faction had. Augustus surely would have supported that.

²²⁵ Levick (1976), pg. 42-44; H. W. Bird, "L. Aelius Sejanus and His Political Influence", *Latomus* 28 (1969): pg. 77-85.

²²⁶ DSM-IV, pg. 279.

Cicero in his work *de Amicitia*, discusses two types of friends: true friends, and false friendship in which both parties gain something, such as power.²²⁷ The latter definition appears to describe very accurately the political allies that Tiberius had, and what modern scholars appear to be referencing when they discuss his friends. Certainly it is impossible to tell from the sources, unless otherwise determined, or specified, whether any one individual was a true friend to Tiberius. A careful examination of the ancient sources provided a very scant list of true friends with whom the friendship appeared to be significant and mutual. Any friendship which appeared to be a political alliance, or cannot be determined for certain, was not considered. Based upon this analysis, it appears that Tiberius had at least three close, or true, friends throughout the course of his life, excluding immediate family.

The men, who were considered to be Tiberius' true friends, were those whom the sources uniformly mention. They were also confidantes, and men whom Tiberius could trust during the more difficult times of his life. These were: L. Calpurnius Piso, Sejanus, and Lucilius Longus.²²⁸ Two of these friendships are noted in detail in the sources. The third, Lucilius Longus, is given in less detail but the information provided about this relationship is very telling. Tiberius was noted for his lack of friends, and his ability to

²²⁷ Cicero, *de Amicitia*. See, in particular, books 6-8 for a detailed discussion of the two types of friendship. False friendship appears to reflect the qualities of a friendly political alliance. True friendship reflected a harmonious relationship in which the two parties held common interests, and were similar in personality. See also, Sen *Ep.* 3.

²²⁸ Cn. Calpurnius Piso was left off of the list because his friendship is uncertain, and still heavily under debate. See Bird (1987), pg. 74. Thrasyllus was also omitted because his companionship was spurred by paranoia. Tiberius killed numerous astrologers until he found one who had proven himself. The sources do reference other close friends of Tiberius, but these are often such scant references that little may be drawn about the relationship the individual had with Tiberius. For example, Seius Tubero in Tac. *Ann.* 4.29.1 and Pomponius Flaccus who was made governor of Syria after a drinking bout in Suet. *Tib.* 42.

hold grudges for decades.²²⁹ This aspect of Tiberius' life is very indicative of a diagnosis of OCPD. However, prior to discussing his true friends, observations about those men with whom Tiberius chose to ally himself must also be discussed in further support of OCPD.

Levick claims that Tiberius appears to have valued loyalty most of all in those whom he supported.²³⁰ There appears to be no homogeneity among those whom he supported because not all of them were nobles, and not all had numerous successes behind them. The men whom Tiberius supported were the first of their families to enter the senate, or were men who shared similar political views to Tiberius, or men who had strong military backgrounds.²³¹ However, what appears to be the case, and is more apparent in Tiberius' provincial policies in his later reign,²³² was that he supported individuals whom he viewed as being adequate. In other words Tiberius would not support any individual who was not strongly deserving of it. Some of them even had a rigid personality like Tiberius' own.²³³ This is highly indicative of a diagnosis of OCPD, where the sufferer prefers people who have proven themselves, or who work as hard as he/she does.²³⁴ In many cases, the people whom OCPD patients prefer to respect and

²²⁹ For example Asinius Gallus is noted, historically, as a thorn in Tiberius' side. However, Gallus presents a unique behavioural aspect of OCPD in Tiberius. See, Chapter 7. Also for the grudge held against Serenus, see Tac. *Ann.* 4.29.3.

²³⁰ Levick (1976), pg. 44. Levick's account of Tiberius' friends is used here because she provides the most complete discussion.

²³¹ Levick (1976), pg. 52.

²³² See Chapter 6.

²³³ P. Sulpicius Quirinius was a successful soldier, he was notably rigid, and Tiberius was indebted to him for saving his life. Levick calls this man a friend to Tiberius, but the source that she references as evidence for this gives no indication of friendship. See Tac. *Ann.* 3.48.

²³⁴ This and a greater number of working acquaintances than companions is strongly indicative of OCPD.

admire are often incredibly successful.²³⁵ The fact that those whom Tiberius supported were successful surely would have drawn attention to them from other powerful senators. In other words, Tiberius may have regained political prominence, but his political influence at this time is difficult to determine.

Many of the supporters of Tiberius were likely favored by Augustus as well. In fact, many of their careers began before Tiberius' departure to Rhodes, and appear to have been unaffected during his retirement. For instance, Cn. Calpurnius Piso (*cos* 7 BC), and P. Quinctilius Varus (*cos* 13 BC),²³⁶ both held the consulship with Tiberius, but would have been fully supported by Augustus as well. Therefore, the use of the word 'friend' in regard to people who, based upon an examination of the ancient sources, appear to have been mainly political allies may be misleading, especially in a psychological study. Levick even admits that the majority of the people whom she terms as "friends of Tiberius," are actually people who would have been strong political allies.²³⁷ In fact, some of the people who are 'friends' of Tiberius', according to modern scholarship, are obscure references in the sources.²³⁸ However, the ancient sources do provide examples of individuals who may actually be termed as true friends to Tiberius.

²³⁵ However, these people refuse to relinquish control and often oversee all tasks to be sure that they are done correctly. This may be why Tiberius would choose certain individuals for posts in his later reign, and then never replace them. For example, C. Turranius (Tac. *Ann.* 1.7).

²³⁶ *PIR*² Q 30 for the career of Varus.

²³⁷ Levick (1976), pg. These people would have hoped to gain from his patronage.

²³⁸ For example the consuls of 3 and 8 BC, C. Marcius Censorinus and M. Valerius Messalla Messallinus, who are described by Velleius, but are not directly linked as favorable to Tiberius (Levick (1976), pg. 43), and Vell. Pat. 2.102.1.

L. Calpurnius Piso,²³⁹ is, perhaps, the best example of a man who is like-minded to Tiberius, but who was also a true friend. Piso was a pontiff, and had a very distinguished career. Tiberius was likely impressed with what he had accomplished, and would have been drawn to him as a result. Piso is also described by the sources as being Tiberius' confidante, and drinking partner.²⁴⁰ It should be noted that although Piso was a drunkard, who slept until noon, he was also devoted to his appointment, and did his job very well.²⁴¹ The devotion to work would also have been a quality that Tiberius would have liked. This type of behaviour is often seen in OCPD.

The patient with OCPD will have their own set of ethics and expectations, which are often contradictory to the societal norm. In this case, an extreme devotion to work, and to Tiberius, the ability to drink with no impact on productivity, would both be reasons to respect Piso and trust him.²⁴² Also, this relationship meets the criteria for true friendship laid out by Cicero. Tiberius and Piso were like-minded, and appeared to be devoted to each other. The duration of this relationship is unclear; however, since Tiberius did make friends slowly, it makes sense to assume that this relationship was long-standing. Tiberius' relationship with Lucilius Longus is less clear.

Lucilius Longus is mentioned only briefly in the sources, but the circumstances described indicate that he and Tiberius were very close. When Tiberius went to Rhodes, Longus was the only senator to accompany him there. This incident was described by

²³⁹ *PIR*² C 289, pg 64.

²⁴⁰ *Suet. Tib.* 42.1; *Pliny NH* 14.145; *Dio* 58.3; and *Sen. Ep.* 83.14.

²⁴¹ *Sen. Ep.* 83.15. This trait is also an aspect of Stoic philosophy; however, it is apparent from his drunkenness that Piso was not the epitome of Stoic with regard to this habit. He was the director of Public Safety, and did his job well.

²⁴² The fact that Augustus also trusted Piso could also have furthered Tiberius' trust in him (*Sen. Ep.* 83.15).

Tacitus who says that Longus was a man of humble origins. He became consul in AD 7, and was awarded a public funeral at his death.²⁴³ According to Levick, Longus had no political reason to stay in Rome.²⁴⁴ However, he also was not obligated to follow Tiberius into retirement. Only their friendship would explain Longus' voluntary retirement as well. Also, if they were close friends, then it makes sense that Tiberius would honour him with a public funeral.²⁴⁵ During Tiberius' depression and terror on Rhodes, when he had no idea if he would live or die, Longus was likely there for support. These two men, other than Sejanus, are the only two who are discussed in detail by the ancient sources, and may be termed true friends. The remaining Tiberian senators, who are called 'friends' by modern scholars, were examined in the ancient sources and were determined to be political allies of Tiberius.

Therefore, it appears that Tiberius had only a few true friends in his life. The majority of the men with whom he had contact appear to have been political allies who were also supported by Augustus. All of these men were men of merit, and to a person who values work and efficiency over personal qualities, these men would be worthy of support. Both a life of few friends and a rigid set of expectations for self and others are keynote features of OCPD. Another feature of Tiberius' career that is prominent in this time period, and is further indicative of OCPD, is his military career, which will be the focus of the next section.

²⁴³ Tac. *Ann.* 4.15.2.

²⁴⁴ Levick (1976), pg. 44.

²⁴⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 4.15.3. Tiberius also provided a public funeral to P. Quirinius. However, Quirinius had been instrumental in sparing Tiberius' life. It is likely that his public funeral had been awarded in thanks, and the fact that Lollius was ridiculed when Quirinius was praised is further indicative of this. The reasons for Longus' are less clear, and it is likely that he had been awarded for his friendship, and support, during Tiberius' exile at Rhodes.

II. *Tiberius' Military career AD 4-14*

The fact that Tiberius was a brilliant military commander was one trait on which modern scholars were, and still are, in agreement. Tiberius proved himself many times to be a capable general, which earned the trust of Augustus. All of the ancient sources are kind to Tiberius in their description of his achievements in the field, yet none are quite as descriptive as Velleius who actually had the privilege of serving beside Tiberius. It is at this point that Tiberius' military practices in the field, as well as his achievements, after his Rhodian retirement, must be considered in order to further demonstrate the harsh and regimented nature of his person. OCPD is most commonly found in work that offers rewards for increased productivity,²⁴⁶ such as the military; therefore, this aspect of Tiberius' life is very important to consider. No eye-witness accounts of Tiberius' practices in the field survive except for the work composed by Velleius, and it is his work that will be the primary focus of this section.

Velleius is traditionally overlooked by scholars due to his sycophantic writing about Tiberius. However, he does manage to supply some very personal, and unique, characteristics of the emperor that no one else could. Velleius entered the field with Tiberius in AD 4, and served with Tiberius for approximately eight years as prefect of the cavalry, and as a *legatus*.²⁴⁷ Therefore, he would have dealt with Tiberius personally.

²⁴⁶ DSM-IV, pg. 687. Dr Taylor explains that careers in the military, corporate business, or scholarship, would be most attractive to an individual with OCPD.

²⁴⁷ The first command occurred in AD 4, the second in about AD 7, on which, see Levick (1976), pg 56-63.

Also, it is possible that Tiberius was patron of his family.²⁴⁸ The traits which Velleius conveys about the emperor, although presented in a very positive light, are also reflected in the works by other ancient authors. The details of each campaign will not be discussed but key behaviours which are indicative of OCPD, that were raised during Velleius' discussion of the campaign, will be discussed.

The first campaign in which Velleius served under Tiberius was in Germany, which lasted from AD 4 – 6. Shortly after his adoption, Tiberius was sent on campaign to Germany to put down a revolt. It was during the first portion of Velleius' description of this campaign that a key piece of information is supplied. In Germany, Tiberius reserved the most dangerous missions for himself, and allowed Saturninus to handle the less dangerous ones.²⁴⁹ This detail, in and of itself, is telling of Tiberius' personality. He was such a perfectionist, and so cautious that it appears that he did not wish to leave the more dangerous and complicated tasks to anyone other than himself. This is actually common in an OCPD. The individual will never relinquish control out of the fear that someone else will do a less adequate job.²⁵⁰ However, they will allocate a lesser task to someone that they feel is adequate enough to do the job.²⁵¹ Velleius was trying to show that Tiberius was very considerate; however, it was more likely that Tiberius did not wish to

²⁴⁸ Vell. 2.104.3.

²⁴⁹ Vell. 2.105.1.

²⁵⁰ DSM-IV, pg. 726.

²⁵¹ Dr. V. Taylor, "Personal Interview", St. Joseph's Mental Health: Mountain Site, April 6, 2006. Individuals with this condition rarely allocate tasks; however, if they find someone whom they view as adequate, then they will allow them a lesser task to complete. In the military, Tiberius was the general, and because of the way the military was structured, Tiberius would have full control over how tasks were completed, and all personnel had to comply.

have anything go wrong. Further evidence of this will be supplied within chapter 4. Velleius also makes mention of other traits which can be easily attributed to OCPD.

In the following summer, Tiberius successfully led his army through all of Germany, subduing tribes. Velleius describes that Tiberius led his army 400 miles past the Rhine to the Elbe River.²⁵² He further states that Tiberius took everything into consideration, such as season, and extreme planning to be sure that he took the path that would allow them to rendezvous with the fleet at just the right moment. The fleet was also carefully planned as it bore supplies for the weary soldiers.²⁵³ This is one of many examples that Velleius supplies of Tiberius' meticulous planning,²⁵⁴ and his ability to be sure that he had a plan in place for any foreseeable catastrophe. In fact, this incredible caution was criticized, which reflects that it was a trait unique to Tiberius.²⁵⁵ Tiberius even used diplomacy, instead of war, in cases when the parties were willing.

This in itself may be telling, because, according to Velleius, Tiberius was not willing to wage war, if unnecessary death could be avoided. Tiberius was willing to bring the tribes near the Marcomanni, or interior of Germany, under control via diplomacy as well as war.²⁵⁶ This cautious nature may have been guided by a desire to be perfect.²⁵⁷ After all Tiberius did fail Augustus once before, so he would have to be especially sure to not do it again. It is also likely that Augustus would have had little tolerance for any

²⁵² This event likely occurred when Tiberius had to backtrack to Pannonia in AD 5 in order to put down that revolt. Levick (1976), pg 57; Vell. Pat. 2.110.6,

²⁵³ Vell. 2.106.3.

²⁵⁴ The majority of the examples are, understandably, from Tiberius' reign itself.

²⁵⁵ Inferred from Suet. *Tib.* 21.5. Augustus sent a large group of reinforcement.

²⁵⁶ Vell. 2.108.2.

²⁵⁷ Individuals with OCPD will over plan, over prepare, and over think all situations to avoid imperfection. DSM-IV, pg. 727, and Robinson, pg. 119-120.

failures of his adoptive son, given the events of 6 BC. Tiberius' caution and careful planning were also evident in Pannonia and Illyricum in AD 6-11.

Tiberius in his campaigns preferred efficiency to show, and he preferred to do things his own way, rather than rely on tried methods.²⁵⁸ Tiberius clearly thought of everything because when a large reinforcement from Rome arrived in AD 7 that he thought was too large to manage, he allowed them to rest, then sent them back, accompanied by the troops that he planned to keep with him.²⁵⁹ This was to prevent the departing army from being attacked, and to discourage the enemy from attacking the united forces.²⁶⁰ According to Velleius, Tiberius recognized that he could not exert effective control over an army so large. This demonstrates, yet again, Tiberius' need to have everything under his complete control. Tiberius' need for complete control and desire for perfection are both indicative of OCPD. The fact that Tiberius would rather send a portion of the army away in order to ensure control and efficiency exemplifies this fact.²⁶¹ Velleius also continues to describe a variety of personal attributes Tiberius displayed throughout both the German and Pannonian wars.²⁶² These are worth mention as they provide further evidence for OCPD.

Although Tiberius was a very principled man, he, almost contradicting himself, would allow his soldiers to use the staff of doctors which accompanied him on campaign.

²⁵⁸ Vell. 2.113.2.

²⁵⁹ This must be the reinforcements that Augustus sent, likely to hasten a victory. See Levick (1976), pg. 57.

²⁶⁰ Vell, 2.113.3.

²⁶¹ If this army had been sent by Augustus then this presents an interesting point: individuals with OCPD expect people to conform to the way that they want things done, and how they want them done. Tiberius removing the army reflects this. He was not looking for a hasty victory, he was looking for perfection (DSM-IV, pg. 726).

²⁶² Velleius does not describe when he observed these personality traits.

This detail is interesting for two reasons. First of all it demonstrates that Tiberius had an ample staff if he was able to care for his army. One of the keynote behavioural examples of OCPD is being over prepared for every situation.²⁶³ This was not the only time that Tiberius had traveled with a retinue of doctors. In fact, when he went to live on Capri he had an extensive medical staff there as well.²⁶⁴ Being prepared is key to these people because they prepare for the worst.²⁶⁵ The second factor that is interesting to note about this account is that he provided all of his extensive staff for the soldiers; however, it is unclear if he supplied this service for all soldiers, or just higher ranking ones.

It would make sense that he would for all, because, surely he would recognize that his success as a general hinged on the survival of his army and the defeat of enemies. To lose many of his soldiers in a poorly executed plan would make him appear to be inadequate.²⁶⁶ Also, Tiberius had failed Augustus once before, and it can hardly be imagined that Augustus would be able to tolerate another error on his part. The loss of an army, as the Varus incident would later exemplify, was not an error that was well received by Augustus.²⁶⁷ Yet again, Tiberius' need to be over prepared, and perfect, is demonstrated which is another trait that is highly indicative of OCPD. Velleius also discusses other traits which appear to not be tied to any particular battle.

Velleius relates one trait which is very interesting for the purpose of this argument. Tiberius also ignored people who were not as disciplined as he was. He would

²⁶³ DSM-IV, pg 728. I am indebted to Dr Taylor for this particular observation.

²⁶⁴ Houston, pg. 181.

²⁶⁵ Dr. Taylor described this as almost a doomsday conspiracy theory, where the individual expects the worst, therefore they must prepare.

²⁶⁶ Therefore: Vell. 2.114.1-2.

²⁶⁷ Suet. Aug. 23.2.

admonish and give verbal reproof occasionally, but would avoid punishment. According to Velleius this was because he would pretend not to see the things that bothered him.²⁶⁸ This example provides a number of points of discussion related to OCPD. Generally what this was showing was that Tiberius was emotionally restricting his anger. In other words, toward those who were not as stern, he stifled his anger. This is common in OCPD, as patients are often forced to stifle any unwanted, or negative, emotions at a young age.²⁶⁹ For these people the emphasis is put on being perfect. If children are throwing tantrums, then they are not maintaining good behaviour, and order. The notion that children should be seen and not heard is almost the mantra of the caregivers of those who later develop OCPD.²⁷⁰ It was only when the behaviour became too aggravating for Tiberius to bear that he would have an outburst.²⁷¹

When an individual with this condition does become aggravated enough to express their anger, they do so with no tact. These people are incredibly critical and quick to point out the flaws of others, and are often emotionally abusive.²⁷² Suetonius describes that Tiberius revived old methods of punishment, and became infuriated when a commander allowed some of his soldiers to accompany his freedman on a hunting trip.²⁷³ However, this only occurs when the individual views the offender as being inferior to

²⁶⁸ Vell. 2.114.3.

²⁶⁹ Robinson, pg. 119-120 and DSM-IV, pg. 728.

²⁷⁰ Robinson, pg. 119.

²⁷¹ There are numerous examples of this from Tiberius' reign.

²⁷² Robinson, pg. 120; DSM-IV, pg. 729, and Dr. Taylor, "Personal Interview," St. Joseph's Mental Health – Mountain Site, Hamilton, April 4th, 2006. Alcohol consumption, which is common in this condition, often aggravates it, making the outbursts worse.

²⁷³ Suet. Tib. 19.1.

themselves. Otherwise, they are so restricted that they may almost seem robotic in their movements and mannerisms, barely reacting to the situation at all, or fixing it themselves.

Therefore, any niceties displayed in Tiberius' discipline was likely a result of this emotional restriction toward those whom he viewed as adequate, and the need to remain in complete control of his emotions too. When any problem arose, the individual with OCPD would ruminate over how to deal with it.²⁷⁴ If no solution is available,²⁷⁵ and the problem persists, the OCPD individual becomes frustrated and angry. This appears to be the scenario in Tiberius' case. In fact there are numerous examples from his reign that demonstrate this very point.²⁷⁶ Also, it may be stated that Tiberius was likely not pretending not to see what was going on around him. It is more likely that he was actively attempting to come up with the best solution. This contradictory method of discipline described by the sources may therefore be accounted for by OCPD.

The conduct of the army was another topic of discussion for Velleius, and provides very good evidence for the OCPD thesis. Tiberius was not the type of person to rush victory without careful planning. In other words, he refused to sacrifice his soldiers in order to win a war.²⁷⁷ The safest course of action was always the best to Tiberius. He thought about a course of action carefully, then he considered how it would make him look, and he refused to allow the army to have any say in what he decided. He believed

²⁷⁴ Keep in mind that the OCPD individual would also be trying to find the best solution to deal with it, or the perfect solution. Perfection and control are a must with this condition.

²⁷⁵ Or, a solution that is the 'perfect/right' answer to the problem.

²⁷⁶ For examples, see Chapter 6.

²⁷⁷ Vell. 2.115.5.

that only the general knew what was best.²⁷⁸ This description is also very interesting in that it provides further obsessive-compulsive traits.

First of all, Tiberius required careful planning, which may seem to not be overly extraordinary for a general; however, Tiberius appears to have planned too much. In fact, Levick even credits his campaign delays, due to his caution, as being a major factor of the political unrest in AD 6 and 7.²⁷⁹ Numerous fires had ravaged the countryside, and Tiberius was cautious to the point that victory was delayed. As is often the case with OCPD, perfection is sought to the point that the task is never completed, or it is completed late.²⁸⁰ The fact that Tiberius was excessively cautious and that it may have impeded his productivity is demonstrated by his role as *quaestor Ostiensis*, which he held in 23 BC.²⁸¹ Tiberius was unable to effectively alleviate the grain shortage, and public outcry forced Augustus to step in and remedy the situation.²⁸² Therefore, based upon the evidence, it appears that this was an established personality trait of Tiberius'. Velleius furnished further proof of just how cautious Tiberius was by providing a discussion on the Varus disaster which occurred in AD 9.

²⁷⁸ Vell. 2.116.

²⁷⁹ Levick (1976), pg 57.

²⁸⁰ DSM-IV, pg 725.

²⁸¹ Suet. *Tib.* 8.

²⁸² Dio, 54.1.3 and Augustus, *Res Gestae* 5.2. The sources remain very quiet on what it was that Tiberius attempted to do to fix the shortage. What is clear, is that whatever measures Tiberius did take, they were ineffective, which is actually quite common with individuals affected by OCPD (DSM-IV pg. 725). One can only speculate what Tiberius might have done; however, if the public outcry was serious enough that Augustus had to become involved right away, then it is likely that Tiberius' approach made little change, if any, to the current shortage. Also, since Augustus was able to remedy the situation, then that eliminates the possibility that Tiberius was dealing with factors that made a remedy impossible. Factors such as a famine, or shortage due to war, or incompetence would be acceptable reasons for failure. Since Augustus assigned him the post, it is unlikely that Augustus viewed him as incapable for the role of Quaestor. See Dio, 53.28.3 and Tac. *Ann.* 3.29.1.

In describing the Varus disaster, Velleius points out a number of traits about Varus that are clearly meant to demonstrate just how cautious Tiberius was, by comparison. According to Velleius, Varus thought that he could simply subdue the German peoples by imposing laws on them. Varus, because of his less cautious nature, was lulled into a false sense of security. He had been warned that an attack was coming, and refused to believe it. Varus was a bit of a lazy man, quiet, mild, loved to spend money, and mentally slow; however, he had strong morals, and was loyal to Rome. What the description of the Varus disaster shows for the reader, in the long discussion provided in 2.118-120, is that Varus, though he was a good character and had strong morals, was not as cautious as Tiberius, and not as much of a perfectionist. So by comparison, and in Velleius' opinion, Tiberius was a far superior officer.

In the aftermath of the Varus disaster, Tiberius was sent to rectify the situation. Again he approached the situation the only way that an individual with OCPD could: with extreme caution and emotional restriction. He settled by restraint, rather than punishments, the revolts that had broken out in Germany, after the Varus disaster.²⁸³ Again, the aim here appeared to be regaining control. Punishing the individuals responsible for the uprising could mean that the uprising could occur again.²⁸⁴ Therefore, by restraining the people of the region, the OCPD general would achieve his ultimate goal: complete control. Punishment achieves nothing if control is lost by an individual

²⁸³ Vell. 2.121.1.

²⁸⁴ Punishment is never final to an individual with OCPD. Absolute control must be gained by being present and continually restraining poor behaviour (DSM-IV, pg. 728).

with OCPD. Given Tiberius' successes up until AD 9, it makes sense to discuss Velleius' description of his achievements.

Based on all of the accomplishments that Tiberius had achieved, he was happy with receiving fewer than the eight triumphs that he should have received. In Rome, this was a sign of his 'moderatio'.²⁸⁵ However, if one is to examine this from the psychological angle, one may make a few interesting observations. First of all, in Rome, a more somber mood may have prevented Tiberius from wanting to hold his triumphs: after all, Varus' army had been lost.²⁸⁶ However, there may be some truth in what Velleius says with regard to limiting the number of triumphs celebrated. In conjunction with OCPD, people often refuse awards because they refuse to believe that they have earned them. The timing may have been poor, but given Tiberius' track record of refusing honours, it is not absurd to believe that Tiberius may have refused them. A similar behaviour is apparent when Tiberius succeeds Augustus.²⁸⁷ If this latter scenario was the case, then it is likely that the same core belief is behind it as it seems to have been for all other refusals of honour: Tiberius was not good enough. Tiberius was his own worst critic, as his reign would later demonstrate, and was quick to dampen any flattery toward himself. It is likely that he did the same for the earlier triumphs.²⁸⁸

Although the above situations may seem typical for a military lifestyle, they are important for this study. According to the DSM-IV, military life is completely

²⁸⁵ Vell. 2.122.1.

²⁸⁶ Levick (1976), pg. 62; Vell. Pat. 2.117.1; Suet. *Tib.* 17.2.

²⁸⁷ He refused the principate long enough that the senators virtually had to force him to take it. Tac. *Ann.* 1.11-13.

²⁸⁸ Cf. the refusal of the tribunician power, chapter 3, pg. 53, as another example. Tiberius' continual refusal of honours are a prevalent example of behaviour associated with OCPD (DSM-IV, pg. 726, and 728).

harmonious with the diagnosis of OCPD.²⁸⁹ In the army, the general is viewed as adequate and no one could question him. All those below the general had to do his bidding, no matter what was asked. In order to succeed, the general had to be completely cautious, detail-oriented, and a perfectionist. However, the fact is that other generals were also successful, and were more prompt in waging wars and were less cautious.²⁹⁰

The fact that Tiberius was incredibly successful in the field, and the fact that he stubbornly adhered to the use of diplomacy also shed light on this matter. If he could settle a matter out of war, he did. It is possible that he did this in order to minimize death as Velleius suggests, but this would further emphasize his need to ruminate on all issues, as well as his excessive caution. One of the main criteria for OCPD would be the need to make the right choice. It is possible that Tiberius feared making a decision that would kill his men, and would possibly infuriate Augustus. Therefore, he may have opted to sign treaties as a means of minimizing the risk of failure.

Tiberius remained to be a successful commander in the field until the death of Augustus on August 19, AD 14. Upon hearing the news, Tiberius departed from the battle at Illyricum, and went to Augustus at Nola. Tiberius was now left in charge of the state and it is his reign that shall be the focus of the following chapters. The elements of his personality are much more vivid, since, as with any celebrity, all eyes were on him.

²⁸⁹ DSM-IV, pg. 725, which indicates that careers that place a great deal of weight on success, hierarchy, and hard work, tend to draw people with OCPD.

²⁹⁰ For instance Tiberius' brother Drusus also did well in the field, and his personality seems to have been different from Tiberius'. Germanicus is another example of one who was successful but who differed from Tiberius (Tac. *Ann.* 1.7). Therefore, these examples appear not to be the rule, at least to the extreme that Tiberius took them.

Chapter 5: Tiberius' Early Career

I. *Tiberius' Accession*

In AD 14, Augustus died at Nola leaving the empire in the capable hands of Tiberius. Immediately after Augustus had passed away, Tiberius sent notice of his death to the legions and to the provinces.²⁹¹ Tiberius also provided the watchword to the praetorian cohorts.²⁹² He also made sure to have soldiers present during Augustus' funeral, in which he played a large role, to prevent the masses from taking the body and burning it in the forum.²⁹³ It was also at this time that Tiberius was informed of the death of Agrippa Postumus.

Agrippa had been exiled in AD 5 as a result of his violent nature,²⁹⁴ and it has been concluded that he had been the figurehead for the faction that had once supported Julia. It is uncertain who gave the order to have Agrippa murdered. Tacitus declares that Tiberius did it of his own volition but used Augustus as a means of justifying the deed. However, it seems strange that Augustus would order his death since by Tacitus' own admission Augustus was not one to kill a relative.²⁹⁵ The fact that Agrippa posed a threat was demonstrated by the subsequent trial and execution of Clemens, Agrippa's slave. Although it may never be known who killed Agrippa Postumus²⁹⁶ the assertion that

²⁹¹ Dio, 57.2.1-3.

²⁹² Tac. *Ann.* 1.7; Smith, pg. 14.

²⁹³ Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.

²⁹⁴ A. E. Poppano "Agrippa Postumus," *CP* 36.1 (1941), pgs. 33-37, who did a survey of the ancient sources and claimed that the sources were more harsh on Agrippa Postumus than was warranted.

²⁹⁵ Levick (1976), pg. 65. However, Augustus did have a fiery temper, and the sources do attribute to Livia his clemency.

²⁹⁶ For a discussion on the various contemporary theories of who was responsible for Agrippa's death, see R. Deitweiler, "Historical Perspectives on the Death of Agrippa Postumus," *CJ* 65.7 (1970), pgs. 292-294.

Tiberius ordered the murder also seems suspect because Tiberius wanted to raise the issue before the senate. A certain Crispus, however, who was close to the imperial family, told Livia to convince Tiberius to keep the matter to himself. The issue was never addressed again, but Tiberius' desire to have the matter out in the senate demonstrates an interesting point in conjunction with OCPD.

Individuals with this condition are often very strict when it comes to their own moral code, or the law. The fact that Tiberius wanted to bring the matter before the senate indicates that he was willing to investigate what circumstance led to Agrippa's death; therefore, he was following procedure for any law case. However, this was silenced by what Tacitus called 'deference to a parent'.²⁹⁷ All individuals with OCPD recognize a hierarchy in society and authoritative figures, whether real,²⁹⁸ or perceived,²⁹⁹ are always right. In Roman society, no one would question the wishes of a parent; therefore, Tiberius would go against his better judgment to bring the case to the senate, and would instead yield to his mother. Furthermore, this scenario does not fit well with the fact that Tiberius was not spontaneous as is evidenced by the extreme caution used in his campaigns, and the length of time it took him to fully plan out Sejanus' downfall.³⁰⁰ If it was Tiberius' doing, he started plotting long before Augustus died. Regardless of this incident, Tiberius was sworn in as emperor.

²⁹⁷ Tac. Ann. 5.3.

²⁹⁸ A real authority figure would be a parent, guardian, or elder (Millon, pg. 217).

²⁹⁹ Therefore the perceived authority figures are believed to be authorities on various subjects because these individuals have proven themselves to be experts (Stone, pg. 349; Kantor, pg. 223).

³⁰⁰ Vell. 2.97; Tac. Ann. 4.74.

The consuls Sextus Appuleius and Sextus Pompeius pledged an oath to him, and similar oaths followed from the people.³⁰¹ Tiberius was, essentially, running the empire³⁰² and it was no small wonder that the senators were confused by his actions. Tiberius then called a meeting in the senate to discuss the funeral arrangements. Augustus' will was also read at that meeting after the witnesses had verified the seals and declared its authenticity.³⁰³ The senators then discussed the details of the funeral. Some senators even offered to carry the bier containing the body on their shoulders, but Tiberius promptly relieved them of that duty.³⁰⁴ This meeting was viewed by many as an unnecessary use of the tribunician power. However, to a person with OCPD, it was not.

People with this condition are often indecisive, and more often than not the individual with OCPD will get bogged down in details, and enlist the help of the expert(s) to minimize it all.³⁰⁵ However, this should not be confused with relinquishing control to the expert(s). Consulting with the senate to ensure that the procedure of Augustus' funeral ran perfectly, and to ensure that all necessary precautions and details were being considered is necessary to anyone with OCPD. An example provided by the DSM-IV casebook listed a man who would consult his therapist when he had an emotional issue that he could not resolve, but when the issue was no longer a problem, he would cease

³⁰¹ Tac. *Ann.* 1.7. For an example of the oath pledged, see *CIL* II, 172.

³⁰² Dio, 57.2.3.

³⁰³ Tac. *Ann.* 1.7, and Suet. *Tib.* 23.

³⁰⁴ The offer would have offended his sense of morality, since he loathed excessive displays. If he was haughty, it was because of this offense.

³⁰⁵ Therefore, the individual is making an appeal to the authority figure to resolve the indecisiveness, but never relinquishing the control that they have on the situation. The advice is considered, but the individual with OCPD always has the ultimate say in any matter (Stone, pg. 348).

therapy.³⁰⁶ Tiberius consulted the senate in much the same way. This is not to say that Tiberius could not organize the funeral on his own, but to an individual with OCPD, perfection and all details must be carefully considered especially for something as important as Augustus' funeral. The senate, providing their expertise, would also minimize any indecision which Tiberius may have had about the procedure of the funeral.

The funeral was carried out based upon all of the senatorial decisions. Those who had tried to earn a greater name for themselves by carrying the bier were abruptly silenced by Tiberius. The bier was carried into the *campus martius* where centurions lit the pyre. Livia stayed with the remains for five days before removing the ashes and placing them in the Mausoleum of Augustus.³⁰⁷ The senate then embarked on a long process of convincing Tiberius to accept what he had already assumed: the role of emperor.

Tiberius, by all appearances, after assuming control then refused the title of Augustus,³⁰⁸ and the empire itself. This refusal is very interesting when examined from an OCPD perspective. First of all, it is interesting to note that many of the inscriptions in which Tiberius is referred to as Augustus are from the provinces.³⁰⁹ Many scholars have suggested that Tiberius used this title in order to maintain power. The majority of the power was centred at Rome, and he used this title among the masses in Rome to maintain loyalty to Augustus' empire. He also reserved it for use in official letters, and in the

³⁰⁶ DSM-IV-TR Handbook, pgs. 148-149.

³⁰⁷ Dio, 56.42.4.

³⁰⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 1.72; Smith, pg. 23.

³⁰⁹ For example the inscription from Gythium. Taylor (1929), pg. 90; *CIL* II, 1660, 2037, XIII, 1036, 4481.

provinces.³¹⁰ What appears to be the case was that Tiberius was appealing to Augustus' authority in the provinces, which makes sense. By associating himself with Augustus, he would be able to cultivate loyalty. However, initially, he gave the impression that he viewed the senators as his betters. He called upon them for advice, and through this the senate achieved a higher position in the government. Tiberius' position with the senate may also explain the reason why he refused the principate.

The senators were very confused as to why Tiberius refused the empire when he had already made use of his tribunician power. Some scholars claim that he did not want to be emperor, and some think that he wanted the senate to commit to him.³¹¹ However, if Tiberius was suffering with OCPD, then his actions in this refusal make perfect sense as they are. This situation helps to demonstrate Tiberius' need to be in control.

The date on which Tiberius accepted the role of the princeps has been under debate. Some suggest that Tiberius accepted the principate as early as September third, while others suggest that he delayed until October 13.³¹² Although the dates vary, one aspect of the accession debate appears to be uniformly accepted: Tiberius made motions that he did not wish to have the principate. Numerous reasons for this have been postulated. Levick suggests that Tiberius had a unique political agenda that was troublesome to the senate.³¹³ Some modern scholars claim that the refusal was an act.³¹⁴ Among the ancient scholars Tacitus claims that it was because of Tiberius' caution and

³¹⁰ Wallace-Hadrill, pg. 302.

³¹¹ Syme (1974), pgs. 483-486.

³¹² Levick (1976), pg. 69-73.

³¹³ Levick (1976), pg. 81.

³¹⁴ Smith, pg. 23; Shotter (2004), pg. 78.

cunning.³¹⁵ Suetonius and Dio attribute his hesitation to fear of the legions.³¹⁶ However, the fact of the matter is that none of the sources seem very clear on why Tiberius refused the principate; therefore, it is still open for interpretation.

Tiberius did have a history of refusing honours. In fact he had refused the tribunician power when Augustus had offered it to him upon his return from Rhodes.³¹⁷ It would seem then that refusal of lofty positions was common for Tiberius. If this is the case then what might have contributed to his refusal? Tiberius was by all means a very able general, and he was capable in the administrative sphere. He was more than capable of running the empire. However there was one aspect that these two situations had in common: they were both forced upon Tiberius.³¹⁸

In the documented clinical cases of OCPD, the individuals in question would often act out of rebellion when they felt that they were losing control of any given situation. There are also case studies of people with this condition who do almost childish things to ensure that they are the ones who are in control.³¹⁹ Some individuals made use of silence in order to provide the information on their own terms.³²⁰ Others would go so far as to retaliate completely and do the complete opposite of what they wanted to do in order to defy the imposing person or persons.³²¹ These acts of rebellion were the OCPD sufferer's way of regaining control in their lives. Therefore, another

³¹⁵ Tac. Ann. 1.11; Suet. Tib. 24.

³¹⁶ Suet. Tib. 25; Tac. Ann. 1.7, and Dio, 57.3.

³¹⁷ Vell. 2.104.2; Suet. Tib. 16.1; Dio 55.13.2; Tac. Ann. 1.3.3.

³¹⁸ Both situations were forced upon him by Augustus. The senators were essentially acting as advocates for Augustus' will which forced Tiberius to accept the role as emperor.

³¹⁹ Millon, pg. 221.

³²⁰ Kantor, pg. 224.

³²¹ Stone, documents a clinical case of a man named Oscar who would adhere to parental strict standards of behaviour, and would expect it of others, but when out of the house, would contradict those harsh rules. Stone, pg. 346.

possible explanation is that Tiberius refused the principate because he wanted to accept it on his own terms.³²²

It should be noted that during the duration of the debates, Tiberius never did relinquish his tribunician powers. Had he truly been sincere in refusing the principate, then he would have given up those powers. Also, the refusal of honours by Tiberius was quite different, and much more tactless, than the refusals made by Augustus. Tiberius often evaded answering any questions, leaving the senators frustrated. Avoiding a question and discussing irrelevant details is very common with this diagnosis.³²³ Tiberius was noted for his speech, which Tacitus insists was used for the purpose of dissimulation, and the senators must have been confused by Tiberius.

Discussions in the senate consisted of a variety of ideas that indicate that an OCPD emperor was at the helm. Tiberius suddenly entertained ideas of dividing up the empire. When Gallus asked him to specify which portion that he would like for himself, Tiberius hesitated, and gave yet another obscure answer. One senator asked him how long he would leave the empire without its head. Scaurus annoyed Tiberius when he asked him why he had not relinquished the tribunician powers. Finally, after many entreaties, Tiberius accepted the empire. Given that Tiberius had refused honours previously, and had acted in an almost immature fashion when he did not get his own way by going to Rhodes, it is equally likely that Tiberius was having control issues, and needed to re-establish that control by acting out. This explanation upon first glance may

³²² i.e. when he decided that he wanted to accept the principate. Dr Taylor explains that this type of 'childish' behaviour is actually quite common in clinical situations.

³²³ Kantor, pg. 223-225; Stone, pg. 346; M. Maj, *Personality Disorders* (Naples, John Wiley & Sons, 2003) pg. 177; Sperry, pg. 183.

seem ridiculous to the reader who is skeptical of the impact of mental illness; however, the case studies do contain multiple examples of these types of power struggles, and the issue of control seems to be a recurring one for Tiberius. In the next section, Tiberius' relationship with Germanicus will be used to further support this notion.

II. *Tiberius, Germanicus, and Piso*

At the time of Tiberius' accession, the senate was not his only concern. A number of revolts and riots arose among the troops due to unfulfilled promises that had been made by Augustus. Drusus, Tiberius' son, was sent to Pannonia to deal with the unrest there. Drusus used tact and diplomacy in order to attempt to quell any uprising which he chose to do via an embassy to Tiberius with a list of requests. The situation would have been worse had it not been for the fact that a lunar eclipse had occurred that scared them back into submission. Just after the revolts had broken out in Pannonia, the legions in Lower Rhine region revolted.³²⁴ Germanicus was sent to deal with the revolts there.

Upon arrival, Germanicus found the troops in a state of low morale. The soldiers were so mutinous that they even tried to pledge allegiance to him. Germanicus, in an attempt to dissuade them from declaring such treasonous things, threatened to commit suicide. When this failed Germanicus forged a document from Tiberius stating that the soldiers would be compensated.³²⁵ Finally, in A.D. 15, Germanicus ended the remaining revolts in the Rhine area. Rather than return to Rome, Germanicus proceeded to move the troops into Germany in order to allay any further restlessness.³²⁶

A series of campaigns against Arminius³²⁷ led the army to the Teutoberg Forest, and upon reaching it, they raised a funeral mound for the Romans that had fallen in battle under the command of Varus in A.D. 9. Tiberius was not impressed with the actions of

³²⁴ The revolt occurred near Cologne (Tac. *Ann.* 1.21-26).

³²⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 1.36, Smith, pg. 48; C. Mierow, "Germanicus Caesar Imperator," *CJ* 39.3 (1943), pg. 140.

³²⁶ Smith, pg. 53-55.

³²⁷ A battle which was started when he decided to raze the Marsi in the Caesian Forest (Tac. *Ann.* 1.56, *Germ.* 30).

Germanicus in this regard because Germanicus as an augur should not have been conducting funerary rites.³²⁸ It is also possible that Tiberius was distressed that the soldiers should have to see such a gruesome sight which could have a negative impact on morale.³²⁹ Either way, it is not surprising that Tiberius was upset.³³⁰ Germanicus had disregarded orders, performed rites that he should not have been performing, and risked the morale of the legions, yet Germanicus seems to have not been rebuked for it.³³¹ However, it was clear by now that Germanicus was a very ambitious man, and his ambitions would eventually prove to be fatal.

Germanicus continued to fight against Arminius, and in doing so it took him far into enemy territory.³³² In the summer of AD 16, strong gales destroyed the fleet that carried some of the legions. Understandably, Germanicus was upset and he even threatened suicide again.³³³ It was at this point that Tiberius decided to call off Germanicus' campaigns and recall him to Rome to celebrate the triumph that had been awarded to him.

Numerous issues are raised by the discussion of Germanicus' German campaigns. First of all, Germanicus had a severely unstable character. He feigned suicide twice, went

³²⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 1.61-62, *CIL* II, 1517, III, 334, for Germanicus as an augur. Smith claims that it was not an augur's place to conduct funerary rites, and Tiberius, who was so particular, may have been distressed about that (Smith, pg. 96). See also, "Augur, Augurium" in W. Smith, *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (London: John Murray, 1873), pgs. 174-179 in which there is absolutely no mention of augurs as officiates of funerary rites. Tiberius with his strong sense of hierarchy would have been perturbed by Germanicus' blatant disregard for rank.

³²⁹ Mierow, pg. 143.

³³⁰ It is also possible that Tiberius did not want Germanicus in Germany campaigning because Augustus had many failures there (C.M. Wells, *The German Policy of Augustus: An Examination of the Archaeological Evidence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), pg. 239-249.

³³¹ Instead he was given a triumph. Tac. *Ann.* 1.52.

³³² Numerous encounters occurred, and the fleet was employed to transport troops (Smith, pg. 74).

³³³ Smith, pg. 75; Tac. *Ann.* 2.24.

on dangerous campaigns, and took matters into his own hands. By attempting to quell rebellion among the soldiers, he needlessly risked their lives. He nearly suffered a similar fate as Varus, and sustained great losses when the fleet was destroyed. This type of reckless behaviour could have been anything but favourable to someone as principled as Tiberius. Germanicus' behaviour likely upset Tiberius, who expected that the orders that he had given would be followed.³³⁴ However, if Tiberius was upset with Germanicus, why did he not censure him?

The OCPD individual always sees things in terms of a hierarchy. Tiberius expected Germanicus and Drusus to do precisely what they were told because he was the *imperator*, and because he was right. While he was at the top of the chain of command, those below it had to follow all orders. However, Tiberius' treatment of Germanicus differs from the treatment of his own son. Tiberius thought that Drusus was too fond of the life in the city of Rome, and put him on campaign in Germany in order to discipline him.³³⁵ In fact, Tiberius was on occasion gruff with his son in public, and attempted to control all that he did.³³⁶ So in essence, Tiberius treated Drusus like a soldier, but his dealings with Germanicus are baffling.

Germanicus nearly obliterates his army, and receives a triumph. This strange contradiction makes more sense when one considers that Germanicus was Tiberius'

³³⁴ After all, Tiberius did not instruct Germanicus to lead the troops on campaign against the German nations, Germanicus had made that decision (Smith, pg. 76). Also the fact that Tiberius had made a point to state that the empire should remain within its boundaries (as per the orders of Augustus) at his accession speech further supports the notion that he was annoyed by Germanicus' behaviour (See page, 103-104).

³³⁵ See K. Scott, "Drusus, Nicknamed 'Castor,'" *CP* 25.2 (1930), pgs. 155-161 for a fuller discussion on the temperament and conduct of Drusus Caesar.

³³⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 2.43, 3.17, 3.22; Plin. *NH* 19.41.

adopted son, as per the orders of Augustus.³³⁷ Therefore, regardless of his own personal convictions about Germanicus, he had to promote him because with OCPD, whatever the authority figure mandates that is the path that shall be followed in order to maintain order. The fact that the senate and the people adored Germanicus could only secure his promotion.³³⁸ However, there is also another matter at hand here.

Recalling Germanicus to Rome under the guise of celebrating his triumph also served as a means of regaining control over him. Tiberius had received triumphs for his work in Germany while he was the designated heir, and in following precedent, decided to promote Germanicus.³³⁹ However, it is highly likely that Tiberius was irritated with him, he just did not express it openly. In OCPD, annoyance is very often expressed indirectly.³⁴⁰ Rather than express the frustration that one feels, what occurs most times is that the individual will sit in silence, or use other somewhat manipulative means of regaining control of the situation.³⁴¹ Tiberius' use of the triumph would have appealed to the emotionally fickle Germanicus, thus convincing him to come home prior to causing any major harm.³⁴² This notion is further supported by the fact that Drusus did not receive a triumph for his work in Pannonia which appears to have been more effective.³⁴³ Tacitus' assertion that Tiberius was jealous of Germanicus seems absurd considering that Germanicus accomplished nothing and made a series of blunders which cost many

³³⁷ Suet. *Tib.* 52; Tac. *Ann.* 1.3 and Mierow, pg. 138.

³³⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 1.29, and Millon, pg. 223.

³³⁹ Levick (1976), pg. 56.

³⁴⁰ After all, emotions are avoided because they are viewed as undesirable, therefore, their expression becomes indirect or imputed to others (Stone, pg. 345; Millon, pg. 223-237; Kantor, pg. 223-225).

³⁴¹ Unless the situation is a direct attack on the integrity of the individual with OCPD (Millon, pg. 221).

³⁴² Tiberius had sent a letter to Germanicus explaining that letting the tribes fight amongst themselves was the best course of action, and that active campaigns there were dangerous (Tac. *Ann.* 2.26).

³⁴³ Smith, pg. 76-77.

soldiers their lives.³⁴⁴ Tiberius did not give Germanicus orders to campaign; Germanicus made that decision on his own. Also, Germanicus forged letters from Tiberius making concessions to the rebels, actions which Tiberius could hardly have thought worthy of any type of reward. This was the historian's own attempt at explaining the odd behaviour exhibited by Tiberius. The nonsensical offer of a triumph, then, appears to have been in keeping with established precedent, and secondarily as a means of convincing Germanicus to leave Germany, a method that proved to be effective.³⁴⁵

Once Germanicus was back in Rome, he was sent to the east, in AD 17, in order to select a king for the province of Armenia. This mission was difficult because Germanicus was responsible for installing Zeno, and not provoking Parthia. Augustus had established the tradition of sending the heir designate to the east, thus Tiberius sent Germanicus.³⁴⁶ It is entirely possible that Tiberius had misgiving about Germanicus going to the east.³⁴⁷ After all, he had feigned suicide under considerably stressful situations, and he had ignored direct orders for his own objectives in Germany. There certainly was a chance that Germanicus may not have the tact required to handle the delicate situation between Parthia and Armenia.³⁴⁸ However, in keeping with the precedent established by his successor, Tiberius went against his better judgement and sent Germanicus to the east, but not without a man to keep watch over him.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁴ Smith, pg. 77; Tac. *Ann.* 2.44.

³⁴⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 2.42. However, Tacitus' assertion that Tiberius removed Germanicus for alternate reasons than simply to award him a triumph seems very reasonable and in keeping with Tiberius' controlling personality. Tiberius also awarded to the people of Rome the only donative of his reign (Mierow pg. 145).

³⁴⁶ Smith, pg. 78.

³⁴⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 21, *Tib.* 9; Tac. *Ann.* 2.4.

³⁴⁸ Marsh, pg. 87.

³⁴⁹ Mierow, pg. 146.

In the fall of 17, Germanicus left Rome with his wife and family,³⁵⁰ toured the entire eastern region beginning in Illyricum, where he visited Drusus. In the year 18, Germanicus was awarded a consulship, but he was not recalled to Rome. He continued on his journey stopping at Athens where his grace and charm earned him favour among the Athenians. The journey continued to Rhodes where he met Piso, who was on his way to take up his position as governor there.³⁵¹ Germanicus successfully established Zeno on the Armenian throne, but he did not return to Rome right away. In the winter of 18/19, Germanicus entered Egypt, without permission, and for unknown reasons.³⁵² Egypt was considered to be the provincial property of the emperor, and was, in his absence, placed in the charge of a prefect selected from the *equites*. In other words, Germanicus should never have been there.³⁵³

The conduct of Germanicus in Egypt was anything but discreet.³⁵⁴ The emperor learned of his conduct there and promptly reprimanded Germanicus for his selfish action. Germanicus, who had already ventured up the Nile, did not learn of the letter from Tiberius until he had come back.³⁵⁵ What is most interesting about the reprimand is the way in which it was presented.

Tiberius, when he wrote his letter, explained to Germanicus that he had to leave Egypt right away because according to the precedent set by the divine Augustus, no man

³⁵⁰ Mierow, pg. 139.

³⁵¹ Tac. *Ann.* 2.54-55. Germanicus rescued Piso from a potential shipwreck.

³⁵² Suet. *Tib.* 52; Tac. *Ann.* 2.59.

³⁵³ Smith, pg. 95-96.

³⁵⁴ He impressed the Alexandrians by wearing Greek dress, and he distributed grain from the granaries in Neopolis to the populace because of a famine in Egypt. Germanicus, because of his deeds had numerous honours bestowed upon him (Tac. *Ann.* 2.59; L.A. Post, "A New Reading of the Germanicus Papyrus," *AJP* 65.1 (1944), pg. 81).

³⁵⁵ Suet. *Tib.* 52; Tac. *Ann.* 2.59; and Post, pg. 81.

of senatorial rank was to enter the province of Egypt. Rather than rely upon the law itself to force Germanicus to leave Egypt, Tiberius opted to appeal to his predecessor to justify his own action.³⁵⁶ This is very common in OCPD, and as has been demonstrated, Tiberius deferred to Augustus throughout his reign. Authority figures are often referenced as a means of justifying why the individual with OCPD is right.³⁵⁷ Rather than request that Germanicus leave right away, Tiberius added that it was the law which had been laid down by his predecessor. Germanicus received the letter, and promptly left Egypt.

Meanwhile in Syria, Piso, possibly thinking that Germanicus had fallen out of favour by now, began to undo many of the decrees which Germanicus had established.³⁵⁸ Germanicus, upon hearing about this became angry and reprimanded Piso when he returned to Syria.³⁵⁹ Germanicus fell ill and he ordered Piso to leave the province, and when Piso reached the island of Cos he found out that Germanicus had fallen severely ill. Germanicus died on the 10th of October, A.D. 19, and the funeral was held in Antioch.³⁶⁰

Numerous points of interest arise in the treatment of Germanicus. First of all, Germanicus was incredibly emotionally fickle. Tiberius, given Germanicus' conduct in Germany, may have felt it necessary to send someone who would keep a close watch on

³⁵⁶ Millon, pg. 227, Stone, pg. 345; Post, pg. 81, explains that Germanicus had refused numerous honours because they were reserved for the Augusti, Tiberius and Livia, only.

³⁵⁷ Millon, pg. 228; Sperry pg. 187.

³⁵⁸ It is also possible that Piso misunderstood his role in the east as a sort of guardian, not an opponent to Germanicus. Tiberius' communication skills were described as obscure and confusing at best (Tac. *Ann.* 69).

³⁵⁹ Mierow, pg. 148.

³⁶⁰ Mierow, pg. 148.

Germanicus' actions. It cannot be said for certain why Tiberius chose Piso,³⁶¹ besides the fact that he had demonstrated himself as being quite adequate as far as his republicanism was concerned. His temperament was disagreeable, but he could perform his job, and since Tiberius had served a term as consul with him, he had experience with his abilities.³⁶² He probably chose Piso because Piso was a very strict and rigid man who would be sure to keep Germanicus in check. This may have worked had Piso been able to maintain control by use of moderation, rather than arrogance. The actions that are described after the death of Germanicus helped to seal his fate.

Piso, upon hearing the news that Germanicus had died, attempted to return to the post of Syrian governor, even though the position had been given to Sentius.³⁶³ He used a fortress in Cilicia as his base of operations and was besieged by Sentius, who after negotiating with Piso, furnished him with ships and a safe passage to Rome.³⁶⁴

Meanwhile, Agrippina had arrived in Brundisium with the ashes and the populace was in mourning. Honours were voted to Germanicus, but Tiberius and Livia did not meet Agrippina when she arrived. At the funeral in Rome, Tiberius did not attend, nor did he really mourn.³⁶⁵ Certainly this act was bound to further any unpopularity he had already cultivated. Tiberius censured Germanicus for his mistakes, yet showed no

³⁶¹ Although according to Tac. *Ann.* 3.12, the senate had chosen Piso.

³⁶² Levick (1976), pg. 46. Also, the fact that Piso had been a trusted confidante of Augustus would not have hurt his reputation with Tiberius either. See, T. T. Rapke, "Tiberius, Piso, and Germanicus," *Act. Cl.* 25 (1982), pgs. 62-63.

³⁶³ Although Piso had *imperium*, he had abandoned his post and thus had forfeited that power. Piso returned to Syria and attempted to regain favour among the troops there (Smith, pg. 98; Mierow, pg. 149; Tac *Ann.* 2.78).

³⁶⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 2.80.

³⁶⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 3.44; Smith, pg. 106; Mierow, pg. 150.

emotion on his death.³⁶⁶ This type of reaction is very much in keeping with a diagnosis of OCPD.

Under all circumstances, emotions are kept under control. Therefore, it is easy to see why one may think that Tiberius was Stoic. However, it is unfair to suggest that because Tiberius and Livia did not attend they were pleased with Germanicus' death. Both were incredibly principled and had flat affects,³⁶⁷ yet with OCPD when unforeseen situations arise, emotions are usually at their peak.³⁶⁸ Also, the fact that Tiberius cut the mourning short, claiming that the state lives on and that everyone should return to their duties, and therefore work, is also very disconcerting.³⁶⁹ Yet again Tiberius is an exemplary case of OCPD with his entire focus being work rather than human emotion. His treatment of Piso is also very interesting.

When Piso arrived in Rome, he was welcomed with all of the respect that a man of his rank should receive, but this did not necessarily mean that he would be spared in his trial. Tiberius was a man who strictly adhered to the law.³⁷⁰ He wished for Piso to have a fair trial, and decided that he was too involved in the case since he was the step-father of Germanicus, and because the trial was a trial of treason. Tiberius, who had a strict ethical system when it came to justice, would wish to remove himself from the

³⁶⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 52.

³⁶⁷ Livia was well-known for her restricted affect, particularly when Drusus died (Barrett (2002), pg.44).

³⁶⁸ It would make sense within the context of this diagnosis that Tiberius, was angry about the fact that he had to deal with finding a new heir, refused to go out in public when he had little control over his emotional state. These individuals are not noted for their ability to deal with sudden change (Robinson, pg. 121).

³⁶⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 3.4 and 46.

³⁷⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 3.9.

picture, if it meant that justice would not be served. He transferred the case into the hands of the senate to prosecute.³⁷¹

Piso was charged with treason, but the poisoning charge was dropped, due to insufficient evidence.³⁷² The senate did ask Piso for the written documents which had been given to him by Tiberius on his way to the east, but the papers were not shown. The reason for this was never given by the ancient sources. It is possible that the document contained information that Tiberius did not wish to share with the senate.³⁷³ It is also possible that Tiberius had written information in a very obscure way which caused Piso to misinterpret what the orders had been regarding Germanicus.³⁷⁴ It is probable that Piso had been ordered to ensure that Germanicus not go on any unnecessary campaigns as he had in the Rhine Region.³⁷⁵ However, clearly, Piso far exceeded what was expected of him.

The trial continued and Piso had to be escorted home to prevent him from being attacked by a mob. Plancina, his wife, had been saved by Livia's influence, and deserted her husband. With the realization that Tiberius would not intercede on his behalf, Piso took his own life.³⁷⁶ In the note he left behind, he cleared both of his sons of any association in his fate. Tiberius took care that neither boy suffered the fate that their

³⁷¹ The trial is unique because it presents Tiberius as stepping back and allowing the senate to decide, but he is full of plenty of ideas, and guiding questions for the senate to consider with regards to the trial. His way of ensuring justice was to leave, and tell the senate how he would do things (Tac. Ann. 3.13).

³⁷² It appears that Tiberius was the one who dropped the charge of murder (Tac. Ann. 3.12).

³⁷³ Rapke, pg. 67.

³⁷⁴ Tac. Ann. 13.3.

³⁷⁵ Smith, pg. 112. Based upon the fact that Tiberius supposedly used archaic and pedantic phraseology, Piso may have misinterpreted what he was being ordered to do. Therefore, instead of keeping Germanicus in line, he thought that he was ordered to take charge of everything that Germanicus did. Evidence for his confusing communication style is found in the table in Appendix A.

³⁷⁶ Tac. Ann. 3.16; Smith, pg. 114.

father had. The relationship that Tiberius had with the senate was somewhat precarious as a result of similar behaviour exhibited in the trial of Piso. In the following chapter, Tiberius' relationships with the senate, and the provinces, respectively, will be considered.

Chapter 6: An Agenda of Perfection

I. *Tiberius and the Senate*

The position of the senate during Tiberius' reign has been a topic of discussion for many years among scholars. It is generally agreed that Tiberius elevated the senate as a means of restoring the republic. Shotter claims that when Tiberius elevated the senate, he recreated the factions which were prevalent during the republic.³⁷⁷ Now new senators were vying for factional dominance. Levick claims that Tiberius created a new role for the senate by elevating it as an advisor to him.³⁷⁸ Most modern scholarship will agree that the senate took on a more prominent role during Tiberius' reign; however, nowhere in the sources does it state that this was Tiberius' intention.³⁷⁹ Therefore, the reasons for the senate's elevation could be considered in conjunction with the established traits of OCPD that Tiberius exhibited.³⁸⁰

To claim that the senate was raised as part of a restorative republican political agenda is not absurd. Tiberius, by all appearances, held strong republican values which were the ideal traits of a republican senator. However, the moral and ethical systems were not responsible for the personalities of the senators of the day.³⁸¹ So if in practice, these values were not always met, one must wonder why Tiberius so rigidly adhered to

³⁷⁷ His argument was establishing that Tiberius aimed to restore the republic.

³⁷⁸ Levick describes the position of the senate as superior to Tiberius, but that he was acting as a teacher, guiding them. She claims that the main pitfall of his policy was the lack of consistency (Levick (1976), pgs. 97-115).

³⁷⁹ Suetonius claims that the position of the senate became more prominent because Tiberius transferred all matters, large or small, to it (Suet. *Tib.* 30).

³⁸⁰ See Appendix A.

³⁸¹ Many senators were Stoic, but this philosophy cannot account for any of their personalities because each was different within that context (Syme (1939), pg. 516).

them. If restoring the republic was truly his main concern, why, then, did he keep his tribunician power and maintain control over the military and the *aerarium*? Why would he elevate the senate, and adhere strictly to Augustan precedent? By all appearances, Tiberius had placed the senate in control, but in reality, he was the one who had control all along.³⁸²

How the senate came to be elevated is interesting. Tiberius during his accession deferred to their wishes after a long, drawn out debate. He attempted to convince the senators to divide the empire and assign him a part of it to govern, and eventually accepted the empire as it was.³⁸³ After that embarrassing debate, Tiberius began to refer everything to the senate. Court cases and any minor decisions that needed to be made were all decided upon within that body.³⁸⁴ The senate during all debates and proceedings was permitted to genuinely debate and give honest opinions.³⁸⁵ The senators were permitted to vote against his opinions, if they so chose.³⁸⁶ However, Tiberius, though he did allow all of this, still had influence over the senators.

During the course of various debates, Tiberius would always provide what he thought would be the best course of action in order to ensure that justice was followed.³⁸⁷

³⁸² Ober briefly discusses the idea that Tiberius was in full control all along, and that he appealed to precedent for his own purposes. See Ober, pg. 327.

³⁸³ Tac. *Ann.* 1.12-13.

³⁸⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 30.

³⁸⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 1.74, 77; Suet. *Tib.* 30.

³⁸⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 31, describes a debate in which Tiberius went over to the side of the minority on a certain issue and none on the majority followed suit.

³⁸⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 2.86, 3.37, 4.13, 4.14, and 4.16. In particular, Tiberius' gentle reminder to the senate with regards to Cn. Piso. He also insisted on seeing all proceedings of treason cases, so that he could ponder, and formulate his own opinion on the matter which he provided to the senate. In the case of Libo Drusus, Tiberius insisted that the trial continue regardless of Drusus' suicide (Tac. *Ann.* 2.27-31). In another example, Tiberius had a man executed who clutched a serpent egg in order to guarantee himself a win in a case (Plin. *NH* 29.12).

If the senate made a decision that was contrary to what he would have done, or if things were not running the way that he thought they should, he made sure to express his opinion on the matter.³⁸⁸ Surely he had to realize that these actions would have an impact on the members. By providing his opinion, then, he would be swaying the vote, and by sitting in on court proceedings, he would throw the senate into doubt about their decision. The senate did end up reversing decisions that they had passed, as should be expected under the circumstances.³⁸⁹

Just as he did during the accession, Tiberius both submitted and asserted himself. A person with OCPD, though they do submit to those whom they view as their equals, or betters, will still attempt to maintain control of the situation.³⁹⁰ The senate was consulted as a group of advisors, where each member could give his opinion and allow Tiberius to see every possible angle to any argument. It is not surprising that Tiberius did bring everything before them, in fact, it is typical in OCPD. Whenever a problem arises, the individual with OCPD examines every possible option, and asks every possible ‘expert’.³⁹¹ Even though Tiberius claimed to be ‘servant to the senate’, he still wished to assert control, and he did so by taking, or leaving, the advice received.³⁹² He even did this while Augustus was still alive, as was evidenced by his departure to Rhodes. However, what made that situation different was the fact that Augustus had full control

³⁸⁸ Dio, 57.7.3; Suet. *Tib.* 31, provides an example of a debate in the senate when Tiberius thought that the people of Trebia should be permitted to use a sum of money received in a will for road repair. He also became angry if persons were acquitted without a trial, or if senators overstepped their boundaries as far as duty was concerned, he censured them (Suet. *Tib.* 73).

³⁸⁹ The senate had admitted an oracle to the Sybilline books but had to reverse the decision when Tiberius became angry (Tac. *Ann.* 6.12).

³⁹⁰ Stone, pg. 344.

³⁹¹ Robinson, pg. 123.

³⁹² Suet. *Tib.* 29, 67.

and could choose to accept, or ignore, anything that Tiberius said.³⁹³ Now that Tiberius was emperor, he could assert control directly.

A fine example of the control that Tiberius did exert was during the revolt of the Treveri and the Aedui in A.D. 21. When the revolt occurred, Tiberius assumed responsibility for it on his own and would not leave the capital, claiming that it was nonsensical to compromise the safety of Rome by removing the *princeps*.³⁹⁴ No emotion regarding the gravity of the affair was expressed to anyone.³⁹⁵ Furthermore, Tiberius handled everything himself without discussing with the senate his plans to resolve the issue. If Tiberius were truly submissive, then he would have asked for their expertise in such an affair. Instead, Tiberius sent the senate a letter describing the beginning and end of the war, and how his policy and the loyalty of his generals had been successful.³⁹⁶

In A.D. 21, when Tacfarinas revolted, the senate decided to allow Tiberius to choose the best course to rectify the situation. Instead of assuming the responsibility as he had before, he censured the senate for not fulfilling their duty.³⁹⁷ Then, instead of leaving the senate to debate the matter, Tiberius presented two candidates, Junius Blaesus, and M. Lepidus, one of which the senate was instructed to choose in order to settle the matter.³⁹⁸ Tiberius was in retirement at the time of this uprising, and because of

³⁹³ Suet. *Tib.* 10.2.

³⁹⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 3.43.

³⁹⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 3.44, 47. Tiberius was notorious for his lack of affect during stressful situations. For example, his demeanor during the trial of Libo Drusus in AD 16 (Tac. *Ann.* 2.28-29); his reaction to the death of Germanicus (Tac. *Ann.* 3.2, 3.3; Suet. *Tib.* 25-26); Tac. *Ann.* 3.10-15; Smith, pg. 38; Levick (1976), pg. 86; H. W. Bird, "Tiberius, Piso, and Germanicus: Further Considerations," *Act. Cl.* 30 (1987), pg. 74, which discusses Tiberius' stoney presence at the trial, and how Tiberius was ready to renounce his friendship with Piso.

³⁹⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 3.47.

³⁹⁷ Levick (1976), pg. 109; Suet. *Tib.* 31.2.

³⁹⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 3.32 and 35.

that may have expected the senate to take on a larger role; however, this contradiction, among many others, must have left the senate very confused and discouraged.

The senate's increased importance in Tiberius' reign is evidenced by Tiberius' transferal of all legal and political matters to that body. In AD 14, Tiberius moved all of the elections from the people, and transferred them to the senate. By doing this, the control was suddenly back in Tiberius' hands. After all, the senate purge under Augustus in AD 4 had removed a number of his enemies. It is almost certain that a senator would not risk his career and promote someone of whom Tiberius did not approve. The elections would be more controlled and there would be less bribery, at least in theory.³⁹⁹ Also, Tiberius himself seems to have gained a unique role in the elections which differed from that of Augustus. Tiberius received, and read aloud, in the senate the names of the candidates, which could be intimidating to potential candidates.⁴⁰⁰ The fact that Tiberius had to have a role seems to reflect the controlling nature that he had. He was not content unless he was actively involved, but by being actively involved in these elections, it is likely that the senators felt that they could not elevate those whom he would not approve.

The *imperium* that he held would influence how the senate took his criticism and advice, thus removing any real authority and leaving them with a perceived authority.⁴⁰¹ It makes sense that he would want to elevate a body of adequate men, who were most representative of the senatorial class.⁴⁰² However, it would appear that the senate served

³⁹⁹ Levick (1976), pg. 97.

⁴⁰⁰ Shotter (1966b), pg. 321-323.

⁴⁰¹ The fact that he was inconsistent with them left them very confused, and possibly wondering if they ever had an authority (Levick (1976), pg. 110-115).

⁴⁰² Tiberius was notably indecisive, and the senate would act as an advisory body for him. See Chapter 5, Section 1.

the same purpose as the therapist does for the OCPD patient. The senate was a body on whom Tiberius could rely for sound advice for decision making.⁴⁰³ This should not be surprising, after all an individual with OCPD can never completely relinquish control, and there should be little confusion as to why he was viewed as a hypocrite.

The DSM-IV provides an example of a man who with OCPD attempted to delegate tasks to his co-workers, but when they continually made mistakes, or they made decisions that were contrary to his thinking, he would rebuke them and complete the task himself. This was because his co-workers had not met with his expectations.⁴⁰⁴ As Tiberius' reign progressed, this type of behaviour became apparent. Men with OCPD expect that those whom they view as adequate will have similar views to them. In other words, the senate would know what was right - after all it was a body of highly adequate men. As his reign progressed, and the senate became increasingly deferential to him, and he became distraught with them, even though he had been in control all along.⁴⁰⁵ It appears that the senate had not lived up to his expectations of being able to handle the majority of its affairs on its own.⁴⁰⁶ Eventually Tiberius ended up doing what the man in the above example did: he took outright control. Had Tiberius truly been sincere in allowing the senate to be in charge of all things, his retirement would have been the

⁴⁰³ Kantor recounts a patient who would come to him only when he had a problem that he, or his other 'advisory persons', could not resolve (Kantor, pg. 221).

⁴⁰⁴ American Psychiatric Association, Casebook: A Learning Companion to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Spitzer, et al. Ed. (Washington, American Psychiatric Publishing, 2000) pg. 148-49. Although Tiberius was not an emotional man, he showed anger when his expectations had not been met, or when his moral rectitude had been questioned. For example, see the case of Gallio in AD 33 who overstepped his boundaries by recommending that retired soldiers be permitted to sit in the 14 rows of the praetorians (Tac. Ann. 6.9).

⁴⁰⁵ Tac. Ann. 3.65.

⁴⁰⁶ Even though Tiberius read senate proceedings and would issue statements of what should be changed, or decisions that had upset him. For example, Suet. Tib. 73.

perfect opportunity for him to do so. Instead he insisted on receiving copies of all senatorial proceedings, and his letters at the end of his reign seemed more like the commands that he had once issued to his army.⁴⁰⁷ Criticism, rigid opinions, and a desperate need for control plagued Tiberius' reign, all of which are very common with OCPD as well as a large source of social dissension among colleagues, friends, and family.

Tiberius was a man who admired *constantia* in the functioning of the empire.⁴⁰⁸ In order to obtain this, each individual part had to fulfill all of its duties. In many of his letters to the senate, Tiberius made it very clear what those duties were, and if one area was shirking theirs, or had overstepped boundaries, Tiberius offered a sharp rebuke.⁴⁰⁹ The need to organize, compartmentalize, and define roles is incredibly important to the obsessive-compulsive personality.⁴¹⁰ Certainly defining roles is part of human nature; however, with OCPD those roles are concrete, and if lofty expectations are not met, then harsh consequences are the result. Not surprisingly, Tiberius slowly began to organize his own divisions of power.

One of the first things that Tiberius did in AD 14 was to remove the *consilium* that Augustus had established which was responsible for the preparation of the agenda for the senate.⁴¹¹ It is uncertain how the agenda was prepared, however, given that Tiberius removed the *consilium*, and as there are no references to another like that of Augustus like

⁴⁰⁷ Vell. 2.97.

⁴⁰⁸ Levick (1976), pg. 86.

⁴⁰⁹ Tiberius gave sharp rebuke to the senate on numerous occasions for not doing their job, but would also be infuriated if they did various things without conferring with him (Suet. *Tib.* 73.1).

⁴¹⁰ Kantor, pg. 224.

⁴¹¹ Dio, 53.21.2; Suet. *Aug.* 35.2; Syme (1939), pg 403.

that of Augustus being put in place, he must have had intentions of being in control.⁴¹² In fact the agenda for the senate was full when he transferred every matter to them, both public and private. However the notion of the *consilium* was not removed. He formed a new one, the purpose of which was to advise him on his administrative duties.⁴¹³ It was comprised of his closest friends and 20 permanent representatives. As was noted above, a person with OCPD is very indecisive, and quite often other, more respected people are consulted to help resolve an issue. However, it is interesting that Tiberius needed a committee above and beyond the senate to help him make decisions, but there are numerous factors at play here. For one thing, Tiberius was indecisive, but he was also a man who hated making a mistake.⁴¹⁴ The committee would help him make the ‘right’ choice, and he would have been in charge of implementing the decision. A person with OCPD cannot stand any error where it could have been avoided.

It is interesting that Tiberius would control the senate agenda, and what it was that the senate handled. By removing the *consilium*, Tiberius was effectively removing power from the senate. Under the Augustan system members of the senate had been in charge of deciding what was important enough to be discussed in meetings. In Tiberius’ principate, he apparently made those decisions, and in typical OCPD fashion, all matters big and small, had equal importance.⁴¹⁵ According to Suetonius, everything came before the senate. The senate aided him in deciding military matters, spending matters, construction

⁴¹² Levick suggests that Tiberius removed the *consilium* to encourage an open schedule for freer debate (Levick (1976), pg. 93).

⁴¹³ Suet. *Tib.* 55.

⁴¹⁴ He was incredibly detail oriented, and things had to be perfectly in order. For example, Suet. *Tib.* 32.2, 55.

⁴¹⁵ Kantor, pg. 223; Stone, pg. 343. These individuals cannot see the ‘forest for the trees’, and minor details were considered to be on equal footing with larger issues.

of public buildings, and court cases.⁴¹⁶ He created numerous committees to make specialized decisions on matters of state, as well to define laws in which criteria were unclear.⁴¹⁷ It would appear that under Tiberius' principate, though the senators were being controlled, the careers of those who worked hard would advance. Under Augustus, those who were impoverished or who had gained a questionable reputation were purged. Senate purges, which had been conducted four times under Augustus were avoided by Tiberius.⁴¹⁸

The reasons for this are unclear because it had been an Augustan precedent to do so, and Tiberius rigidly adhered to the ways of his predecessor. However, Tiberius' indecisiveness may have contributed to his inability to purge the senate. On a number of occasions, Tiberius has demonstrated himself to be unable to make a choice. An example was in AD 16 when Asinius Gallus asked Tiberius to choose magistrates in advance, and Tiberius said that he would have no idea whom to choose so that he could avoid offense.⁴¹⁹ Another occasion was during his later reign when he sent a letter to the senate requesting that he have a bodyguard to keep him safe upon entering the senate. Togonius Gallus requested that Tiberius choose whom he wished to have as his guard, and Tiberius responded via letter saying that he was unable to decide.⁴²⁰ Is it not possible then that

⁴¹⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 30.

⁴¹⁷ For example, the committee to monitor the flooding of the Tiber, Tac. *Ann.* 1.76, and the committee responsible for defining various laws, Tac. *Ann.* 3.25.

⁴¹⁸ Levick (1976), pg. 95.

⁴¹⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 2.36.

⁴²⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 6.2. Tiberius was notoriously indecisive according to Tacitus. Whenever new problems arose, vast numbers of details were amassed and considered, but few decisions were made. For instance, Tiberius could not decide whom to choose for his heir so in AD 35, he named his grandson Tiberius Gemellus, and Caligula, his joint heirs (Tac. *Ann.* 1.80; Barrett, *Caligula: The Corruption of Power* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1989), pg. 39-40; Suet. *Tib.* 76). The fact that he had failed to properly train an heir indicates that he could not decide whom to choose. In AD 16, when Asinius Gallus proposed that

Tiberius did not purge members of the senate because he was unable to decide who should be removed?

Members of the senate lost their place due to conspiracy, and poverty, but it would be difficult to decide which men should lose their place due to their lavish lifestyles. This is especially difficult when one considers that most senators were excessive in their private life.⁴²¹ When it was proposed that there should be limitations on excess, the extreme measures of the proposal were dismissed. However, Tiberius probably did recognize how much trouble this act could cause as well. It would be difficult for him to decide because senators who were incredibly capable, and from noble families, could be the most excessive. Besides this, it would earn him resentment from a body of men from whom he sought respect.⁴²² This concern likely figured largely in Tiberius' mind, thus preventing him from actually purging the senate.

Tiberius elect magistrates five years in advance, Tiberius admitted that he would not be able to chose (Tac. Ann. 2.36); In AD 32, Togonius Gallus requested that Tiberius be escorted into the senate by soldiers of his choice. Tiberius responded in a letter stating that he would not know whom to choose (Tac. Ann. 6.15). Later on that year, Tiberius requested that he be permitted to have Macro and some centurions escort him into the senate. All of this is indicative of his inability to decide whether or not he wished to return to Rome. People with this condition eventually become so overwhelmed with detail that their work falls behind (Stone, pg. 346).

⁴²¹ If they were not luxurious in private life, then sumptuary legislation would not have to be passed in AD 22, limiting the amount of household furniture, silk, golden dinnerware, and that prices in the market should be regulated (Tac. Ann. 2.36, and Suet. Tib. 34). Tiberius himself tended to limit his leisure activities, as well as the money that he spent on entertainments for the people (Tac. Ann. 1.54, 1.76. See K. Galinsky, "Augustus' Legislation on Morals and Marriage," Philologus 125 (1981), pg. 127, note 2, which describes the fact that Augustus forbade unmarried men from attending games. This may be another reason why Tiberius did not attend; however, if that is the case, then it is yet another example of his strict adherence to the laws in order to be a 'perfect' citizen. One can only be perfect if they follow precedent). However, the creation of the administrative post in charge of the emperor's entertainments further supports his organizational skills. It should also be noted that Tiberius had few leisurely activities, and the ones he enjoyed most were organized. For instance, Suet. Tib. 72.2. The DSM-IV-TR stipulates that OCPD patients, in some cases, do take part in what would be considered leisurely activities, but they must be highly organized and structured. See DSM-IV-TR, pg. 727-728.

⁴²² Tac. Ann. 4.38.

Tiberius was a dedicated attendee of the senate and he expected that the senate would also be as devoted. Even after Tiberius had departed for Capri, he lectured the senators in A.D. 33 for scant attendance at meetings.⁴²³ Tiberius was hopelessly devoted to his work as is evidenced by his actions surrounding Germanicus' and Drusus' funerals, and he had high expectations that the senate would be too.⁴²⁴ While on Capreae, Tiberius kept up correspondence with the senate, albeit on a much harsher level. The senate now was faced with open autocracy. Since Tiberius was no longer in Rome, they could not even debate the issues, or decisions which he presented to the body, nor was it likely that he was willing to listen to their opinions. This was much different from the courteous debate which he had allowed previous to his departure.⁴²⁵ Essentially, Tiberius' policy was consistently inconsistent.

His policy was essentially a policy of OCPD. It is no small wonder that the senators were completely confused. First they would be expected to be autonomous, but their opinions were always directed. Tiberius accused them of being ready for slavery, yet Tiberius forced his opinion on them, indirectly. By offering his opinions inconsistently such as in the beginning, middle, end, or not at all, during debates, the senators were likely unsure if they actually had any power at all. The senators were consulted to decide matters of state, yet Tiberius would solve some problems on his own

⁴²³ Tac. Ann. 6.17.

⁴²⁴ Suet. Tib. 52. Tiberius worked continually because he was incredibly detail-oriented, which appears to have been time consuming. For instance, he delayed taking his provincial tour due to various situations that had to be rectified (Suet. Tib. 38). This behaviour is reminiscent of his army days when he would tell the soldiers to come to him with any concerns (Vell. 2.116); When Livia died in AD 29, Tiberius delayed coming back so long that they had to bury her without him (Suet. Tib. 51); When an embassy from Rhodes had come to Rome with a written document that did not have the proper notation, he sent them away to supply it (Suet. Tib. 32.20); He also held a meeting which would aid him in writing a decree without the use of a Greek term (Suet. Tib. 71).

⁴²⁵ Suet. Tib. 31.

without even informing the senate that they had occurred. At the end of his reign he encouraged senators to stick to their duties, but he himself had given up on some of his own.⁴²⁶ In essence, Tiberius was the one who had all of the control. Tiberius' mode of communication could have done little to alleviate the confusion among the senators.

In the case of communication style, Tiberius is an exemplary case.

Communication in OCPD cases is often very stilted, overly detailed, and incredibly formal. Complex synonyms and phrases are used in place of simpler ones, and Augustus often criticized Tiberius for his style of writing and speaking because he used very pedantic phrases and archaic vocabulary.⁴²⁷ Although very little of Tiberius' writing survives, it is held that Tacitus was mimicking his style in the created speeches within the Annals.⁴²⁸ Tacitus described Tiberius' mode of speaking as very hesitant and confusing, dry, and detailed enough that the senators did not always understand him;⁴²⁹ however, whenever he had been emotionally stirred, or strongly supported an idea, then his meaning was clear.⁴³⁰ In all of the speeches represented in the Annals,⁴³¹ it appears that

⁴²⁶ He had given the appearance of giving up on his imperial obligations, but he, instead, became very autocratic.

⁴²⁷ Suet. Tib. 84.2. Tiberius was particularly concerned with word choice (Tac. Ann. 13.3). Also, Tiberius forbade the use of Greek in the senate, and if a native word could not be substituted for a foreign one, then a series of native words had to be used to convey the same message as the foreign word (Suet. Tib. 71). Many individuals with OCPD have a very strict way of communicating, and insist that there are differences between words that are otherwise synonymous. One patient refused to accept anyone else's wording and would waste time re-writing everything to his own specifications (Stone, pg. 347; DSM-IV-TR Casebook, pg. 147-148).

⁴²⁸ N. P. Miller, pg. 12. Tacitus would have had access to the original speeches that Tiberius had written.

⁴²⁹ Tac. Ann. 1.11, 4.31, 6.8, 13.3; Suet. Aug. 86, and Tib. 70.

⁴³⁰ Tac. Ann. 4.31; Suet. Aug. 86.2. Communication is both very formal and polite, or it is harsh and unyielding when expectations have not been met (Millon, pg. 228-229).

⁴³¹ As well as the letters which appear to have been quoted within the Annals, Suet. Tib. 70.1, and Div. Aug., 86.2; see also, N. P. Miller, "Tiberius Speaks: An Examination of the Utterances Ascribed to Him in the Annals of Tacitus," AJP 89.1 (1968): pg. 3-7. The speeches ascribed to Tiberius contain archaic verb forms, and formulae, which are not Tacitean.

they all follow the description of Tiberius' style of speaking.⁴³² Advanced vocabulary, and archaic phrases are very common aspects of OCPD communication.⁴³³ However, this was not the only source of confusion for the senators.

Tiberius was the one who defined each role of government, and organized a hierarchy to maintain, and provide, specific details. He created a group of advisors to aid him with his difficult decisions over and above the senate. Essentially, Tiberius never had revoked control of the senate, though in the beginning this fact was far less obvious. The senators always knew that he held the *imperium*, and when he offered his opinions, they did have an impact on the decisions that the house made. In OCPD, a contradictory nature is always the result of the individual's need to be perfect. What produces perfection one day, may not produce perfection the next.

Debates in the senate would differ depending upon the nature of the matter at hand, its importance, and who was involved. Tiberius, who was a huge supporter of justice, would drop charges against certain individuals if they were exceptionally adequate, or indispensable.⁴³⁴ There were other cases in which Tiberius brought the trial before the senate to decide the outcome.⁴³⁵ There were similar contradictions in terms of money, wars, public duties, and even affect. For example, in AD 33, when there was a

⁴³² For instance, archaic verb forms were used in the speeches (Miller, pg. 13).

⁴³³ Sperry, pg. 187; Kantor pg. 216-218. Further evidence to support that Tiberius' style of communication was confusing and archaic was the teachers that he chose. After he returned from Armenia, in 20 BC, he stopped by Rhodes and became a student of Theodore of Gadara. Theodore did not consider brevity and clarity to be overly important (Levick (1976), pg 17; Suet. *Tib.* 57; Quintilian 4.2.32.). This style would have fit well with Tiberius' own need to be exceptionally detailed. Tiberius' style of communication may account for why he had a difficult time working with M. Valerius Massalla Corvinus (See *ILS* 6688). Corvinus taught a plain and unadorned style which did not work well with Tiberius' pedantic way of speech. Tiberius chose not to follow his teachings. Keen attention to details as well as an inflexible way of communicating are both keynote features of OCPD communication styles (Robinson, pg. 121).

⁴³⁴ For instance Tiberius dismissed the charges against Messalinus Cotta (Tac. *Ann.* 6.5).

⁴³⁵ For example, L. Piso's trial (Tac. *Ann.* 3.10-12).

monetary crisis in Rome due to interest rates which had become too high, and creditors had begun to calling in their debtors to pay the full price, he gave 100,000,000 sesterces;⁴³⁶ yet, he would refuse to help various individuals unless they pled their case before the senate. Contradictory policy, need for control, hierarchy, and attention to details are all keynote features of an obsessive-compulsive personality disorder. The fact that Tiberius hoarded money toward the end of his reign is also worth noting.

In AD 24, after the death of C. Silius, a monetary gift which had been given to him by Augustus was confiscated and placed in the the *fiscus* rather than the *aerarium*.⁴³⁷ In AD 31, the property of Sejanus was also confiscated and put in the *fiscus*.⁴³⁸ The following year, the gold and silver mines of a Spaniard who had been executed, were placed in the *fiscus*.⁴³⁹ Hoarding of money is very common in OCPD, and since Tiberius' mental state was slowly declining at the time, it makes sense that he would want large sums of money under his control for any future catastrophes.⁴⁴⁰

It appears then that his policy was not one that he consciously chose, but one that resulted from his own personality. Since a contradictory nature is always present with OCPD, it is not surprising that Tacitus accused Tiberius of promoting dissimulation.⁴⁴¹ When one examines his dealings with the senate, the events observed would lead to this conclusion; however, an obsessive-compulsive personality is not planned. It is highly unlikely that he set out to fool the senate, but his senatorial 'policy' certainly did leave the

⁴³⁶ D. B. Kaufman, "Hoarding by the Romans," *CJ* 27.9 (1932), pg. 685-686; Suet. *Tib.* 48.

⁴³⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 4.20.

⁴³⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 4.2.

⁴³⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 4.19.

⁴⁴⁰ Patients with OCPD tend to think in terms of future difficulties, and preparation for those via hoarding behaviours.

⁴⁴¹ Millon, pg. 222.

senators wondering what their role actually was. Although a major component of the dissimulation charge against Tiberius was his dealings with the senate, this was not the only reason why both ancient and modern scholars are confused by his principate. The following section will probe deeper into Tiberius' personality in practice through his policies within the provinces.

II. *Tiberius and the Provinces*

It is uncertain which ancient author is correct about the events surrounding Augustus' death. According to Tacitus, Velleius, and Suetonius, there were three documents that were included among Augustus' documents that were handed to the senate. These were his will, his *Res Gestae*, and a budget for the military.⁴⁴² Dio mentions one more document, and even discusses the contents in detail. He claims that Augustus also left Tiberius with a document outlining precisely how the empire should be governed. However, the validity of this last document is called into question because none of the previous authors who were contemporary with the reign of Tiberius mention it.⁴⁴³ As Ober observed, it is particularly suspicious that Suetonius does not mention this fourth document because he had access to the imperial archives.⁴⁴⁴ However, if Tiberius did not receive a document containing instructions on how to run the empire, why did he adhere so closely to Augustan precedent?

One suggestion that Ober made was that Augustus gave Tiberius advice on his last day not to expand the empire beyond its current boundaries. However, Tiberius did not adhere to all Augustan precedents. What appears to be the case is that Tiberius used Augustan principles when they suited his political agenda.⁴⁴⁵ However, the reason why Tiberius did this was not discussed. Ober's astute observation is strengthened in conjunction with an OCPD diagnosis.

⁴⁴² Suet. *Aug.* 101; *Tib* 23; Dio, 56.32; Vell. 2.124.3; Tac. *Ann.* 1.11.

⁴⁴³ Dio, 56.33, Ober, pg. 306.

⁴⁴⁴ Considering that Suetonius did reference many of Augustus' policies, it seems odd that he would be silent about this one (Ober, pg. 307).

⁴⁴⁵ Ober, pg. 335-337.

As has already been established, Augustus appears to have been an authority in Tiberius' mind. His precedent, because it had been proven, was not to be questioned.⁴⁴⁶ The rules of the authority become the rules of the OCPD patient, who then becomes infuriated if this precedent is questioned. However, there is an interesting contradiction with regard to this behaviour. In OCPD, the individual will appeal to the rules of the established authority when it best suits their purposes.⁴⁴⁷ In a number of cases documented by Dr. Stone, patients with OCPD would often harshly criticize others, or have unrealistic expectations of others based on standards that have been set by an authority figure. However, in these cases the individual appealed to the authority figure's rules only when it would assure their control over the situation.⁴⁴⁸ Tiberius would often appeal to precedents laid down by Augustus as a means of justifying his own actions, and those of others. Therefore it is possible that Tiberius was appealing to Augustan precedent for his own purposes, but it does not specifically indicate that Tiberius did this for political reasons. Based upon Ober's own reasoning, Tiberius' reasons for using Augustan principle are unclear and it is possible to conclude that they were adhered to because of his own personality.

Ober has claimed accurately that Tiberius had a strong and imposing nature, and that surely he performed acts the way that he pleased. Tiberius had a strong need for control as he had proven in war when he sent back a portion of the army sent to him by Augustus because he preferred to leave his army at a manageable size.⁴⁴⁹ The same

⁴⁴⁶ See Chapter 2, pg. 39-42.

⁴⁴⁷ Kantor, pg. 221-223.

⁴⁴⁸ Stone, pg. 349, and Millon, pg. 223.

⁴⁴⁹ Vell. 2.113.

mechanism was likely involved in his consideration of the empire which was at a manageable size, and could be properly controlled. In situations in which stability was threatened, he did add new territories and provinces, since the stability that was gained by subduing these areas far outweighed the slight increase in size of the empire.⁴⁵⁰ However, Tiberius did not actively campaign for these additions and since he did recall Germanicus from Germany this indicates that he was not interested in expanding. Although he may have been confusing and awkward among the senators, Tiberius was loved in the provinces.⁴⁵¹

Tiberius did allow the provincials in Asia to build a temple to him because the dedication also included the senate, and because Augustus permitted a temple to be built to him in Pergamum.⁴⁵² However, when a similar request came from Hither Spain, Tiberius refused it because he had no Augustan precedent to follow in that province.⁴⁵³ Although the provincials did tend to worship their rulers, Tiberius was not fond of ruler worship himself. Tiberius viewed himself as a man and wanted to be treated as such. He thought that being worshipped was arrogant, and wished to be found worthy of his

⁴⁵⁰ For instance, it would appear that Cappadocia was added due to strife in that region (Smith, pg. 200-202).

⁴⁵¹ Tiberius' strong sense of justice ensured that corrupt government officials in the provinces were tried and kept in check. For example, Gaius Silanus the proconsul of Asia was tried for extortion and cruelty in AD 22. Tiberius personally questioned witnesses as well as slaves and when enough evidence had been amassed, the senate decided to exile him. Tiberius proposed that Silanus be sent to Cytharus, a motion that was approved by the senate (Tac. *Ann.* 3.67-69). Other provincial officials were also tried for various abuses. Pomponius Labeo was also accused of maladministration of Moesia in AD 34, and committed suicide (Tac. *Ann.* 4.20; R. S. Rogers, *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation Under Tiberius*, (Middleton: APA, 1935), pg. 34. For other examples see, *Ann.* 3.38, 3.70 (Caesius Cordus); 4.20 (Gaius Silius)). As a result of this trial, and the prosecution of Lucilius Capito who had usurped the authority of the provincial governor in AD 23, a temple was built in Tiberius' honour (Tac. *Ann.* 4.15. Tiberius further demonstrates his sense of hierarchy when he promptly reminded Capito, and the senate, what his role had been in the province as imperial procurator. See also Smith, pg. 203).

⁴⁵² Smith, pg. 205 and Tac. *Ann.* 4.15.

⁴⁵³ Tac. *Ann.* 3.37; Smith, pg. 205.

ancestors through his deeds.⁴⁵⁴ It is interesting to note that regardless of the fact that Tiberius avoided divine honours, the number of inscriptions from the provinces dedicated to his divinity indicates that he was well liked.⁴⁵⁵ His sense of justice was a trait that benefited the provincials greatly.

This strict sense of what is just and adequate determined whom Tiberius chose for the various posts in the imperial provinces. Those who were chosen were of good character, and were loyal to the emperor, and their duty. Tiberius tended to pick only the best men for each post, and if he could, would leave them in a particular province as long as possible.⁴⁵⁶ The reasons why Tiberius did this have been discussed by Tacitus who claims that Tiberius probably had this policy because he was indecisive, and once he had made a decision, he tended not to go back on it.⁴⁵⁷ However, it is also possible that in the course of his various duties and active engagement in every aspect, and detail, of the empire, he simply did not have time to ruminate over other possible candidates and just left those who had been chosen in posts until they needed to be replaced.⁴⁵⁸ Either way, it

⁴⁵⁴ Tac. Ann. 3.37, 4.38.

⁴⁵⁵ L. R. Taylor, "Tiberius' Refusal of Divine Honours," TAPA, 40 (1929), pg. 101. See also C.I.L. II, 1516 and III, 12036.

⁴⁵⁶ For example, Lucius Apronius, legate of Lower Germany (AD 28-37), Tac. Ann. 4.73; C. Lentulus Gaetulicus, legate of Upper Germany (AD 29-37), Ann. 6.30; C. Calvius Sabinus, legate of Pannonia for almost the duration of Tiberius' reign, Smith, pg. 208; P. Cornelius Dolabella, legate of Dalmatia (AD 14-19), Vell. RH 2.15 and CIL III, 1741, 2908; C. Poppaeus Sabinus, legate of Macedonia, Achaëa, and Moesia (AD 15-35), Dio, RH, 58.24.4. See also S. Corrigan, Tiberius and the Roman Senate: The Struggle for Concord (McMaster University: MA Thesis, 1997), pg. 53-58.

⁴⁵⁷ Tac. Ann. 1.80.

⁴⁵⁸ Ample evidence for his indecision may be found in Appendix A. Further evidence may be suggested by the argument that he had with Asinius Gallus with regards to magistrates. Gallus asked him to pick some five years in advance, and Tiberius said that he would not due to causing offense. However, his policy of leaving governors in office could cause just as much offense which leads one to conclude that Tiberius was likely not consciously leaving the governors there, but did so out of necessity and procrastination. See Tac. Ann. 2.33. Syme (1981), pg. 195, also raises the valid point that leaving governors in such a position could give them more power such as with the case of Gaetulicus in Germany (AD 34), who threatened Tiberius with the legions under his control.

appears that Tiberius' indecision, and rumination on various details, had an impact on provincial government.

When dealing with people, individuals with OCPD have incredibly high expectations. Certain criteria have to be met in order to earn any respect, or to earn any recognition from these people. In the cases of the provincial legates, Tiberius likely had a hard time finding individuals who met his very strict standards of military experience, and morality.⁴⁵⁹ When he finally did find these people, he left them in office, simply because if he did not, he would have a difficult time choosing another suitable replacement. This may be why he resorted to choosing candidates for posts who were not permitted to leave Rome. He needed a man to fill the post, but did not want that person to leave Rome because they were not quite adequate and may make a mistake, or he feared that they could not be trusted to be loyal to his wishes.⁴⁶⁰ Choosing perfect legates means maintaining peace, and therefore control over the imperial provinces. However, the fact that he was only able to find a few suitable people meant that his standards were too high, and when perfect people could not be found it appears that he could not decide on a possible solution.

The fact that Tiberius was devoted to his duty to the provincials is further evidenced by his various donations of money made during catastrophes. Although Tiberius was frugal,⁴⁶¹ he did have money on reserve for such an emergency. In AD 17,

⁴⁵⁹ Smith, pg. 209.

⁴⁶⁰ Although L. Arruntius was made a legate and never left Rome, it is highly unlikely that he could be viewed as inadequate. Therefore, in his case, the issue was likely one of control. Tiberius probably thought that he may not be able to control someone so intelligent (Tac. *Ann.* 6.27 and Syme (1981), pg. 194).

⁴⁶¹ Tiberius dressed very plainly, and would serve half-eaten food to guests and he would return gifts that he viewed as being too expensive (Suet. *Tib.* 34); however, his use of money was contradictory. He had very

Tiberius gave a large sum of money to the cities of Asia that had been affected by an earthquake.⁴⁶² In AD 23, Tiberius gave monetary support to Cibyra and Aegium after they had sustained damage due to an earthquake.⁴⁶³ Tiberius extended the same type of support to the provinces that he exhibited in Rome.⁴⁶⁴ The fact that he gave money during times of disaster, and rarely any other time, is indicative of OCPD since with this condition money is hoarded for any future catastrophes.⁴⁶⁵

Tiberius' strict sense of duty, at the expense of religious beliefs, is also notable in particular with the rights of asylum. Temples and shrines housed various criminals and slaves who could escape justice simply by being in these sacred structures. The matter was referred to the senate, and all cities had to send emissaries to Rome with evidence verifying their rites of asylum.⁴⁶⁶ Again, a strict sense of justice and a keen attention to detail are certainly traits of OCPD. Tiberius had likely learned just how important careful

refined tastes and would import various vegetables and preferred foods (Plin. *NH.* 14.3, 14.28, 15.16, 19.23, 19.28, 19.41, 19.42; Sen. *Ep.* 83, and Suet. *Tib.* 34 and 42). He also purchased paintings, and had an almost obsessive appreciation for art (Plin. *NH.* 34.62). He would also provide money to those whom he viewed as being adequate, or who had good arguments for their complaints. For instance, he gave money to a senator whose property had been devalued by the construction of an aqueduct (Tac. *Ann.* 1.76). He also gave one million sesterces as a dowry to a girl who was not selected as a vestal virgin (Tac. *Ann.* 2.86).

⁴⁶² Tac. *Ann.* 2.47.

⁴⁶³ Tac. *Ann.* 4.13.

⁴⁶⁴ For instance, when Rome sustained fire on the Caelian Hill in AD 26, Tiberius gave financial aid. See Tac. *Ann.* 4.63, and Suet. *Tib.* 40.

⁴⁶⁵ Individuals with OCPD hoard money and objects as a means of protecting themselves from a future catastrophe. Tiberius likely feared losing his status, and being viewed as a failure, so he prepared for the worst. This would certainly explain his outburst toward Hortalus (Suet. *Tib.* 47). Whenever a person with OCPD is confronted with a situation that directly challenges the defensive outer shell, the result is often anger. Hortalus reflected what he feared could happen to himself if he was not frugal. Caligula, who managed to spend 2,700,000,000 sesterces in under one year, also reflected the negative consequences of being an impulsive spender (Suet. *Cal.* 37.2). Perhaps this is also why he maintained control of the *aerarium*, and toward the end of his reign, hoarded money in the *fiscus*. He was afraid of some future catastrophe which is common in OCPD hoarding behaviour (Stone, pg. 348; Levick (1976), pg. 95).

⁴⁶⁶ It was left to the consuls to decide which places deserved to retain these rights (Tac. *Ann.* 3.60-3.63).

examinations were from his searches of the *ergastula*.⁴⁶⁷ By regulating the rights of asylum, Tiberius would promote justice and would further increase the control within the empire. Although Tiberius was a strict disciplinarian, the provinces appear to have really appreciated his efforts.

An individual with OCPD tends to be a brilliant administrator because they are organized, detailed, and just. These people ensure that every job is completed as perfectly as possible. However, the condition tends to become most noticeable via the person's social life. Those who are in closest contact with the individual with OCPD are often the ones with whom the most difficulties arise. Therefore, Tiberius' difficulties, as were described in the previous section, were within Rome and the senate. The provinces could do nothing but benefit from the strict care that he took to ensure that the provincial governors were not corrupt. This may account for why Tiberius received so many requests for temples and has numerous surviving inscriptions denoting the worship of his *genius* and his *Lares*.⁴⁶⁸ Kantor explains that those with OCPD are always appreciated by those who don't have to work with them directly.⁴⁶⁹ It appears that Tiberius' experience with the senate and the provinces was no different.

The fact that OCPD causes social difficulty can hardly be debated. These people demand that everyone around them conduct business as they would, and follow the strict rules and regulations which are established by the patient. It should come as no surprise then that Tiberius did have difficulties with a variety of people in Rome. In the following

⁴⁶⁷ Suet. *Tib.* 8.

⁴⁶⁸ Taylor, (1929), pg. 101.

⁴⁶⁹ Kantor, pg. 220.

section, Tiberius' relationships with the two people who appear to have particularly turbulent relationships with him will be considered: Asinius Gallus and Agrippina.

Chapter 7: Tiberius, Asinius Gallus, and Agrippina

The relationship that Tiberius had with Asinius Gallus was discussed by Tacitus throughout the *Annals*. Tacitus claims that Tiberius did not like Gallus because he had married Vipsania after Tiberius divorced her in 12 BC. Tacitus primarily used Gallus as a means of demonstrating that Tiberius was capable of holding a grudge for years and striking when it was most opportune.⁴⁷⁰ Shotter, in keeping with Tacitus, claims that Tiberius was embarrassed by Gallus, but that there was no reason to suspect that Tiberius disliked him or held a grudge.⁴⁷¹ However, when one considers an OCPD diagnosis, it is possible to gain insight into this complex relationship.

Asinius Gallus was the son of Asinius Pollio, who was an incredibly outspoken senator during the reign of Augustus, a trait which Asinius Gallus inherited from his father, though he was less offensive.⁴⁷² His career, though he reached the consulship, had no military component. He was promoted by Augustus despite this, which may have infuriated Tiberius.⁴⁷³ Therefore, Gallus was more of a tolerated annoyance than anything else. Even Augustus in deciding his succession said that Gallus was ambitious but incapable of running the empire.⁴⁷⁴ Gallus' ambitions were reflected by the company that he kept.

He allied himself with other extravagant, powerful people such as Agrippina, and befriended anyone who could bring him even more power. He wished to be closely allied

⁴⁷⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 1.12.6.

⁴⁷¹ Shotter (1971), pg. 447.

⁴⁷² D.C.A. Shotter (1971), pg. 444.

⁴⁷³ Syme (1939), pg. 320.

⁴⁷⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 1.13.

with any descendent of Augustus who also happened to be popular in the empire. He eventually became a friend of Tiberius' closest friend Sejanus.⁴⁷⁵ Gallus was one of the first men to be charged after his fall in A.D. 31 due to his relationship with Sejanus.⁴⁷⁶ Essentially, Gallus was everything in manners and associations that Tiberius was not. Tiberius loathed those who had political power and had not earned it. He also loathed those who were emotionally extravagant, and those who were ambitious enough that their morality was lost.

Tiberius preferred men who were stable, morally upstanding citizens who had worked hard to earn the post that they had. To a military man, and OCPD sufferer, like Tiberius, hierarchy is incredibly important. There is no way that these people can have respect for anyone who had not earned their position. Gallus used flattery to further his career, and since Tiberius knew that he had not truly earned his political position,⁴⁷⁷ it is likely that Tiberius resented him and viewed him as inadequate.⁴⁷⁸ This strict attitude towards what constitutes 'adequate' may very well explain the complex relations that Tiberius had with Gallus.

Upon his succession in AD 14, Tiberius had proposed that the empire be divided and that the senate should assign him one of the parts. Gallus in one of his tactless moments asked Tiberius which portion it was that he wanted. When he realized that

⁴⁷⁵ Shotter (1971), pg. 446.

⁴⁷⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 4.71, and 6.25.

⁴⁷⁷ Therefore, Gallus had not earned his post through devotion, long military campaigns, and hard work. Gallus had advanced his career with no military experience, and as a result, he may have viewed Gallus as an inferior annoyance. OCPD patients usually have difficulty imagining that there is any other way of achieving goals than their own way. This is why they often have great difficulties with co-workers (DSM-IV-TR, pg. 727-728).

⁴⁷⁸ Millon, pg 228-229. OCPD patients tend to resent those who do not have to earn their position the 'proper/right' way.

Tiberius had been offended by his question, he attempted to explain that the empire could not be divided. Tiberius was not impressed.⁴⁷⁹ Essentially Gallus had made Tiberius look like an idiot before the entire senate by attempting to extract his true wishes. To further complicate matters, Gallus was an inferior.

An individual with OCPD tends to avoid direct questions about their own intentions, and tends to talk around the issue, especially with those whom they view as superior to themselves.⁴⁸⁰ Tiberius explained that he would not choose a portion of the empire because he had asked the senate to assign him one and in making a choice he would defeat the purpose of the question.⁴⁸¹ Because these individuals tend to be cautious speakers and especially guarded about their own needs and wants, a direct question causes them embarrassment, especially if they are unsure how to answer it.⁴⁸² Given that the inquiry had been made by Gallus, Tiberius' anger is justified. OCPD patients tend to regard their inferiors with complete contempt. The fact that Gallus is so prominent in the sources, and that almost every time that Tiberius disagrees with him, or is questioned by him, he becomes angry, indicates that Tiberius viewed him as a lesser senator.⁴⁸³ Therefore, it appears that Gallus caused offense by asking Tiberius to give his

⁴⁷⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 1.12-13.

⁴⁸⁰ This mechanism is used as a means of regaining control over a situation. See Chapter, 5, pg. 67-70.

⁴⁸¹ Tac. *Ann.* 1.13.

⁴⁸² OCPD speakers are rarely quick-witted simply because they must ponder over words and meaning so carefully so as not to convey emotion (Kantor, pg. 218).

⁴⁸³ This is based upon the information provided in various case studies regarding co-workers is somewhat more logical than the emotional mind reading of the ancient sources who told that Tiberius loathed Gallus purely for his marriage to Vipsania. Tac. *Ann.* 4.71. Also, for example, see DSM-IV-TR Casebook, pg. 148-149 for an example of bullying in OCPD.

true preferences before the senate, an act which no individual with OCPD could do.⁴⁸⁴ It is likely that had Tiberius not been before the rest of the senate, he would have lost his temper with Gallus. However, because it was in the senate meeting that he was asked, Tiberius had to keep his emotions in check.⁴⁸⁵ The only glimpse into his emotions that the senate got was a disgruntled look on his face.

Although Gallus' apparent desire to clarify is perfectly normal, to an individual with OCPD it is entirely offensive, since they guard their emotions and desires so intensely. Tiberius used the characteristic silent pause before answering, which may indicate that he was thinking of an appropriate answer.⁴⁸⁶ Everything that an individual with OCPD does has to be perfect and giving an emotional answer does not meet this criterion. This would not be the only embarrassing incident between the two men.

Individuals with OCPD tend to have a heightened sensitivity to the superimposed perfection of the superego. When Gallus embarrassed Tiberius, Tiberius probably held a grudge, but would never voice his annoyance. Instead, whenever Gallus proposed anything that irritated Tiberius, Tiberius responded with contempt. For instance in A.D. 15, the Tiber flooded, and Asinius Gallus proposed that the senate consult the Sybilline

⁴⁸⁴ Kantor actually provides an example of a patient who responded in an identical fashion to a probing question as Tiberius had. The speaker completely evaded the question, and was visibly irritated, but would not vocalize it. See, Kantor, pg. 224.

⁴⁸⁵ Tiberius' continual deference to the senate in general indicates that he viewed many of its members as adequate authority figures. It was only when they failed to meet his expectations that they diminished in his eyes.

⁴⁸⁶ All of the case studies described by Dr. Stone describe the pause after an uncomfortable, emotional, question had been asked, or if the individual was confronted with an emotional situation. The OCPD patient in every case would pause, and then provide an emotionless response of a similar kind to Tiberius' above.

books about the matter. Tiberius refused, but his reason for doing so was unclear.⁴⁸⁷

Instead he assigned the matter to Lucius Arruntius and Ateius Capito so that they could devise a means of preventing further floods.⁴⁸⁸

During the following years Tiberius had planned to leave Rome and tour the provinces, and during one of these times, Asinius Gallus proposed that the senate should not meet while Tiberius was away. Piso made a case against this, and it was dismissed.⁴⁸⁹ This act would anger Tiberius because he was devoted to work, and the idea of the senate not meeting due to his absence would anger him.⁴⁹⁰ Not only was Gallus flattering a man who hated flattery,⁴⁹¹ but he was also sending the clear message of laziness. To a workaholic OCPD sufferer, laziness, or anything resembling laziness, causes anger. If Gallus was adequate, then he would have never made a proposal that was not in keeping with continued hard work. After all, the empire stopped for no provincial tour.⁴⁹² Gallus was certainly not demonstrating to Tiberius that he was a very capable senator. However, even though the two men generally disagreed, it is interesting to examine the circumstances under which they were in agreement.

⁴⁸⁷ His unclear reason should come as no surprise given his history of obscure communication. See Chapter, 2, pg. 69-71.

⁴⁸⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 1.76, and Shotter (1971), pg. 448; R. S. Rogers, "Lucius Arruntius," *CP* 26.1 (1931), pg. 33; Dio, 57.14; *CIL* 266.

⁴⁸⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 2.35.

⁴⁹⁰ Work is incredibly important to an individual with OCPD who regarded hierarchy as a finely tuned machine that had to continue functioning in order for everything to be done correctly.

⁴⁹¹ Individuals with OCPD loathe flattery because they feel inadequate and unworthy of being flattered.

This statement is not based on Tacitus, but on the findings of OCPD case studies and the astute observations of doctors in clinical situations. These people are, essentially, robots who have turned off all sense of pleasure and are slaves to a rigid superego that is preoccupied with outward appearances (Millon, pg. 222). Dr. Taylor also described this phenomenon, but avoided the Freudian jargon (May 3rd, 2006).

⁴⁹² One may assume that laziness would be an irritation to Tiberius considering that he continually worked through mourning periods (Suet. *Tib.* 52).

In A.D. 16, Quintus Haterius and Octavius Fronto proposed that reforms be made to the sumptuary laws. They proposed that golden vessels should not be used to serve food, and that senators should not wear eastern silk.⁴⁹³ Fronto further proposed that there be restrictions placed on personal belongings. Gallus argued against this, stating that men demonstrated their status by their wealth and that it was a means of differentiating between the layers of society. Even Tiberius agreed with this point, stating that there was no need for a reform at that time, but if immorality occurred as a result of the extravagance, reforms would be made.⁴⁹⁴ It is interesting to see that both Tiberius and Gallus agree that there needs to be a hierarchy, demonstrated via possessions.⁴⁹⁵ However, based on this account, Tiberius' main concern was not the possessions that the senators had, but rather their morality.⁴⁹⁶ Again this refers back to Tiberius' strict adherence to Augustan precedent, and his moral principles. Augustus did not, unreasonably, restrict the senators in their possessions, provided that morality was upheld.⁴⁹⁷ For once, the debate ended with Tiberius and Gallus in agreement.

As should be apparent, the psychology behind why Tiberius was not fond of Asinius Gallus is very complex. For instance, why would Gallus, who asked a direct question during a long, and irritating, debate about the accession, annoy Tiberius? A diagnosis of OCPD helps to clarify some emotional aspects which scholars postulate, but never fully explain. Gallus was outspoken, quick-tempered, a flatterer, extravagant, and

⁴⁹³ Tac. *Ann.* 2.33.

⁴⁹⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 2.33.

⁴⁹⁵ It is interesting to note that many people with OCPD are very possessive of personal objects. In Tiberius' case, he was possessive in terms of status. See chapter 3, pg. 72-73.

⁴⁹⁶ This is also further evidence of Tiberius' hierarchical thinking because he agreed that the upper classes needed to distinguish themselves from the lower classes.

⁴⁹⁷ No mention of limiting the possessions of senators is made outright (Suet. *Aug.* 34, and *RG*, 1.6).

he gave the appearance of laziness. Essentially, Gallus was the total opposite of what Tiberius viewed as adequate and respectable.⁴⁹⁸ He was an inferior man who had earned a position in the senate not via hard work like Tiberius, but through flattery of Augustus. However, simply because Tiberius did not appear to like Gallus, this did not mean that he was waiting for the appropriate time to destroy him either. Gallus fell in the aftermath of Sejanus' undoing by attaching himself to someone who was too ambitious for his own good. In the end, Gallus proved his inadequacy to Tiberius and his flattery earned him a verdict of treason. However, Tiberius' relationship with Gallus did not seem nearly as stressful as his relationship with Agrippina.

Of all the people in Tiberius' reign who were known to clash with his personality, Agrippina the Elder should be the most memorable. Agrippina is described as being proud, quick-tempered, ambitious and intolerant.⁴⁹⁹ All of these traits were things that Tiberius, who was austere, loathed in a person. The fact that he felt that women had no place in politics certainly did not help matters since Agrippina is known for her many interventions in the affairs of state. However, Tiberius' interactions with Agrippina are of two types: her disregard for the societal boundaries of women, and her emotional excessiveness. It is within this section that some examples will be provided as a means of examining some of Tiberius' own personality traits.

To say that Agrippina was ambitious is an understatement. She was known throughout antiquity to assume roles that were best left for men. For instance in AD 15,

⁴⁹⁸ Augustus could not have worded it better when he referred to Gallus as ambitious but incapable. It would appear that Tiberius disliked him for the same reasons (Tac. *Ann.* 1.13).

⁴⁹⁹ Barrett (2002), pg. 22.

she prevented the Romans from destroying a bridge at Vetera, which did spare the army. She provided clothes and dressed the wounds of the soldiers, and offered moral support.⁵⁰⁰ This was hardly something of which Tiberius would have approved. She had essentially assumed the role of general in issuing commands, and, to make matters worse, the soldiers listened! Furthermore, the fact that she used her son Caligula as a pawn to curry favor among the soldiers could hardly have been approved. Tiberius despised extravagance and those who assumed lofty roles in society that were not theirs.⁵⁰¹ Agrippina was guilty of this, and the aftermath of the death of her husband demonstrates her extravagance, and assumed prominence, well.

Agrippina, instead of coming directly back to Rome, took a long and slow trip, stopping at various sites on her way back to Rome, currying pity and sympathy for herself and her children. Tiberius did not attend the funeral in Antioch, nor did he meet her in Italy after her detour.⁵⁰² This may have been the inspiration for Tiberius' statement that was issued at the time stating that men die but the state lives on. The fact that she was willing to mourn in public, and so openly is indicative of her instability.

Tiberius likely avoided the whole scene because, again, it was a very emotional atmosphere, and individuals with OCPD will outright avoid all emotion. Agrippina herself would have caused much difficulty for Tiberius, which was probably why he had such a difficult relationship with her.⁵⁰³ Emotions are viewed as a sign of character weakness, and as a result, the OCPD patient avoids them via various defense

⁵⁰⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 1.59; Barrett (2002), pg. 27.

⁵⁰¹ Capito in Asia was tried for assuming the role of governor (Tac. *Ann.* 4.15).

⁵⁰² Tac. *Ann.* 2.75-77.

⁵⁰³ Dr. Kantor describes a patient who could not stand his wife's constant upset with him for not being intimate. He felt that her emotions were a weakness (Kantor, pg. 225).

mechanisms, such as work. Regardless of Tiberius' own thoughts, Agrippina loved attention and when Tiberius did not give it, she became offended.⁵⁰⁴

The trials that occurred beginning in AD 24 also did nothing to resolve the dissension between the two. Gaius Silius and his wife were tried and convicted of treason. In AD 26, Claudia Pulchra was charged with treason, and Agrippina took it personally.⁵⁰⁵ She interrupted Tiberius while he was sacrificing to the divine Augustus, and accused him of being a hypocrite for sacrificing to Augustus while Tiberius killed his descendents. Tiberius replied in a rage, accusing her of being overly ambitious.⁵⁰⁶

Agrippina's actions here are contrary to what Tiberius would view as right and proper. First of all she took it upon herself to assail him with her temper because of Claudia's trial.⁵⁰⁷ The impression given is that she expected Tiberius to acquit Claudia of all charges, however, Tiberius being a man of justice would not do that. The fact that Tiberius did acquit others may have further infuriated Agrippina, who would have been

⁵⁰⁴ Barrett claims that it is very possible that Agrippina was a member of a faction, currying support for her cause by using Germanicus, but he believes that it was more likely her character itself that was problematic. However, given that the populace and members of the senate supported her, if her power was left unchecked, it could prove problematic (Barrett (2002), pg. 33).

⁵⁰⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 4.52.

⁵⁰⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 53.

⁵⁰⁷ Asinius Gallus also had quite an extravagant temper as was exemplified in AD 15 during a debate in the senate about a riot that had broken out in a theatre which had resulted in a number of deaths and one of the praetorian guards being injured. The senators wished to pass a law stating that praetors had a right to whip the actors. However, the tribune of the plebs vetoed the proposal and was promptly censured by Asinius Gallus (Tac. *Ann.* 1.77). This emotional outburst could have done nothing to improve Tiberius' view of Gallus. Both he and Agrippina have this in common, thus making it clear that Tiberius appears to have an aversion to overly emotional people. Tiberius' reaction to Gallus in this particular case was different. He remained silent during the debate, likely because he knew that Augustan precedent was being upheld. Kantor describes a situation in which an individual with OCPD would become silent if asked emotional questions (pg. 232).

offended by this contradiction.⁵⁰⁸ However, the fact that Tiberius appears to have disliked Agrippina certainly did not help her cause.

Soon relations became so bad between the two that each believed that the other was attempting to poison them.⁵⁰⁹ The role that Sejanus played made this relationship even more volatile than it had been on its own. Many of Agrippina's friends and associates were arrested and tried during this time.⁵¹⁰ Agrippina was also placed under house arrest in AD 27, after a letter condemning her had reached the senate, and was exiled with Nero in AD 29.⁵¹¹ She was then exiled, to Pandateria, and eventually succeeded in starving herself.⁵¹²

Agrippina's personality was one of extreme forwardness. She did not recognize the boundaries between the roles of men and women in Roman society, and she was emotionally excessive, losing her temper very easily. This lack of decorum could hardly have been appreciated by Tiberius, a man who was a very austere and reserved OCPD sufferer. As a result of her personality, Tiberius became increasingly frustrated and eventually lost his temper enough to destroy her. She, like Asinius Gallus, was arrested as a result of the influence of Sejanus, and it is this very influence that is the subject of the following chapter.

⁵⁰⁸ Charges against Lucius Arruntius were dropped (Tac. Ann. 6.7).

⁵⁰⁹ Tac. Ann. 4.54.

⁵¹⁰ For instance, Quintilius Varus (AD 27), Tac. Ann. 4.66; Titius Sabinus (AD 27), and Tiberius wrote a letter to the senate thanking them for removing his enemy, Tac. Ann. 4.70; Asinius Gallus was arrested in AD 30, and was held in prison until he died in AD 33, Tac. Ann. 4.23. See also R. S. Rogers, "The Conspiracy of Agrippina," TAPA 62 (1931), pg. 155-161.

⁵¹¹ The letter was so unclear that it had to be sent twice because the populace believed it to be false, and the senators were unsure if Tiberius wanted them to arrest her or not. A second letter had to be sent by Tiberius in order to officially condemn her. (Tac. Ann. 5.4). Drusus was also arrested and placed in prison under the palatine hill; however, his exact trial date is unknown. He died in AD 31 or 32. See Rogers TAPA (1931), pg. 161.

⁵¹² Tac. Ann. 6.25-26.

Chapter 8: Tiberius on Capreae

I. *Tiberius, Sejanus and Delusional Admiration*

The first portion of Tiberius' reign appears to have been peaceful and rather uneventful. Even the ancient sources are kind in their accounts, indicating that Tiberius had been a very capable emperor, and that he had encouraged democracy in Rome.⁵¹³ He ruled the empire well, and acted with justice. However, the last years of his life coloured the extant accounts of his reign. Tacitus claims that Tiberius revealed his 'true' nature in his later years. His account describes a paranoid old man, hidden away in his island fortress, dealing with the senate via letters, cold-heartedly issuing commands. Supposedly, his morality declined and he was wont to indulge in various sexual indiscretions.⁵¹⁴ These views are supported by the other ancient authors whose accounts describe, more or less, the same idea.⁵¹⁵ The agreement of the sources indicates that a decline of some sort must have occurred, but why? In this section, an attempt will be made to establish a plausible explanation for why Tiberius declined in his later years, and why Sejanus fell from grace.

The role that Sejanus played in the life of Tiberius has been debated among modern scholars. Sejanus may have been raised as a means of following precedent,⁵¹⁶ or because Tiberius made a poor judgement of character,⁵¹⁷ or because Tiberius was socially

⁵¹³ Suet. *Tib.* 26; Tac. *Ann.* 1.77.

⁵¹⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 6.1, and Suet. *Tib.* 42.

⁵¹⁵ Dio, 58.1-3, and Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 12.7.

⁵¹⁶ Levick (1976), pg. 170-171. Sejanus' advancement is briefly compared to Augustus' advancement of Agrippa in AD 4.

⁵¹⁷ Smith, pg. 163.

awkward and required a socially adept colleague.⁵¹⁸ Sejanus was described as hard-working, loyal, capable, organized, social, and very moral.⁵¹⁹ His service in Pannonia with Drusus,⁵²⁰ and the decision to move the Praetorian Guard just outside of Rome would have appealed to a man like Tiberius who insisted on having complete control of all situations in his life.⁵²¹

Sejanus not only worked hard and was successful, but he was also very adept socially. He had many of the qualities that Tiberius lacked and it was most likely for these reasons that Tiberius felt that he could trust him.⁵²² Sejanus could not only relate to Tiberius, but he had enough personal charm, and self-control, that he could relate to the other senators without compromising the appearance of being a morally upright man.⁵²³ Sejanus had proven himself to be adequate; however, he appears to have had ambitions of his own and as a result he used the trust that he had earned from Tiberius to his advantage.

Sejanus must have recognized that Tiberius was beginning to become weary of office, and as a result he became increasingly close to Tiberius as his administrative assistant.⁵²⁴ However, this position also gave Sejanus a greater influence over Tiberius, a fact that Tiberius' son Drusus resented.⁵²⁵ It is uncertain if Sejanus actually killed Drusus

⁵¹⁸ Shotter (2004), pg. 51.

⁵¹⁹ Smith, pg. 118-119.

⁵²⁰ Shotter (2004), pg. 47-48.

⁵²¹ Tac. *Ann.* 4.2, and Smith, pg. 117-118.

⁵²² Tac. *Ann.* 3.72, Dio, 57.21.3-4.

⁵²³ Shotter (2004), pg. 48.

⁵²⁴ Levick (1976), pg. 171-172.

⁵²⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 4.3, in which Sejanus is punched in the face by Drusus as a result of his influence.

as a result of the political competition, but after Drusus' death, Sejanus' influence increased even more.

It was after the death of Drusus that Sejanus was able to convince Tiberius that Agrippina had a faction that needed to be controlled, and numerous accusations were levied at Agrippina's friends. In particular, Gaius Silius and his wife Sosia Galla were both condemned in AD 24.⁵²⁶ In AD 26, Claudia Pulchra, Agrippina's cousin was accused of sorcery, which resulted in an altercation.⁵²⁷ Tiberius' continual arguments with Agrippina and her supposed faction, as well as his declining relations with the senate, surely contributed to his sense of dread; however, it is unlikely that this was the only cause of Tiberius' decline.

In AD 26, Tiberius made the decision to remove himself from Rome never to return for the remainder of his reign.⁵²⁸ Numerous reasons for Tiberius' departure were provided by Tacitus. One of the reasons given was that Tiberius had become increasingly sensitive about his reputation for cruelty and sexual perversion. His outburst during the trial of Votienus Montanus helps to demonstrate this point.⁵²⁹ During the trial, Tiberius was forced to listen to an account of the various insults discussed in secret about him. He became so upset that he claimed that he was willing to undergo a legal investigation to

⁵²⁶ DCA Shotter, "The Trial of Gaius Silius (AD 24)," *Latomus* 26 (1967), pg. 713, Tac. *Ann.* 4.17-20. When Silius complained that the consul in AD 24, who oversaw the case was biased due to previous bad relations, Tiberius claimed that the consuls had a right to be involved in any case. This dependence on republican precedent helped to reflect the ethical system that Tiberius followed. He was rigidly adhering to the republican past, regardless of the unfairness of the situation. If Tiberius was truly a stoic, then he would have removed Visellius as the prosecutor because this is not promoting true justice as stoic ethics dictates. Shotter (1967), pg. 714; Tac. *Ann.* 1.7. Tiberius' adherence to republican precedent is likely a result of his strict adherence to republican rules and regulations which he believed were 'right'. The inability to make an exception for this particular case indicates his maladaptive adherence.

⁵²⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 4.52.

⁵²⁸ Suet. *Tib.* 41; Dio, 58.1, and Tac. *Ann.* 4.67.

⁵²⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 4.42, and Smith, pg. 134.

prove his innocence. Even the constant reassurance from friends and the assembly could not quell his anger.⁵³⁰ A similar claim was made by Tacitus with regard to Tiberius' departure to Rhodes.⁵³¹ Certainly Tiberius' introverted character and upstanding morality did nothing to help his cause. After all, Augustus, who claimed to be the epitome of moral rectitude, was also accused of sexual indiscretions.⁵³² His physical appearance,⁵³³ and declining relations between him and his mother⁵³⁴ were also provided by the sources as possible reasons for his departure.

All of these are valid reasons, but to know which one, if any, was the actual cause of his retirement is impossible. Rather, what one must do in this case is to examine the various reasons and see to what conclusion they may lead. All of the above descriptions are unpleasant. If one were to superimpose the incredible stress from Agrippina,⁵³⁵ the associated treason trials and the fact that his ideals did not fit in with the new regime, one explanation becomes abundantly clear: a second bout of depression.

The suggestion that Tiberius left due to depression can hardly be a shock. If Sejanus had shown Tiberius that there was need to punish a pro-Agrippina party, then this

⁵³⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 4.42; Shotter (2004), pg. 51.

⁵³¹ Tac. *Ann.* 1.4.

⁵³² Suet. *Aug.* 71.

⁵³³ Tiberius was described as handsome by the sources, however, as he aged his posture suffered and he suffered from an unsightly skin ailment (Tac. *Ann.* 4.57, and Suet. *Tib.* 68.2). An article written by Walter Hayes indicates that Tiberius also may have suffered from polar cataracts (Hayes, pg. 3). This deterioration may have been a harsh reminder of the fact that he was aging.

⁵³⁴ It is said that she harassed him, and reminded him of the debt he had to her for securing him the succession (Dio 57.3.3). Suetonius also supplies details of an anecdote in which she showed Tiberius letters in which Augustus had criticized his character (Suet. *Tib.* 51). Certainly Livia was ambitious, and it is entirely possible that she expected to share the same position in the government with her son as she had once shared with Augustus. Livia advised Augustus on numerous matters, a fact which the truly republican Tiberius must have come to loathe (Suet. *Aug.* 84; Dio. 57.6). The fact that Tiberius did not attend her funeral, refused various honours for her, and did not execute her will certainly does indicate that there was some discord between the two (Suet. *Tib.* 51).

⁵³⁵ Smith, pg. 134.

would lend further support to the fact that he was generally disliked, a fact of which he had to be aware. There is a line supplied from the ancient sources that indicates his awareness when he said that the people could hate him, so long as they had respect for him.⁵³⁶ His morose nature could hardly have been personable, and in a bout of depression he would have been even less tolerable.⁵³⁷ Tiberius could hardly have been unaware of this, and the fact that Tiberius had so few friends further supports this notion.

His popularity is indicated by the meager party that saw him off, and accompanied him, to Rhodes. The party that accompanied him to Capreae was probably similar in size. He had with him Sejanus, Cocceius Nerva, a senator and learned man in law, Rufus Curtius, an equestrian knowledgeable in literary arts, numerous teachers, and Thrasyllus.⁵³⁸ With age, the number of friends that Tiberius had would further dwindle due to death, and the treason trials were certainly doing nothing for his popularity.

The trials, which were aimed at culling Agrippina's party, were viewed as malicious by the people, who had grown to love her as Germanicus' wife. Sejanus, who continually told Tiberius that he had enemies, and who reported what they were saying in great detail, did nothing to help Tiberius feel any more secure about his position.⁵³⁹ Tiberius was disliked, he had lost his son, and the dissension between him and his mother likely weighed heavily upon him.⁵⁴⁰ Due to his indecision, and keen attention to detail,

⁵³⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 59.1.

⁵³⁷ Suet. *Tib.* 68.3; Tac. *Ann.* 1.6.

⁵³⁸ Barrett (1996), pg. 36.

⁵³⁹ For example, Nero, Tac. *Ann.* 4.66.

⁵⁴⁰ Interestingly enough, Livia's funeral was also not attended by him because of work (Suet. *Tib.* 51).

he likely fell behind on his work, which further upset him, making him feel completely inadequate.⁵⁴¹

Tiberius, recognizing that he was old, unpopular, and surrounded by hate, probably viewed himself as a failure. He left Rome in AD 26 on the pretense of establishing two temples for Augustus in Campania, but would never return.⁵⁴² The circumstances at this point in time were certainly conducive to depression, and it would certainly explain why a man who had been so devoted to his public duty, suddenly removed himself.⁵⁴³ It was during the few years prior to Tiberius' retirement that his shortcomings became more apparent as the stresses of office increased. The sources do not provide a detailed account of his state of mind while on Capreae before the fall of Sejanus; however, once on Capreae, Tiberius' condition further evolved.

Depression is quite common with the diagnosis of OCPD. In conjunction with this condition, it occurs as the result of the realization that perfection will never be achieved, or that achievements fall short of personal expectations, or those superimposed from an authority figure. Eventually when accomplishments fall short of lofty goals, or when the weight of excessive work becomes too much, the individual becomes depressed.⁵⁴⁴ Tiberius had a long history of excessive attention to detail and indecision

⁵⁴¹ Suet. *Tib.* 38. He had also failed to conduct a provincial tour as he had promised a number of times, earning himself the nickname Callippides.

⁵⁴² Tac. *Ann.* 4.59; Smith, pg. 133.

⁵⁴³ According to Dr Taylor, depression is characterized by depressed mood, and sudden disinterest in activities once enjoyable. Although the sources do not record Tiberius' sad mood, his sudden removal from Rome after such a horrible amount of stress makes this conclusion most logical. See DSM-IV-TR, pg. 114 for a discussion on the symptoms of depressive disorder.

⁵⁴⁴ I am indebted to Dr. Taylor for the explanation of the causes of depression in patients with OCPD. See also Suzuki, et al., pg. 1223.

which did result in unfinished projects.⁵⁴⁵ However, Tiberius' position is different from the examples presented in the case studies. Tiberius was an emperor, and vulnerability could lead to him losing his life. The vulnerability, and the knowledge that he was in a precarious position, would lead him back into a state of event-caused delusional disorder similar to the one that he had suffered at Rhodes.⁵⁴⁶

Once Tiberius had removed himself to Capreae, he became increasingly paranoid. After the trial of Titus Sabinus, Tiberius wrote a letter to the senate thanking them for removing an enemy to the state.⁵⁴⁷ He proceeded to inform them that he lived in fear of his enemies daily, but when questioned by Asinius Gallus as to who the enemies were, Tiberius was silent.⁵⁴⁸ Although his enemies were unnamed, it was assumed that he was referring to Agrippina.⁵⁴⁹ Further evidence of paranoia is supplied when Tiberius asked that he be escorted into the senate by armed guards, but then refused.⁵⁵⁰ Tiberius also made sure that no one could access him without permission and his 'island fortress' was heavily guarded and unapproachable.⁵⁵¹ These events were the beginnings of the delusional disorder that would plague Tiberius for the remainder of his life. The fears of 'enemies' from whom he needed 'protection' indicate that his delusions were persecutory.

⁵⁴⁵ He left Pompey's theatre, and the temple of Augustus in Rome unfinished (Suet. Tib. 47.1).

⁵⁴⁶ See Chapter, 2, pgs. 44-47.

⁵⁴⁷ Smith, pg. 136; Tac. Ann. 4.67.

⁵⁴⁸ Tac. Ann. 4.71. This example is especially interesting because it shows an example of Tiberius admitting emotion, and when Gallus questioned him, he remained silent on the matter, a pattern of behaviour which was seen previously in his reign with numerous other outbursts. For example, Suet. Tib. 47.

⁵⁴⁹ DCA Shotter (2000), pg. 354, Smith, pg. 136, Barrett (1996), pg. 33; Tac. Ann. 4.17.4.

⁵⁵⁰ Tac. Ann. 6.2, and 15.

⁵⁵¹ An anecdote supplied by Suetonius describes what happened to a fisherman who had arrived unannounced to Capreae bearing a mullet for Tiberius. His face was scratched with it, and then he was assaulted with a crab that he had caught as well (Suet. Tib. 60).

Event-caused persecutory delusional disorder is often characterized by an extreme belief that a person or persons is/are trying to harm the sufferer. For instance, one case study described a man who believed that a woman, whom he called ‘the barracuda’ was impeding his success because she stole from him.⁵⁵² These people often have altercations with the law because they are so convinced that the delusion is real that they will seek legal action.⁵⁵³ The delusions are always of plausible situations: for example, it is plausible that a woman could steal from the man mentioned in above example. However, a very important aspect of delusional disorder is the fact that the individual with it can usually function normally. This means that in most cases work is not hindered in any type of delusional disorder.⁵⁵⁴

In the case of emperor Tiberius, his unnamed enemies became sources for the delusion that his life was in grave danger, and that all of his enemies had to be kept at bay.⁵⁵⁵ The reality of the situation cannot be doubted because it was entirely possible that Tiberius could be murdered by an enemy since he was so disliked in Rome. Just as was the case at Rhodes, Tiberius’ delusional disorder arose from a depressed state.⁵⁵⁶ Again the situation is similar: Tiberius had reason to believe that his life was in danger. This was why he had a strict system of permission required to gain access to him.⁵⁵⁷ All of

⁵⁵² DSM-IV-TR Casebook, pg. 489-491. Delusional disorder can last for decades. DSM-IV-TR, pg. 326.

⁵⁵³ DSM-IV-TR, pg. 325.

⁵⁵⁴ Event caused persecutory delusional disorder has the best prognosis and is often not as prolonged. It usually is the result of severe psychosocial stressors (DSM-IV-TR, pg. 326).

⁵⁵⁵ Rogers (1931b), pg. 145.

⁵⁵⁶ See Chapter 3, pg. 44, and DSM-IV-TR, pg. 326; I am indebted to Dr. Taylor for her explanation of how delusional disorder factored into this diagnosis.

⁵⁵⁷ Tac. Ann. 4.68.

those whom he did not wish to see were rejected.⁵⁵⁸ It was also why he only attempted to return to Rome twice.⁵⁵⁹ During this time Sejanus was the perfect loyal servant to Tiberius, and Tiberius' relationship with him seemed secure. However, one question must be asked: why did Tiberius place so much trust in Sejanus?

To the OCPD sufferer, adequacy and perfection are both necessary in every aspect of their lives. The OCPD sufferer, though they strive for perfection, often recognizes that they themselves are not perfect. Therefore, if they encounter another individual in their lives whom they feel is very adequate, then that person comes to embody what they view as perfection in a person.⁵⁶⁰ These individuals may earn a loftier position as a result of their presumed perfection. Stone, a practicing psychiatrist, views these objects of admiration as similar to gurus. These 'gurus' embody everything that the OCPD individual views as perfection, and therefore what the OCPD individual is not.⁵⁶¹ The emperor had placed an unprecedented amount of trust in Sejanus; however, this did not mean that Sejanus was safe in a delusional episode. Even one's closest friends are viewed as potential enemies.

In AD 30, Sejanus in an attempt to strengthen his power, approached the Rhine legions and began to curry support with the populace. Although Tiberius was isolated on Capreae, he did receive visitors from whom he would have heard reports about Sejanus'

⁵⁵⁸ He actually issued orders that prevented people from bothering him while he was in retirement (Suet. *Tib.* 40).

⁵⁵⁹ Suet. *Tib.* 72.

⁵⁶⁰ Millon, pg. 217; Stone, pg. 345-348.

⁵⁶¹ In many cases, the 'guru' or object of admiration is not nearly the caliber or quality of person that one would expect. In many cases, these people have very shady characters (Stone, pg. 343-344).

activities.⁵⁶² Although it is uncertain how Tiberius discovered Sejanus' indiscretions, it is likely that he became paranoid of Sejanus upon receiving this information, since there is no other information extant which would indicate why Tiberius began to distrust him. Tiberius likely recognized the danger, and decided to bide his time until he had a 'perfect' plan in motion.⁵⁶³ The extreme caution with which he acted should come as no surprise since Tiberius was not known for hasty decisions.⁵⁶⁴

Once the timing was right, Tiberius exacted his plan and an unsuspecting Sejanus was arrested and executed.⁵⁶⁵ This event would only further Tiberius' delusion since it would be apparent that even those who appeared to be friends could actually be enemies. In Rome, the reaction to the prefect's fall was riotous. His children were taken from their home and executed,⁵⁶⁶ and his wife, before she committed suicide, blamed Sejanus for the death of Drusus in a letter which she sent to Tiberius.⁵⁶⁷ The people began to riot and they tore down all of the statues to him. Soon, all of Sejanus' associates and friends were put on trial.⁵⁶⁸

These further trials did nothing to increase Tiberius' popularity because those who had sought Sejanus' friendship as a means of demonstrating their loyalty to the princeps were suddenly facing charges for the very thing which they had hoped to avoid: treason.

⁵⁶² J. Nichols, "Antonia and Sejanus," *Historia* 24 (1975), pg. 55.

⁵⁶³ Smith, pg. 143-144.

⁵⁶⁴ He was almost cautious to a fault when he was a general (Vell. 2.97).

⁵⁶⁵ Sejanus received proconsular powers, and during a meeting when he expected to be named heir, Tiberius denounced him (Dio, 58.7-8).

⁵⁶⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 5.9.

⁵⁶⁷ Dio, 58.11.5-6.

⁵⁶⁸ Smith, pg. 149-150. The letter which the senate received condemning Sejanus in AD 31 is particularly interesting. Tiberius' letter was detailed, and unclear, then as he became more enraged by the subject of Sejanus, his words became increasingly clear and Sejanus was arrested and executed (Juv. *Sat.* 10).

Although many senators were found guilty, many were also acquitted.⁵⁶⁹ However, the fact that Tiberius had begun to initiate trials himself is also key to this diagnosis.⁵⁷⁰ The letters that Tiberius sent at the end of his reign were also indicative of delusion since he was suddenly very concerned for himself, when previously he had not considered slander toward him as punishable.⁵⁷¹ Trials in which the offender had slandered the imperial family were also heard on Capreae and many were executed.⁵⁷² The fact that Tiberius had become increasingly paranoid and was using the law against potential accusers is indicative of delusion.

Tiberius would spend the remainder of his days, isolated on Capreae with Gaius and Gemellus his chosen successors. His paranoia never did subside and he ended his days isolated, fearful, and supposedly in debauchery. This subject of his debauchery tends to be discredited by scholarship, but the ancient sources claim that Tiberius suffered from moral decay during his last years at Capreae, and this will be the subject of the following section.

⁵⁶⁹ Based upon a brief examination of the data compiled by R. S. Rogers, it would appear that the majority of the treason trials were after Tiberius had removed himself from Rome, which is further indicative of the impact that delusional disorder had upon him. Although the number of treason trials had increased in the latter part of Tiberius' reign, there were many trials in which the charges were dropped. However, it is interesting to note that there was an increase in trials of a slanderous nature, and since Tiberius tended to have a great deal of say with regards to condemning, or acquitting various people, he was likely responsible for many of the trials. The fact that Terentius tells Tiberius that he is no more guilty for his friendship to Sejanus than Tiberius is, indicates that Tiberius had a close watch over the proceedings. Terentius was acquitted (Tac. *Ann.* 6.8; Rogers, pg. 193).

⁵⁷⁰ Gallio in AD 32; Q. Servaeus and Minucius Thermus (AD 32), Tac. *Ann.* 4.7.2; C. Proculus (AD 33), Tac. *Ann.* 18.1.

⁵⁷¹ Levick (1976), pg. 199.

⁵⁷² Suet. *Tib.* 62.2.

II. *Tiberius' Alcoholism and Sexual Deviance*

The fact that Tiberius' mental state deteriorated while he was on Capreae can hardly be debated. He had gone from a very devoted emperor to a morose recluse, terrified of unnamed enemies. However, the ancient sources claim that while he was on Capreae, and at Rhodes, he indulged in numerous perversities.⁵⁷³ Suetonius even went so far as to claim that Tiberius encouraged Caligula to indulge so that his morose nature might be softened.⁵⁷⁴

Modern scholarship has chosen to reject that these sexual transgressions did occur simply because Tiberius was too principled. Maranon, a psychiatrist, claims that it was simply rumour due to his reclusive nature which has been sensationalized.⁵⁷⁵ However, to suggest that it was nearly impossible, or to reject this theory completely on the grounds that Tiberius was principled, seems rash. Augustus, the man who restored morality to Rome, who was also principled, was also accused of indulging in many transgressions which the sources supply in ample detail.⁵⁷⁶ Augustus was hardly reclusive. However, since Tiberius was very moral, one must consider what might have led him to err.

If one examines the sources closely, there is one detail on which Tiberius and Augustus differ greatly: Both men had completely opposite drinking habits. Augustus was known for his stoic approach to food and wine. It is documented that he could only

⁵⁷³ Tac. *Ann.* 1.4, 6.1; Suet. *Tib.* 42-45.

⁵⁷⁴ Suet. *Cal.* 11.

⁵⁷⁵ For example, Maranon, pg. 210; Levick, (1976), pg. 167; Smith, pg. 155.

⁵⁷⁶ Suet. *Aug.* 71.

drink wine in very small quantities or he would vomit.⁵⁷⁷ Tiberius, on the other hand, was documented as being a very heavy drinker. He made numerous political appointments during some of his drinking parties. He drank enough that he was nicknamed “Biberius Caldius Mero”.⁵⁷⁸ Since the sources do not indicate that Tiberius needed to increase the amount that he drank, or that he drank while he worked, or that he went into shock if he did not drink, one cannot assign the diagnosis of alcohol dependency.⁵⁷⁹ However, since he did drink to excess, and often, then one may conclude that he suffered from alcohol abuse.⁵⁸⁰ It is entirely possible that the alcohol abuse was what caused Tiberius to deviate.

The symptoms of alcohol use are not difficult to recognize. In many cases the individual experiences slurred speech, loss of motor stability, and a personality shift. In one of the DSM-IV case studies the man described was normally an introverted, quiet man. However, when he was drunk he became loud, violent, and perverse.⁵⁸¹ In the case of OCPD the addition of alcohol can cause many problems. Because individuals with this condition are emotionally restricted, any suppressed anger may be violently released.⁵⁸² Also, any inner repressed urges are expressed, and they are in many cases sexual.⁵⁸³ Tiberius was very sexually restricted. He apparently waited seven years before having

⁵⁷⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 77.

⁵⁷⁸ Sen *Ep.* 83, Suet. *Tib.* 42.

⁵⁷⁹ DSM-IV-TR, pg. 211.

⁵⁸⁰ Suzuki, et al., pg. 1225.

⁵⁸¹ DSM-IV-TR, Casebook, pg. 538.

⁵⁸² Kantor, pg. 224. I am also indebted to Dr. Taylor for her explanation of the role that anger plays in this diagnosis.

⁵⁸³ Millon, pg. 222.

sexual contact with Vipsania,⁵⁸⁴ he was appalled by Julia's sexual transgressions,⁵⁸⁵ and he never remarried after his divorce from Julia. Therefore it is not unrealistic to suggest that while he was under the influence of alcohol he deviated, sexually, from his normal restricted state.

It is uncertain whether or not all of the documented examples are true. For instance, it is uncertain whether he raped senatorial women, or had a pond full of youths for his pleasure.⁵⁸⁶ However, it is entirely possible that he deviated. His violent outburst during the trial of Votienus Montanus is also worth considering. If Tiberius did deviate while he was under the influence of alcohol, then this would appear to be hypocritical to any onlooker because he was so morally principled. His violent reaction in the trial of Votienus Montanus also makes sense in the context of an OCPD diagnosis. In the case studies documented by doctors Kantor and Stone, individuals with OCPD who were questioned about their moral integrity became violently angry.⁵⁸⁷ The superego insisted that they maintain that air of being morally perfect. The situation that the sources present about Tiberius is no different.

When he heard what was being said about him in private, he became infuriated, which indicates that the information had struck a nerve.⁵⁸⁸ Tiberius offered to allow the senate to do a legal investigation; however, he must have been fully aware that no one

⁵⁸⁴ This estimate is based upon the time elapsed between the marriage and when Drusus was born. (19BC-12BC).

⁵⁸⁵ Dr. Stone provides numerous examples of individuals with OCPD who were horrified by anything sexual and when these individuals saw anything sexual, they would appeal to their strict sense of morality to suppress any resulting urges (Stone, pg. 353, 355).

⁵⁸⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 43.

⁵⁸⁷ Kantor, pg. 222; Stone, pg. 355. In some of the cases, OCPD individuals actually had deviated sexually, but were violently opposed to being reminded of the transgression (Stone, pg. 354-355).

⁵⁸⁸ After all, an individual with OCPD had to be perfect, and having any faults brought to light results in angry outbursts (Kantor, pg. 233).

would insist that it occur. He was the emperor and investigating such a charge into Tiberius' private world would surely incur his wrath. If neither flattery from the assembly nor reassurances from his friends could calm his anger, then taking him up on his offer of a legal investigation would have done no better.⁵⁸⁹

It is uncertain whether Tiberius actually did deviate sexually; however, it is surprising that modern scholarship has not recognized that it is entirely possible, given that he drank to excess. After all, people who have become drunk often undergo a change in personality in which they say or do things that they would not normally do. It is hard to accept that this would not be the case for Tiberius as well.

His violent reaction to the accusations that he was immoral may also be indicative of an actual deviation. After all, if he did deviate while he was drinking, then it is an indication that he lost control of his urges. If this did occur, then having it brought up to him directly would only remind him that he had lost control, was not perfect, and had been immoral.⁵⁹⁰ Therefore it is perfectly within reason, given his reaction upon hearing these accusations, the fact that he drank to excess, and the examples provided in the case studies mentioned above, that sexual transgressions could have occurred. However, whether or not they occurred to the extent that the ancient sources claim will never be known.

⁵⁸⁹ Shotter (2004), pg. 51.

⁵⁹⁰ According to Dr Taylor, there is nothing an individual with OCPD hates more than being reminded that they have faults and that they are not perfect.

III. *Tiberius' Death*

Tiberius' death has been a controversial topic since antiquity. Numerous versions of how he died survive in the ancient texts. Some of them include murder by Caligula or Macro, while some versions contain elements that sound natural.⁵⁹¹ In 1956, Maranon concluded that Tiberius died of pneumonia.⁵⁹² However, this explanation does not account for the various apparent heart failures. It is in this section that the more plausible diagnosis of a myocardial infarction (heart-attack) will be discussed as further proof of an OCPD diagnosis.

The description of the natural death given by Seneca the Elder and Suetonius is Tiberius fell ill at Astura but continued on to Circeii, where games had been organized in his honour.⁵⁹³ Tiberius was taking part in a javelin contest when he felt a sharp pain in his side and collapsed. He had to be taken to Misenum in a litter where he remained bedridden. Further storms prevented his return to Capreae, so he remained in Misenum.⁵⁹⁴ According to the sources, on his last morning, Tiberius called out to request some food, and no one came. He likely became annoyed and got up himself when he finally collapsed dead beside his bed.⁵⁹⁵ Another interesting piece of information supplied by

⁵⁹¹ Suet. *Tib.* 73.2; Suet. *Cal.* 12.4; Tac. *Ann.* 6.50.4.

⁵⁹² Maranon, pg. 134.

⁵⁹³ Suet. *Tib.* 72.3. Tiberius' need for control is also apparent in this situation when he refused to be treated as though he was ill. He insisted that his schedule go on as usual.

⁵⁹⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 72.5.

⁵⁹⁵ M. Pont, "Did Emperor Tiberius Die from Myocardial Infarction?" *Medicina nei Secoli* 2 (1996), pg. 239.

Cassius Dio is that each time Tiberius fell ill, he completely recovered consciousness after each episode, and was perfectly normal physically.⁵⁹⁶

Further information that may be gleaned was that the doctor Charicles⁵⁹⁷ also claimed that Tiberius' pulse was irregular.⁵⁹⁸ When one considers that the sources all describe some form of chest pain, and that Tiberius lost his strength but regained his awareness, this indicates a form of heart failure. When he went to stand, this was enough strain to force his blood pressure up, finally killing him.⁵⁹⁹

Individuals who have OCPD are at high risk for heart-attack because they usually have heightened levels of anxiety which has been associated with heart-disease. Many stress-induced conditions arise with this personality disorder.⁶⁰⁰ The fact that Tiberius was emperor could have done nothing to help his stress levels. He had been forced to go into a profession that required good social skills, which he did not possess. After many years of failing to meet his own expectations he became depressed.⁶⁰¹ The level of continuous stress that Tiberius must have had was more than enough to result in heart-attack. The stories of murder were likely concocted as a means of making Macro and Caligula seem even more evil by comparison, given the atmosphere of the latter's reign. However, a natural death is verified by a source who was contemporary with Tiberius;

⁵⁹⁶ This latter fact removes the possibility that the collapsing episodes were due to epilepsy. Epilepsy was rampant in the Julian family, but details of this kind are not provided for the Claudians. For a brief description of epilepsy in the Julian family, See, Barrett (1989), pg. 12; Dio, 58.28.

⁵⁹⁷ Tiberius' relationship with doctors is interesting. He always kept them around, but he refused to listen to their advice ever since he was 30 years old (Suet. *Tib.* 68.4). This further indicates the sense of control reflected in cases of OCPD in relation to doctors. Many patients will refuse to do anything that the doctor says because they want to be in control (Robinson, pg. 121).

⁵⁹⁸ The irregular heart rate is called tachycardia (Tac. *Ann.* 6.50, and Suet. *Tib.* 72.6).

⁵⁹⁹ Pont, pg. 240-241.

⁶⁰⁰ Robinson, pg. 120, DSM-IV-TR, pg. 725. Tiberius was an alcoholic, and he had a history of depression.

⁶⁰¹ His later reign was plagued by delusion which caused him great distress since he was unsure as to who his real friends were.

therefore it is this version that is most likely the correct one. Tiberius died on March 16th, AD 37 at the age of 78.

Conclusion

Tiberius' contradictory, and enigmatic, personality has proven to be enigmatic to scholarship, so much so that the subject was either avoided, except by one psychiatrist who wrote in the late 1950's whose theories are severely out-dated. The perceived innate personality that Tiberius had based on his appearance formed the basis of this diagnosis. The assumed emotions associated with this innate personality were viewed as being 'wrong' and were used to determine what his behaviour would be. Tiberius was assumed to be resentful, and all of his behaviours were described as such. However, without a personal interview with Tiberius, this theory cannot stand, because it is impossible to know how Tiberius felt. Also, in recent years, the focus has turned from an emotional focus to a behavioural one in which the individual's behaviour is observed, and any major themes observed. Emotion is never assumed as every person is different and experiences emotion differently.

A careful observation of Tiberius' behaviour has never been conducted in modern scholarship before now. Scant references are made to his principled and austere nature, but never anything in depth. Scholarship chose to examine Tiberius from a political point of view, which indirectly provided interesting details about Tiberius the man rather than the politician. Tiberius was regimented, controlling, frugal, strict, detailed, cautious, and emotionally restricted. Although these behaviours resemble those exhibited in Stoicism, Tiberius also exhibited many that did not. His heavy drinking habits, hierarchical thinking, and bouts of depression contradict Stoic principles. The only other conclusion

to make is that Tiberius' behaviour was a function of a personality disorder, and the various associated conditions with it. The only personality disorder which exhibits all of the traits that Tiberius had is OCPD. The observed depression, drinking, and delusion associated with the depression, are all explained by this diagnosis.

Personality disorders tend to become visible in social situations, and Tiberius' social difficulty was enough to leave those around him confused, and desperate. His regimented behaviour and restricted affect gave him the appearance of being unapproachable. His desperate need for control, which he asserted via contradictions, stubbornness, and direct orders, confused the senators who had been elevated to act as his advisors. Tiberius gave the appearance of wanting to give the senate control, but in typical OCPD fashion it was ultimately up to him whether he used, or disregarded, their advice.

His relationships with his family were no better. Germanicus was placed under surveillance, which resulted in the death of a prominent senator as well as that of Germanicus himself. Tiberius' relationship with Agrippina and Livia was strained to say the least, and numerous senators died as a result of their alliance with Agrippina. His wife Julia made him scorn women enough to never remarry. Sejanus was not a family member per se, but even his friendship to Tiberius did not spare him from a horrible death.

Tiberius' bouts of depression and resulting delusional spells also account for behaviours which had previously not been accepted. For instance, delusion explains the account that he had taken up Greek dress while at Rhodes. It also explains why Tiberius

became so paranoid and more preoccupied with his enemies at the end of his reign. This conclusion is not made by accepting Tacitus at face value, but by a careful observation of Tiberius' behaviours and a close examination of the DSM-IV.

What makes this diagnosis so valuable to modern scholarship is that it is in complete agreement with modern political studies on Tiberius, and even strengthens the arguments made by scholars. The observation made by scholars that Tiberius was an excellent administrator, but awkward socially, fits well with this personality disorder. Individuals with OCPD are brilliant administrators, provided that everything is done their way. His elevation of the senate, constant interruptions to correct wording or conduct, and particular attention to detail, may all be explained with this diagnosis. His nature, which seemed difficult for those who had to work closely with him, was not so difficult for the people in the provinces, who could only benefit from his generous nature during natural disasters, and the selection of governors who were not corrupt. All of this is in keeping with OCPD.

The rumours about Tiberius' sexual conduct may be true, a conclusion which modern scholarship has chosen to reject. However, because of the fact that Tiberius was a heavy drinker, and that the incidences of sexual misconduct appear to be during bouts of depression, indicate that he, at the very least, was sexually indulgent during heavy drinking. Alcohol consumption, in conjunction with OCPD and depression, often results in a decreased ability for an individual with OCPD to maintain the strict control that they have over their own inner desires and emotions. Therefore, it is possible that Tiberius did

deviate while under the influence of alcohol, and the argument that he could not have deviated sexually because he was austere, and a brilliant administrator, suddenly fails.

Suddenly the character of Tiberius seems less implausible. Even Tiberius' death appears to meet the criteria for this diagnosis. Tiberius appears to have had a series of heart-attacks, the last of which ended fatally. In a typical fashion for an individual with this condition, Tiberius was in bed and when none of his servants responded to his call for food, he likely became annoyed. When he got up he had the final heart-attack that claimed his life. Even in the end, despite all of the hardships, Tiberius died in control.

Appendix A

Table 1: A compilation of the various behavioural aspects which correspond with the primary characteristics of OCPD.

Traits OCPD	Tacitus	Dio	Suetonius	Velleius	Seneca	Pliny The Elder
Preoccupation with Details, Lists, Rules, and Organization	1.06, 1.07, 1.08, 1.10, 1.14, 1.11, 1.15, 1.25, 1.52, 1.72, 1.73, 1.75, 1.76, 1.77, 1.80, 1.81, 2.02, 2.36, 2.43, 2.44, 2.64, 2.65, 2.66, 2.59, 2.83 3.08, 3.17, 3.20, 3.22, 3.24, 3.38, 3.37, 3.39, 3.47, 3.51, 3.60, 3.71, 3.72, 4.03, 4.06, 4.22, 4.30, 4.68, 4.69, 4.70, 5.05, 6.08, 6.09, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 6.13, 6.14, 6.15, 6.16, 6.17, 6.18, 6.19, 6.21	6.4.2, 57.1, 57.11.1, 57.11.2, 57.11.6, 57.12.3, 57.12.4, 57.12.5, 57.12.6, 57.13.1, 57.17.2, 57.17.3, 57.17.4, 57.17.5, 57.17.9, 57.18.5, 57.19.7, 57.20.3, 57.20.4, 57.21.1, 57.21.4, 57.23.5, 58.8.4, 58.14.1, 58.14.2, 58.14.3, 58.14.4, 58.21.1, 58.21.2, 58.21.3	TIB 8, TIB 11.3, TIB 15.2, TIB 18.1, TIB 18.2, TIB 19.1, TIB 31, TIB 31.2, TIB 32.2, TIB 32.2, TIB 33, TIB 37.4, TIB 49, AUG 51.3, AUG 63.2	2.97.4, 2.103.1, 2.103.2, 2.103.3, 2.103.4, 2.106.2, 2.106.3, 2.110.6, 2.112.7, 2.113, 2.115.5, 2.126.2, 2.126.3, 2.126.4	de Clem.: 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, de Ben.: 2.6.1, 2.6.2, 3.24, 3.25, 3.26, 3.27-3.28.3, Ep: 83, 95, 122	19.41, 29.12, 36.66
Flat Affect / Angry Outbursts	1.06, 1.07, 1.10, 1.11, 1.14, 1.25, 1.52, 1.54, 1.74, 1.76, 2.28, 2.35, 2.36, 2.38, 2.47, 2.50, 2.59, 2.65, 3.02, 3.03, 3.04, 3.54, 4.03, 4.06, 4.08, 4.13, 4.64 4.71, 4.67, 5.01, 6.06, 6.15, 6.31, 6.45	6.4.2, 55.9.1, 55.9.2, 55.9.3, 55.9.4, 55.9.5, 55.10.18, 55.10.19, 55.11.1, 55.11.2, 55.11.3, 56.13.1, 56.13.2, 57.1, 57.2, 57.3.5, 57.3.6, 57.7.2, 57.7.3, 57.8.1, 57.8.2, 57.19.2, 57.19.3, 57.19.4, 57.19.7, 57.20.3, 57.20.4, 58.1.1, 58.4.8, 58.6.4, 58.8.4, 58.10.1, 58.10.2, 58.10.3, 58.14.1, 58.14.2, 58.14.3, 58.14.4, 58.21.3, 58.22.1, 58.23.1, 58.23.2, 58.23.3, 58.23.4	AUG 51.3, AUG 63.2, TIB 10, TIB 11.3, TIB 11.4, TIB 12.2, TIB 12.3, TIB 13.1, TIB 13.2, TIB 14.4, TIB 15.1, TIB 15.2, TIB 41, TIB 42, TIB 43, TIB 44, TIB 45, TIB 52, TIB 63, TIB 64, TIB 65, TIB 66, TIB 67, TIB 68	2.98, 1.10.6, 2.112.7, 2.115.5, 2.118.1, 2.122.1	de Clem.: 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, de Ben.: 2.6.1, 2.6.2, 3.27.3-3.28.3, Ep. 95, 122	3.12, 7.46, 13.27, 14.28, 15.10, 16.75, 19.41, 28.5
Strict Morals and Ethics	1.06, 1.07, 1.08, 1.10, 1.11, 1.14, 1.25, 1.47, 1.54, 1.62, 1.72, 1.73, 1.74, 1.76, 1.77, 1.78, 2.32, 2.32, 2.33, 2.34, 2.36, 2.42, 2.44, 2.48, 2.52, 2.86, 2.87, 3.08, 3.10, 3.14, 3.15, 3.20, 3.39, 3.52, 4.13, 4.30, 4.59, 5.02, 6.07, 6.21, 6.39	6.4.2, 57.2.3, 57.4.1, 57.4.2, 57.4.3, 57.4.4, 57.4.5, 57.9.3, 57.10.1, 57.13.1, 57.12.5, 57.12.6, 57.13.3, 57.15.1, 57.15.2, 57.15.7, 57.15.8, 57.18.2, 57.18.5, 57.18.9, 57.18.10, 58.1.6, 58.14.1, 58.14.2, 58.14.3, 58.14.4, 58.18.1, 58.18.4, 58.19.1, 58.19.2, 58.19.3, 58.19.4, 58.19.5, 58.20.1, 58.20.2, 58.20.3, 58.20.4, 58.20.5, 58.21.3	AUG 48, AUG 51.3, AUG 63.2, AUG 86.2, AUG 101.2, TIB 7.2, TIB 2.3, TIB 11.3, TIB 15.2, TIB 21.2, TIB 21.3, TIB 21.4, TIB 21.5, TIB 21.6, TIB 23, TIB 26, TIB 28, TIB 29, TIB 30, TIB 32.1, TIB 35, TIB 36, TIB 37.3, TIB 50, TIB 51, TIB 52, TIB 53, TIB 54, TIB 56, TIB 57, TIB 58, TIB 59, TIB 61, TIB 62, TIB 69, TIB 70, TIB 71, TIB 72, TIB 73, TIB 75, TIB 76	2.97.4, 2.99.2, 2.100.3, 2.100.5, 2.103.1, 2.103.2, 2.103.3, 2.103.4, 2.110.6, 2.112.7, 2.113, 2.114, 2.115.5, 2.122.1, 2.124.2, 2.126.2, 2.126.3, 2.126.4	de Clem.: 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, de Ben.: 2.6.1, 2.6.2, 3.27.3-3.28.3, Ep: 83, 95, 122	19.41
Frugal	1.76, 2.38, 2.47, 2.83, 4.06, 4.13, 4.64, 6.45	2.11.6, 2.11.7, 2.11.8, 13.4.8, 58.16.1, 58.26.5,	TIB 7.1, TIB 8.1, TIB 11.1, TIB 15.2, TIB 34.1, TIB 34.2, TIB 40, TIB 47, TIB 48, TIB 49, TIB 50, CAL 37.3, CAL 21.1	2.97.4, 2.122.1	Ep: 95, 122	35.10, 35.40

Table 1: Continued

Traits OCPD	Tacitus	Dio	Suetonius	Velleius	Seneca	Pliny The Elder
Excessively Devoted to Work	1.15, 1.76, 2.66, 3.06, 3.37, 3.60, 4.06, 4.08, 4.13, 4.54, 4.67, 5.01, 6.45	57.14.6, 57.22.3, 58.2.1, 58.2.2, 58.2.3	TIB 27, TIB 38	2.113, 2.114, 2.115.5, 2.127.3		
Controls Others / Inflexible	1.07, 1.07, 1.08, 1.14, 1.25, 1.47, 1.62, 1.69, 1.72, 1.73, 1.74, 1.76, 1.77, 1.78, 2.31, 2.32, 2.33, 2.35, 2.36, 2.42, 2.48, 2.52, 2.66, 2.87, 3.24, 5.02, 6.39	6.4.2, 55.27.5, 55.28.5, 55.28.6, 56.12.1, 56.12.2, 57.1, 57.2.3, 57.4.1, 57.4.2, 57.4.3, 57.4.4, 57.4.5, 57.5.5, 57.6.3, 57.6.4, 57.9.3, 57.10.1, 57.13.1, 57.12.5, 57.12.6, 57.13.3, 57.15.1, 57.15.2, 57.15.7, 57.15.8, 57.18.2, 57.18.5, 57.18.9, 57.18.10, 57.19.7, 57.20.3, 57.20.4, 58.1.6, 58.8.4, 58.14.1, 58.14.2, 58.14.3, 58.14.4, 58.18.1, 58.18.4, 58.19.1, 58.19.2, 58.19.3, 58.19.4, 58.19.5, 58.20.1, 58.20.2, 58.20.3, 58.20.4, 58.20.5, 58.21.3	AUG 48, AUG 51.3, AUG 63.2, AUG 86.2, AUG 101.2, TIB 7.2, TIB 2.3, TIB 11.3, TIB 15.2, TIB 21.2, TIB 21.3, TIB 21.4, TIB 21.5, TIB 21.6, TIB 23, TIB 24, TIB 26, TIB 28, TIB 29, TIB 30, TIB 32.1, TIB 35, TIB 36, TIB 37.3, TIB 50, TIB 51, TIB 52, TIB 53, TIB 54, TIB 56, TIB 57, TIB 58, TIB 59, TIB 61, TIB 62, TIB 69, TIB 70, TIB 71, TIB 72, TIB 73, TIB 75, TIB 76	2.97.4, 2.113, 2.118.1, 2.126.2, 2.126.3, 2.126.4, 2.127.3		19.41
Task Completion Hampered by Perfection	1.47, 1.80, 2.32, 3.65, 3.68, 3.72, 4.31	55.31.1, 56.12.1, 58.2.6, 58.3.1, 58.3.2, 58.3.3, 58.3.4, 58.3.5, 58.3.6	TIB 38, TIB 47, TIB 51	2.97.4		
Hoarding			TIB 34, TIB 60	2.97.4, 2.115.5		34.62,
Secondary Traits						
Few friends	1.06, 1.07, 1.10, 1.11, 1.25, 1.76, 3.37, 4.57, 4.58, 4.59, 4.70	6.4.2, 57.1, 57.19.7, 57.20.3, 57.20.4, 58.8.4, 58.14.1, 58.14.2, 58.14.3, 58.14.4, 58.21.3	AUG 51.3, AUG 63.2, TIB 11.3, TIB 15.2	2.98, 2.99.2	Ep: 83	19.41
Indecisive	1.11, 1.12, 1.80, 2.11, 2.36, 3.36, 3.41, 3.44, 4.52, 5.03, 6.46	55.9.1, 55.9.2, 55.9.3, 55.9.4, 55.9.5, 55.10.18, 55.10.19, 55.11.1, 55.11.2, 55.11.3, 56.13.1, 56.13.2, 57.2, 57.3.5, 57.3.6, 57.7.2, 57.7.3, 57.8.1, 57.8.2, 57.19.2, 57.19.3, 57.19.4, 58.1.1, 58.4.8, 58.6.4, 58.10.1, 58.10.2, 58.10.3, 58.22.1, 58.23.1, 58.23.2, 58.23.3, 58.23.4	TIB 13.2, TIB 10, TIB 11.4, TIB 12.2, TIB 12.3, TIB 13.1, TIB 13.2, TIB 14.4, TIB 15.1, TIB 41, TIB 41, TIB 42, TIB 43, TIB 44, TIB 45, TIB 63, TIB 64, TIB 65, TIB 66, TIB 67, TIB 68	2.97.4, 2.124.2	Ep: 83	3.12, 7.46, 13.27, 14.3, 14.28, 15.10, 16.75, 28.5
Stilted Speech	1.11, 4.31, 6.8, 13.3		AUG 86, TIB 70			
Deference to Authority	1.06, 1.07, 1.10, 1.25, 1.77, 1.78	6.4.2, 57.1, 57.19.7, 57.20.3, 57.20.4, 58.8.4, 58.14.1, 58.14.2, 58.14.3, 58.14.4, 58.21.3	AUG 51.3, AUG 63.2, TIB 11.3, TIB 15.2			19.41

Bibliography

- Allen, W. "The Political Atmosphere of the Reign of Tiberius", TAPA 72 (1941) 1-25.
- , "The Monetary Crisis in Rome, AD 33", TAPA 18 (1887) 5-18.
- Altman, M. "The Ruler Cult in Seneca," CP 33.2 (1938), pgs. 198-204.
- American Psychiatric Association. Quick reference to the Diagnostic criteria from DSM – IV, Washington D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 1993.
- American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-IV. Washington: American Psychiatric Assoc., 1994.
- American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-IV-TR. Washington: American Psychiatric Association, 2000.
- American Psychiatric Association, Casebook: A Learning Companion to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Spitzer, et al. Ed. (Washington, American Psychiatric Publishing, 2000)
- Balsdon, J. P. V. D. "The Successors of Augustus", G and R 2.6 (1933) 161-169.
- Barnes, T. D. "The Victories of Augustus," JRS 64 (1974), pg. 21-26.
- Barrett, A. A. Caligula: The Corruption of Power. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- , Agrippina: Sex, Power, and Politics in the Early Empire. London: Yale University Press, 1996.
- , Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome. London: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Bauman, R. A. Women and Politics in Ancient Rome. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Bird, H. W. "L. Aelius Sejanus and His Political Influence", Latomus 28 (1969) 61-98.
- , "L. Aelius Sejanus: Further Considerations", Latomus 29 (1970) 1046-1050.
- , "Tiberius, Piso, and Germanicus: Further Considerations", Acta Classica 30 (1987) 72-75.

- , "Tiberius, Piso, and Germanicus: Further Considerations", Acta Classica 30 (1987) 72-75.
- Boddington, A. "Sejanus. Whose Conspiracy?", AJP 84 (1963) 1-16.
- Braund, D. C. Augustus to Nero: A Sourcebook on Roman History 31 BC – AD 68. London: Croom Helm, 1985.
- Brennan, T. The Stoic Life: Emotions, Duties, and Fate. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.
- J. Briscoe, "Supporters and Opponents of Tiberius Gracchus," JRS 64 (1974), pgs. 125-135.
- Brunt, P.A. "The Role of the Senate" CQ 34.2 (1984) 423-444.
- Charlesworth, M. P. "Tiberius and the Death of Augustus", AJP 44.2 (1923) 145-157.
- Chatman, S. Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Conger, R. *et al.* "Adjustment Problems and Emerging Personality Characteristics from Early to Late Adolescence," American Journal of Community Psychology 27.3 (1999), pg. 429-459.
- Corrigan, S. Tiberius and the Senate: The Struggle for Concord. MA Thesis, McMaster University, 1997.
- Crook, J. A. Law and Life of Rome: 90 B.C.- A.D. 212, New York: Cornell University Press, 1984.
- Dennison, W. "The Epigraphic Sources of Suetonius," AJA 2.1/2 (1898), pgs. 26-45.
- Ehrenberg, V. and A. H. M. Jones, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Echeburua, E. et al. "Alcoholism and Personality Disorders: An Exploratory Study," Alcohol and Alcoholism 40.4 (2005), pgs. 323-326.
- Esser, A. "Vision of the Emperor Tiberius," Klinischen Monatsblatt der Augenheilkunde 119.4 (1935), pg. 428-432.
- Fowler, R. Linguistics and the Novel. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1977.

- Flory, M. “*Abducta Neroni Uxor*: The Historiographical Tradition on the Marriage of Octavian and Livia,” APA 118 (1988), pgs. 343-359.
- Galinsky, K. “Augustus’ Legislation on Morals and Marriage,” Philologus 125 (1981), pgs. 126-144.
- Halloran, *et al.*, “The Relationship of Adolescent Personality and Family Environment to Psychiatric Diagnosis,” Child Psychiatry and Human Development 32.3 (2002), pg. 201-216.
- Hammond, M. The Augustan Principate. New York: Russell and Russell, 1968.
- Harrer, G. A. “Tacitus and Tiberius”, AJP 41.1 (1920) 57-68.
- Harvey, W. J. Character & the Novel. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1965.
- Hayes, W. M. “Tiberius and the Future,” CJ 55.1 (1959), pgs. 2-8.
- Henting, D. Über den Caesarenwahnsinnen, die Krankheit des Kaisers Tiberius. Munich, 1934.
- Housman, A. E. “Manilius, Augustus, Tiberius, Capricornus, and Libra”, CQ 7.2 (1913) 109-114.
- Houston, G. W. “Tiberius on Capri”, G and R 32.2 (1985) 179-196.
- Hunt, J. Personality and the Behaviour Disorders. Vol 1 & 2. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1984.
- Jakobson, A. and H. M. Cotton, “Caligula’s *Recusatio Imperii*”, Historia 34 (1985) 497-503.
- Jones, A. H. M. “The Imperium of Augustus,” JRS 41.1-2 (1951), pgs. 112-119.
- Kampff, G. “Three Senate Meetings in the Early Principate”, Phoenix 17 (1963) 25-58.
- Kantor, M. Diagnosis and Treatment of the Personality Disorders. Tokyo: Ishiyaku EuroAmerica, Inc., 1992.
- Kaufman, D. B. “Hoarding by the Romans,” CJ 27.9 (1932), pgs. 684-686.
- Konstan, D. Some Aspects of Epicurean Philosophy. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Krappe, A. H. “Tiberius and Thrasyllus”, AJP 48.4 (1937) 359-366.

- Levick, B. M. Tiberius the Politician. London: Thames and Hudson, 1976.
- , "The Fall of Julia the Younger", Latomus 35 (1976) 301-339.
- , "Julians and Claudians", G and R 32.2 (1975) 29-38.
- , "The beginning of Tiberius' Career", CQ 21.2 (1971) 145-157.
- , "Tiberius' Retirement to Rhodes in 6 BC", Latomus 25 (1966) 227-231.
- Lintott, W. "P. Clodius Pulcher – 'Felix Catilina?'" G & R 2nd Ser., 14.2 (1967), pg. 157-169.
- Maj, M. Personality Disorders Naples: John Wiley & Sons, 2003.
- Maranon, G. Tiberius: A Study in Resentment. London: Hollis and Carter, 1956.
- Marsh, F. B. The Founding of the Roman Empire. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931.
- , The Reign of Tiberius. Oxford: Oxford University press, 1931.
- McCartney, E. S. "Why Did Tiberius Wear Laurel in the Form of a Crown during Thunderstorms?", CP 24.2 (1929) 201-203.
- Mellor, R. Tacitus. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Mierow, C. "Germanicus Caesar Imperator," CJ 39.3 (1943), pgs. 137-155.
- Miller, N. P. "Tiberius Speaks: An examination of utterances ascribed to him in the Annals of Tacitus", AJP 89.1 (1968) 1-19.
- Millon, T, with Roger D. Davis et al. Disorders of Personality: DSM-IV and Beyond. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1996.
- Mitford, T.B. "A Cypriot oath of Allegiance to Tiberius", JRS 50 (1960) 75-80.
- Mommsen, T. A History of Rome Under the Emperors. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Nicols, J. "Antonia and Sejanus", Historia 24 (1974) 48-58.
- Ober, J. "Tiberius and the Political Testament of Augustus", Historia 31 (1982) 306-328.

- Paris, J. Social Factors in the Personality Disorders : A Biopsychosocial approach to Etiology and Treatment. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Pappano, A. E. "Agrippa Posthumus", CP 36.1 (1941) 30-45.
- Pont, M. "Did Emperor Tiberius Die from Myocardial Infarction," Medicina nei Secoli 8.2 (1996), pgs. 237-245.
- Post, L.A. "A New Reading of the Germanicus Papyrus," AJP 65.1 (1944), pgs. 80-82.
- Reed, N. "Some Neglected Evidence on the Early Career of Tacitus," CQ 26.2 (1976), pgs. 309-314.
- Rimmon-Kenan, S. Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics. London: Routledge, 1983.
- Robb, M. E. The Character of Tiberius as Represented by Tacitus and Velleius. Diss. Chicago, 1904.
- Robinson, D. J. DSM-IV Personality Disorders Explained. Port Huron: Rapid Psychler Press, 2000.
- Rogers, R. S. Studies in the Reign of Tiberius: Some Imperial Virtues of Tiberius and Drusus Julius Caesar. Westport: Greenwood press, 1972.
- , Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation Under Tiberius. Middletown: APA, 1935.
- , "Tiberius' Reversal of an Augustan Policy", TAPA 71 (1940) 532-536.
- , "The Conspiracy of Agrippina", TAPA 62 (1931) 141-168.
- , "Lucius Arruntius", Classical Philology 26.1 (1931) 31-45.
- Ryberg, I. S. "Tacitus' Art of Inuendo", TAPA 73 (1942) 383-404.
- Scott, K. "The *Diritas* of Tiberius", AJP 53.2 (1932) 139-151.
- , "Tiberius' Refusal of the Title 'Augustus'", CP 27.1 (1932) 43-50.
- , "Drusus, Nicknamed 'Castor,'" CP 25.2 (1930), pgs. 155-161.
- Seager, R. Tiberius. London: Eyre Methuen, Ltd., 1972.
- Shaw-Smith, R. "A Letter from Augustus to Tiberius", G and R 18.2 (1971) 213-214.

- Shotter, D. C. A. "The Fall of Sejanus: Two Problems", CP 69 (1974) 42-46.
- , "Tiberius and Asinius Gallus", Historia 20 (1971) 443-456.
- , "Julians, Claudians and the Accession of Tiberius", Latomus 30 (1971) 1117-1123.
- , Tiberius Caesar. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- , "Tiberius and the Spirit of Augustus", G and R 13.2 (1966) 207-212.
- , "Elections Under Tiberius", CQ 16.2 (1966) 321-332.
- , "The Trial of Gaius Silius (AD 24)", Latomus 26 (1967), pgs. 712-716.
- Smith, C. E. Tiberius and the Roman Empire. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1972.
- Smith, W. A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. London: John Murray, 1875.
- Sperry, L. Handbook of Diagnosis and Treatment of DSM-IV-TR Personality Disorders 2nd Ed. New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2003.
- Spitzer, R. L. (Ed.) DSM-IV Casebook: A Learning Companion to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 4th Edition. Washington: American Psychiatric Association, 1994.
- Stewart, A. F. "To Entertain an Emperor: Sperlonga, Laokoon, and Tiberius at the Dinner-Table," JRS 67 (1977), pgs. 76-90.
- Stone, M. H. Abnormalities of Personality: Within and Beyond the Realm of Treatment. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1993.
- Sumner, G.V. "The Truth about Velleius Paterculus: Prolegomena", Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 74 (1970) 257-297.
- K. Suzuki, et al. "Co-occurrence of Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Traits in Young and Middle-Aged Japanese Alcohol-Dependent Men," Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research 26.8 (2002), pgs. 1223-1227.
- R. Syme. The Augustan Aristocracy. Oxford: Clarendon press, 1989.
- , "Some Notes on the Legions Under Augustus," JRS 23 (1933), pgs. 14-33.

- . The Roman Revolution. Oxford: Oxford University press, 1939.
- Taylor, L. R. "Tiberius' Refusals of Divine Honors", TAPA 60 (1929) 87-101.
- , "M. Titius and the Syrian Command," JRS 26.2 (1936), pgs. 161-173.
- . The Divinity of the Roman Emperor. Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1931.
- Taylor, Dr. Valerie, M.D. Psychiatry, "Personal Interview", St. Joseph's Mental Health, Mountain Site, August 4th, 2005.
- Toolan, M. J. Narrative: A critical Linguistic Introduction. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Treggiari, S. Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic.
- Vanderpool, E. "Athens Honors the Emperor Tiberius", Hesperia 28.1 (1959) 86-90.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. "The Emperor and his Virtues," Historia 30 (1981), pgs. 299-318.
- Wellesley, K. "The *Dies Imperii* of Tiberius", JRS 17 (1967) 23-30.
- Wells, C. M. The German Policy of Augustus. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Woodman, A. J. Velleius Paterculus 2.94-131. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1977.
- . Tacitus Reviewed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.