

THE SENATE UNDER AUGUSTUS:

THE EVIDENCE OF DIO

By

BERNARD DEXTER HOYOS, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

October 1967

MASTER OF ARTS (1967)  
(Latin)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY  
Hamilton, Ontario.

TITLE: The Senate under Augustus: the Evidence of Dio

AUTHOR: Bernard Dexter Hoyos, B.A. (University of the West  
Indies)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. G.M. Paul

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 185



## PREFACE

This study attempts to investigate the position, working and activity of the Senate as revealed in Cassius Dio's account of the Principate of Augustus. I have selected what seem to me to be the principal passages on this theme in Books 52 to 56 for comment (the list is provided in the Table of Contents), and have freely referred to many others not so chosen.

Although the work is in no way a treatment of the constitutional position of the Princeps, this topic must intrude often on a discussion of the Senate's relation to its new master: and so must other, at first glance unrelated, subjects such as provincial governorships and financial administration—so central to the government of the State was the Senate. Frequent references also must be made to Republican usages, and to developments between the age of Augustus and Dio's own time.

A list of abbreviations and a Bibliography are provided, so that references in the commentary are, as a rule, concise.

I should like to acknowledge with thanks the constant and generous aid afforded me by my Thesis Supervisor, Dr G.M. Paul, and also the thoughtful criticisms of Dr A.G. McKay, Chairman of the Department of Classics. It needs no expert's eye to divine that the deficiencies nonetheless remaining are entirely due to me.

DEXTER HOYOS

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	.	.	.	.	.	page	1
CHAPTER ONE	.	.	.	.	.		29
—52, 19 - 23, 3; 25, 6 - 26, 2; 31, 1 - 33, 4							
CHAPTER TWO	.	.	.	.	.		62
—52, 42							
CHAPTER THREE	.	.	.	.	.		73
—53, 11 - 15							
CHAPTER FOUR	.	.	.	.	.		95
—53, 16 - 18							
CHAPTER FIVE	.	.	.	.	.		107
—53, 21, 3 - 22, 4; 32, 5-6							
CHAPTER SIX	.	.	.	.	.		125
—54, 13 - 14, 5; 17, 1-3; 26, 3-9; 35, 1							
CHAPTER SEVEN	.	.	.	.	.		146
—55, 3 - 4, 1; 13, 3; 24, 9 - 25; 34, 1-2							
CHAPTER EIGHT	.	.	.	.	.		163
—56, 28							
APPENDIX: A List of Senators in the Principate of							
Augustus mentioned by Dio in Books 52-56							168

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Ann.: Tacitus, Annales.
- Boiss.: Boissevain's edition of Dio (see Bibliography).
- BSR Papers: Papers of the British School at Rome.
- CAH : The Cambridge Ancient History.
- E J: V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, Documents illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius <sup>2</sup>.
- Greenidge, RPL : A.H.J. Greenidge, Roman Public Life.
- Hammond, A M : M. Hammond, The Antonine Monarchy.
- Hammond, A Pr : M. Hammond, The Augustan Principate.
- Holmes, Arch.: T. Rice Holmes, The Architect of the Roman Empire.
- Homo, RPI: L. Homo, Roman Political Institutions.
- ILS: H. Dessau, Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae.
- Jones, Studies: A.H.M. Jones, Studies in Roman Government and Law.
- JRS: Journal of Roman Studies.
- Mommsen, R Str: Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht
- OCD: The Oxford Classical Dictionary
- PBA: Proceedings of the British Academy
- RG: Res Gestae diui Augusti
- Suet. D. Iul.: Suetonius, Diuius Iulius

Suet. DA: Suetonius, Diuus Augustus

Suet. Tib.: Suetonius, Tiberius

Suet. D. Claud.: Suetonius, Diuus Claudius

Suet. D. Vesp.: Suetonius, Diuus Vespasianus

Suet. Dom.: Suetonius, Domitianus

Syme, R R: R. Syme, The Roman Revolution

T A P A: Transactions of the American Philological Association

NOTE. In citing passages from the final decad of Dio's History, the page-number of Boissevain's edition is also given.

## INTRODUCTION

### I. The Life of Cassius Dio

THE abundance of personal references in Dio's Roman History is valuable, for they provide a detailed biography uncommon for an ancient writer. He was born at Nicaea in Bithynia, perhaps in A.D. 163 or 164.<sup>1</sup> His father was Cassius Apronianus, a Senator in imperial service who governed Dalmatia at an unknown date and Cilicia around 182-83.<sup>2</sup>

Dio arrived at Rome in the reign of Commodus. It was under that emperor that he also held the first offices of the cur-sus honorum, and entered the Senate: Pertinax, in the year 193, named him to be Praetor.<sup>3</sup> On the accession to power of Septimius Severus in that same year the Bithynian Senator secured favour by presenting a pamphlet in which he recounted the dreams and portents that had foretold Severus' rise.<sup>4</sup> Four years later Dio was

---

<sup>1</sup> 75, 15, 3 (Boissevain, III, 354); Millar, p. 13—cf. Schwartz, PW, III, 1684. I provide a chronology of Dio's life and work at the end of this Introduction.

<sup>2</sup> 69, 1, 3 (see PIR<sup>2</sup>, C 485); 49, 36, 4; 72, 7, 2 (287) —the news of the execution of the Quintilii reached him and Dio in Cilicia: these deaths followed the attempt on Commodus' life in 182 (cf. CAH, XI, 380).

<sup>3</sup> 73, 12, 2 (316). Probably for 194: Millar, p. 16.

<sup>4</sup> 72, 23, 1-3 (304). This appears to have been incorporated into the History as 74, 3, possibly in abbreviated form.

present in the Senate when the emperor, fresh from his bloodstained victory over Albinus, fulminated against the disloyal.<sup>5</sup>

It may have been now that the historian confirmed his own favour by bringing forward a history of the wars and civil upheavals that followed the death of Commodus,<sup>6</sup> but the date is probably later.<sup>7</sup>

Dio probably held the Consulship, as suffectus, during the reign of Severus.<sup>8</sup> Discussing that emperor's campaign against adultery, he says: 'at any rate when I was Consul I found three thousand indictments entered on the register'<sup>9</sup>; and if, as seems likely, these were pending at the time (and so do not represent the total number of cases brought during the reign), this, combined with the statement that the emperor soon lost interest (and therefore, Dio seems to imply, dropped the cases), would make the matter more certain.<sup>10</sup> A reference in an earlier book to *ἡμεῖς οἱ ὑπατευκότες* may also help<sup>11</sup>: it is to be suggested below that Dio wrote the History c. 212-24; thus,

<sup>5</sup> 75, 8, 1-3 (344-45).

<sup>6</sup> So Millar, pp. 17, 29.

<sup>7</sup> See below.

<sup>8</sup> Millar suggests 205 or 206 (App. II, p. 207).

<sup>9</sup> 76, 16, 4 (371).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Millar, App. II, pp. 204-5.

<sup>11</sup> 60, 2, 3: ex-Consuls, like emperors, borne in covered chairs from the time of Claudius.

even if we assumed that he spent an equal length of time composing each book or group of books, Book 60 would have been written around 221; in fact, as Bowersock has pointed out, the historian is unlikely to have written as much when curator at Pergamum and Smyrna under Macrinus (or on the succeeding appointments he held) as when unemployed<sup>12</sup>, so that the book may have been written earlier still. Unless Dio inserted the remark later<sup>13</sup> (and the detail seems too trifling to expect him to have kept track of it afterwards), it thus makes a first Consulship in 223 or 224 unlikely.<sup>14</sup>

That he was an amicus who sometimes sat in the emperor's consilium appears from the description of Severus' habit of hearing cases in the morning: 'καὶ ἡμῖν τοῖς συνδικάζουσιν αὐτῷ παρησίαν πολλὴν ἔδιδου'.<sup>15</sup> His account of the reign has many critical observations on Severus, which have suggested to some that he fell from favour (which in turn would account for the gap between his Praetorship of 194 and the late Consulship proposed by certain scholars).<sup>16</sup> But he is even harsher to Caracalla, and disapproves

---

<sup>12</sup> Bowersock in Gnomon, XXXVII (1964), p. 471.

<sup>13</sup> For an example of such later insertions see Sect. II, n. 13 (below).

<sup>14</sup> As suggested by (e.g.) Cary, Dio's Roman History, I, p. ix; cf. Bowersock, p. 473, who does not, however, suggest a precise date.

<sup>15</sup> 76, 17, 2 (372): cf. 75, 16, 2-4 (356); Millar, pp. 17-18; Crook, Consilium Principis, pp. 81, 157 no. 80.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. 74, 2, 3 (325-26) and 8, 4-5 (333) on wasteful ex-

of Macrinus<sup>17</sup>, though he was comes of the former and received an appointment from the latter.<sup>18</sup>

Dio's first appearance in Caracalla's reign is at Nicomedia in winter 214-15, as one of the companions of the emperor. This was, he records, the last time Caracalla spoke to him: he was dead by mid-217.<sup>19</sup> Dio was in the Senate when Macrinus' announcement of his accession arrived.<sup>20</sup> That emperor gave him the appointment of curator at Pergamum and Smyrna in mid-218<sup>21</sup>, a post followed (after an illness) by a 'governorship in Africa' as Dio puts it, and after that by the governorships of Dalmatia and Pannonia. These three commands probably occupied the years 223-28.<sup>22</sup>

---

penditure; 74, 2, 2 (325) on violation of the oath not to kill Senators, and 'many actions not to our liking'; *ibid.* 2, 5-6 (326) on bad results of opening Praetorian Guard to all the legions; 75, 7, 3-4 (344) on 'what actually happened' as opposed to Severus' version of Albinus' death—observe the comment 'ἐφ' οἷς δηλὸς γινόμενος ὥς οὐδὲν εἴη οἱ αὐτοκράτορες ἀγαθοί'. Cf. Bowersock, p. 473.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. his summing-up: 78, 41 (450-51).

<sup>18</sup> 79, 7, 4 (461).

<sup>19</sup> 78, 8, 5 (411); *ibid.* 5, 4 (408).

<sup>20</sup> 78, 37, 5 (446); cf. 16, 2 (419-20).

<sup>21</sup> Millar, p. 23.

<sup>22</sup> 80, 1, 2-3; 4, 2 (474, 476); Millar, *l.c.* These appointments are the chief problem in Dio's career. Such a curator was normally praetorian. But ex-Consuls are found now and then (Millar, p. 205; cf. *ILS* 1182—a cura after the Proconsulship of Africa). If Dio was a consular, his African governorship would have been the Proconsulship: but imperial commands after this high post are again rare. On the other hand, somewhat similar cases can be found (Millar, p. 206). Furthermore there may have been



In 229 Dio was consul II ordinarius with the emperor Severus Alexander. The occasion of this honour reflected some credit on him, for his strict handling of the Pannonian troops had so roused the Praetorians that Severus Alexander had to advise him to spend the duration of his Consulship outside the capital: but the old Senator nevertheless visited Rome afterwards, was seen by the soldiers without suffering danger, and then set out for Bithynia 'to spend all the remainder of my life in my homeland'. There he brought his historical work to a close.<sup>23</sup>

---

sufficient reason to make the appointment—Millar suggests Dalmatia was to prepare him for Pannonia (p. 25).

It should be remarked that, if Dio were only an ex-Praetor, and thus Legatus of Numidia (a view Bowersock supports, p. 473), the transfer to Dalmatia would still be unusual. The governor of a province with a legion rarely if ever was assigned afterwards to a province without one (E. Birley in PBA, XXXIX [1953], p. 212)—as Dalmatia was.

<sup>23</sup> 80, 5 (476). On Dio's life and career see also PIR<sup>2</sup>, C 492. He may have had descendants: one Cassius Dion was Consul in 291, Proconsul of Africa in 295 and Praefectus Urbi in 296/97 (PIR<sup>2</sup>, C 491).

## II. The Roman History

AS mentioned above, the first work of Cassius Dio known to us is the book on the dreams and portents foretelling the accession of Septimius Severus. The next work dealt with the πόλεμοι ... καὶ στάσεις μέγιστα that followed the death of Commodus.<sup>1</sup> Dio does not say where this narrative stopped: Millar suggests a terminal date of 197, which excludes the Parthian War of 197-98 and so restricts the 'πόλεμοι' treated to an early foray against Parthia in 195.<sup>2</sup> The point is important: the success of the book, Dio says, encouraged him to start on his full-length History. Thus the date of the former's appearance will determine that of the latter.

The History involved ten years' research into 'πάντα τὰ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις μέχρι τῆς Σευήρου μεταλλαγῆς πραχθέντα'.<sup>3</sup> A starting date of 197 would end Dio's research four years or so before Severus' demise—the first objection to it.<sup>4</sup> Now Dio gives

---

<sup>1</sup> 72, 23, 1-3 (304).

<sup>2</sup> Millar, p. 29. Schwartz assumes that it went up only to Severus' first return to Rome, thus dating the composition of the Roman History to about 194-216 (PW, III, 1686).

<sup>3</sup> 72, 23, 5 (305).

<sup>4</sup> Millar defends it by suggesting that 'it must be taken that the sentence is not pedantically correct, since the period of note-taking ends before the death of Severus' (p. 30, n. 2).

a few other suggestions that may help determine the date, by referring here and there to contemporary events. Thus a statement of the continuing dangers of the Parthian Empire must have preceded the fall of that State about A.D. 224.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, Dio's reference to his own governorship of Pannonia must be a later insertion.<sup>6</sup> A difficult remark comes rather earlier. After mentioning Plautianus' being counted as consul iterum on holding that magistracy, because he had been granted ornamenta consularia previously, the historian adds that others after him were similarly so counted.<sup>7</sup> The next men so known held the Consulship in 215 and 218, so unless Dio's ἕτεροι is a rhetorical plural Millar's date for this part of the work will not fit.<sup>8</sup> If, however, Dio began to write in 212/13 (as seems likely on other evidence) the reference would be straightforward.

Under date 217 Dio relates a dream he had shortly after Severus' death; it presented to him the late emperor, who advised him to 'learn and write down' (μάθῃς ἀκριβῶς καὶ συγγράψῃς) events after 211.<sup>9</sup> It is not clear why this should be taken as an

---

<sup>5</sup> 40, 14: the fall is mentioned in 80, 3, 2 (475).

<sup>6</sup> 49, 36, 4; Millar, App. III, p. 209; Bowersock, p. 472.

<sup>7</sup> 46, 46, 4.

<sup>8</sup> Millar, pp. 208-9.

<sup>9</sup> 78, 10, 1-2 (412-13).

indication that he had already begun to write.<sup>10</sup> (If anything, *μαθήσ* would suggest he was still on research; at all events the incident hardly throws light on how far Dio had got with his work by 211.) The reference, in the present tense, to spending his leisure at Capua and using it to write his History suggests he was in Italy close to the completion of the work:<sup>11</sup> this may have been written during his short visit there between the assignment in Africa and his northern commands.

So it seems reasonable to propose that Dio's second work covered the civil and foreign wars of 193-98, and appeared circa 202 when Severus returned to Italy. The interval would permit Dio time for research and formal writing, and a narrative suitably stressing the imperial qualities of the conqueror would not be unwelcome to Severus, even after a lapse of time.<sup>12</sup> Dio's research for the History, therefore, was probably begun in 202 or 203, and the greater part of the writing (up to Severus' death)<sup>13</sup> completed

<sup>10</sup> Schwartz, 1686, who also refers to 76, 2, 1 (358). But here again no valid conclusion can be drawn. The passage comes under date 202. If the reference (in the present tense) to Dio's spending time at Capua to compose his history is also taken to show that he was writing by 202, this would mean he had begun research in 192 at the latest—for he devoted ten years to that first. But in 192 Dio had not composed even the early book on Severus' imperial portents. On the other hand, the passage may well have been written at Capua (see foll. note), and Dio may well have done all or some of his research there too. This would amply explain the personal interjection here.

<sup>11</sup> 76, 2, 1 (358: cf. preceding note).

<sup>12</sup> The opposite is suggested by Millar, p. 29.

<sup>13</sup> It should be noted that the passage describing the progress of his historical labours (72, 23, [304-5]) must have been a later insertion, as it comes after the account of Commodus' death but speaks of the work (at least up to 211) as completed.

by 225.

Dio says he read virtually all the books on Roman history, 'συνέγραψα δὲ οὐ πάντα ἀλλ' ὅσα ἐξέκρινα'.<sup>14</sup> In another fragment he explains that he selected what he judged 'worthy of record' ('πάνθ' ὅσα τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις . . . ἀξιῶς μνήμης ἐπράχθη').<sup>15</sup> It need not be assumed that the selection was done only in the second period, of twelve years,<sup>16</sup> and we should not rule out the possibility of some further research being done in that period; but in any case Dio's language suggests that, in general, research on any part of his theme was separated by some ten years from the formal writing-up.<sup>17</sup>

The History is arranged on the annalistic model. Each year is introduced by the names of its consules ordinarii.<sup>18</sup> Dio also provides a consular list at the start of each book.<sup>19</sup> But he sometimes strays from the annalistic framework, notably in the survey of the Principate in the fifty-third book.<sup>20</sup> There is some evidence of broader arrangement: the Suda says Dio wrote

<sup>14</sup> Fr. 1, 2.

<sup>15</sup> Fr. 1, 1 (Boiss., I, 12).

<sup>16</sup> So Millar, p. 33, contradicted by Bowersock, p. 474. Vrind in Mnemosyne, LIV [1926], p. 324) suggests the selection did take place in the first period and affected the character of the formal version when that came to be written.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Vrind, loc. cit.

<sup>18</sup> In the period after suffecti became regular, Dio mentions them only if a special reference is needed, e.g. 56, 10, 3.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Schwartz, 1688.

<sup>20</sup> 53, 11-19. See also 54, 20, 3-6; *ibid.* 34, 5-7 (cf. CAH, X, 357 n. 1); 55, 4, 2-3.

‘κατὰ δέκαδας’,<sup>21</sup> and the Republican decads at any rate do appear to be organized so as to open at significant periods: for example Book 11 (in Boissevain's reconstruction) at the start of the First Punic War, and Book 41 with New Year 49 B.C.<sup>22</sup> The fiftieth book ends with Actium, and in opening the fifty-first the historian explicitly dates the start of monarchy to 2 September, 31 B.C.<sup>23</sup> There is less evidence for the arrangement in the imperial books—Book 61 in Boissevain's reconstruction opens in A.D. 47 with Claudius' Censorship, Book 71 with the accession of Marcus Aurelius (which was, at least, close to Dio's own date of birth).

The final thirty books thus cover the two hundred and sixty years between the foundation of the Principate and Dio's own old age. Unfortunately only Books 36 to 60 are preserved in anything like full form; for the period after A.D. 47 we must fall back on Byzantine excerpts and the eleventh-century epitome of Books 36 to 80 by the Byzantine monk Xiphilinus, together with the ‘Επιτομή Ἱστοριῶν of Zonaras (early twelfth century) who used Dio among his sources.<sup>24</sup> These works and extracts are also needed to help fill gaps that occur in the extant MSS. of Dio.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Cited by Millar, p. 38 and n. 2.

<sup>22</sup> Millar, p. 38.

<sup>23</sup> 51, 1, 1.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Millar, pp. 1-4 and App. I.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. the ones between 55, 10, 15 and 10a, 1; and again between 55, 11, 2 and 13, 2. Cf. also 56, 28, 6 and the note on § 2 of that chapter.

### III. Sources for Augustus

AS with the rest of the History, it is difficult or impossible to determine the sources of Dio for the Augustan period.

His principal source for the earlier part (at any rate up to 27 B.C.) was, it has been suggested, Livy, followed thereafter by Aufidius Bassus.<sup>1</sup> This may be so. It need not be the whole picture, all the same. Two further points should be observed.

First: the historian includes a considerable amount of biographical and anecdotal material usually after narrating a person's death.<sup>2</sup> Some of this may well have occurred in the formal histories, but secondary authorities are likely to have been used as well—Millar has shown that there are, for example, significant resemblances in places to Suetonius.<sup>3</sup>

Secondly: it is possible that for any given topic Dio may have used a different source providing a version more detailed, or in his judgment more probable. Cremutius Cordus, cited by Suetonius for some details of the lectio senatus of 18 B.C., may

---

<sup>1</sup> Levi, Il Tempo di Augusto, App. 6, pp. 421-22, 433-34.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Vedius Pollio (54, 23, 1-6); Maecenas (55, 7); Augustus (56, 43); cf. the sketch of Tiberius at the opening of his reign (57, 1; 7-13, 5).

<sup>3</sup> E.g. 56, 29, 4 (cf. DA 97, 3)—the most striking; 54, 1, 4 (DA 52); *ibid.* 4, 3 (DA 91, 3). Cf. Millar, p. 86. The use of biographical material is suggested and investigated also by C. Questa in Studi sulle fonti di Tacito, App. I, pp. 253-69: see esp. pp. 267-69.

have been used by Dio, who repeats one detail in a slightly altered form.<sup>4</sup> Millar suggests that on conspiracies against Augustus Dio may have consulted a general (and chronologically vague) work on that topic.<sup>5</sup>

The historian makes few references by name to his sources. He quotes (it seems) Augustus' autobiography for the sum distributed to each citizen in 44 B.C. under Caesar the Dictator's will: the figure he gives is wrong, but the one then mentioned, on the authority of *ἑξέσσι*, is correct, so that the error may be simply a mixup in attributions.<sup>6</sup> Livy, Sallust, and Arrian receive passing mentions, but not as sources consulted.<sup>7</sup> More frequently, as in the instance just cited, there are general references to writers;<sup>8</sup> if a dispute between differing versions is announced, he may either choose one version by commonsense argument, or baldly assert the trustworthiness of 'some writers' over 'others'.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *DA* 35, 2; Dio 54, 12, 3-4; cf. n. to 54, 13, 1 in the commentary; also *Vrind*, pp. 324-25.

<sup>5</sup> Millar, pp. 87-90. Cf. C. Fannius' monograph 'de occisis aut relegatis a Nerone' (Pliny the Younger, *Epist.* 5, 5, 3). Dio may have employed a brief annalistic source also: the accounts of certain years occupy little space, e.g. 54, 18, 1-3; 36, 2-4; 56, 25, 2-8 (17 and 10 B.C., and A.D. 11). See Millar, p. 38.

<sup>6</sup> 'Thirty drachmas' attributed to Octavian's account: the emperor himself gives 'HS trecenos' (44, 35, 3 vs. *RG* 15, 1). This corresponds to the 'seventy-five' Dio then states. Cf. Stuart (cited below, n. 9), pp. 109-10, who argues against *RG* as Dio's source here. For Augustus' autobiography see Suet. *DA* 85, 1.

<sup>7</sup> Livy, 67, 12, 4; Sallust, 40, 63, 4 and 43, 9, 2-3; Arrian, 69, 15, 1.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. 56, 23, 1; 57, 14, 3; 22, 3.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. 55, 9, 6-8; 56, 31, 1. Dio's use of epigraphic



He has few comments on the nature of his sources. The principal discussion is well-known; it follows the description of the Principate, and concerns the difference between sources for republican and imperial history.<sup>10</sup> In the Republic (Dio declares) there was public debate on all issues, and the accessibility of public records, and of historical writers of varying sympathies enabled the truth to be got at.<sup>11</sup> But in the Empire decisions were taken secretly, news that might leak out was distrusted as being government-inspired, and the immensity of the empire impeded easy communications: thus groundless rumours gained currency and many real events remained unknown.<sup>12</sup> His intention, therefore (Dio says), is to record events as they were given out, and if necessary to modify that account 'ἐκ πολλῶν ὧν ἀνέγγων ἢ καὶ ἤκουσα ἢ καὶ εἶδον'.<sup>13</sup>

A similar comment is made on conspiracies. He will give the recorded version of each affair, as the truth is impossible to get at in all but 'τῶν πάνυ φανεράων', owing to the suspicion that attaches to the government's explanations.<sup>14</sup>

A Roman predecessor of Dio also remarked on the disingenuousness of authors in the imperial age. 'Postquam bellatum apud

---

sources is discussed by D.R. Stuart in University of Michigan Studies, I (1904), pp. 101-47, who concludes that on the Principate of Augustus the historian did not refer to Res Gestae (pp. 102-12).

<sup>10</sup> 53, 19.

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.* 1-2.

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.* 3-5.

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.* 6.

<sup>14</sup> 54, 13, 2. Cf. Domitian's remark: Suet. Dom. 11, 2.

Actium atque omnem potentiam ad unum conferri pacis interfuit, magna illa ingenia cessere; simul ueritas pluribus modis infracta, primum inscitia rei publicae ut alienae, mox libidine adsentandi aut rursus odio aduersus dominantis: ita neutris cura posteritatis inter infensos uel obnoxios.<sup>15</sup> And again, 'sed ueteris populi Romani prospera uel aduersa claris scriptoribus memorata sunt, temporibusque Augusti dicendis non defuere decora ingenia, donec gliscente adulatione deterrerentur: Tiberii Gaique et Claudii ac Neronis res florentibus ipsis ob metum falsae, postquam occiderant recentibus odiis compositae sunt.'<sup>16</sup>

In both works, Tacitus promised his own impartiality; but the touchiness of descendants of those he treated, and of persons who felt they too closely resembled—or failed to resemble—the figures he treated, made even an independent historian's task hard.<sup>17</sup> Dio, like Tacitus, was not deterred.

---

<sup>15</sup> Tac. Hist. 1, 1, 1.

<sup>16</sup> Ann. 1, 1, 2.

<sup>17</sup> ibid. 4, 33, 4: 'at multorum, qui Tiberio regente poenam uel infamias subiere, posteri manent, utque familiae ipsae iam extinctae sint, reperies qui ob similitudinem morum aliena malefacta sibi obiectari putent. etiam gloria ac uirtus infensos habet, ut nimis ex propinquo diuersa arguens.'

#### IV. Dio and other Principal Sources

FOR the reign of Augustus, from 31 B.C. to A.D. 14, there are, besides Dio, four principal written sources: Augustus' own inscriptional memoir, Res Gestae, a later section of Velleius Paterculus' Compendium,<sup>1</sup> certain references in the historical works of Tacitus,<sup>2</sup> and the biography by Suetonius together with references in other Lives. These present widely divergent attitudes to that momentous era.

The inscriptional account of Augustus is a superb work of propaganda, presenting the emperor as a Roman of the old stamp, pious, constitutional, the benefactor of the State in war and peace, and the foremost man of his age. The ex-officer Velleius is fulsome in praise for the restorer and promoter of peace, order, prosperity and freedom, and for his no less enlightened successor Tiberius (also for the loyal and industrious Seianus), and his narrative of the period is mainly a cavalcade of wars and rebellions. Tacitus gives the lie to the official celebration of Augustus as the ruler, and in large part maker, of a golden age, in his introduction to the history of the Julii and Claudii: 'pacem sine dubio post haec, uerum cruentam',<sup>3</sup>—and though he often

---

<sup>1</sup> 2, 89-123.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Ann. 1, 2-5; 9-10; 3, 28, 2-3; 13, 29, 1.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. 1, 10, 4.

uses the first Principate later as a favourable foil to those who succeeded,<sup>4</sup> his bitterness does not really abate.<sup>5</sup> Suetonius, though he records items to Augustus' discredit in the Triumviral years,<sup>6</sup> has little that is not favourable for the decades following Actium—owing perhaps to the general absence of hostile sources after 31 B.C.<sup>7</sup> As a biographer rather than a historian, his interests are more in incident and personal life than the how and why of public events: thus he is more taken with the breastplate and bodyguard the emperor used for protection in his second lectio than the political (or even chronological) details of that measure.<sup>8</sup>

Dio's own attitude to Augustus and his Principate is to be discussed in Section VI. His History is by far the fullest account of the reign surviving: five books to Suetonius' one and to Velleius' thirty-five chapters. He is concerned to give details of constitutional and administrative developments:<sup>9</sup> topics that Suetonius touches lightly on,<sup>10</sup> that Velleius summarizes

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Ann. 4, 34, 3-5.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Ann. 3, 28, 2-3.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. DA 11; 15 ('arae Perusinae'); 68-70.

<sup>7</sup> Timagenes burnt his books—though copies might have survived (Seneca de Ira 3, 23, 4-8); cf. Millar, p. 84.

<sup>8</sup> DA 35, 1-2.

<sup>9</sup> Though he regards the settlement of 27 as the principal one and so is brief to the point of obscurity (and dispute) over the modifications of 23 and 19: 53, 32, 5-6; 54, 10, 5-7.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. DA 27, 5; 37; 47.

happily and vaguely with: 'restituta uis legibus, iudiciis auctoritas, senatui maiestas, imperium magistratum ad pristinum redactum modum, tantummodo octo praetoribus adlecti duo. prisca illa et antiqua rei publicae forma reuocata;'<sup>11</sup> and that Tacitus necessarily refers to only in brief.<sup>12</sup> Augustus himself mentions his tribunicia potestas more than once<sup>13</sup>—his imperium on one occasion, and concisely.<sup>14</sup>

Dio's treatment of the Senate under Augustus is again the fullest we have. There is little mention of it by Velleius (and in Res Gestae it is usually recorded offering new honours and powers to the Princeps); there are only a few chapters in Suetonius:<sup>15</sup> this thesis investigates Dio's handling of the subject. In military history Dio competes with Velleius<sup>16</sup>—and proves the fuller source. Velleius' best account is of the Pannonian Revolt, in which he served.<sup>17</sup> This war is one of several that Dio treats at length.<sup>18</sup> Velleius comes off badly in some other instances—no mention of M. Crassus' Balkan campaigns<sup>19</sup>, and a hasty mention of

<sup>11</sup> 2, 89, 3. He does bring in a reference to tribunicia potestas in 90, 1.

<sup>12</sup> Ann. 1, 2; 3, 56, 2.

<sup>13</sup> RG 6, 2; 10, 1.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.* 1, 2.

<sup>15</sup> DA 35-38; 54-55; 58.

<sup>16</sup> Only three chapters in Suetonius: DA 20-21; 23.

<sup>17</sup> 2, 100-16.

<sup>18</sup> 55, 28, 7-34, 7; 56, 11-17; cf. Millar, p. 91.

<sup>19</sup> Dio 51, 23, 2-27, 3.

the subjugation of Spain by Augustus and Agrippa.<sup>20</sup> The comparative fullness of Dio on these matters makes him far more than simply an unwelcome pis aller.

---

<sup>20</sup> 2, 90, 1; cf. Dio 53, 25, 2-26, 1; 29, 1-2; 54, 5, 1-3; 11, 2-6. However, Velleius is not so at fault as Syme declared, citing 2, 90, 4 as a statement that Augustus personally reduced Spain in 26-25 B.C. (R R, p. 333, n. 2): the reference to Augustus there as subjugator is not so literal, cf. R G 26, 5 'meo iussu et auspicio'; Suet. D.A 21, 1 'domuit autem partim ductu partim auspiciis suis Cantabriam, Aquitaniam, Pannoniam' etc.

## V. Errors in Dio

PERHAPS it is inevitable that mistakes should occur in the Roman History. Even Tacitus is not exempt;<sup>1</sup> and Suetonius is frequently suspect.<sup>2</sup>

Dio's reports of constitutional developments are often (one might say usually) confused and disputable. For example, the offer of tribunicia potestas in 30 B.C., followed by its repetition in 23—without indication whether it was accepted or refused the first time;<sup>3</sup> also the curious statement that in A.D. 4 Augustus assumed proconsular power to hold the census;<sup>4</sup> while, as in Suetonius, there is the assertion that the emperor did accept a cura morum.<sup>5</sup> Other reports, such as that of the conferment of consulare imperium, and that of imperium maius, have been

---

<sup>1</sup> See Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 61-62, 69 (pp. 746-49, 762-66); note also the curious allegation that nearly all the men Augustus reportedly suggested as possible claimants to the succession were soon got rid of by Tiberius (Ann. 1, 13, 2-3)—on this cf. T.S. Jerome, Aspects of the Study of Roman History, pp. 326-29.

<sup>2</sup> Observe the confusion between lectiones in DA 35, 1; and the register of a 'morum legumque regimen' is almost certainly wrong (ibid. 27, 5: on both, see n. to 54, 13, 1).

<sup>3</sup> 51, 19, 6; 53, 32, 5-6; see n. to 52, 42, 3.

<sup>4</sup> 55, 13, 5: see n. on 4.

<sup>5</sup> 54, 10, 5; its renewal announced, 30, 1.

incessantly argued.<sup>6</sup>

There are other difficulties in Dio's narrative. He and Suetonius cannot both be right in their figures for the minimum Senatorial census finally fixed by Augustus.<sup>7</sup> His account of lectiones under the dates 13 and 11 B.C. is puzzling.<sup>8</sup> The survey of the system of provincial governorships and the powers of the emperor, by interweaving observations on later usages and those of his own time with information on the Augustan practices is peculiarly tangled.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, Millar has pointed out that sometimes the historian passes a valid political judgment, has been interpreted in a literal constitutional sense, and so suffers criticism for the 'error': thus the statement that Augustus accepted τὴν μὲν φροντίδα τὴν τε προστασίαν τῶν κοινῶν πᾶσαν—producing the theory of a legal cura et tutela rei publicae.<sup>10</sup> Note also the frequent reference to Augustus 'appointing' magistrates: this does not necessarily mean that the proper formalities were not observed, but it certainly expresses political reality.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> 54, 10, 5; 53, 32, 5. Cf. (e.g.) M. Grant, From Imperium to Auctoritas, Part IV, chap. 2; Chilver in Historia, I (1950), pp. 408-35; Jones, Studies ..., chaps. I-II; Astin in Latomus, XXII (1963), pp. 226-35.

<sup>7</sup> 54, 17, 3; DA 41, 1; see n. ad loc.

<sup>8</sup> 54, 26, 3-9; 35, 1; see n. on 26, 3.

<sup>9</sup> 53, 11-18; see notes ad loc., also Millar, pp. 83-102.

<sup>10</sup> 53, 12, 1; cf. Millar, pp. 92-93.

<sup>11</sup> 53, 2, 3; 54, 10, 2; 55, 34, 2: cf. Brunt in JRS, LI (1961), 78.



Dio cannot therefore be implicitly believed for constitutional matters. On the other hand he is far from being incorrigibly mistaken. The contradictions and obscurities in his constitutional account can be explained by his failure to understand fully the novel nature of the Principate in the age of Augustus. Writing in a time when emperors needed to give little if any constitutional justification for the measures they took, he sometimes fails to appreciate that the early monarchy required fair and convincing legal authorization for many of its policies; or he fails to distinguish properly the precise legal competence called upon in such matters.

## VI. Dio and the Augustan System

THE attitude of Cassius Dio to the system set up in 27 B.C. must now be considered.

His basic opinion is stated at the opening of the sixth decad. 'Τότε πρώτον (2 September, 31 B.C.) ὁ Καῖσαρ τὸ κράτος πᾶν μόνος ἔσχεν, ὥστε καὶ τὴν ἀπαρίθμησιν τῶν τῆς μοναρχίας αὐτοῦ ἔτων ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας ἀκριβοῦσθαι'.<sup>1</sup> And following the report of the provinces and honours granted to Octavianus Augustus, he observes: 'οὕτω μὲν δὴ τό τε τοῦ δήμου καὶ τὸ τῆς γερουσίας κράτος πᾶν ἐς τὸν Αὐγουστον μετέστη, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκριβὲς μοναρχία κατέστη'.<sup>2</sup> To Dio the change—despite the difficulties for historical research—was inevitable, and preferable. Democracy had a fine sound, but was unstable and too easily belied its name, especially when it was summoned to govern an empire.<sup>3</sup> In the speech urging Octavian to monarchic power, Maecenas puts his finger on the cause of the Republic's collapse: '... τό τε πλή-

---

<sup>1</sup> 51, 1, 1-2. At the opening of Book 52, Dio, under date 29 B.C., says that after 725 years of varying systems of government (i.e. 753 to 29) monarchy had come back. This does not invalidate his earlier statement but merely serves to introduce the debate that ensues: cf. Millar, p. 93. In 56, 30, 5 he once more dates Augustus' monarchy from Actium. (On Dio's chronology see W.F. Snyder, 'Chronology in the imperial books of Dio's History', *Klio* XXV [1940], pp. 39-56.)

<sup>2</sup> 53, 17, 1.

<sup>3</sup> 44, 2, 1-4; cf. 47, 39, 5; 52, 16, 1-2.

θος τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν πραγμάτων —the one divided and diversely endowed in capacity, the other so vast as to be dealt with only amid great difficulty.<sup>4</sup> Thus the historian's opinion was that at Philippi the issue was ἐλευθερία and δημοκρατία—and the victory of their enemies was the rescue of Rome, for popular rule would have destroyed her.<sup>5</sup>

Hence he approves of μοναρχία, entirely in the name of public order and efficient government: 'δυσχερὲς μὲν ἀκούσαι, χρησιμώτατον δὲ ἐμπολιτεύσασθαι ἐστί'.<sup>6</sup> Specifically, he approves the Augustan system. 'Ἡ μὲν οὖν πολιτεία οὕτω τότε πρὸς τε τὸ βέλτιον καὶ πρὸς τὸ σωτηριοδέστερον μετεκοσμήθη· καὶ γάρ που καὶ παντάπασιν ἀδύνατον ἦν δημοκρατουμένους αὐτοὺς σωθῆναι'.<sup>7</sup> His summing-up of the rule of Augustus is even more significant: to him that emperor had combined μοναρχία and ἐλευθερία, so that Romans lived 'in a liberty of moderation and in a monarchy without terrors'.<sup>8</sup> Dio clearly commends. We are reminded of Tacitus' compliment to Nerva and Trajan—libertas and principatus were at last reconciled, 'res olim dissociabiles'.<sup>9</sup> In the monarchic system Dio would

<sup>4</sup> 52, 15, 6.

<sup>5</sup> 47, 39.

<sup>6</sup> 44, 2, 1.

<sup>7</sup> 53, 19, 1.

<sup>8</sup> 56, 43, 4 (trans. E. Cary).

<sup>9</sup> Agricola 3, 1; cf. Hist. 1, 1, 4.

most have liked to see, things would have resembled the Augustan system; only, the Senate would have been still more prominent.<sup>10</sup>

As a Senator and holder of public office, he has a special interest in matters that involve the Senate and magistrates. In this he resembles Cornelius Tacitus.<sup>11</sup> It has already been observed that he is our fullest extant source for such affairs under Augustus. He reports lectiones (even if a couple of them do have to be scrutinized with care),<sup>12</sup> regulations enforced by Augustus,<sup>13</sup> the six-month and later annual consilium,<sup>14</sup> and the system of Senatorial as well as Equestrian governorships:<sup>15</sup> as well as a crowd of smaller references.<sup>16</sup>

The picture of the Senate, though Dio does not pass any direct comment,<sup>17</sup> is unflattering. He prepares us for it by the announcement that a monarchy was now founded, and by adding, after

<sup>10</sup> See chapter I of the commentary.

<sup>11</sup> Who however gives much fuller details of Senatorial sessions—a principal, or the principal, reason being of course his fuller scope in general (thus six books on Tiberius vs. two of Dio's, and probably the same number for Nero compared with about the equivalent of another two in Dio: see Boissevain, III, 18-100).

<sup>12</sup> 52, 42, 1-5; 54, 13-14, 5; 26, 3-9; 55, 13, 3.

<sup>13</sup> 52, 42, 6-7; 54, 35, 1; 55, 3-4, 1.

<sup>14</sup> 53, 21, 3-6; 56, 28, 2-3.

<sup>15</sup> 53, 12-15.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Index historicus to Boissevain's ed. (Vol. IV), s.v. 'senatores' (p. 597) and 'senatus' (pp. 606-8).

<sup>17</sup> Except a sharp observation on those who voted to condemn the once-flattered Gallus (53, 24, 1).

an assurance that old forms continued to be observed: 'οὐ μέντοι καὶ ἐπράττετό τι ὃ μὴ καὶ ἔκεινον (Augustus) ἤρεσκε'.<sup>18</sup> Thus it is nearly always the emperor who is presented as inspiring Senatorial, or administrative, action: establishing the seminstre consilium,<sup>19</sup> fixing the number of Praetors at ten,<sup>20</sup> setting up curae,<sup>21</sup> laying down a minimum Senatorial census,<sup>22</sup> associating with himself colleagues in tribunicia potestas,<sup>23</sup> creating the acrarium militare<sup>24</sup> and so on. The Senate is frequently recorded showering honours and powers upon him<sup>25</sup> and displaying other marks of flattery.<sup>26</sup> Flattery might be regarded with some indulgence, perhaps, as a genuine expression of esteem: that is Dio's opinions of the honours conferred in 23 B.C.<sup>27</sup> But again and again the historian clearly reveals the subservience and dependence of the Senate—for example, the scene in the Curia on the momentous day in 27, when Octavian offered to resign power: he had primed some

<sup>18</sup> 53, 21, 6.

<sup>19</sup> *ibid.* 4-5.

<sup>20</sup> 53, 32, 2.

<sup>21</sup> 54, 1, 4; 8, 4; 17, 1; 55, 26, 2; 27, 6, etc.

<sup>22</sup> 54, 17, 3.

<sup>23</sup> 54, 12, 4; 28, 1; 55, 9, 4; 13, 2; 56, 28, 1: cf. RG 6, 2.

<sup>24</sup> 55, 24, 9-25, 3.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. 51, 19-20, 5; 53, 16, 4-8; 32, 5-6; 54, 10, 3; 25, 3; 27, 2-3.

<sup>26</sup> 53, 28, 1-2; 54, 35, 2; 56, 26, 3.

<sup>27</sup> 53, 33, 1.

key supporters beforehand, and his offer was followed by his confirmation as master.<sup>28</sup> The fall from favour of Cornelius Gallus was the signal for accusations against him, and his condemnation in the Senate, which demanded severe punishment. Most members (the historian adds) proceeded to flatter and cultivate the principal accuser, Gallus' treacherous friend Valerius Largus.<sup>29</sup> Rather than decide on a question of Eastern foreign policy the Senate referred the matter back to the Princeps.<sup>30</sup> The independent stance of M. Antistius Labeo received prominence, like that of Pollio and a few anonymous spirits.<sup>31</sup> But there is no record of Augustus ever being thwarted by his Senate over any measure; though it nearly did come to that—once.<sup>32</sup> In a newly established system where a single man engrossed so many functions and exerted so much power, it is not surprising there was considerable apathy over holding some of the lesser offices of State: the Aedileship went through some lean times, also the Tribune and even, it seems, the Vigintivirate, essential though this was for an aspirant to the Senate.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> 53, 2, 7; 11-12, 3.

<sup>29</sup> *ibid.* 23, 5-24, 1.

<sup>30</sup> *ibid.* 33, 2.

<sup>31</sup> 54, 15, 7-8; *Sen. de Ira* 3, 23, 4-8 (but Pollio offered to turn Timagenes out if Augustus desired); *Suet. DA* 43, 2; 54-55.

<sup>32</sup> Over the five per cent. inheritance tax (56, 28, 4-6).

<sup>33</sup> 53, 2, 2; 54, 11, 1; 55, 24, 9 (Aedileship).—54, 26, 7; 30, 2; 56, 27, 1 (Tribunate).—54, 26, 5 (Vigintivirate). Cf. n. on 55, 24, 9.

Dio's picture of Augustus must also be viewed, as a complement to that of the Senate. He is inclined to be well-disposed towards the emperor: in summing up his achievements he declares (as already mentioned) that Augustus combined liberty and monarchy—we might render it 'despotism'—which endeared him to his people; and, having stated what the emperor wrought (the termination of civil war, the strengthening of the body politic and the vast extension of its power), he excuses 'any occasional deeds of violence' by laying the blame on circumstances.<sup>34</sup> He is careful to record how Augustus showed respect for the Senate in various ways, for example by giving the House prior notice of proposed legislation, by regularly attending sessions and by allowing freedom of speech.<sup>35</sup>

But now and then less reassuring glimpses appear. Octavian, in 29 B.C., tried to allay the fears of ex-Antonians in the Senate by announcing that he had burned the letters captured in Antonius' strongboxes: according to Dio, 'it is quite true that he had destroyed some of them, but he was very careful to keep the larger part, and afterwards he did not scruple to make use of them either.'<sup>36</sup> Dio found it difficult to vouch for the truth or

---

<sup>34</sup> 56, 43-44, 2. Cf. Tacitus, giving the argument of the favourable side: 'pauca admodum ui tractata, quo ceteris quies esset' (Ann. 1, 9, 5).

<sup>35</sup> 54, 4, 1; 55, 12, 3; 34, 1; 56, 40, 3; 41, 3.

<sup>36</sup> 52, 42, 8 (trans. Cary). Also noteworthy is Octavian's speech to the Senate in 27 as given, and doubtless composed, by Dio (53, 3-10): it is tasteless, boastful, brash and highly unsuit-

falsehood of reports of conspiracies in Augustus' reign as in later emperors'.<sup>37</sup> The open contempt and hatred Augustus felt for the fallen Triumvir Lepidus, which Dio devotes a long section to, cannot have been pleasant for Senators to watch: Lepidus, if nothing else, was a noble and a consular, and his gens remained closely connected with the circles of power.<sup>38</sup> Some of the men the Princeps associated with were disreputable or disgusting: Licinus, for example, Vedius Pollio, and perhaps Quintilius Varus.<sup>39</sup> Later ages idolized the age of Augustus. But that hero was a dictator, risen to supreme power through murder, betrayal and battle; some of his closest associates had risen with him, others (like Sulpicius Quirinius and Sallustius Crispus<sup>40</sup>) hastened later to offer their service; during his supremacy there were plots and scandals to be lived down. The brief glimpses Dio affords of the iron fist beneath the velvet, like the mordant résumé of Tacitus, are important reminders of the other—and likely the truer—side of the Restored and revitalized Republic.

---

able for the delicate occasion. A clumsy failure by the historian to appreciate the situation, or perhaps a heavy irony?

<sup>37</sup> 54, 15, 1-3.

<sup>38</sup> 54, 15, 4-7; see the stemma in Syme, R R, Table IV at end.

<sup>39</sup> 54, 21, 2-8; 23, 1-6; 56, 18, 3. Cf. Velleius on Lollius and Varus (2, 97, 1; 102, 1; 117, 2-4), and Tacitus on Quirinius (Ann. 3, 22-23; 48).

<sup>40</sup> Tac. Ann. 3, 30, 2-4.



# AN APPROXIMATE CHRONOLOGY OF DIO'S LIFE AND WORK

(All dates are A.D.)

163 or 164	Birth
182/83	In Cilicia with Cassius Apronianus
c. 184	Arrival in Rome
193	Designated Praetor by Pertinax
	Book on dreams and portents foretelling Severus' accession
194	Praetorship
c. 202	History of 'wars and civil strife' presented to Severus
c. 202/3	Research on the <u>Roman History</u> begins
before 211 (? 205/6)	Suffect Consulship
c. 212/13	Writing of the <u>History</u> begins
214-15	<u>Comes</u> of Caracalla at Nicomedia
217	In Rome on announcement of Macrinus' accession
218-?221	<u>Curator</u> at Pergamum and Smyrna
between 219 and 221	Reference to ἡμεῖς οἱ ὑπατευκότες (60, 2, 3)
223-28	Governorships: Africa, Dalmatia, Pannonia
c. 224/25	Completion of the <u>History</u> up to 211
229	<u>Consul II ordinarius</u> with Severus Alexander
	Return to Bithynia

## CHAPTER ONE

THIS chapter shall deal with the proposals concerning the Senate advanced by Maecenas in the debate composed for Book 52 by Dio. The speech in which they occur is a reply to the much shorter address by Agrippa favouring the restoration of democracy (737 lines of text in Boissevain's edition, vs. 308 for Agrippa: see Boiss., II, 388-410 and 379-88; both are incomplete, with a lacuna at 52, 13, 7/14, 1). The oration has been much commented on by moderns (the latest treatments: Hammond in TAPA, LXIII [1932], pp. 80-102; Bleicken in Hermes, XC [1960], pp. 444-67; Millar, pp. 102-18).

The two speeches are clearly inventions of the historian. For example Agrippa, used as the proponent of democracy, is described by Dio later as co-operating zealously with Octavian in establishing the monarchy (52, 41, 2; 54, 29, 2). Again, many of the proposals of Maecenas have relation more to the early third century A.D. than the Augustan age—and others pretty clearly represent Dio's own biases as a conservative and provincial Senator (for example, the division of Italy beyond one hundred miles from Rome into provincial areas, and the limitation of the freedom of the empire's cities: 22, 1; 30) rather than any ideas of Maecenas two and a half centuries previously.

The reason for inserting the two compositions may be found in Dio's view that Actium closed the Republic and that the settle-

ment of 27 B.C. imposed a virtual monarchy on Rome (51, 1, 1-2; 53, 17, 1). It is evident that Octavian's return from the East in 29 must have been followed by debate among the Caesarian leaders about the political future: Agrippa and Maecenas were the two leading Caesarians after Octavian himself, and Agrippa's reputation for probity, admired by Dio (e.g. 53, 23, 3-4), made him the choice for supporter of the ideal of liberty. Dio is not novel in giving a debate between opposed political outlooks: Herodotus depicted Persian nobles discussing the relative merits of democracy, oligarchy and monarchy (3, 80-82)—monarchy won; and Thucydides drew the contrast between political ideal and necessity in the Melian Dialogue (5, 84-113), with necessity overpowering ideals. Both monarchy and necessity carry the day in Dio. His originality appears in the second part of Maecenas' address after the speaker's reply to Agrippa's criticisms of monarchy (52, 18, 6 ff.: on Agrippa's oration cf. Millar, p. 106).

That Dio is not merely having Maecenas propose measures that later formed the Augustan constitution appears from 41, 1f.: '(Octavian) did not ... immediately put into effect all his suggestions, fearing to meet with failure at some point if he purposed to change the ways of all mankind at a stroke; but he introduced some reforms at the moment and some at a later time, leaving still others for those to effect who should subsequently hold the principate' (trans. Cary). It is also clear from such advice as that to increase the membership of the Senate by admitting prominent men of the subject peoples, without concern for numbers

(19, 4); to extend citizenship to all provincials—or all leading provincials—(19, 6); to grant extensive authority to the Praefectus Urbi (21, 1); and to recruit as Senators equites who had passed through the emperor's service (25, 6). Hammond suggested Dio is giving a view of the monarchy's development and its implications for the future, as they appeared to him in the early third century (op. cit., pp. 101-2). This interpretation is weakened by the admission that Dio has a 'program' (p. 99) and that some of the proposals are in fact reactionary (p. 96, on the proposals for finance, on which see also Millar, pp. 109-11 and p. 99). Nor does Hammond fully treat the implications of the proposals for provincial government and for restricting the duties of equites to finance and praefecturae at Rome (21, 8; 24-25, 5). These topics, and those of the ὑποτιμητής and legislation—advising that all laws be enacted through the Senate—(21, 3; 31, 2), also show that the historian is not portraying the Severan monarchy either.

No: he is in fact outlining the type of monarchy he thinks both preferable and practicable. He draws on existing features of the imperial system but amends or modifies as he sees fit (compare Cicero's ideal Res publica, combining ideals with actual Roman practice: de Legibus 3, 3-4); and the speech has three main ideas.

First, monarchy is unavoidable and necessary (16, 3: cf. Introduction, Section VI). Second, peace and order must be obtained, and if possible the subject peoples won over to Roman rule—Dio's proposals on how to handle men of importance among

the provincials, employ the army (defensively only) and treat the cities of the empire all have this purpose in view. Third, and perhaps of greatest interest to the writer, the dignity of the Senate, and its use in administration, must be preserved, indeed extended (cf. notes to 21, 3; 8; 25, 6; 31, 2—and notice also Maecenas' injunctions to handle malcontents with restraint, and accusations with circumspection.) Thus all governors are to be Senators, and must have satisfying, three to five-year terms of office; the functions the Praefectus Urbi exercised in Dio's day are upheld; and, most revealing of all, a subcensor (ὑποτιμητής) is to be appointed to supervise not only the members of the senatorius ordo but also those of the equester (22-23; 21, 1-2; 3-7). Dio also wants any Senator accused of offences to be tried before the Senate, as also any person charged with conspiracy against the Princeps (31, 3-4; 32, 9-10).

The enhancement of the senatorius ordo involved limiting the activity of the equester, as in the ways mentioned above (cf. Millar, p. 113). To obtain it Dio is prepared to accept the loss of the administration of Italy beyond the hundredth milestone and the admission of equites to the Senate, even ones who had served as centurions (22, 1; 25, 6-7; Bleicken, pp. 454, 457, 462). The emperor in turn is to treat Senators as his helpers and his peers: he must take counsel with οἱ ἄριστοι ἄνδρες and οἱ ὁμότιμοι on all questions of state, men who would (no doubt) be mainly Senators (15, 1-2; Bleicken, p. 455). In other words

Dio wishes the usual imperial consilium to be adapted to include only persons of whom a Senator like the historian would approve. Similar persons—'the most distinguished Senators and equites'—are to form the emperor's judicial consilium (33, 3); the equites would no doubt be 'senatoria dignitate' (cf. Tac. Ann. 16, 17, 1) and so, it may be taken, congenial to Dio. It should be added that these consilia have little or nothing to do with the State Council set up by Augustus (for which see 53, 21, 4-5; 56, 28, 2-3; and notes ad loc.): cf. Crook, Consilium Principis, pp. 18, 88-89.

Dio is not, it should be stressed, concerned with the true source of power—that lies with the emperor, in accordance with his constitutional opinions (cf. Introduction, Sect. VI). But the Senate must seem to be dominant ('καὶ σεμνὸν καὶ ἀξιόλογόν ἐστι τότε τὴν βουλὴν πάντων κυρίαν δοκεῖν εἶναι': 31, 1), and the emperor must show himself to be one of its members, and must remain on proper terms with it. Dio's generation had seen the philosenatorial regime of the Antonines replaced by caprice and military tyranny—thus the historian describes Marcus' death as ending the age of gold and introducing one of iron and rust (71, 36, 3-4 [279]). His ideas in the speech of Maecenas aim at recalling and buttressing those happy days: they do not reveal particular insight into the causes of the Senate's decline (among which, as has been suggested, was Senators' own distaste for long and arduous service in imperial provinces, resulting in their increasing replacement by equites: Birley in PBA, XXXIX [1953], pp. 207-8),

but they do provide a revealing view of what a third-century Senator considered necessary and important for the proper direction of the imperial Roman state.

-----

19, 1 τίνες οὐκ ἐπιτήδευοι κ.τ.λ. : According to Dio later, 'πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἱππῆς πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ πεζοὶ παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐκ τῶν ἐμφυλίων πολέμων ἐβούλευον' (52,

42, 1: see n. ad loc.). Augustus did hold several lectiones senatus, the evidence for which is given by RG 8, 2; Suet. DA 35, 1; Dio 52, 42, 1-4 (under date 29 B.C.); 54, 13-14 (under 18 B.C.); *ibid.* 26, 3-9, and *cf.* 30, 1-2 (13 B.C.); *ibid.* 35, 1 (11 B.C.); 55, 13, 3 (A.D. 4).

Augustus in his inscription mentions three lectiones without dating them, though the lustrum and census are given as having been held in 28 and 8 B.C. and A.D. 14 (RG 8, 2-4). Suetonius mentions only two lectiones, of which the second is associated with Augustus and Agrippa while the first resembles that described by Dio under date 18 B.C.: it looks therefore as though the biographer inverted the order (DA 35, 1). In considering the apparent discrepancy between Dio and Res Gestae, two points are worth noting. First, the lectio of A.D. 4 was carried out by IIIuiri (*cf.* Suet. DA 37, 1) and so would not be counted by Augustus as one he himself performed. Second, that of 29 B.C. will have been timely, indeed almost inevitable—it followed the final triumph of

the Caesarian party: its historicity can be accepted. This leaves two others by Augustus to be established. One in 18 also seems reasonable. It was ten years since the last, and the power of the Princeps had perhaps been strengthened recently by a grant of consulare imperium (Dio 54, 10, 2: for a discussion of this see n. to 54, 13, 1 below, and on the subject cf. also Jones, Studies, p. 13; Chilver in Historia, I [1950], 431; Salmon in Historia, V [1956], 471-73), which might suggest a tightening of control over the State.

This leaves the alleged lectiones of 13 and 11 B.C., on which see nn. to 54, 26, 3-9 below.

19, 2 χρήματα... δός: Augustus did in fact do this on several occasions. Cf. 54, 17, 3 'καί τισι... ἐλάττω κερκτημένοις ἔχαρίσατο ὅσον ἐνέδει' (with n. to that section). According to Suetonius, 'suppleuitque [censum] non habentibus' (DA 41, 1)—for an instance see Ann. 2, 37, 1 (M. Hortensius Hortalus). Tiberius sometimes did the same (Ann. 1, 75, 3; 2, 38, 4; Dio 57, 10, 3). A similar act of generosity is recorded of Nero, to a Messalla Corvinus (Ann. 13, 34, 1).

ibid. μὴ μόνον ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας: Recruitment of provincials was a long-established practice when Dio wrote. It had occurred earlier than the time of Caesar and Octavian also: cf. Syme in BSR Papers, XIV [1938], 14. Caesar had introduced provincials, among them the younger Balbus (Quaestor in 44), L. Decidius Saxa (Tribune in 44; of Italian descent, see



Syme in JRS, XVII [1937], pp. 127-37, especially 132 ff.). Many men from the provinces, whether of Italian extraction or native descent, advanced to prominence under Augustus and his successors; for example, Junius Gallio (Syme, R R, p. 367), a friend of the Annaei of Corduba; possibly the Domitii Corbulones, father and son (Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 83); D. Valerius Asiaticus (ILS 212, n. 2; 7006; Tac. Ann. 11, 1, 2); Cn. Domitius Afer (Syme, R R, p. 367) and the statesman and philosopher Seneca. The emperor Claudius, in his partially extant address to the Senate on granting citizenship to Gauls, declared that 'sane nouo m[ore] et diuus Aug[ustus au]onc[ulus m]eus et patruus Ti. Caesar omnem florem ubique coloniarum ac municipiorum, bonorum scilicet uirorum et locupletium, in hac curia esse uoluit' (ILS 212, II lines 1-4).

By the age of the Severi provincials composed, as far as can be calculated, about fifty-one to fifty-seven per cent. of the Senate (Hammond, A M, p. 252). Dio himself was a Bithynian (above, p. 1), and the emperor Septimius Severus came from Africa, probably of Italian stock (cf. Barnes in Historia, XVI [1967], pp. 89-90).

The entry of an increasingly wide selection of members to the Senate was a principal trend in Roman history from the earliest times. We may compare Appius Claudius' alleged admission of sons of freed slaves (Suet. D. Claud. 24; Homo, RPI, pp. 60-62), the growth of the plebeian nobility in the fourth and third centuries and the opening of the Senate to Italians in the first B.C. Under the Empire, overseas Romans and native provincials grew increasing-

ly numerous and influential—first Westerners, in the first century A.D., then men from Africa and the East in the second, as romanization spread. However, the extension of the ordo senatorius beyond Italy was not very pronounced in Augustus' time; among those known are Pompeius Macer, Praetor in A.D. 15, who was son of Pompeius Magnus' client Theophanes of Mitylene (Tac. Ann. 1, 72, 3; 6, 18, 2); the elder Corbulo—possibly—who by the year 21 had also been Praetor (Ann. 3, 31, 4), and Domitius Afer, Praetor in 25 (cf. ibid. 4, 52, 2), as well as Gallio and Balbus mentioned already.

Note the phrase κοινωνοί... τῆς ἀρχῆς : in fact, within a century of 29 B.C. provincials were to be closely involved in the highest councils, as Seneca, Licinius Mucianus and Licinius Sura (on the latter two see Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 85).

19, 4 μηδὲν περὶ τοῦ πλήθους αὐτῶν ἀκριβολογούμενος : Elsewhere  
Dio says

that the Senate had over one thousand members (52, 42, 1; cf. n. ad loc.), and in 54, 14, 1 he records that Augustus wanted ἑξήκοντα αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ποιῆσαι but only succeeded in reducing the number to six hundred. Here, therefore, as in other passages of Maecenas' speech (see pp. 30-31 above), Dio has the speaker put forward measures not in fact adopted by Augustus. But the suggestion may be relevant to the age of the Severi. The Senate, after remaining (it seems likely) at about six hundred for two centuries, now appears to have increased to well over this

total—perhaps to eight or nine hundred (Hammond, A M, p. 254). If so, this was probably the result of Senatorial rank becoming a social distinction par excellence: 'Septimius' action [may have been an] attempt ... to extend its [the Senate's] membership more widely among the many in the empire whose wealth and importance justified their inclusion' (Hammond, loc. cit.). Cf. also Millar, pp. 111-12. Of course Dio also envisaged the Senate as a body of consequence and authority, cf. 31, 2 (all legislation to be enacted through the Senate) and 32, 1 (all major matters to be transacted through that assembly: 'τὰλλα τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ μέγιστα τῶν τῷ δημοσίῳ προσηκόντων, τῇ γερούσιᾳ ἀνατίθει').

19, 6 τῆς πολιτείας πᾶσι σφισι μεταδοθῆναι: Another broad suggestion which was only gradually adopted by emperors. Augustus is not recorded as a generous giver of citizenship—rather the opposite (Suet. DA 40, 3). Probably the most numerous group to acquire it in the early Principate were military personnel: a recruit who was not already a citizen obtained that status on enlisting with a legion, and the eastern forces in particular were largely supplied from native sources (cf. CAH, X, 226-27; Pareti, Storia di Roma, V, 490), while an auxiliary received ciuitas on his discharge, as did ex-sailors of the imperial fleets (Marquardt, II, 564).

The power of the Princeps to confer citizenship with the rank of eques must have developed under Augustus. Not long after his death the Senate passed a resolution to check fraudulent as-

sumptions of this grant by former slaves and their sons (A.D. 23; Pliny the Elder, Nat. His. 33, [7], 32), and the year after that a Lex Visellia, among its provisions, restricted municipal office to freeborn persons and to those who received the gold ring, badge of equestrian rank, from the Princeps (Pliny, loc. cit.; CAH, X, 616). The descendants of men thus raised to the second class in the State—or such men themselves: Augustus admitted equites in special circumstances (Dio 54, 26, 5 and 30, 2; cf. n. to 54, 26, 3 below)—could in turn enter the Senate.

In later times, Roman citizenship was increasingly widely diffused, culminating in the Constitutio Antoniniana under Caracalla in Dio's own lifetime, which extended it to nearly all the freeborn inhabitants of the Empire. In relating this measure later, Dio is a good deal less highflown than he makes Maecenas—according to him, it was done simply as a device to raise cash (77, 9, 5 [382]; cf. Millar, p. 153).

20, 1 ΠΕΝΤΕΚΟΙΣΙΚΟΙΣΤΗΣ : This appears to have been carried into effect. Tiberius was allowed to hold the Quaestorship five years before the regular age (53, 28, 3; Suet. Tib. 9, 3), and held that office in the year 22 (cf. Dio 54, 1, 1-4 with Vell. 2, 94, 2—Velleius describes Tiberius as 'undeicensimum annum agens' [= eighteen years by modern reckoning] but this would give 23; cf. also RG 5, 1-2). The same was done for his brother Drusus in 19 (Dio 54, 10, 4), presumably for the Quaestorship of the following year: Drusus was born in 38 (cf. Suet. D. Claud. 1, 1; and on both Tiberius and

Drusus, Tac. Ann. 3, 29, 2). The normal minimum seems thus to have been twenty-five (Sumner in Latomus, XXVI [1967], pp. 413-35; esp. 422-25: he suggests that the limit of twenty-five years was interpreted to allow as candidates persons in their twenty-fifth, i.e. twenty-four years and a given number of months old; cf. also Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 17, p. 652).

Evidence for a minimum age for the Quaestorship in the Republic is obscure, but twenty-seven may have been a 'normal minimum' (Astin, The Lex Annalis ..., p. 45; for discussion of the question, pp. 42-45), at least until the time of Sulla (OCD, s.v. 'Sulla', p. 866; Scullard, From the Gracchi to Nero, pp. 85 and 403, n. 33a; cf. examples in Mommsen, R Str, I<sup>3</sup>, 570 n. 3, whose theory [pp. 570-71] is criticized by Astin, p. 40). As Syme observes, the lowering of the minimum age by five years under Augustus in effect increased the average length of a Senatorial career by one-sixth (B&SR Papers, XIV [1938], p. 29). This would tend, after a few years, to add to the numbers of that House.

The Quaestorship had to be preceded by a minor office among the uigintiuiri, the minor magistrates who dealt with some judicial cases (IIIuiri capitales and Xuiri stlitibus iudicandis), directed the mint (IIIuiri monetales) and supervised streets in Rome (IVuiri uiis in urbe purgandis). A uigintiuir could decline to go on to higher posts, as Ovid did (Tristia 4, 10, 35). Of those who did go on, military service also was required, in many or most cases, either before or after the Vigintivirate. The rule may not have been wholly rigid. Ovid for example makes

no mention of army service (Trist. 4, 10, 33-36), nor do some otherwise detailed inscriptions (E J, nos. 197-98, 205, 212 [first part: this dates from Tiberius' reign]). Cf. Furneaux, *Introd.* to The Annals of Tacitus, I, 95.

D. McAlindon (in JRS, XLVII [1957], pp. 191-95), suggests that Senators' sons, and sons of influential Equites, in the early Principate held, first, the Vigintivirate and, second, the Military Tribune. Sons of other Equites held, first, the Military Tribune, then the Vigintivirate; other Equites, however, held the Military Tribune followed by the Quaestorship, bypassing the Vigintivirate. Ovid was likely enough in the first group, as the son of an important Italian family (he would have been the first Paelignian Senator: cf. E J, no. 205 with Syme's comment, R R, p. 363). If McAlindon's view is correct military service would have followed his Vigintiviral post—which may well explain his reluctance! Note, however, that Varius Geminus, who did become the first Paelignian Senator, lists no military service between the Vigintivirate and Quaestorship ('Q. Vario Q.f. Geminus leg. diui Aug. II procos. pr. tr.pl. q. quaesit. iudic. praef. frum. dand. Xuir. stl. iudic. curator aedium sacra monumentorumque public. tuendorum': E J, loc. cit.). It is reasonable there could have been some exceptions to the general rule of early military service: Birley (PBA, XXXIX [1939], pp. 199-200) suggests that such exceptions were not as a rule employed in the emperor's service afterwards (but Geminus' example shows that this too was not invariably so).

Augustus recognized the hereditary nature of Senatorial rank by permitting sons of Senators to assume the latus clauus, denoting that status, along with their toga uirilis (Suet. D A 38, 2). This may have been recognition of an already existing custom (cf. Jones, Studies, pp. 30-32). It does appear that under Augustus and after, only laticlauii could stand for office: cf. Pelham, Essays, p. 126, and Syme, R R, p. 358. The only mention of this restriction in Dio occurs at 59, 9, 5 where he says that 'persons born into the Senatorial order' wore the latus clauus when 'ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς βουλῆς ἐλπίδι', a privilege extended (according to him) to Equites who hoped for office, by Caligula. If his account is not simply mistaken, the historian may be trying to report Caligula's grant of the latus clauus to men who were already in one or other of the militiae equestres; such a grant was one of the recognized means of entry into the Senate (cf. McAlindon, p. 192).

The Senate was not thus turned into a hereditary preserve by Augustus—just as his recognition that Senators' sons were expected to be Senators in their turn was not in any way an innovation: the Republican oligarchy held the same view (cf. Homo, RPI, pp. 124, 134). Augustus granted the latus clauus to Equites frequently enough, introducing numerous Italians into the Senate thereby (eg. E J, nos. 197, 205, 207, 359; Vell. 2, 111, 2; Dio 54, 26, 5; 30, 2; 56, 27, 1; cf. Syme, R R, pp. 359-63). Ovid turned him down (op. cit., 4, 10, 35-36). The recruitment of new blood into the Senate was regular and necessary

—note Tac. Ann. 3, 25, 2 for the ineffectiveness of the Lex Papia Poppaea, and 11, 25, 2 for the extinction of the patrician families created by Caesar and Augustus; cf. also Hammond, A M, p. 251, on a later period: 'it appears that, after the reign of Severus, senators were rare whose rank went back more than one or two generations.'

20, 2 ταμειύσαντες τε καὶ ἀγορανομήσαντες : Actually, regulations under the Republic had laid down a 'certus ordo magistratuum'. The Lex Villia Annalis of 180 B.C. may have established the rule in the middle Republic; however Astin has argued that 'there is no evidence whatsoever to link this type of regulation' with that enactment, and he adds that 'the evidence for the compulsory praetorship suggests that it was introduced a considerable number of years before that law'; evidence for the Quaestorship is indecisive (The Lex Annalis ..., p. 30; discussion of the compulsory cursus, pp. 19-30). Sulla did include the Quaestorship in his arrangements: 'στρατηγεῖν ἀπεῖπε πρὶν ταμειύσαι καὶ ὑπατεύειν πρὶν στρατηγήσαι' (Appian, Bell. Ciu. 1, 12, 100; cf. Greenidge, RPL, p. 186). It had been customary also to hold the Aedileship or Tribunate between the Quaestorship and Praetorship (Homo, RPI, pp. 70, 135).

The minimum age for the Praetorship in the Republic is uncertain. Astin suggests that thirty-nine was legally fixed before as well as after Sulla (op. cit., p. 41; forty was put forward by



Homo, RPI, p. 70). The Consulship in Cicero's day was tenable at the age of forty-two (Cic. Philippic 5, 17, 48: cited by Greenidge, RPL, p. 186, n. 3). Under the Empire, the Consulship could be held at thirty-three at earliest: thus Tiberius, who was permitted to hold each office five years under the legal limit, could attain it in 13 B.C. aged twenty-eight (he did not reach twenty-nine until 16 November of that year). Cf. Syme, BSR Papers, XIV [1938], p. 29, n. 156; and RR, p. 369. But apart from nobiles (on the connotations of which term cf. Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 18, p. 654), most Senators had to wait longer as a rule: Agricola was Consul at thirty-seven (in 77), Tacitus about the age of forty (cf. Syme, Tacitus, I, p. 63 and n. 6 with pp. 129-30; also II, App. 18, pp. 653-56). Evidence, however, suggests that the Praetorship could be held about the age of thirty, as Maecenas is made to advise: Agricola held it in 68, benefiting by the legal preferences for fathers (cf. Furneaux-Anderson, App. I, p. 166), Tacitus in 88 (Ann. 11, 11, 1: at thirty-one or thereabouts, Syme, op. cit., App. 17, p. 653), Pliny the Younger around 93 (Syme, *ibid.*), when aged about thirty-one. Dio, whose birth may be placed c. 163-64, was Praetor (probably) in 194 (Millar, pp. 13, 16). (The date of 93 for the Praetorship of Pliny is sustained by Sherwin-White, App. IV, pp. 763-71.)

The regulations on the minimum ages for office were affected by Augustus' marriage legislation. This made it possible for a father to stand for a magistracy as many years under the minimum as he had children (cf. Dio 53, 13, 2; Tac. Agric. 16, 1-4 and

Furneaux-Anderson ad loc., also their App. I, p. 166; CAH, X, 452; Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 17, p. 652).

20, 3 τῷ πλήθει ἢ τῷ δήμῳ : Cary in a note on this phrase explains it as a reference to the Concilium Plebis (which elected the Tribunes and plebeian Aediles) and the Comitia (electing the curule magistrates and Quaestors) respectively: Vol. VI, 125. For another conjunction of πλήθος and δήμος, see 53, 21, 6 (cf. *ibid.* 7); and for the use of πλήθος as meaning plebs, 58, 2, 8: πρέσβεις... τό τε πλήθος ἐκ τε τῶν δημάρχων καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀγορανόμων τῶν σφετέρων... ἔπεμπε (to Tiberius and Seianus); cf. 42, 40, 4.

20, 4 χρόνου διεξελθόντος : Referring to the Lex Pompeia of 52 B.C. which enacted a five-year interval between tenure of the Praetorship and of a provincial governorship, and one of ten between Consulship and governorship (cf. 40, 46, 2; also CAH, X, 213; Marquardt, I, 546). Augustus reaffirmed this rule, which naturally applied only to the Senate's provinces (53, 14, 2), as he himself technically was the governor of the 'imperial' provinces. Nonetheless, men of influence might be released from the obligation, for example Paulus Fabius Maximus and L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, who held Asia and Africa respectively two to four years after being Consuls (EJ, no. 98; ILS 5601, 6095; cf. Fasti for 16 and 11 B.C. in EJ, p. 37; Syme, RR, 395).

20, 5 δικαστήρια κ.τ.λ. : The sense of this is not fully clear, ἐκείνους being ambiguous, but the translation of Cary probably gives an accurate sense: 'courts should be established, to be sure, with the other senators and knights as members, but final authority should rest with these magistrates' (VI, 127). In support of this version, note the contrast συναγέσθω μὲν / τὸ δ' ὅλον . (Millar shares this view: p. 112).

What does the historian mean? Courts at Rome did have Senatorial and Equestrian members, to whom Augustus added a fourth decuria (of members with a census of 200,000 HS) to supplement their three. That Senators did continue to form part of the three decuriae is denied by Mommsen (R Str, III 1, 535 n. 3, mainly by argumentum ex silentio—though note Tacitus, Ann. 14, 20, 5: 'decurias equitum'); but in III 2, 897 n. 3 (published a year later) he corrects his opinion, referring to Frontinus, de Aquaeduc. 101 ['ut curatores aquarum iudiciis uacent priuatis publicisque': cf. E J, no. 278 A; Lewis and Reinhold, II, 70: it is part of the S.C. de aquaeductibus of 11 B.C.]; suggesting that the reason why membership in the decuriae, though often mentioned in the inscriptions of equites (e.g. E J, no. 230; ILS 1320; McCrum-Woodhead, no. 343; Smallwood, no. 266, cf. 281), is not entered on those of Senators' was 'daß das senatorische Album als integrierender Theil der Geschworenliste galt und also jeder Senator, aber keineswegs jeder Ritter den Decurien angehört.' Pliny the Elder does say that, 'diuo Augusto decurias ordinante, maior pars

iudicum in ferreo anulo fuit', implying, that is, the membership of at least some Senators (Nat. His. 33, [7], 30)—who, as Jones points out, would have been in a small minority if distributed among all three decuriae (as Suetonius implies: DA 32, 3, on which see Jones in JRS, XLV [1955], p. 15) each a thousand strong (Pliny, loc. cit.; Jones, p. 17: on this difficult passage in the Nat. His. see now Henderson in JRS, LIII [1963], pp. 67-70, 71, who tries to elucidate the role and position of equestrian members of the decuriae—concluding that, by and large, iudices were not identical with equites equo publico).

But the language of the Tabula Hebana seems to imply the absence, by A.D. 5, of Senators from these decuriae ('inq. is omnib[us centuris] senatores et equites omnium decuriarum quae iudicior. publicor. caussa constitutae sunt erun[t suffragium] ferant': EJ, no. 94a, lines 7-9), an interpretation supported by the 'decurias equitum' of Tacitus. Jones therefore suggests that Augustus by the Lex Iulia iudicaria (of 18 B.C.; cf. CAH, X, 148) released Senators from the burden of jury-service.

In the public courts, however, the decision of the jury was binding (cf. Crook, p. 7). In making his proposal Dio may be thinking of the procedure of an imperial court, where the president, whether Princeps or Praefectus, had an advisory consilium (CAH, X, 169; Crook, pp. 31, 54; and Hammond, A Pr, pp. 186-87 and AM, p. 423, for the presidency of the Princeps: for that of the Praefectus Praetorio, cf. Crook, p. 80; Greenidge, RPL, pp. 409-10: on imperial and senatorial jurisdiction gener-

ally, Jones, Studies, chap. V). The quaestiones, it may be added, had died out by the time of Severus Alexander (CAH, XII, 28; Hammond, AM, p. 418), and elsewhere Dio proposes to restrict the activity of the Praefecti Praetorio to military affairs (52, 24, 3-5: cf. pp. 31-32 above), thus implicitly denying their judicial competence, which was independently established in his own lifetime (cf. Millar, p. 115). Dio's idea, reflected here, was probably that the procedure of the imperial courts was acceptable, but that the magistrates of the State (i.e. members of the Senate) should exercise it in courts of their own. He approves of the Princeps' own role as judge (33, 1): not his equestrian officials'.

21, 1 πολιάρχος : In Latin, praefectus urbi. Originally an alter ego of the Consuls in Rome while these were off to hold the feriae Latinae on the Alban Mount (Ann. 6, 11, 1), this official was apparently elected, even in the Empire (Dio 54, 6, 2: 'τὴν τοῦ πολιάρχου τοῦ διὰ τὰς ἀνοχὰς αἰρουμένου χειροτονίαν'; cf. ibid. 17, 2), and had the power to summon the Senate (Aulus Gellius 14, 7, 4; Mommsen, R Str., I, 209-10; Greenidge, RPL, pp. 61, 161). But Maecenas proposes a permanent Praefectus Urbi to administer the City and hold jurisdiction up to one hundred miles beyond.

Caesar had appointed eight praefecti to discharge the duties of the Republican magistrates in 45 B.C. (Dio 43, 28, and 48), and Maecenas in the civil wars had exercised a general control, without office or title, over Rome in Octavian's absence (Ann. 6, 11, 1; cf. Dio 49, 16, 2 and 51, 3, 5). Agrippa was

to have a similar charge in 21 (54, 6, 5). Between these two occasions Augustus did appoint an official with the title Praefectus Urbi: the ex-Consul Messalla Corvinus in 26; but he promptly resigned 'quasi nescius exercendi' (Tac., loc. cit.; according to Jerome's version of the Eusebian Chronicle, 'inciuilem potestatem se esse contestans': S. Hieronymi Opera, ed. Migne, VI, 435 [a. Abrah. 1991]). Ten years afterwards T. Statilius Taurus was given the same appointment (see also Dio 54, 19, 6). On both occasions Augustus was himself shortly due to leave the capital for the provinces. The next known occupant was L. Calpurnius Piso (Ann. 6, 11, 3) who held it 'uiginti per annos': as Piso died in 32 he must have been appointed in 12 or 13 (the reading 'uiginti' has been challenged, see Koestermann ad loc.: but it is defended, e.g. by Mommsen [R Str., II 2,<sup>2</sup> 1060 n. 3]; Furneaux on Ann. 1, 7, 3; cf. CAH, X, pp. 201, 646; Syme, Tacitus, II, p. 746; against 'uiginti' see Marsh, Reign of Tiberius, p. 126 and n. 2). With him the post apparently became permanent. Only ex-Consuls were eligible to hold it.

The activity of this new appointment was quite limited at first—'qui coerceret seruitia et quod ciuium audacia turbidum, nisi uim metuat' (in Tacitus' description). The Praefectus also commanded the three cohortes urbanae (cf. Tac. Hist. 3, 64, 1). Under the Julio-Claudians his authority grew: it appears from Tacitus (Ann. 14, 41, 2) that his sphere of competence coincided at least partly with the Praetor's by the reign of Nero.

Dio is, in fact, describing through Maecenas the Praefec-

tus Urbi of his own day. That official now had jurisdiction in appeal cases (and, if Dio is actually reflecting the situation in his time, in homicide cases also: τὰς δίκας ... τὰς τοῦ θανάτου § 2), up to one hundred miles from Rome (CAH, XII, 28; Digest 1, 12, 1; cf. Lewis and Reinhold, II, 26-27). This competence may have existed before the reign of Septimius Severus: see Hammond, A M, p. 426.

The exceptions to be made (πλὴν ὧν ἂν εἴπω ) are given in 31, 3; 9, and 10 (q.v., with notes ad loc.). Altogether we may conclude that the Praefectus and his functions were fully approved by Dio, who found nothing in them to alter when composing Maecenas' address; it is noteworthy that the Praefectus Urbi emerged 'in the later empire as the chief spokesman for the senate and the City ... [and] in fact displaced the consuls' (Hammond, A M, p. 445). The original reason for the appointment of such an official, on the other hand, as the employment of Maecenas and Agrippa without official standing also indicates, will have been his usefulness as the representative of the absent emperor, both to keep control over affairs at Rome and to strengthen the ruler's entente with the Senate (which will have been gratified by the selection of Corvinus and Piso, and probably Taurus also: observe Tacitus' praise, 'eam potestatem ... egregie toleravit'). The administrative usefulness of the post may have been discovered during Tiberius' later absence at Capreae from A.D. 27 on (as suggested by Pelham: Essays, p. 151). The Praefectus seldom or never became a policymaker like the Praefectus Praetorio;

he was usually a distinguished, and non-political, Senator.

The existence of this post may also furnish a clue on the question whether or not Augustus ever received a grant of consulare imperium, or at any rate imperium valid in Rome and Italy, as Dio says he did (54, 10, 5). In 26 B.C., when he appointed Messalla, or had him elected, he was Consul; this was not so when Taurus and Piso held the position, and Augustus may have been empowered through imperium to appoint them. See below, n. to 54, 13, 1; also, among recent writers, Chilver in Historia I (1950), p. 431; Jones, Studies, chap. I; Salmon in Historia V (1956), pp. 472 f., who suggests acceptance of certain aspects only of consular power.

The emperor's Praefectus Urbi was (or developed into) a new office; the older Praefectura, representing the Consuls in their absence at the feriae Latinae, continued to exist—Tiberius' son Drusus Caesar held it in A.D. 25 (Ann. 4, 36, 1), and Nero, before his accession, also (Suet. Nero 7, 2). Cf. Furneaux on Tacitus, l.c.

21, 3 ἑτέρος τε τις : Dio entitles this functionary ὑποτιμη-  
τής (B 5), which in Latin would be subcensor. Augustus did set up a triumviratum legendi senatus (Suet. DA 37; Dio 55, 13, 3 [A.D. 4]), and used Senatorial tresviri centuriis equitum recognoscendis (Suet., ibid.; EJ, no. 209—which adds 'censoria potestate'). The latter came to be replaced by the office a censibus, which supplied the emperor with



information for his recognitions: cf. Greenidge, RPL, pp. 403-4; Hammond, AM, p. 130.

Dio is therefore not referring to an existing office but putting forward an idea of his own. The title subcensor reflects the fact that by the end of the first century A.D. the Princeps himself effectively possessed perpetual censorial power (see 53, 17, 7 and n. ad loc.: below); but the proposal is clearly aimed at reducing the emperor's control over the Senate (cf. Millar, p. 113).

21, 8 στρατηγήσαντες κ.τ.λ.: Dio's proposals are now quite individual. These are (to paraphrase briefly):

(i) To each province two ex-Praetors, one fresh from office, and one ex-Consul should be sent, the latter as governor (§ 3); the ex-Praetors should each command a legion and share the civil administration and jurisdiction (§ 5), or, if there are few troops, the senior of the two should command them and at the same time administer the large cities, while his junior should have competence over 'all matters pertaining to persons of private life' (τὰ ἰδιωτικὰ πράγματα: Cary's version) and over the commissariat (§ 2).

(ii) The ex-Consul should be the judge of appeals, and also the judge in cases of disfranchisement or death (§ 3).

(iii) But the emperor must judge cases involving prominent persons or centurions (ibid.).

(iv) There should be at most two legions in each prov-

ince (§ 4).

(v) Italy beyond the hundredth milestone from Rome should be part of this system (§ 6).

The provincial organization of the early Empire (to deal with that first) was quite different—see 53, 13, 2-15, 1 and nn. below. But some of the scheme does reflect procedure in the provinces of Dio's time. Septimius Severus, for example, broke up Syria and Britain each into two provinces, also dividing their garrisons, so that none of the four areas held more than two legions (C A H, XII, 11 and 15). The Rhine provinces each had two legions after Trajan's time (cf. Marquardt, II, 451 n. 2). In the list of contemporary legions with their provinces which Dio later gives, no region appears with a larger number (55, 23-24, 4, with aid from C A H, XII, Index s.v. 'Legion'). No doubt Dio approved of an arrangement which diminished the danger of a rebellious subordinate gathering powerful forces to make an attempt on the throne—he had seen it happen. It may be observed how carefully the functions of governorship are divided between the three administrators in his scheme.

Under the Principate, the imperial governor of a province had the legionary commanders under his authority: cf. Furneaux, I, Introd. 118, 124; C A H, X, 216. In provinces where only one legion was garrisoned the governorship seems sometimes to have been separate from the direct command of the legion, but in other cases combined with it: the distinction may lie between those provinces normally reserved for ex-Consuls (thus Ser. Galba, as

Legatus of Tarraconensis, had T. Vinius as legatus of the Spanish legion: Suet. Galba 14, 2; CAH, X, 807, 811) and those given to ex-Praetors (e.g. Numidia after the age of Severus: CAH, XI, 482 f.; Millar, pp. 205-7: other exx., ILS 478; Birley in PBA, XXXIX [1953], p. 212; Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 15). The command of legions was given to men who held the Quaestorship, Praetorship or, in Dio's phrase, 'some other office between the two' (53, 15, 1). Imperial provinces were governed by ex-Praetors and ex-Consuls, and a hierarchy of praetorian and consular provinces developed (cf. CAH, X, 214-15; Syme, RR, pp. 326-30, 393; Birley, pp. 206, 209-13).

Dio's system is more uniform, and he applies it to all provinces. He obviously aims at the increase of Senators' activity—and the exclusion of Equites from the provincial government. His ideas on this point differ considerably from the practice of his day, for Septimius Severus had placed his three new legions, stationed in Italy and Mesopotamia, and the new province of Mesopotamia itself, under equestrian praefecti (as Egypt and its forces were from the earliest period of the Principate); moreover he continued the trend to replace Senatorial administrators with equestrian (CAH, XII, 25 ff.; Hammond, AM, pp. 131-32, 451). It is notable also that Dio advocates terms of three to five years (23, 2 below), whereas actual tenure in his time seems in general to have been shorter than three (Millar, p. 114).

23, 1 μισθόν : Information on governors' salaries is small.

Early in the third century A.D., the salary

offered to a Proconsul in lieu of actual governorship (of Africa, one of the two most distinguished provincial posts in the Empire) was one million sesterces (78, 22, 5 [428]; for this practice, cf. Tac. Agric. 42, 3). The salaries of procuratores in the early Empire ranged from sixty thousand to three hundred thousand sesterces—hence the titles sexagenarii etc. (cf. ILS 478 and nn. 3-5; the earliest ref. is Suet. D. Claud. 24, 1, to ducentarii; Marquardt, I, 557-58 and nn.; Pflaum, Procurateurs, Part II, chap. IV, pp. 210-96, and see also pp. 322-54). Some such reform was clearly necessary in order to check the scandalous speculation indulged in by numerous governors during the late Republic, and to recompense them for the relative infrequency of profits from military booty under the pax Romana. One million sesterces was the equivalent of the minimum Senatorial qualification (54, 17, 3 and n.: below). But if a Senator possessed an income of a million this of course meant he owned a far larger fortune than the minimum: Sherwin-White, who suggests an income of eight hundred thousand to a million per annum for Pliny the Younger, indicates that his fortune may have been not less than twelve or fifteen millions' (Letters, p. 149). A Senator even of considerable wealth could therefore benefit from the proconsular salary, while one of moderate means must have found it, and even lesser grades of pay, of substantial benefit. Extortion, however, did not die out in the Roman Empire.

25, 6 ὅστις δ' ἂν τῶν ἱππείων κτλ.: Cf. 54, 26, 5 and 30, 2; also

Suet. DA 40,1 for entry into the Senate of equites who had held the Tribune or Quaestorship. Dio does not, apparently, envisage entry by equites at an early age; or else he is concerned here only with those who have undertaken an equestrian career. The emperors used the grant of the latus clausus to enable suitable young men of the ordo equester to start on the cursus honorum (cf. pp. 42-43 above). It was also possible for equites to be brought into the Senate by the Princeps exercising censoria potestas: for example Vespasian and Titus, as Censors in 73, are said to have quintupled the number of Senatorial families (Aurel. Vict., Caesares 9, 9)—the increase may well be exaggerated, but the new Senatorial families can only have come from the equester ordo; just as this will have been the source of new members brought into the Senate by Augustus' lectiones.

The Praefecti Praetorio, who were often prime ministers in effect, became increasingly connected with the Senate. Seianus was given 'ornamenta praetoria' by Tiberius (Dio 57, 19, 7): cf. his later Consulship. Praetorian or consular insignia were similarly conferred on later Praefecti, who might be adlected to the Senate, as Plautianus by Severus (46, 46, 4), or admitted thereto on vacating the Praefectura—in fact promotion to the Senate became the regular method of dismissal (Hammond, A M, pp. 247 and 270 notes 23-24; also CAH, XII, 60-61; Mommsen, R Str, III 1, 508).

This proposal seems intended by Dio to compensate equites for their lack (under his system) of many of the functions which in actual fact they performed in imperial service. An eques,

having gone through a career as financial agent and perhaps as commander of the night-watch, administrator of the corn-supply or commander of the guard, could by this arrangement hope for a seat in the Senate and thus an opportunity to proceed to a provincial appointment. Graduation by equites into the ordo senatorius would also tend towards greater closeness between the two classes, thus recruiting equestrian energies for the government of the Empire while at the same time countering the growth of a separate and powerful equestris nobilitas.

ibid. λελοχαγότες τινές : Dio seems to refer to equestrian centurions (πλὴν τῶν ἐν τῷ τεταγμένῳ ἑστρατουμενων), who are found in the imperial armies (e.g. E J, no. 232; ILS 1332, 1372; cf. CAH, X, 226, and Syme, R R, p. 356). It was possible for such men to be promoted to the Senate: some may have been so advanced by Vespasian in 69 (see Tac. Hist. 2, 82, 2; cf. Suet. D. Vesp. 9, 2). It does not seem to have happened frequently: such equites would have been aiming at a military career, and, apart from extraordinary circumstances like Vespasian's rise in 69, would have little to draw them to the emperor's attention.

On the other hand, many centurions who had come up from the ranks were promoted to the equester ordo. This in fact became customary: for examples, E J, nos. 242-43, 245, 247; McCrum-Woodhead, no. 372; cf. CAH, X, 226. The sons of these men could become Senators, as did those of the tax-collector and moneylender Flavius Sabinus (Suet. D. Vesp. 1, 2-3).

In § 7 ('it is both a shame and a reproach that men ... who have carried faggots and charcoal should be found on the roll of the senate': Cary's version) Dio may have in mind the alleged practice of Caesar the Dictator and the Triumvirs (see 52, 42, 1 and notes).

26, 1 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα τρέπωνται: A reference to the iuuentus organization which provided upper-class youths in Italy with military exercise (Hammond in TAPA, LXIII [1932], p. 95; CAH, X, 462-64), and the entry of young laticlauii to military service itself (Suet. DA, 38, 2). Augustus' purpose was to provide future administrators of the empire with army as well as civilian experience.

+

31, 1 πρεσβείας : See n. on 53, 21, 6 (pp. 111 ff. below). The observation of Maecenas indicates no doubt Dio's Senatorial sympathies: 'it is both awe-inspiring and calculated to arouse comment for the impression to prevail that the senate has full authority in all matters' (trans. Cary: see above, p. 33). This was indeed the great fiction of the Principate. As Res Gestae asserts: 'rem publicam ex mea potestate in senat[us populique Rom]ani [a]rbitrium transtuli' (34, 1); according to the Fasti Praenestini for 13 January, 27 B.C., '[... quod rem publicam] p.R. restituit' (EJ, p. 45; cf. nos. 17-18). For the realistic view,

Dio's comment on the same event: 'in this way the power of people and senate passed entirely to Augustus, and from his time an undisputed monarchy was established' (53, 17, 1, cf. also p. 21 above; see also Tac. Ann. 1, 2-3; 9-10). 'The masters of the Roman world surrounded their throne with darkness, concealed their irresistible strength, and humbly professed themselves the accountable ministers of the senate, whose supreme decrees they dictated and obeyed' (Gibbon, chap. 3).

31, 2 πάντα τὰ νομοθετούμενα δι' αὐτῶν ποιῆ : Another proposal benefiting the Senate. Augustus did not use the Senate for legislation: note RG 6, 2 '[quae tum per me geri senatus] u[oluit, per trib[un]ici[a]m p[ro]testatem perfeci]', and the titles of the laws passed during his Principate—for example Lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus, Lex Aelia Sentia, Lex Papia Poppaea etc., indicating passage by the popular assembly. But the Senate did become a source of law as its resolutions became so looked upon by jurists. The earliest known senatus consultum which came to have legislative force is the S.C. Silanianum of A.D. 10, on the punishment of slaves if their master was murdered (CAH, X, 166; and for other Julio-Claudian examples, Hammond, A Pr, p. 157). These Senatusconsulta were technically advice to Praetors to make changes in their edicts (Hammond, *ibid.*).

At the same time there grew up the legislative competence of the Princeps, through edicta (decrees), mandata or instructions



to his officials, decreta or judicial decisions, and rescripta (replies to petitions). From the earliest times these constitutiones (their generic name) created precedents (Hammond, A Pr, pp. 160 ff.; A M, pp. 338-39). The imperial power to create law came to overshadow senatus consulta, especially under and after Septimius Severus—which may add to point to Dio's present recommendation (see CAH, XII, 29).

31, 3 ἂν τοὺς τε βουλευτὰς κ.τ.λ.: Dio is having Maecenas inculcate as an act of policy a practice that grew up gradually; see n. to 53, 21, 6.

31, 5 ὅτι τις ἐλοιδορήσῃ σε κ.τ.λ.: Such testimony as there is suggests Augustus was tolerant of libel and invective, cf. Dio 56, 43, 4 'καὶ τοῖς λυπήσασί τι αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀκρατῶς ὠργίζετο', and also 55, 4, 3 (a story of his composure in the face of πολλή παρρησία); Suet. DA 51; 54-55. In a letter to Tiberius, quoted by the biographer, the emperor advises: 'noli in hac re indulgere et nimium indignari quemquam esse qui de me male loquatur; satis est enim si hoc habemus, ne quis nobis male facere possit' (DA 51, 3). Libels against others, however, might be punished: Dio 56, 27, 1 (cf. Tac. Ann. 1, 72).

31, 9 ἂν δὲ δὴ τις ἐπιβουλεύειν σοι αἰτίαν λάβῃ κ.τ.λ.: There were conspiracies under Augustus—discovered or alleged: Lepidus the younger in 30

B.C. (Appian, Bell. Ciu. 4, 50; Vell. 2, 88, 1; Dio 54, 15, 4), Varro Murena and Fannius Caepio (23 or 22 B.C.: Vell. 2, 91; Dio 54, 3—the date is disputed, cf. CAH, X, 136: K.M.T. Atkinson in Historia, IX [1960], pp. 440-73, argues for 22, but the arguments for 23, particularly the identification of Murena with the cos. ord. of that year<sup>1</sup> and questions of chronology, as propounded by Stockton in Historia XIV [1965], pp. 18-40, still seem more convincing), M. Egnatius Rufus in 19 (Vell. 2, 91-92), Cornelius Cinna in A.D. 2 (Dio 55, 14, 1; cf. Syme, RR, p. 414). These conspiracies and others are briefly indicated in Suet. DA 19.

In fact most of these were not dealt with before the Senate. Lepidus had been executed by Maecenas, Octavian's agent in Italy. Murena and Caepio were condemned by the verdict of the public quaestio, Tiberius being the prosecutor (Suet. Tib. 8). Cinna (as the edifying story went) was dissuaded by Augustus; whether Egnatius was condemned or not Velleius fails to say, and the judicial treatment of the other plotters mentioned by Suetonius is unknown. The case of C. Cornelius Gallus, the first Praefectus Aegypti, is rather different: on his fall from favour in 26 B.C. the Senate took a hand by voting that he be condemned and lose his property, but it is significant that the condemnation was to take place 'in the courts' ('ἀλῶναί τε αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις... ἐψηφίσατο' : Dio 53, 23, 7). The jurisdiction of the Senate

---

<sup>1</sup> Dio calls him Licinius M. (l.c.) but his sister, whose name was Terentia, was married to Maecenas (ibid. 5); Suetonius calls him Varro M. (DA 19, 1), and Tacitus refers to the execution of 'Varrones' (Ann. 7, 10, 4). The Consul of 23, as recorded on-

is discussed below, n. to 53, 21, 6.

In having Maecenas advise against the emperor judging in person on charges of conspiracy, Dio is stating a principle of great importance to Senators, sometimes violated by the autocrat—Claudius' secret trials had been dreaded (cf. Tac. Ann. 13, 4, 2; for an example, 11, 2, 1 ff.: the trial of Valerius Asiaticus—'neque data senatus copia: intra cubiculum auditur'), and in Dio's lifetime the Praefectus Praetorio, Fulvius Plautianus, was summarily executed in the Palace (76, 4, 3-5 [359-60]), favourite though he had been like Gallus and Seianus.

32, 2 ὅταν δὲ κατηγορηταί τις αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. : A highly partial arrangement that does not, however, appear to have been followed in actual trials (thus it tells against the theory of the speech proposed by Hammond: cf. p. 99 of his art.). For example, Tacitus, who did not hold the Consulship until 97 (Pliny, Epist. 2, 1, 6; cf. Sherwin-White ad loc., p. 144), took part in the condemnation of an ex-Consul, Helvidius Priscus (Consul before 87: see McCrum-Woodhead, p. 11): Agric. 42.

33, 1 δίκαιε δὲ καὶ αὐτός : The Princeps did exercise jurisdiction, arising partly out of

---

ly in the Fasti Capit., was 'A. T[erentius A.f. ? n. Var]ro Murena' (E J., p. 36). Velleius gives 'L. Murena' but this cannot determine the gentilicium. Syme suggests the full name was A. Terentius Varro Licinius Murena (R R., p. 325, n. 5, on p. 326).

his imperium proconsulare, partly perhaps out of the imperium consulare (assuming this was granted to him from 19 B.C.: see n. on 54, 13, 1 below), partly perhaps (as suggested by Jones, Studies, pp. 88 ff.) by law, or else through a gradual widening of the executive power, in the cognitio (cf. Hammond, A Pr, p. 181; Marsh, pp. 123-24). Anecdotes in Suetonius suggest that Augustus exercised criminal jurisdiction (DA 33; 51); a story in Dio involving Maecenas would then accord him capital jurisdiction earlier than 8 B.C. (54, 7, 2). Serious cases involving Senators and E- quites, however, and their relatives, tended in the early Prin- cipate to come before the public courts or (increasingly) the Senate: see n. on 53, 21, 6 below.

33, 4 τὰς γνώμας αὐτῶν κατὰ: For a related observation cf. Cn.

Piso to Tiberius: 'quo loco cen- sebis, Caesar? si primus, habeo quod sequar; si post omnis, ue- reor ne imprudens dissentiam' (Tac. Ann. 1, 74, 5).

Augustus did not usually act as Maecenas-Dio here advises, but in A.D. 6 something of the kind did happen when he wanted suggestions for raising money to finance the aerarium militare (55, 25, 4). Suetonius reports his usual practice: 'sententias de maiore negotio non more atque ordine, sed prout libuisset per- rogabat, ut perinde quisque animum intenderent ac si censendum magis quam adsentiendum esset' (DA 35, 4). Dio says he asked most Senators their opinion in the regular order, but called at random on the ex-Consuls; except that Lepidus the former Trium-

vir was always called on last of that group (54, 15, 5-6; cf. 55, 34, 1). For Tiberius' practice of casting his vote sometimes among the first, sometimes among the later voters: Dio 57, 7, 3-5.

## CHAPTER TWO

52, 42, 1 μετὰ ταῦτα: The date is 29 B.C., cf. 41, 3 'ἐν τῷ ᾧ ἔτει  
ἐκείνῳ ἐν ᾧ τὸ πέμπτον ὑπάτευσεν' ; 53,  
1, 1 'τῷ δὲ ἐξῆς ἔτει ἔκτον ὁ Καῖσαρ ἤρξε' (i.e. 28: cf. Fasti in EJ,  
p. 35).

ibid. τιμήτευσας σὺν τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ . . . τὴν βουλὴν ἐξήτασε : The  
precise  
meaning of τιμήτευσας here is hard to decide. If rendered  
'holding the Censorship' it accuses Dio of error (which is possi-  
ble); Holmes suggested 'exercising censorial power' (Arch., I,  
262) and this is quite likely, for Dio tends to describe things  
as they were in practice, rather than as they were technically  
(cf. p. 19 above; Millar, pp. 92-93)—and to all intents the two  
Consuls were acting as Censors in 29 B.C.

Under date 28 the Fasti Venusini state that Octavian and  
Agrippa (who were Consuls in that year also) 'censoria potest[ate]  
lustrum fecer[unt]'. Dio reports the Senatorial lectio under  
29, but clearly it may very well have formed part of the same  
censorial activity: which, likely enough, began in 29 and was  
completed the following year (so Astin in Latomus, XXII [1963],  
p. 231, n. 1).

Augustus himself does not mention any use of censoria

potestas (RG 8, 2). Since his words are 'in consulatu sexto censum populi conlega M. Agrippa egi. lustrum ... feci', and since he then records two further censuses and closings of the lustrum 'consulari cum imperio' (ibid. 3-4), he seems to intend the reader to conclude that his Consulship empowered him to close the lustrum, after also carrying out the census, in 28. This appears to contradict both the Fasti Venusini and Dio.

The Consuls had, however, been the original holders of the census (Mommsen, R Str, II 1, 334; cf. 334-38); and in recent years Consuls had performed certain censorial duties, for example as signing contracts (in 80 and 75 B.C.: Cic. Verrines 1, 50, 130; 3, 7, 18, cited by Mommsen, p. 336 n. 4). It would therefore be legal for Consuls to hold a census, a Senate revision and the lustrum. But in view of the long desuetude of these functions as part of the Consular office, it seems reasonable that some form of public proclamation may have been made, to assure Romans that censorial power did lie in the highest magistracy. Such an announcement could without much difficulty (especially after some time had passed) produce the impression that censoria potestas had been specially granted or assumed: thus accounting for the statements of the Fasti Venusini and of Dio's source or sources. See further the discussion in the note on 54, 13, 1.

Dio's rough figure for the unrevised Senate (ἐς χιλίους) is matched by Suetonius' ('super mille': DA 35, 1). The usual number after the time of Sulla was six hundred, but accretions under the Dictator Caesar and the Triumvirs had inflated the number

—principally (according to hostile propaganda) with desperadoes and upstarts. The Triumvirs, Dio says, had enrolled 'not merely a great number of allies, together with soldiers and freed slaves' sons—they enrolled slaves and all' (48, 34, 4). There were similar stories about Caesar (as Dio 43, 47, 1; Suet. D. Iul. 76; 80). Caesar at least was given a bad press on this point (cf. Syme in JRS, XXVII, [1937], pp. 127-32; also in BSR Papers, XIV, [1938], pp. 12-18 esp.; and RR, chap. VI). Dio's reference here to 'many cavalrymen and many infantrymen' may well mean, in fact, equites Romani and ex-centurions respectively (note Syme in JRS, XXVII, pp. 128-29), though he himself may not have properly understood his source (Sattler, p. 32). There was no doubt considerable prejudice against some of these persons both by Senators of aristocratic family and by outsiders (cf. the popular jokes about Caesar's appointees: Suet. D. Iul. 80). More to the point, a good number of the Senate had followed Antonius in the recent conflict: Augustus records over seven hundred on his side (RG 25, 3), but in 29 there were a good thousand Senators in all.

The motives of Octavian in holding the lectio will thus have been political—to conciliate the aristocracy and those with aristocratic sympathies, presumably by bearing down on the most unpopular members of the Senate, and to remove some unwanted ex-adversaries. Identities of those persuaded or pressured into retirement are not attested. But some Antonians disappear from history, like M. Insteius and Q. Nasidius, and may have been among the hundred and ninety (Syme, RR, p. 350 n. 1; cf. BSR Papers,



XIV, p. 27).

42, 3 Κύντιον Στατίλιον...τῆς δημαρχίας...εἶρξεν : Not much is known of this episode. Was it an exercise of tribunician intercessio by Octavian?

This would mean that he possessed tribunicia potestas already, as Dio appears to report under the year 30 B.C. —supposedly a grant for life (51, 19, 6). Other ancient writers put the life grant of this power in 36 B.C. (Appian Bell. Ciu. 5, 117, 485; Orosius 6, 18, 34: both cited by Holmes, Arch., I, 221, nn. 9, 10), where Dio only mentions the grant of sacrosanctitas (49, 15, 5-6). Dio himself repeats the permanent grant to Augustus under date 23; it is from this date that Augustus subsequently reckoned his tenure (e.g. RG 4, 4); the power was therefore most probably conferred in that year (53, 32, 5-6). If Octavian's powers were increased at all in 30 B.C. (and to be precise, Dio records not the acceptance, merely the offer), it was probably by the addition of the rights Dio also mentions in the same passage: the ius auxilii of a Tribune (the historian errs in saying that an ordinary Tribune could not exercise this ius between the City and the first milestone outside: cf. Livy 3, 20, 7 referred to by Cary ad loc. [VI, 54]; Hammond, A Pr, p. 82), and the ψήφος Ἀθηναίων, which Jones suggests was 'the power to vote acquittal when the jury in a quaestio condemned' (Studies, p. 95). In this case Dio may have misunderstood the source he drew upon—or the tribunicia potestas was one of the few honours Octavian, according

to Dio, did refuse in 30 (51, 20, 4).

There were, of course, other ways to block a man from office—and Octavian at this time was 'potitus rerum omnium' (RG 34, 1). If a simple order to step down was not effective, a declaration of 'uitio creatus' might serve; or even the precedent of deposition by vote of the Assembly, set by Ti. Gracchus in deposing Octavius in 133. But these would be extreme measures to take against an otherwise unknown figure, as Statilius is to us: it implies fear, or offense taken. There may be a simpler explanation. The Statilii Tauri of Lucania were Caesarian (cf. Syme, RR, pp. 237, 382). In 30, acting under the Lex Saenia empowering him to create new patrician families, Octavian so honoured the Statilii (on creation of new patricians: RG 8, 1; Tac. Ann. 11, 25, 2; Dio 52, 42, 5; de Laet, De Samenstelling van den rom-einschen Senaat ..., no. 356). Although all other known Statilii of the early Empire have the praenomen Titus (cf. de Laet, nos. 357-60, 788, 791), it is not impossible for the Tribune-elect Q. Statilius to have been a member of the gens, shared in the elevation to the patriciate and thus been unable to hold the Tribunate. It is curious that, if this was the case, what would have been an honour for the recipient should be so misinterpreted by later writers as to produce the account Dio gives here.

42, 4 Κλούουιον . . . καὶ Φούρνιον Γάϊους : Cluvius is unknown, as  
also whether he was an  
enemy of Octavian like Furnius and for this reason failed to hold

his Consulship (cf. Sattler, p. 33; PIR<sup>2</sup>, C 1204). C. Furnius was an Antonian (cf. Dio 48, 13, 6; 49, 17, 5 for earlier activity); the intervention of his son saved his life after Actium. That this pair had been kept out of their Consulships may indicate they had been consules designati for part of 31 or a later year. This is suggested by the fact that both Consuls of 32, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus and C. Sosius, were avowed Antonians who joined their leader when the crisis came (50, 2, 6)—but they had not been kept from office because of their opposition to Octavian, as Furnius and (it may be) Cluvius appear to have been. In 31 Octavian and Messalla Corvinus the converted Republican were Consuls, followed by the suffecti M. Titius and Cn. Pompeius (a descendant of Sulla: de Laet, no. 295); in 30 Octavian held the office again, this time with M. Crassus (a timely defector from Antonius: cf. Dio 51, 4, 3; Syme, R R, p. 296); with C. Antistius Vetus, M. Cicero (cf. 51, 19, 4) and L. Saenius for suffecti—safe men, no doubt. Furnius and Cluvius perhaps were suspected.

Thus the honour now paid to these men is an indication of the policy Octavian adopted as soon as the tensions of civil war were relaxed—an attempt to secure the fullest possible entente with the Senate, which was indispensable for the maintenance of the Republican framework (or façade) of government. It was not to reach complete success for some years, with the elevation first of L. Piso and then of L. Sestius to the Consulship of 23 marking the finally achieved goal: cf. below, 53, 32, 5 and n. As Sen-

eca pointed out to the young Nero: 'ignouit abauus tuus uictis; nam si non ignouisset, quibus imperasset? Sallustium et Cocceios et Deillios et totam cohortem primae admissionis ex aduersariorum castris conscripsit; iam Domitios, Messallas, Asinios, Cicerones, quidquid floris erat in ciuitate, clementiae suae debebat' (de Clementia 1, 10).

42, 5 τό τε τῶν εὐπατριδῶν γένος συνεπλήθυσεν : This was done, Augustus says, 'iussu populi et senatus' (RG 8, 1). He was empowered by a law carried in 30 by one of the Consuls (Ann. 11, 25, 2; cf. last note, and also that to § 3 above). Among the new patricians (sixty-two of whom are known) were the Iunii Silani, the Appuleii (closely connected with the Princeps by the marriage of Sex. Appuleius [de Laet, no. 36] to his half-sister Octavia [cf. Table III in Syme, RR, at end]), the Statilii Tauri (see n. to § 3 above) and the Calpurnii Pisones (complete list in de Laet, p. 224). The patronage value of the Lex Saenia was obvious, particularly to the leader of a numerous and successful faction.

42, 6 προσάπειπε πᾶσι τοῖς βουλευούσι μὴ ἐκδημεῖν ἔξω τῆς Ἰταλίας:

A regulation perhaps laid down in a senatus consultum (cf. CAH, X, 123, n. 1). One reason may have been to ensure greater attendance at meetings of the Senate. This will not have been the only cause. Dio follows up with a description of the fears many former Antonians continued to have of Octavian—in the aftermath of a civil war, the victor's relations with men of position

would be delicate, as the affair of M. Crassus' claim to spolia opima and the title imperator showed not long after (cf. Syme, R R, pp. 308-9). Octavian probably found it expedient therefore to reaffirm the rule, which had existed in Republican times (as a passage in Suetonius shows: Caesar 'sanxit, ne ... qui senatoris filius nisi contubernalis aut comes magistratus peregre proficisceretur': D. Iul. 42, 1. See Mommsen, R Str, III 1, 912-13). If Dio is being precise here, permission in future appears to have lain with the Princeps. On the other hand, he may again be recounting what took place in fact, though technically it may well have continued to be given by the Senate.

### CHAPTER THREE

THIS chapter will treat Dio's description of the system of provincial governorships, in 53, 11-15.

53, 11, 1 ὀλίγοι : In 2, 7 of this book Dio relates that Octavian addressed the Senate 'τοὺς μάλιστα ἐπιτηδεύουσας οἱ τῶν βουλευτῶν παρασκευάσας; those persons would be the 'few' here mentioned (cf., e.g., Sattler, pp. 36-37). Obviously Octavian could not leave this important political move to chance, particularly as not merely a simple confirmation of his position was needed, but also (and more importantly, given the evident fact that he did not really intend to surrender power—cf. § 5) a detailed regularization of it. Dio's rhetorical and heavily antithetic description of the scene (§ 1 οἱ μὲν...οἱ δέ...; 2 οἱ μὲν...οἱ δέ... [twice], τοῖς μὲν παθήμασι...τοῖς δὲ ἐπινοήμασιν...; 3 οὐθ' οἱ βουλόμενοι...οὐθ' οἱ ἕτεροι..., etc.) may telescope into one session the reactions of several days or weeks, as rumours (and perhaps calculated 'leaks') spread about Octavian's intentions.

The significance of this event—which took place on 13 January, 27 B.C. (cf. E J, Fasti Praenestini, p. 45)—in Dio's eyes is clear: the monarchy was formally begun. Hence the extended discussion that follows on the principal points of that system; the adoption of the name Augustus (on 16 January: cf. E J, p. 45) is recorded when the historian begins to discuss the emperor's own

titles and powers (16, 6), and the regular narrative is not resumed until 53, 20. Dio's judgment is sound. At the close of the year 28 Octavian had, indeed, acknowledged the end of the civil wars by his decree annulling the illegalities of the Triumviral period (53, 2, 5; cf. Sattler's comments, p. 35); he repeated the theme in his speech to the Senate (53, 3-10); and at the beginning of his sixth Consulship he had reduced his Lictors from twenty-four (the number apparently granted him when Triumvir) to twelve, the same total as his colleague Agrippa possessed (53, 1, 1; Mommsen, R Str., I, 387 and n. 5; cf. ibid., pp. 37-40). Yet he was confirmed in power and the political arrangements laid down, 'quis pace et principe uteremur' (Ann. 3, 28, 2). The crisis of 23 altered theory, not practice, by bringing into prominence the tribunicia potestas, 'summi fastigii uocabulum'; similarly the possible grant of consulare imperium in 19. The significance of 27 was that Octavian altered his hitherto extraordinary position to one recognized by Senate and People—without surrendering control.

Dio's picture of the Senate's reaction to the speech of Octavian is probably accurate, all the same. It is likely that many Senators did fear the 'Leader's' relinquishing power like Sulla: for a crowd of marshals stood behind him—Agrippa, Taurus, Cornelius Gallus, L. Arruntius, Calvisius Sabinus and others. It is also likely that many would have been glad of it. If nearly two hundred Antonians had been removed in 29 (and not all the dismissed need have been such) nonetheless over a hundred would re-

main [cf. n. on 52, 42, 1, p. 67 above]; and there were also Republicans like Pollio (for whose sympathies see esp. Cic. ad Fam. 10, 31, 2-3; Tac. Ann. 4, 34, 4; Syme, R R, pp. 5-6, 482-85) and Antistius Labeo (Ann. 3, 75; Dio 54, 15, 7-8; Syme, p. 482). But on the whole Octavian had a tame Senate (§ 4). For its honorific replies to his offer, see RG 34, 2; E J, p. 45, under 16 Jan.; nos. 22, 24-25; cf. above, Introd., pp. 24-25.

11, 5 διπλάσιον τὸν μισθόν: According to Tacitus, a Praetorian soldier was paid thirty-two asses (two denarii) a day, an ordinary legionarius ten (Ann. 1, 17, 6). This ratio (more than three to one) is higher than that voted by the Senate, but in the early years of the regime the levels of A.D. 14 may not have been attained: Augustus seems to have reorganized the terms of army service in 13 B.C. (though Dio speaks only of the period of service and the discharge praemia: 54, 25, 5-6), and to have modified them in A.D. 5 (55, 23, 1; cf. CAH, X, 221).

The ten asses mentioned by Tacitus may have some relation to the statement of the Elder Pliny on the denarius: 'Q. Fabio Maximo dictatore asses unciales facti: placuitque denarium sedecim assibus permutari ... in militari tamen stipendio semper denarius pro decem assibus datus' (Nat. His. 33, 3, 45). One explanation of this is that 'after the time of the Gracchi the military currency had only 10 asses to the denarius whereas everyone else counted 16' (Watson in Historia, VII [1958], 117; cf. Fur-



neaux on Tac., loc. cit. [I, 207-8]), but Watson proposes a simpler: that 'in cases where the complete rate had been less than a complete denarius (= 10 asses) payment continued to be made in asses, and their number was unchanged; where, however, the daily rate had been a denarius (= 10 asses), or more, payment continued to be made in denarii, and their number also was unchanged. Pliny's words then mean that those who had received 10 asses a day continued to receive a denarius, even though that denarius was now worth 16 asses'; however those soldiers whose daily pay was raised to ten asses by Caesar (Suet. D. Iul. 26, 3: 'stipendium ... duplicavit') did not thereupon receive a denarius—the mutinous troops in A.D. 14 demanded 'ut singulos denarios mererent' (Ann. 1, 17, 5; cf. 26, 1). This would have restored the proportion mentioned here by Dio, for the Praetorian soldier earned twice this sum.

Octavian had had praetoriae cohortes in the civil wars, some of whom he settled in colonies after Actium, while retaining others in service; these became the bodyguard of imperial times. See Pauly-Wissowa, XXII 2, 1613.

12, 1 τὴν μὲν φροντίδα τὴν τε προστασίαν τῶν κοινῶν : Sattler (pp. 40-41) suggests that this translates 'curam principatumque rei publicae suscepit'; possibly, that is, the words of a source used by Dio. The phrase may even go back to Caesarian propaganda; cf. Horace's flattery:

cum tot sustineas et tanta negotia solus,

res Italas armis tuteris, moribus ornes,  
legibus emendes, in publica commoda peccem  
si longo sermone morer tua tempora, Caesar

(Epist. 2, 1, 1-4).

12, 2 τὰ μὲν ἀσθενέστερα κ.τ.λ. : Cf. Suet. DA 47, 1, 'prouincias ualidiores et quas annuis magistratuum imperiis regi nec facile nec tutum erat, ipse suscepit, ceteras proconsulibus sortito permisit.' Dio is not quite accurate (nor Suetonius)—Africa, Macedonia and Illyricum (called Dalmatia in Dio's list) did not cease to hold armies in 27. The force in Africa (one legion, III Augusta, after A.D. 6, though possibly more in earlier years, cf. CAH, X, 347) remained until A.D. 40 under the Proconsul (59, 20, 7; CAH, X, 658). In Illyricum and Macedonia, armed formations are found early in the Principate: Lollius was active in Macedonia c. 19-18 B.C. (54, 20, 3), M. Vinicius in Illyricum c. 14 (Vell. 2, 96, 2; cf. Syme, R R, pp. 328-30). But Illyricum was handed over to the Princeps about 11 B.C. (Dio 54, 34, 4), and Macedonia lost its army sometime during the Principate of Augustus to the province of Moesia (cf. CAH, X, 358, 367-68). Under Tiberius, Macedonia became an imperial province, which it remained until Claudius (Ann. 1, 76, 2—A.D. 15; Dio 60, 24, 1—A.D. 44; Suet. D. Claud. 25, 3).

The territory of Baetica may not have been given to the Senate in 27, but c. 13 on Augustus' second visit, after its final pacification (CAH, X, 211, 345; Syme, R R, pp. 326, n. 1, 395 and n. 1; for a suggested explanation, Salmon in Historia V [19-

56], p. 467). Certain other provinces were later handed over to the Senate, as Dio says (§ 7)—Gallia Narbonensis and Cyprus (22 B.C.: 54, 4, 1). At the same time the Princeps might take over a Senatorial province: observe Macedonia-Achaea (Tac. Ann. 1, 76, 2), and the case of Sardinia, administered by the emperor after A.D. 6 through an equestrian governor (Dio 55, 28, 1; cf. Koester on Tac. Ann. 2, 85, 4) until 66 (after a brief Senatorial period it was resumed by Vespasian: CAH, XI, 14-15).

The armed public provinces, with five or six legions, were weak compared to the more than twenty controlled by Augustus (cf. Syme, RR, pp. 326, 328). Dio's general meaning is therefore correct even for 27 B.C., and still more for the last part of Augustus' reign, when only Africa's single legion remained to the Senate.

Egypt (it should be added) was outside the ordinary system of principal governorships which Dio is shortly to describe. Cf. § 7 and ch. 13, 2. He briefly treats that province's position in 51, 17, 1-2: Augustus entrusted it to Cornelius Gallus, an eques (cf. 53, 13, 2) and forbade Senators to sojourn there without his permission. This ban also covered equites inlustres (Ann. 2, 59, 3). Legions in Egypt were commanded by equites with the rank of praefectus castrorum (ILS 2394, 2615; Marquardt, I, 443). The reasons for the exclusion are stated by Tacitus: 'nam Augustus inter alia dominationis arcana, ... seposuit Aegyptum, ne fame urgeret Italiam quisquis eam prouinciam claustraque terrae ac maris quamuis leui praesidio aduersum ingentes exercitus

insedisset' (loc. cit.; similar reasons given in Hist. 1, 11, 1). How this was done is not clear. Imperial permission, as perhaps with Senators wishing to leave Italy (cf. p. 72), may have been required de facto rather than de iure; but the language of Tacitus in a later passage ('nam diuus Augustus apud equites, qui Aegypto praesiderent, lege agi decretaque eorum proinde haberi iusserat, ac si magistratus Romani constituissent': Ann. 12, 60, 2) suggests that the powers and position of the Praefectus were laid down by lex (senatus consulta had not yet legislative force: cf. n. to 52, 31, 2), which, if there was one, may at the same time have granted control over Senators' and leading Equites' visits to the emperor. On the Praefectus Aegypti's position, cf. Marquardt, I, 442-43; O.W. Reinmuth, The Prefect of Egypt ..., pp. 1-10; on the relation of Egypt to the rest of the Empire, CAH, X, 284-85.

12, 8 καὶ συνδύο καὶ συντρία : Several examples may be found in the time of Augustus, especially Gallia Comata, governed by members of the imperial family such as Drusus, Tiberius and Germanicus, also by Lollius and Quintilius Varus. Agrippa in the East, from 23 to 21 and again 17 to 13 B.C., may have held a similar position (CAH, X, 214-15; cf. Marquardt, I, 267-68, 417 and n. 4). A later instance is Corbulo, who amassed provinces—Cappadocia and Galatia from A.D. 55, in addition Syria from 60, and Cappadocia-Galatia again after the débâcle of Paetus (Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 84; CAH, X, 758-59,

765, 771; cf. Marquardt, I, 361-62). The reasons for this, as the examples show, were mainly military.

12, 9 ἡ αὐτόνομα ἀφιεῖτο ἢ καὶ βασιλείαις τοῖν ἐπετέτραπτο : In the

Roman Empire there were many 'autonomous' areas, principally in the East, whose relation to Rome corresponded somewhat to that of the Italian allied states before the Social War (Marquardt, I, 74). (That Dio refers mainly to autonomous regions within the Empire is shown by the preceding clause: '[τὰ δὲ,] εἰ καὶ τότε ἡδη ἔκεχεῖρωτο, ἀλλ' οὐτι γε καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἤρχετο, ἀλλ' ἡ αὐτόνομα' κ.τ.λ.) An autonomous city might be 'sine foedere immunis et libera', or it might be 'foederata'. In the latter case it possessed privileges, such as its own courts, and freedom from tribute, guaranteed by treaty; in the former, the privileges were the grant of the Roman People (and may not have extended to immunity from taxation) —and therefore were revocable: Cyzicus, to give an instance, lost hers from 20 to 15 B.C. (54, 7, 6 and 23, 7).

Among ciuitates foederatae were Massilia, Athens, Rhodes, and Tyre; among immunes et liberae, Utica and six other African towns, Chios, Smyrna, Ephesus and Seleuceia in Syria. These two categories constituted the highest relationship for non-citizen communities to Rome, though later on their value was diminished by the rise of the status of colonia and municipium (Marquardt, I, 71-80; Stevenson, Roman Prov. Admin., pp. 163-65; CAH, X, 453-56).

In 27 B.C. there were several dependent kingdoms on the

borders of the Empire—Galatia, Cappadocia, Commagene, Pontus, Judaea, Thrace, Bosphorus, Noricum and others (e.g. Paphlagonia, and the Syrian principalities, on which see Marquardt, I, 400, or CAH, X, 281). In the year 25 Augustus re-established the realm of Mauretania under Juba II (53, 26, 4); other Oriental arrangements are recorded in 20 B.C. (54, 9, 2-3). Kingdoms such as these provided the Empire with buffer zones, and also relieved the Roman government of administering areas insufficiently romanized or hellenized. It was increasingly usual, however, to reduce their number as time passed by incorporating them into the Empire: as early as 25 Galatia was acquired, on the death of its ruler Amyntas (53, 26, 3). Noricum was annexed in 15 as part of the drive to the upper Danube (Strabo 4, 206, cited in CAH, X, 348 n. 2; Dio 54, 20, 2 gives 16 as the date). The principal part of Judaea, governed from 4 B.C. by Archelaus son of Herod, was placed under a Praefectus in A.D. 6 (cf. Marquardt, I, 408-10; also n. to 53, 21, 4 below; for the title, see n. to 13, 6 ἐπὶ πλείω καὶ ἑνιαυτοῦ χρόνον, below). Tiberius annexed Cappadocia and Commagene in A.D. 18 (Tac. Ann. 2, 56, 4-5). The other dependent realms were absorbed by later emperors, except for the Bosporan which, though (it would seem) annexed by Nero, soon recovered its autonomy: CAH, X, 775-76; Stevenson, Roman Prov. Admin., p. 51.

Rather apart from these were such lands as Britain and Armenia in the early Principate. Britain remained in close contact with the Continent until its conquest, but was hardly subservient (cf. CAH, X, 791 ff.). On the other side of the Empire,

Rome's attempts to reduce Armenia to client status, and the varying results that ensued, occupy much of the foreign policy of the first century A.D. The shortlived subjection of Germany also involved dependency rather than direct Roman rule: Varus to be sure is recorded as holding assizes (Vell. 2, 117, 4), but it is unlikely that Roman methods of taxation had been introduced, and the tribes continued to be headed by their own chieftains as socii of Rome (C A H, X, 373-74; Tac. Ann. 1, 57, 5-58, 1; Dio 56, 19, 4, mentioning τὰ συμμαχικά ).

ibid. τῷ ἀεὶ κρατοῦντι κ.τ.λ.: Thus, under Augustus, the provinces of Egypt, Galatia, Raetia, Noricum, Pannonia, Illyricum, Moesia, Alpes Maritimae and Cottiae, and Judaea; notable examples in later reigns were Britain, Dacia and Mesopotamia (this last in Dio's lifetime: see his strictures, 75, 3, 2-3 [340]).

53, 13-15 In these chapters Dio describes the governors of provinces, giving more information in fact on those of the public, or Senatorial, provinces than those of the imperial (who are treated only in 13, 5-14, 1, and 15, 1): an indication perhaps of his Senatorial feeling. His treatment covers the entire period up to his own day (note the many present or perfect tenses of verbs, e.g. in 13, 7-8; 14, 3-15, 5). This is usually a serviceable method—many of the arrangements of the Augustan system continued to exist in the early third century—but on occasion it can cause difficulty. Note, as an example, 13, 2-4:

after mentioning the appointment of an eques to govern Egypt, he relates that Augustus 'next' (ἐπειτα) laid down various rules for Senatorial governorships—and he includes mention of provisions of the marriage laws bearing on the topic (yet these were nonexistent so early as 27) and of 'men ranking as ex-Praetors' (on whom see the note ad loc.). Another instance is 14, 1, a reference to men who held provincial commands while occupying the office of Praetor or Consul. This is not, perhaps, meant to include Augustus (observe the use of ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ rather than ὁ Αὐγουστος or ὁ Καῖσαρ), though Dio's placing of the statement makes this highly unclear—and he himself may not have been sure whether there were Augustan instances or not. On these passages cf. Millar, pp. 94-95.

Despite such drawbacks, Dio's account is valuable, for it is a continuous description of the system by a man who had experience of it. His opinion of the Augustan arrangement (12, 2-3) is more cynical, and realistic, than Suetonius' or Strabo's: the former's explanation seems to put it down to concern for the public weal (see his remark, p. 77 above), and so does the geographer—Augustus wished to take on the more troublesome and difficult provinces (17, 840), presumably to save the Senate labour and worry. Dio mentions this view with the qualification λόγῳ μὲν, and crushes it with an immediate ἔργῳ δέ—the emperor meant himself to be the only armed power, and all others to be helpless.

13, 1 ἐς δέκα ἔτη : Cf. below: 'on the expiry of the ten-year



period a further five years, then five more, and after that ten, and yet another ten were five times voted to him, so that by the succession of ten-year periods he was sole ruler for life' (16, 2). This would seem to be contradicted by the report of the arrangements of 23 B.C.: 'ἡ γερουσία... αὐτὸν... τὴν... ἀρχὴν τὴν ἀνδύπατον ἑσσεὶ καθάπαξ ἔχειν[ἔψηφίσαντο]' (32, 5). But elsewhere Dio continues to register renewals of the imperium (54, 12, 4-5; 55, 6, 1; 12, 3; 56, 28, 1). The statement in 32, 5 must thus be a slipshod way of conveying that, in practice, Augustus never ceased to hold imperium (cf. Chilver in Historia I [1950], p. 429). The reason for a limited term is clear. A lifetime Proconsulship came too close to the appearance of monarchy to be acceptable to Roman tradition or to chime with the 'restoration of the Republic'. We may note Octavian's promise to hand over his provinces to the Senate within a shorter time than that allotted, if they were pacified (much the same promise was repeated in 18: 54, 12, 5). Caesar the Dictator had alienated feeling with his excessive honours, among them 'continuum consulatum, perpetuam dictaturam' (Suet. D. Iul. 76, 1).

Theoretically, therefore, the Senate and People could refuse to renew Octavian's imperium on its periodic expiry. In fact this was not (and would not be) done. By A.D. 14 the perpetuation of the emperor's imperium was so well established in everybody's mind that Tiberius and his successors could receive it, indeed, ἑσσεὶ καθάπαξ (cf. 16, 3 below).

13, 2 τὸν ὠνομασμένον ἱππέα : C. Cornelius Gallus (51, 17, 1; E J, no. 21), for whose fate in 26 B.C. see 23, 5-7 in this book. Cf. also n. to 21, 6 (below). On the Praefectus Aegypti cf. Marquardt, I, 442 and n. 1; Reinmuth, The Prefect of Egypt.

ibid. πολυπαιδίας ἢ γάμου προνομία : Cf. n. to 52, 20, 2.

This was another privilege conferred by the social legislation of Augustus. Senators' right to hold a governorship in advance of the allotted time—not their term in the province as well, as Dio's wording might be taken to mean—was helped under these laws if they had one or more children (cf. Marquardt, I, 547, 544 and n. 6). As the legislation was not begun until 18 B.C. (though the idea—and even an early enactment that was repealed—seems to have appeared several years earlier: note Propertius 2, 7, 1-2 [abolition of a law that would have parted him and Cynthia]; CAH, X, 441; Syme, RR, p. 443), it is clear that Dio's description of the system of governorships must not be too closely pressed for exact chronological indications: see above, pp. 82-83.

13, 3 μήτε ξίφος παραζωνομένους : Dio states that Proconsuls thus had no military jurisdiction (cf. 13, 6) but this cannot have been true of the armed governors of Illyricum, Macedonia and Africa, all of whom fought wars in the Augustan age (cf. n. on 12, 2 above). But this description became generally true by the end of the reign of Augustus.

tus (except for Africa), and Dio wants to contrast the civilian role of the Proconsul with the imperial Legati (§ 6), *οἷς γε καὶ στρατιώτας δικάζειν ἔξεστιν*.

*ibid.* καὶ ἀνθυπάτους καλεῖσθαι: This title was given in the Empire to all governors of Senatorial provinces, but (as Dio states) only two of these each year had actually been Consuls—the governors of Africa and Asia. (In the early days, this rule was less rigid: for example, M. Lollius is found in Macedonia after his Consulship (Dio 54, 20, 3-6; CAH, X, 214). Epigraphical instances of the title: 'pro consule prouinciam Cyprum optinuit' (P. Paquius Scaeva, never Consul: EJ, no. 197); '... Fauonio cos. pro cos. Asiae' (*ibid.*, no. 209).

*ibid.* δοκούντων γε ἐστρατηγηκέναι: Dio is referring to 'adlecti inter praetorios'. The Princeps, when reviewing the Senate, could not only appoint a man to a seat but also assign him rank equal to those who had served in one magistracy or another. Augustus thus placed Cluvius and Furnius among the consulares in 29 (see above, 52, 42, 4 and n., pp. 69-71). They had been 'consules designati', however, and adlectio inter consulares was not practised as a rule until the reign of Macrinus (78, 13, 1 [416]; Furneaux, I, Introd., p. 94, n. 8). Examples of adlecti inter praetorios: McCrum-Woodhead, nos. 288-91; Smallwood, nos. 207, 209; ILS 1140, 1152, 2935): Marquardt points out that such a person, if he proceeded to the

Consulship, often held a praetorian proconsulship as his first provincial post afterwards, and later, perhaps, one of the consular governorships (I, 547).

13, 5 τῶν γὰρ δύο τούτων ὀνομάτων : A reference to the original title of the chief Roman magistrates—praetores (cf. Livy 3, 55, 12; Festus, pp. 249, 276-77 L; Pauly-Wissowa, IV, 1113-14; Ogilvie on Livy 1, 60, 4 [p. 230]). Though they subsequently received the title consules, the original designation, and its military character, was commemorated in survivals like praetorium, praetoria cohors etc. Dio is also referring to the limitation in practice of the Consulship to home activity in the later Republic, after Sulla (cf. Salmon, p. 463). Such limitation need not have affected constitutional theory (see also Jones, Studies, pp. 6, 76), but Dio will not have been concerned with this if he was here thinking of practice.

13, 6 τῇ τε οὖν ἐπικλήσει κ.τ.λ.: Cf. also § 5, τοὺς δὲ ἑτέρους ὑπὸ τε ἑαυτοῦ ἀῖρεῖσθαι . Dio now discusses the powerful class of imperial governors. Just as all public provinces were administered by proconsules, so all governors of imperial provinces were entitled legati Augusti pro praetore as Dio says, whether they were praetorii or consulares. The reason for this terminology was simply that Augustus himself was proconsul of these territories, and the legati were his deputies—the equals (technically) of the legati of the Senatorial procon-

sul, on whom see n. to 14, 5 below. As example of an ex-Consul holding an imperial governorship, E J, no. 208: 'P. Cornelius Dolabella cos. ... leg(ato) pro pr(aetore) diui Augusti et Ti. Caesaris Augusti' (Illyricum).

In the early Principate, appointments tended to be made according to need rather than on any rigid system. Galatia, later reserved for ex-Praetors, is known to have been governed in Augustus' time by three former Consuls: L. Calpurnius Piso, P. Sulpicius Quirinius and M. Plautius Silvanus (Dio 54, 34, 6:—Tac. Ann. 3, 48, 1:—Dio 55, 28, 2; E J, no. 201; Vell. 2, 112, 4: CAH, X, 877-78; Syme, R R, pp. 398 f.). An ex-Praetor is known as governor of Hispania Tarraconensis, later a consular appointment: he was C. Furnius, son of the man mentioned in 52, 42, 4 (de Laet, no. 184; Dio 54, 5, 1; CAH, X, 214; cf. Marquardt, I, 494, Table III for Tarraconensis). The arrangement came to be that provinces with more than one legion were consular, those with only one, praetorian—and also those with no legion at all, for after Nero the Spanish garrison was reduced to one, at León in Tarraconensis, which left Lusitania with none (and Tarraconensis remained consular: cf. ref. below to Syme): CAH, X, 807 (cf. 789), 847; XI, 150. A list of consular and praetorian provinces in the later first and early second centuries (with remarks) is given by Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 15.

ibid. ἐπὶ πλείω καὶ ἐνιαυτοῦ χρόνον: No fixed term was laid down for the emperor's Legati.

Senatorial governors were usually about a year in their post, but exceptions are found: M. Silanus governed Africa between A.D. 32 and 37, under an emperor notorious for a policy of long tenures (CAH, X, 214; Furneaux, I, Introd., p. 114). The imperial province of Britain furnishes instances of varying terms: the first Legatus, A. Plautius, held the post from 43 to 47 (Dio 60, 19, 1; 30, 2); C. Suetonius Paulinus governed from 58 to 61 (cf. Syme, Tacitus, II, App. 69, pp. 765-66); Cn. Iulius Agricola from 77 (or 78) to 83 (or 84: on the question of the dates, see Furneaux-Anderson, Agricola, App. I; Burn, Agricola and Roman Britain, pp. 87, 134). As governor of the praetorian province Aquitania, Agricola spent 'minus triennium' (Tac. Agric. 9, 6).

Early in Augustus' Principate, L. Lamia was Legatus of Tarracensis in 24-22 B.C. (Dio 53, 29, 1 [erroneously giving the name as L. Aemilius; see Boiss. ad loc.]; 54, 5, 2; cf. the Appendix, no. 2). Ser. Galba was governor of the same province 'per octo annos' (Suet. Galba 9, 1). Tiberius kept men long in their commands: C. Silius in Germania Superior 14-21, Pontius Pilatus as Praefectus Iudaeae 26-36 (the inscription giving his title appeared in A. Frora, Rendiconti dell' Istituto Lombardo, 1961, pp. 419 ff.: referred to by Scullard, Gracchi to Nero, p. 444, n. 18), and Poppaeus Sabinus who governed in the Balkan lands 12-35 are examples (cf. Furneaux, I, Introd., p. 118; Marsh, p. 159). On Tiberius' practice cf. the comments of Tacitus, Ann. 1, 80, 2, and those of Marsh, pp. 157-59, who perhaps assumes too readily that long tenure must imply good administration: note Suet. Galba

9, 1 for deterioration of that person's administration—and also the fumbling rule of Pilatus in Judaea).

ibid. σκευὴν φοροῦντας καὶ ξίφος : Cf. note on § 3 μήτε ξίφος  
 παραζωννυμένους . Military dress included the paludamentum or cloak as well as the sword (Marquardt, I, 547, cf. 533). The Praefectus Aegypti would be one of those equites οἷς τοῦτ' ὑπάρχει (§ 7), as he commanded military forces; the Praefectus (later Procurator) Judaeae also held it (Marquardt, I, 409).

14, 1 καὶ πολλοὶ καὶ στρατηγοῦντες κ.τ.λ.: M. Licinius Crassus, Consul in 30 B.C. with Octavian, was sent to Macedonia in summer of that year (Dio 51, 23, 1-2; CAH, X, 117). But in the Principate proper it is a considerable time before the practice occurs: it is likely that Q. Petillius Cerealis, who was governor of Germania Inferior from early in 70, and then of Britain, and was also consul suffectus in that year, held the magistracy in absentia. The situation in his case was an emergency (Syme in JRS, XLVIII [1958], p. 6). Other Flavian adherents may have held the office in absence also (ibid., p. 7); Lusius Quietus may have done the same in 117 (p. 9). The first documented instance is P. Pactumeius Clemens in 138 (ILS 1067 and n. 4; Syme, op. cit., p. 3).

14, 2 τοῖς τε ὑπατευκόσι κ.τ.λ. : Cf. note on 13, 3 καὶ ἀνθυπάτους καλεῖσθαι above.

ibid. πρὸ πέντε ἔτων : On this see n. to 52, 20, 4 above.

14, 4 αἰρετοῦς τέτινες ... ἔπεμψαν : Dio does not explain how this could be done—but Augustus' power as Consul between 27 and 23, backed by auctoritas, would be sufficient to carry a senatus consultum on the matter. After 23 his maius imperium, backed again by auctoritas, made the same possible. During his Principate there is the case of P. Paquius Scaeva, who was 'procos. iterum extra sortem auctoritate Aug. Caesaris et s.c. misso [mistake for 'missus'] ad componendum statum in reliquum prouinciae Cypri' (E J, no. 197). According to Dio all Proconsuls were appointed (by Augustus, evidently) in A.D. 6 (55, 28, 2). For other examples, 54, 30, 3; Syme, R R, p. 406 and n. 3.

In the case of the armed public provinces, where warfare took place on several occasions, Augustus must necessarily have exercised influence on the selection of governors. Note the presence of M. Lollius in Macedonia in about 19-18, P. Silius Nerva and M. Vinicius in Illyricum c. 17-16 and c. 14-13 respectively (cf. n. on 12, 2 above; Syme, R R, p. 329 and n. 2). An instance of the reverse kind of control appears during the reign of Tiberius: that emperor forbade C. Galba to draw lots for Asia (or Africa: Tac. Ann. 6, 40, 3 and Koestermann ad loc.), on which the disappointed nobleman committed suicide (cf. Suet. Galba 3, 4). This veto may have been an exercise of auctoritas. See on this Hammond, A Pr, pp. 54-55; Furneaux, I, Introd., p. 114.



ibid. ἱππεύειν : Dio is not thinking here of the regular equestrian provinces like Egypt (note τῶν [sc. αὐτοκράτορες] both here and in the preceding main clause) but is referring to cases like the government of Sardinia by equites after A.D. 6 (55, 28, 2; cf. n. on 12, 2), and the case of C. Minicius Italus, an eques and 'proc(urator) prouvinciae Asiae quam mandatu principis [Domitian] uice defuncti proco(n)s(ulis) rexit' (McCrum-Woodhead, no. 366, lines 8-9; cf. Marquardt, I, 556 and n. 9). For examples of Equites replacing Legati in imperial provinces, ILS 1373, 1370, 1369, 1330.

Equites were useful to Augustus because he needed agents to handle his widespread financial interests, and the Equester Ordo was the financiers' class. Senators could not be spared for the private business of the Princeps—there was trouble enough keeping a Senate quorum, as it was (see n. to 54, 35, 1 below)—even if they had the financial experience and even if they were willing to act as his employees. Moreover the Senator was caught up in the distractions of the cursus honorum: not the Eques. Apart from financial Procuratorships, smaller provinces might be placed under Equites (e.g. Alpes Maritimae, Judaea, Sardinia) to spare Senators for office, for larger commands and for curae, and perhaps to avoid placing ex-magistrates in what may have been regarded as obscure stations. Egypt was different: security gave it to an administrator who could be more trusted than a Senator because he owed his position and eminence entirely to the emperor. Such considerations must again have suggested the appointment of

Equites as Praefectus Praetorio and Praefectus Vigilum; also (less for reasons of security than because an Eques could devote himself fully to his job) as Praefectus Annonae. In this way Augustus and his successors harnessed the energies of the wealthy second order in the State—and secured a further column of support for the Principate (cf. Syme, R R, pp. 356-58; Pflaum, Procurateurs, pp. 3-10).

14, 5 οἱ τε ταμειῦντες ... καὶ οἱ παρεδρεύοντες κ.τ.λ.: Respectively, Quaestor and Legatus. Each Proconsul was accompanied by a Quaestor, who dealt with the administrative finances and the provincial tribute, and could also exercise some jurisdiction (Marquardt, I, 529-31). The Legati (three to a consular, one to a praetorian Proconsul) acted as the governor's administrative assistants, like the legati legionum in imperial provinces (Marquardt, I, 526-28; Furneaux, I, 118). This type of legatus had existed in the Republic, and Dio is at pains to distinguish them from the emperor's (cf. n. on 13, 6 above). Their title was legati pro praetore even if they did not act in lieu of the Proconsul (Marquardt, I, 527, n. 7).

15, 1 οἱ ὑπάρχοντες σφῶν: This is a clumsily written paragraph (for another: 52, 20, 5 with n.).

τὰ ἕτερα refers to 'provinces' (ἔθνη, above), and is qualified by the following phrase τὰ τοῦ τε αὐτοκράτορος...ἔχοντα, so that it would seem that σφῶν refers to the same; but as Dio has al-

ready described the imperial Legati (13, 5 ff.), σφῶν must in fact stand for στρατόπεδα (with which πολιτικά does not agree though it may easily appear to: this adjective also qualifies ἔθνη understood); and this interpretation is accepted by Boissvain ad loc. (II, 424) and Smilda (Index historicus [Boiss. Vol. IV], s.v. 'legati legionum').

In Tac. Ann. 2, 36, 1 there is a mention of 'legionum legati, qui ante praeturam ea militia fungebantur', and Velleius—a tried ex-equestrian officer—was sent to Tiberius in the first year of the Pannonian Revolt as legatus, when 'in quaestura' (2, 111, 4). Dio is thus confirmed. At a rather later time, Ti. Plautius Silvanus Aelianus commanded a legion after his Quaestorship, and followed it with the Urban Praetorship: 'q(uaestori) Ti. Caesaris, legat(o) leg(ionis) V in Germania, pr(aetori) urb(ano), legat(o) et comiti Claud. Caesaris in Brittannia [sic]' (McCrum-Woodhead, no. 261).

15, 3 πλὴν καθ' ὅσον τοὺς φόρους οἱ ἀνθρώποι... ἐσπράσσουσιν: Cf. n. on 14,

5 above.

15, 4 τὸ μισθοφορὰν δίδοσθαι : See n. to 52, 23, 1.

## CHAPTER FOUR

NOW follows Dio's account of the titles and powers of the Roman emperor.

16, 2 τῆς γοῦν δεκάετίας ἐξελθούσης κ.τλ. : Cf. n. on 13, 1.

The reading at καὶ

ἕτερα αὖθις δέκα πεμπτάκις... is disputed; see Boissevain ad loc. His reading produces a total of forty years, which carry Augustus up to A.D. 13: notice 54, 12, 4-5, where the emperor is stated to have had his powers extended in 18 B.C. (not 17) first for five years, then, ὕστερον οὐ πολλῶ, for another five. In A.D. 13 he received—ἄκων δὲ—a further ten-year extension (56, 28, 1), which the Boiss. reading does not cover. Hence the reading of Cary, following Mommsen: <καὶ ἄλλα δέκα> ; but this seems to make the occasions six in all, belying πεμπτάκις.

There are two possibilities. First: Dio did not count the grant of A.D. 13, as Augustus died the next year. Second: although two of the grants were for five years each, Dio regards the imperium of Augustus as a series of ten-year blocs—this would make Mommsen's insertion necessary (the two five-year periods being counted as one of ten years) and would justify Dio's reckoning of 'five times', as well as going more easily with the subsequent clause 'so that by the succession of ten-year periods he

was sole ruler for life'; again, the grants mentioned in 54, 28, 2 do not seem to have been very widely spaced, so that the historian may have had further justification for counting them as a ten-year bloc (he does not record a grant in 13 B.C., whereas he does record that of A.D. 13).

16, 3 μήκετ' ἐς τάκτον χρόνον κ.τλ.: See 57, 24, 1 and 58, 24,

1-2. According to Dio the Senate wished it to appear 'as though they were giving him the Principate again, as in Augustus' case' (58, 24, 1) whereas Tiberius avoided this impression (57, 24, 1). See Hammond, A Pr, pp. 32-34; CAH, X, 137-41, 611-12; Syme, Tacitus, I, 409-11; and Hammond in Memoirs of the Amer. Acad. in Rome, XVII (1940), p. 7, n. 62, on 'decennalia'. (In AM, pp. 31-33, however, Hammond questions the idea that decennalia—which after Tiberius do not reappear for a century—were after Hadrian connected with the original ten-year limits on Augustus' imperium.)

16, 6 τὸ τοῦ Αὐγούστου ὄνομα: This was conferred on the motion of L. Munatius Plancus, as Suetonius relates: 'Augusti cognomen assumpsit ... Munati Planci sententia, cum quibusdam consentibus Romulum appellari oportere ..., praeuoluisse ut Augustus potius uocaretur' (DA 7, 2). The role of Plancus is not mentioned by Dio. On the significance of 'Augustus', the biographer continues: 'non tantum nouo sed etiam ampliore cognomine, quod loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur augusta dicantur, ab auctu uel ab auum ges-

tu gustare, sicut etiam Ennius docet scribens:

augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est.'

Dio's explanation is close to Suetonius' (so close that it may be he was acquainted with the biographer's work) but perhaps still more revealing: Αὐγουστος ὥς καὶ πλεῖον τι ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ὧν ἐπεκλήθη· πάντα γὰρ τὰ ἐντιμότερα καὶ τὰ ἱερώτατα αὐγουστα προσαγορεύεται.

(§ 8). And notice the language of Ovid:

hic socium summo cum Ioue nomen habet.  
sancta uocant augusta patres: augusta uocantur  
templa, sacerdotum rite dicata manu.  
huius et augurium dependet origine uerbi  
et quodcumque sua Iuppiter auget ope

(followed by courtly puns on the related words augere and augustus: Fasti I, 608-12).

According to Dio, Romulus was the name desired by Octavian himself. The account of Suetonius (that others urged it) seems more credible: Octavian must have been aware that for the conqueror of the foreign queen to aspire to a kingly name would be a grave miscalculation—and there was a version of the Romulus legend asserting the hero's assassination by the Senators (Livy 1, 16, 4; Plutarch, Rom. 27, 6): an uncomfortable implication for the son of Divus Julius. In any case the name Augustus bore connexions enough with the Founder, as Suetonius' quotation of Ennius shows; cf. CAH, X, 130, and the discussion by Levi, Il tempo di Augusto, App. 9.

According to the emperor himself, the name was conferred 'senatu[s consulto]' (RG 34, 2). Suetonius' language already quoted is inconclusive. Dio has καὶ παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ

δήμου , and Velleius 'quod cognomen ... Planci sententia consensus uniuersi senatus populiue Romani indidit' (2, 91, 2). The analogy of the Lex de Imperio Vespasiani may reconcile these versions—a senatus consultum echoed or reproduced in a resolution of the popular assembly (cf. Hammond, A Pr, p. 26; CAH, XI, 4 and n. 1). The legislative power of the Senate, to be sure, was still undeveloped (cf. n. on 52, 32, 2), but in an honorific resolution of this sort its lead might well be followed closely by the Populus. The day of conferment was 16 January, as the Fasti Cumani and Praenestini record (E J, p. 45). Ovid erroneously, if compendiously, places the events of 13 and 16 January under the 13th:

idibus

redditaque est omnis populo prouincia nostro  
et tuus Augusto nomine dictus auus

(Fasti, I, 586-90). For examples of the Greek version of the name (Σεβαστός), see E J, nos. 62, 67, 98 etc.

17-18 In these chapters Dio sketches the imperial prerogatives.

As he attempts to describe the Principate over its two and a half centuries of development up to his own time, some obscurities or misunderstandings occur. For example in 17, 4 he says, ἀνθύπατοι ... ἀπὸ ... ὀνομάζονται, reporting an imperial title that came into use with Trajan (Hammond, A M, pp. 89, 126 n. 199; Lewis and Reinhold, II, 5, n. 4; exx. in Smallwood, nos. 359, 427, 467, cf. 119 [L. Aelius Caesar]), in a way that could appear to include all the emperors. See the remarks of Millar, pp. 94-

95. Interpretation must therefore be cautious: cf. n. on λέλυνται ... τῶν νόμων (18, 1).

17, 1 οὕτω μὲν δὴ τό τε τοῦ δήμου καὶ τὸ τῆς γερουσίας κράτος κ. π. λ. :

Dio's words imply a single act of transfer. Contrast Tacitus: 'insurgere paulatim, munia senatus magistratuum legum in se trahere' (Ann. 1, 2, 1). There is no real contradiction: Tacitus knew that the Principate began at this time (cf. 3, 28, 3), while Dio knew of extensions of the imperial administration (e.g. the military treasury, 55, 24, 9; 25, 2-3: the semenstre consilium, 53, 21, 4-5; 56, 28, 2-3: etc.). Dio in fact is making a political judgment, as often—it was quite true that Octavian, even when no longer Consul, was master of the State; Tacitus has in mind the administrative usurpations of the Principate and their political implications—the growing direct control the ruler possessed over all branches of the State.

17, 4 ὕπατοί τε γὰρ πλειστάκις γίγνονται: Augustus was Consul every year from 31 to 23, when he resigned it. He held the office later, in 5 and 2 B.C., making his total a proud thirteen (cf. RG 4, 4; Tac. Ann. 1, 9, 2). But although Domitian was Consul seventeen times (see the Fasti in McCrum-Woodhead, pp. 4-10), most emperors were more sparing in assuming a position involving (after 23) prestige rather than actual power: cf. CAH, XI, 409-10. Apart from members of the imperial family, or men closely connected with the ruler, like Licinius Mucianus (cos. tert. A.D. 72), even a third Consul-



ship was a rare, as it was an outstanding, honour (Pliny, Epist. 2, 1, 2, and Sherwin-White ad loc.).

17, 6 ὥστε καὶ ἐντὸς τοῦ πομηρίου καὶ τοὺς ἑπτάς καὶ τοὺς βουλευτὰς

θανατοῦν δύνασθαι : Imperial jurisdiction is discussed in general on 52, 33, 1. As a rule, Senators and Equites were tried before the Senate (see on 53, 21, 6), and there is no known case of Augustus or Tiberius exercising the power Dio mentions. But Claudius, or at any rate his ex-slave Narcissus acting in his name, put Messalina to death apparently out of hand (Ann. 11, 37). If the legal competence for this action had ever been sought, the government might allege the imperium of the Princeps—valid in Rome and Italy from 19 B.C., it would seem (see note on 54, 13, 1)—or, perhaps, the tribunicia potestas, which probably included the right to execute a violator of sacrosanctitas (cf. § 9 of this chapter, and n. below; Livy, Periocha 59; Pauly-Wissowa, VIa, 2476): and any conspirator against the emperor could be so defined.

17, 7 ἔκ δὲ δὴ τοῦ τιμητεύειν : An example of Augustus' engrossing the functions of magistrates.

The Censorship of 28 has been discussed above (Chapter Two). Augustus conducted two further censuses, in 8 B.C. and A.D. 14 (R G 8, 3-4); and reviewed the Senate three times (*ibid.* 2). Apart from tenures of the office by emperors and their colleagues, the last Censorship took place in 22 B.C., with L. Munatius Plancus and Paullus Aemilius Lepidus in that office (54, 2, 1-2; Vell. 2,

95,3). But even then it was Augustus who, owing to their disagreements, performed most of their functions. For Domitian's assumption of a perpetual Censorship cf. McCrum-Woodhead, nos. 59 ('Imp. Caes. Domit. Aug. Germ. Cos. XII Cens. per. P.P.'), 62; Dio 67, 4, 3; and Hammond's remarks, A M, pp. 121-22, nn. 180-82. Later emperors, without assuming censoria potestas, silently took over its functions (cf. 19, 5 below; Mommsen, R Str, II 2, 944-45; Hammond, A M, pp. 85-87). The presence of  $\delta\eta$  here may thus be deliberate: for this word, and even more  $\delta\eta\theta\epsilon\nu$ , can be used to qualify a phrase with the implication 'supposedly' or 'ostensibly': compare 52, 42, 3 and 5 ( $\delta\eta\theta\epsilon\nu$ ); 56, 28, 1 ( $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\nu \delta\eta$ ).

The power of the Censorship was an important instrument for punishment and reward, as the lectiones of 28 and later of 18 demonstrated (cf. notes to 52, 42, 1 and 54, 13, 1). One of the first acts of Vespasian after his salutation as Princeps at Alexandria was to promote several of his supporters ('egregios uiros et mox summa adeptos') to the Senate (Tac. Hist. 2, 82, 2); a few years later he and his son Titus held the Censorship, and among other measures they brought more adherents into the Curia (cf. McCrum-Woodhead, nos. 288-91, 300, 311, 315-16, 321), and promoted others to the patriciate (ibid. 286, 299; Tac. Agric. 9, 1). The emperor could also expel members: Claudius did so when holding the Censorship (Ann. 11, 25, 3), and some years afterwards as well (12, 52, 3), possibly by a simple usurpation of censorial power, possibly acting through the Senate or by auctoritas alone (cf. Ann. 2, 48, 3 with Suet. Vitellius 2, 2); Vespasian got rid

of 'indignissimi' (Suet. D. Vesp. 9, 2). For less outright methods of securing the entry of protégés into the Senate, see n. on 52, 20, 1.

The emperor's practical control over appointments to priesthoods, which Dio goes on to mention (§ 8), even if formal methods of appointment—by comitia or co-optation—continued, was another means of patronage (Hammond, A M., p. 70 and pp. 101-3, notes 69, 72-73). Inscriptions very frequently mention priesthoods: E J., nos. 197-98, 208-9; I L S 949, 954, 972; McCrum-Woodhead, nos. 256, 261, 300 are a few examples.

17, 9 ἡ τε ἐξουσία ἡ δημαρχικὴ καλουμένη : The tribunicia potestas (on which see also n. to 52, 42, 3 for the unlikelihood that Augustus held this in full before 23 B.C.; and 32, 5-6 below for Dio's report of its conferment in that year). This power enabled the Princeps to call the Senate and lay matters before it—though, as Tribunes had a low priority in this, he was also granted in 23 the ius primae relationis: the right to lay one item of business before the House in advance of anyone else; and in 22 the right to summon the Senate whenever he chose (53, 32, 5; 54, 3, 3). He could also use the tribunician power to veto any of the Senate's proceedings or resolutions, as well as any magistrate's actions. He was able to render aid, by his ius auxilii, to persons at least up to one mile from Rome, make arrests by the ius coercitionis, and bring measures before the Populus (ius agendi cum populo). He may also have possessed the power to put to death: see n. to § 6 above.

Some examples of these powers in action may be provided. Tiberius summoned the Senate, on the death of Augustus, through his tribunicia potestas (Ann. 1, 7, 3); the same emperor vetoed an accusation brought before the House (3, 70, 2); Augustus had several leges Iuliae enacted (see n. to 52, 31, 2 above), and the power of arrest seems to have been employed on an occasion narrated in Ann. 6, 3, 3 and Dio 58, 18, 4.

18, 1 λέλονται γὰρ δὴ τῶν νόμων : Dio is either being anachronistic (as far as the early Principate is concerned) or is again talking of the practical rather than the theoretical state of affairs: he can hardly be referring solely to the practical, however, as he proceeds to assure us that 'the very phrase in Latin declares' it, a strong reminder of the statement of Ulpian: 'princeps legibus solutus est' (Digest 1, 3, 31, quoted by Hammond, A M, p. 39).

Complete exemption from the laws was not in force for the early emperors. Dio does report a Senate resolution conferring this freedom (53, 28, 2—under 24 B.C.): it may have been voted, but declined. (For this type of vagueness cf. 52, 42, 3.) Caligula is recorded as receiving the same release: 'ὥστε...πάνθ' ὅσα βούλοιο δρᾶσαι' (59, 10, 2), yet seeks a specific exemption in one field of activity the following year (59, 15, 1). The Lex de Imperio Vespasiani expressly frees Vespasian from 'quibus legibus plebeiae scitis scriptum fuit, ne diuus Aug. Tiberiusue Iulius Caesar Aug. Tiberiusque Claudius Caesar Aug. Germanicus

teneretur' (McCrum-Woodhead, no. 1, lines 22-25. For other examples, and general discussion, see Hammond, A Pr, chap. XIII; A M, pp. 38-40; also CAH, X, 135).

18, 2 ἡ ... τοῦ Καίσαρος ... πρόσρησις κτλ: What Dio seems to refer to here is the practice that developed in the second century, whereby the heir to the throne was accorded the name Caesar which (unaccompanied, that is, by 'Augustus') denoted his position. This is first known for L. Aelius Caesar (Cos. 136 as L. Ceionius Commodus, Cos. II 137 as L. Aelius Caesar: Smallwood, p. 11; see also nos. 119, 204), but it may have been done in earlier cases also (Hammond, A M, pp. 60-61). This practice developed out of the continued use of 'Caesar' by emperors with no hereditary right to it, starting with Claudius (cf. ILS 198 A.D.[37] with 200 [41]).

ibid. τὴν τοῦ ἀξιώματος λαμπρότητα : ἀξίωμα recurs in the Greek text of Res Gestae in 'ἀξιώματι πάντων διήνεγκα' (34, 18, 6), where it renders 'auctoritate [restored from the Mon. Antiochenum] omnibus praestiti'. The attribution of any power to the bearer of the title pater patriae (§ 3) is only a fancy of Dio's (as τάχα shows). For its conferment on Augustus, RG 35, 1; Suet. DA 58; Dio 55, 10, 10; E J, p. 47 (5 Feb., 2 B.C.).

18, 4 καὶ νῦν μὲν πᾶσαι ἅμα κτλ. : In A.D. 14 it would appear that Tiberius was granted the

imperial powers en bloc; the session on September 17 of the Senate ended with the vote of imperium proconsulare to Germanicus, on Tiberius' motion, which implies that the emperor's own position was settled (Ann. 1, 14, 3)—observe, as the possible vehicle of the conferment of Tiberius' power, the 'relatio consulum' (ibid. 13, 4). Dio would imply a similar enactment for Augustus in 23 B.C. (53, 32, 5-6): according to him, the Senate voted the Princeps both tribunician power and a lifelong proconsular imperium, and as a result 'both he and succeeding emperors hold the tribunician power as well as the others through a certain law.' (See note ad loc.; cf. also CAH, X, 140-41.) An attested example of en bloc conferment is that of Otho, on whose seizure of power in 69 'decernitur Othoni tribunicia potestas et nomen Augusti et omnes principum honores' (Tac. Hist. 1, 47, 1).

The Lex de Imperio seems to be such a grant, but with clauses for specific conditions in Vespasian's case, e.g. sanction for his acts prior to the passage of the law (lines 30 ff.), for an instance of which see Hist. 2, 82, 2. (EJ, no. 364; McCrum-Woodhead, no. 1).

The formality of conferment of the tribunicia potestas, and perhaps the other imperial powers, by specially assembled comitia remained. Although Nero's dies imperii was 13 October, his tribunicia potestas dated from 4 December (ILS 229, lines 20-21). Otho's dies imperii was 16 January (McCrumb-Woodhead, no. 2, lines 35-37), his tribunician power dated from 28 February (ib-

id., lines 58-60: 'ob comit(ia) trib(uniciae) pot(estatis) imp(eratoris)'). The last attested tribunician day is Domitian's in 81 (McCrum-Woodhead, no. 12, lines 33-34). Hammond, A M, p. 7, suggests that imperium too may have been formally conferred by a comitia, unmentioned in our surviving sources because it was held on the same day as the Senate's resolution; other comitia are recorded, e.g. 'pontificatus maximi' (Tiberius' was on 10 March, A.D. 15: E J, p. 47; Otho's on 9 March: McCrum-Woodhead, no. 2, lines 72-74), but by the end of the first century all, it appears, had ceased (Hammond, A M, p. 20, n. 32).

It may be to these formal assemblies that Dio is referring, without a wholly clear idea what they signified. On the subject see Hammond, A Pr, pp. 25-28; A M, pp. 7, 20 n. 32, 72-74; Béranger, Recherches, pp. 102-3; CAH, X, 611-12; XI, 404-8.

## CHAPTER FIVE

21, 3 οὐ... πάντα ἰδιωγωνιμονῶν ἐνομοθετεῖ: This phrase is referring to a statement in

§ 1: Αὐγουστος... ἐνομοθετεῖ πολλά. Among Augustus' laws were the statutes of 18 B.C., 'de adulteriis coercendis' and 'de maritandis ordinibus', attempts to encourage greater reproduction in aristocratic circles that Tacitus sneered at (Ann. 3, 25; for the details and working of the laws, Dio 54, 16, 1-2 and 7; H. Last in CAH, X, 441-52). There were also judicial laws, the most noteworthy of which (particularly for the use that was to be made of it in later reigns) was the Lex Iulia de maiestate (for which cf. CAH, X, 147-48). The words of Dio, ἔστι μὲν αὐ καὶ ἐς τὸ δημόσιον προεξετίθη, are confirmed by the fact that these enactments were called 'leges Iuliae' (indicating passage by the popular assembly), and also by Augustus in his inscriptional memoir: '[quae tum per me geri senatus] u[o]luit, per trib[un]ici[a]m p[ro]testatem perfecit' (R G 6, 2). Dio briefly relates some of the provisions of the laws:

Among the laws that Augustus enacted was one which provided that those who had bribed anyone in order to gain office should be debarred from office for five years. He laid heavier assessments upon the unmarried men and upon the women without husbands, and on the other hand offered prizes for marriage and the begetting of children. And since among the nobility there were far more males than females, he allowed all who wished, except the sen-



ators, to marry freedwomen, and ordered that their offspring should be held legitimate

(loc. cit.: trans. Cary). The bribery law was amended in 8 B.C.: candidates had to place a deposit which was forfeited if they were proved to have attempted corruption (55, 5, 3). Other Augustan laws were the 'lex de senatu habendo' of 9 B.C. and the 'lex de uicesima hereditatum' of A.D. 6 (see notes to 55, 3, 1 and 25, 2 [below]). Dio records occasions when Augustus did ask for opinions on his legislation: see 55, 4, 1 (proposed measures presented to Senators before officially moved); 25, 4-5 (Senators invited to suggest methods of raising funds for the army treasury). From 56, 7, 3 and Suet. DA 34, 1 it would seem that, in deference to protests against the 'lex de maritandis ordinibus', its provisions were softened, and its operations suspended for some years (cf. CAH, X, 442).

21, 4 συμβούλους ἔς ἑξάμηνον παρελάμβανεν: This consilium, chosen by lot, acted

as a probouleutic body as Dio states (cf. Suet. DA 35, 3: 'si-bique instituit consilia sortiri semenstria, cum quibus de negotiis ad frequentem senatum referendis ante tractaret'). It was a much more formal body than the occasional consilia used by magistrates and others (cf. Mommsen, R Str, I, 310-16), and it was not a cabinet or privy council—Augustus had his own counsellors, who decided questions of policy, for example on the death of Herod the Great in 4 B.C., when the future of Judaea was discussed. The emperor's sixteen-year-old grandson, C. Caesar,

was among those present. (Josephus, Ant. Jud. 17, 229, ref. to by Syme, R R, p. 415; see also Crook, pp. 31-36).

The formal consilium, 'an organ of administration, not of authority' as Syme says (R R, p. 408), prepared the way for sessions of the full Senate by deciding on the agenda, receiving notice of proposed motions of the Princeps or his advisors and thus enabling the feelings of Senators to be sounded in advance to some extent. In this way a useful relationship was set up between the chief executive and the Senate. According to Dio it was also occasionally used as a judicial body, but this function is obscure.

The formation of the consilium comes under the date 27 B.C. in Dio, but this in itself cannot be taken as a precise indication as the whole discussion of provincial governorships and of the position of the Princeps does the same. The statement that membership included τοὺς τε ὑπάτους ἢ τὸν ὑπάτον, ὅποτε καὶ αὐτοὺς ὑπατεύουσι, if accurate, suggests however that the body was in operation before 23, for after that date Augustus was Consul only in 5 and 2 B.C., each time for less than the full year (Suet. D A 26, 3; Crook, p. 11). On the other hand, the emperor's absence from Italy in 26-24 has been thought to make the existence of the council at this time unlikely (Crook, loc. cit.).

Actually Dio's language is too general to be pressed. The first contemporary notice of the consilium occurs in the Fifth Cyrene Edict: this declares that the senatus consultum therein

was adopted 'ἐξ συμβουλίου γνώμης δ' ἐκ τῆς συγκλήτου κληρωτὸν [Καίσαρ Σεβαστὸς] ἔσχεν' (E J, no. 311, lines 87-88). This is 4 B.C., the Consuls being C. Calvisius Sabinus and L. Passienus Rufus (ibid., line 85). The absence of Augustus twenty years earlier is not, however, an argument against the existence of the consilium, which would still have been useful for preparing the business of the Senate (and keeping a finger on that assembly's pulse) in the important formative years of the Principate. Between 26 and 24 dependable men were the emperor's consular colleagues: T. Statilius Taurus, M. Iunius Silanus and C. Norbanus Flaccus (namesake and possibly close relative of a Caesarian consul of 38: Syme, R R, p. 325).

The composition of this consilium in its earlier days is somewhat obscure. As it existed in 4 B.C., it was begun before six-month Consulships, as Crook observes—though suffect Consuls are found from 5 B.C. (except in 3 B.C., and there was only one in A.D. 1), the year was not equally divided between ordinarii and suffecti until A.D. 2 (Crook, p. 8, and n. 4). The six-month limit of the consilium thus could not at first apply to the Consuls: it may only have applied to the fifteen Senators selected by lot, if a later phrase of Dio can be taken as accurate: 'πρότερον γὰρ καὶ ἑκμῆνον πεντεκαίδεκα προσετίθετο' (58, 28, 2).

This body served Augustus' purpose for the greater part of his reign. It was altered in certain important features in A.D. 13: see 56, 28, 2-3 and n. ad loc.

21, 6 ἔκρινε... καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἡ βουλὴ πᾶσα ὥς καὶ πρότερον : This  
state-

ment is misleading. The Senate is not known to have had any judicial authority under the Republic, although, of course, Senators had formed part of the juries on the quaestiones perpetuae (originally only Senators had sat on them): cf. Homo, R P I, p. 88. However, the case of the senatus consultum ultimum (which—though not a judicial or even legally binding measure—was backed by the acquittal of Opimius in 120 and the recall of Cicero from exile in 57: cf. CAH, IX, 86-89) may have foreshadowed the Senate's later activity as a court. Dio may have thought the S.C. ultimum at least practically valid: he says that the Senate voted impunity to those who had handled the Catilinarian crisis, and reports that in 43 Octavian took 'τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς πόλεως'—the phrase used to describe what the S.C. ultimum conferred, cf. 42, 23, 2—'so as to be able to carry out any action he wished, even against the law' (46, 47, 4).

Even under Augustus, however, judicial activity by the Senate was slow to appear. The cases of Cornelius Gallus, the Praefectus Aegypti, and the conspirators Caepio and Murena are noteworthy. — When accused by enemies, Gallus lost the friendship of Augustus, and the Senate voted 'ἁλῶναί τε αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς δικάστοις καὶ φυγεῖν τῆς οὐσίας στερηθέντα' (53, 23, 7). The young Tiberius prosecuted Caepio and Murena for treason in the courts (Suet. Tib. 8; cf. also Dio 54, 3, 6). The trial of M. Primus, presumably for maiestas in making war without sanction (cf. Tac.

Ann. 1, 72, 2 and Furneaux or Koestermann ad loc.; Hammond, A Pr, p. 173; CAH, IX, 297), also took place in the public court (5<sup>4</sup>, 3, 2). The earliest mention of a trial by Senators is found in the Fifth Cyrene Edict, where a panel of nine selected by lot and consisting of four ex-Consuls, three ex-Praetors and two ordinary Senators is empowered to judge charges of extortion brought by provincials, after a preliminary hearing by the full Senate (E J, no. 311, lines 85 ff.).

The complaints of Ovid that he was exiled though there was neither a 'decretum senatus' nor a vote by 'selectus iudex' (Trist. 2, 131-32, q. by Holmes, Arch., II, 94), suggest that by A.D. 8 (the date of his banishment) Senatorial judgments could take place, at any rate as an alternative to a iudicium publicum (cf. Jones, Studies, p. 88). There are other examples from the last years of Augustus' Principate: the exile of Cassius Severus for libel 'iudicio iurati senatus' (Ann. 4, 21, 5: during Augustus' lifetime, 1, 72, 4; cf. Dio 56, 27, 1 for punishment of libellers—unnamed—in A.D. 12), and the condemnation of Messalla Volesus in A.D. 13 for misgovernment, apparently by the Senate (Ann. 3, 68, 1; but cf. CAH, X, 171). By the early years of Tiberius' reign the Senate's competence was accepted, at any rate in serious cases (as that of Libo: Ann. 2, 28 ff.). That it was still an alternative appears to be implied in Tacitus' version of the address by Tiberius at the opening of the Piso trial: 'id solum Germanico super leges praestiterimus, quod in curia potius quam in foro, apud senatum quam apud iudices de morte

eius anquiritur' (3, 12, 10). The subject is also discussed by Marsh, pp. 118-23, whose view is that Tiberius was 'in large part responsible for' the development of the Senate's jurisdiction.

How did this Senatorial competence develop? Probably from the practice of acting as the consilium of magistrates (cf. Mommsen, R Str, I, 310-11): Senate verdicts may originally have been opinions, not legally binding but of course very strongly so in practice. If a defendant could appeal to the Consuls from the decision of a lesser magistrate (cf. Mommsen, I, 105 f.), this would open the way for investigation before the Senate—a process no doubt facilitated by the prominence of that body in administration under Augustus' Principate. The Consuls continued to preside over the House in the cases brought before it (Ann. 2, 28, 3, 'statim corripit reum, adit consules, cognitionem apud senatus poscit'; cf. 3, 10, 1).

ibid. καὶ τισὶ καὶ προσβείαις καὶ κηρυκείαις καὶ δῆμων καὶ βασιλέων ἐχ-

ρημάτιζεν : Augustus received several embassies of note from distant areas, such as India and Scythia (R G 31; Suet. DA 21, 3; cf. Dio 54, 9, 8), but it is not known—though likely enough—that he involved the Senate in receiving them. In 23 an embassy from the King of Parthia, and also the rival claimant for the throne Tiridates, were presented by the emperor to the Senate (53, 13, 1). Three years earlier King Polemo of Pontus awarded honorary seats in his theatres to Senators on being recognized as amicus populi Romani, which suggests that the title came to him via a senatus consultum (53, 25,

1).

Foreign affairs under the Principate were, however, the field of the Princeps, and this included dependent kingdoms (Strabo 17, 840)—at any rate in practice. The Senate left the Parthian question in 23 to Augustus; and about thirty years later he delegated to three ex-Consuls the job of meeting 'embassies from peoples and monarchs' (Dio-Xiph. 55, 33, 5). Legations from Senatorial provinces, as may be expected, were however received by the Senate, as the procedure in the Fifth Cyrene Edict shows (E J, no. 311, lines 100-4) and as the passage from Nero's address in Ann. 13, 4, 2 suggests ('teneret antiqua munia senatus, consulum tribunalibus Italia ac publicae prouinciae adsisterent: illi patrum aditum praeberent'); also 4, 43, (boundary dispute between Sparta and Messene argued before the House).

21, 7 τοὺς ... ἀρξοντας τοὺς μὲν αὐτοὺς ἐκλεγόμενος : There are instances of Aug-

ustus appointing men to office, for instance the Praetor Urbanus in 27 and 'on several other occasions' (53, 2, 3), Q. Lucretius to the Consulship in 19 to resolve electoral disturbances (54, 10, 2) and all the magistrates in A.D. 7 for the same reason (55, 34, 2). By 'appointed' (ἀπεδείξατο) or 'selecting' (ἐκλεγόμενος) the historian probably does not mean to imply that constitutional proprieties were not observed, but is as usual conveying the political realities; for a candidate supported by the Princeps was virtually certain of election.

The reference to 'selection' may be meant to convey the

imperial practice of commendatio. This has been taken as 'a binding request for the election of a given person' (Hammond, A Pr, p. 133; cf. also Mommsen, R Str, II, 921; Furneaux, I, Introd., p. 94; Marsh, p. 24, cf. pp. 297-98), and this was likely to be the situation in practice. On the other hand commendatio does not seem to have been formally conferred as a legal right (as apparently Marsh holds, p. 24); in origin it appears to be the name for Augustus' habits from A.D. 8, when, unable through age to canvass the voters on the spot, on election-day, to support the men he favoured (Suet. DA 56, 1), he posted a notice to convey his recommendations to plebs and populus (Dio 55, 34, 2): cf. CAH, X, 163. The earlier practice of on-the-spot canvassing was the 'sollemnis mos' (cf. Suet. loc. cit.) and called suffragatio; it may be that commendatio is merely the written substitute for this, when the suffragator found himself prevented by distance or health from going to the site of the elections in person (so Levick in Historia, XVI [ 1967 ], p. 211). Both practices are recognized in the Lex de Imperio Vespasiani: 'utique quos magistratum potestatem imperium curationemue cuius rei petentes senatui populoque Romano commendauerit, quibusque suffragationem suam dederit promiserit, eorum comitis quibusque extra ordinem ratio habeatur' (E J, no. 364 = McCrum-Woodhead, no. 1, lines 10-13). No precedent is adduced for this arrangement, unlike most of the other clauses in the enactment, suggesting that the accession of Vespasian was the first time it was introduced (Levick offers the explanation that, as a new emperor—and one thrown up by the outcome of civil war—he



may have needed the privilege of 'extra ordinem' election of his candidates to assure that they were returned: p. 213): but the 'extra ordinem' arrangement by no means signifies that formal election of the emperor's candidates was now abrogated (Levick, p. 211).

It seems to have been rare for candidates seeking the Consulship to be overtly recommended. An inscription, now partially lost, records its subject as 'per commendation(em) Ti. Caesaris Augusti ab senatu cos. dest.' (E J, no. 213); this may have been such an instance, or it may be the dedicator's interpretation of Tiberius' more roundabout method ('modo subtractis candidatorum nominibus originem cuiusque et uitam et stipendia descripsit, ut qui forent intellegeretur; aliquando ea quoque significatione subtracta candidatos hortatus, ne ambitu comitia turbarent, suam ad id curam pollicitus est': Tac. Ann. 1, 81, 2; cf. Dio 58, 20, 1-3). But, as might be expected, there were less public methods of determining even the supreme magistracy: notice how some Senators were suborned to make an accusation 'cupidine consulatus, ad quem non nisi per Seianum aditus' (Ann. 4, 68, 2).

Candidates for other offices might be recommended: Vell-eius and his brother are an example, for the Praetorship of A.D. 15 (2, 124, 4). The Princeps recommended two candidates annually for the Quaestorship, and it seems to have been these who acted as his liaison officials with the Senate (Mommson, R Str, II 1, 529-30; exx. of the Princeps' Quaestors, E J, nos. 202, 217).

When acting as Consul, or in virtue of his imperium—valid, as it appears, within the City and Italy from 19 B.C. —the emperor might preside over the elections: in this situation, he could accept or reject the professiones of candidates (as Saturninus rejected that of Egnatius Rufus in 19: Vell. 2, 92, 4, cf. also 3), at least with the concurrence of the presiding magistrate, who probably had the legal right to accept or refuse professiones himself (Levick, p. 214; cf. Tac. Ann. 1, 81, 2). This action is usually termed nominatio (Mommsen, R Str. II 2, 917-18; Furgenseaux, I, p. 94; Hammond, A Pr. p. 133; A M. p. 246). Levick however suggests that the term nominatio denotes simply the presentation of a list of candidates to the Comitia, or after A.D. 14 to the Senate—the emperor presenting his list, it would appear, to the Consuls as presiding magistrates: Tac. Ann. 1, 81, 2). Tiberius, as reported by Tacitus, left it open to the Consuls to accept as candidates persons other than those on his list, at least for the consular elections (loc. cit.).

It seems unlikely that the emperor normally reduced the number of candidates permitted to run for any office. Tiberius did present a list of twelve candidates for the twelve Praetorships in 14 (Ann. 1, 14, 4); but Dio mentions fiercely contested elections (58, 20, 4) and Nero soothed three disappointed aspirants to the Praetorship with legionary commands (Tac. Ann. 14, 28, 1). Pliny the Younger also has frequent references to sharp contests (Epist. 2, 9; 3, 20; 6, 6 etc.: and cf. Sherwin-White on 1, 14, 7). No doubt a good deal of bargaining and oth-

er arrangements were made among candidates themselves: cf. Dio 59, 20, 4.

The degree of control exercised by the emperor is difficult to decide. Laws against bribery were enacted by Augustus in 18 B.C. and 8 (54, 16, 1; 55, 5, 3). Furthermore electoral disturbances in A.D. 7 do not suggest a docile Assembly governed by the ruler's intimations. But it is clear that the regime had little difficulty in promoting the men it wanted to high office—or excluding those who failed to acquire favour. The Consul Senti-  
us Saturninus threatened to use every measure to keep out M. Eg-  
natus Rufus; a useful man, on the other hand, could be reward-  
ed, and his unsatisfactory rival effectively discouraged, as were  
Ateius Capito and Antistius Labeo (Ann. 3, 75, 2). As early as  
23 B.C., Augustus could (Tacitus implies) dispose as he willed of  
the highest magistracy: Cn. Piso accepted 'delatum ab Augusto  
consulatum' (2, 43, 2). We can assume that, although palpable  
control was not as a rule exercised over the polls, the desires  
of the government, whenever necessary, made themselves effective-  
ly felt. (For discussion of the electoral arrangements of the  
last part of the Principate of Augustus, see below on 55, 34, 2.)

22, 1 τὰς ὁδοὺς τὰς ἔξω τοῦ τεύχους: In the Republic, roads had  
been built by Censors, for  
example the Via Appia in 312 B.C. by Appius Claudius, or Consuls  
(e.g. Degrassi, Inscriptiones . . ., nos. 450, 452, 454). The  
Censors were responsible for their repair, but curatores viarum  
are found before the end of the Republic (Degrassi, nos. 465, 465a,

ILS 45). The inscription on the arch at Ariminum survives:

'senatus populusq[ue Romanus imp. Caesari diui f. Augusto imp. sept.] cos. sept. designat. octauom u[ia Flamin]ia [et reliquei]s celeberrimeis Italiae uicis consilio [et sumptib]us [eius mu]nitionis' (E J, no. 286). The work on other roads was given to men who had held triumphs—they were expected to spend some of their profits from manubiae on the task (Suet. D A 30, 1). Some milestones from the Via Latina record 'C. Calvisius C.f. Sabinus cos., imp.' (ILS 889): he triumphed 'ex Hispania' in 28 (E J, Fasti, p. 35). Other 'triumphales uiri' probably involved were (for example) L. Marcius Philippus ('ex Hispania' in 33), L. Cornificius ('ex Africa' in the same year), C. Carrinas ('ex Gallis' in 28) and M. Licinius Crassus ('ex Thraecia et Geteis' in 27: one rather suspects Augustus made sure he at least participated): E J, pp. 34-35.

In 20 Augustus accepted a cura uiarum and appointed a board of curatores consisting of ex-Praetors (Dio 54, 8, 4). A coin of 16 B.C. records a financial gift of his to the aerarium for road repairs, and an inscription of 2 B.C. records his attention to the repair of the Via Aemilia 'ab Arimino ad flumen Trebiam' (E J, nos. 287-88).

22, 3 τοὺς θησαυροὺς αὐτῶν : Dio means the aerarium and the fiscus. Despite his language, it is doubtful that a separate emperor's treasury, in which public funds were handled, yet existed. Augustus does not mention one in Res

Gestae: his references are to 'pecunia mea', 'patrimonium meum' etc. (e.g. RG 17, 1-2; 18). Suetonius states that the 'breuiarium totius imperii' included 'quantum pecuniae [esset] in aerario et fiscis et uectigaliorum residuis' (DA 101, 4). Now we do know that separate provincial fisci existed—they had done so in Republican times, apparently to hold any surplus from the public grant promagistrates received on setting out for their governorships, and any stipendia he collected himself from the subject communities (Jones in JRS, XL [1950], pp. 22-23 = Studies, pp. 102-3; in imperial times note Tiberius' freed slave, 'dispensator ad fiscum Gallicum prouinciae Lugdunensis': EJ, no. 158; cf. also Marquardt, II, 307). Where fiscus is used in the singular, with direct reference to the emperor, it seems to mean either his personal patrimonium or 'the whole financial administration controlled by the emperor' (Jones, Studies, 107; cf. Tac. Ann. 2, 48, 1; 6, 2, 1—cf. 6, 19, 1 'sibimet Tiberius seposuit' of the mines of Sex. Marius: cf. Brunt in JRS, LVI [1966], pp. 79-82).

Jones suggests that Augustus was periodically voted sums by the Senate to meet his expenses, these sums to be then drawn from the most convenient sources (compare Pompeius' authorization under the Lex Gabinia: Appian, Mithrid. 94; Plutarch, Pomp. 25: cited by Jones in JRS, XL, p. 22). A grant to Nero is recorded by Jerome, Chron., under date A.D. 67 (referred to by Millar in JRS, LIV [1964], p. 37). Brunt has further suggested that the Senate in fact remained the formal source of grants from the aerarium (JRS, LVI, pp. 86 f.). Augustus' own provinces would

naturally be the first to contribute; then perhaps those public provinces nearby, as most of the imperial would be rather poor (the Danube lands particularly); the aerarium might also be laid under contribution. The latter also paid, it is likely, for some of the emperor's expenses in Rome and Italy, such as the annona and uigiles: Dio seems to imply that the Princeps did get money from τὰ δημόσια (§ 4). If an imperial province did produce a surplus of income over local expenses, the money appears to have been paid into the aerarium, as Egypt and perhaps Gaul (Vell. 2, 39, 2; Jones in JRS, XL, p. 24).

Procedure such as the above would explain the interest early emperors took in the administration of the aerarium (cf. Tac. Ann. 13, 29). Augustus made several subventions to it from his personal resources, to a total of 150,000,000 HS (R G 17, 1; cf. E J, no. 287). He also paid for several public projects (E J, no. 286; R G 18-21), for veterans' land allocations until the aerarium militare was set up -- and he contributed a large sum to that as well to get it started -- (R G 18), etc. This concern, perhaps also a misconception by Dio that a special imperial treasury did exist in the early Principate, and the fact that Tiberius and later emperors (except for a temporary revival of the practice by Caligula) ceased to publish rationes imperii such as Augustus had (Suet. Calig. 16, 1; Dio 59, 9; Brunt in J R S, LVI, p. 89), will explain the historians's perplexity over aerarium and fiscus.

32, 5 καὶ διὰ ταῦθ' ἡ γερουσία κατ: After the settlement of January,

27 B.C., Augustus continued to hold the Consulship annually. He was absent from Rome from 26 to 24, campaigning in Spain and then falling sick at Tarraco (cf. Horace, Carmina 3, 14, 1-4): he recovered and made his way back to Rome. There seems to have been some discontent in certain circles with the new system. In 26 M. Messalla Corvinus, who had been Consul with Octavian in the year of Actium, resigned as Praefectus Urbi a few days after being appointed (Tac. Ann. 6, 11, 3; Jerome, Chron. col. 435 Migne: cf. n. on 52, 21, 1 above). The conspiracy of Caepio and Murena may have taken place (or at any rate its existence, and exposure, announced by the government) in 23 (cf. p. 61 above); and the dissatisfaction that may have produced it might well be detectable earlier. The troublesome M. Primus, Proconsul of Macedonia, whether his trial too occurred in 23 or perhaps 22, probably launched his illegal war while Augustus still held the Consulship: perhaps seeking glory like a second M. Crassus, he will have been another difficulty.

In 23 Augustus fell seriously ill. He summoned the magistrates and Senators to his house, delivered to his fellow-Consul Cn. Piso a 'rationarium imperii' (resembling the 'breuiarium' read to the Senate in A.D. 14) and handed his signet ring to Agrippa (Dio 53, 30, 1-2). But he recovered, thanks to his physician Antonius Musa; and the Senate refused to let him read out his will. He proceeded to lay down his Consulship, going to the Alban Mount to do so in order (as Dio says) to avoid attempts

to prevent it (53, 32, 2). As his successor in the office he saw to it that L. Sestius Quirinus Albinus, once Quaestor to M. Brutus and proscribed in 43 (Appian Bell. Civ. 5, 2, 4 ff.: cited by Syme, R R, p. 206, n. 8), was chosen. The other Consul, Cn. Piso, was also a former Republican: he had remained aloof from public life until Augustus held out the supreme magistracy (Tac. Ann. 2, 43, 2). The appearance of two such men as titular heads of State, and the surrender of the Consulship by Augustus, signified a certain understanding with the former Republicans, although other elements, particularly the commons, soon demanded that the Princeps resume the office and accept a Dictatorship (54, 1; 6, 1-3; 10, 1-2). These were no doubt the ones Augustus had meant to elude by going to the Alban Mount to resign his magistracy (cf. Sattler, p. 68).

Resigning the Consulship freed the emperor from various formal duties (such as the feriae Latinae) and, perhaps, a certain amount of daily routine. But it also deprived him of useful powers, such as the right of summoning and putting business before the Senate, and exercising magisterial imperium at Rome and in Italy. More than that, he was now technically a Proconsul resident in Italy (see note to 54, 13, 1 below). Some of these powers were soon restored, by the grant of tribunicia potestas and two additional rights.

As suggested above (on 53, 18, 4), the grant of imperial powers by the Senate was followed by formal conferment by the Comitia. This probably happened in 23. According to the recipient



himself, 'et ... [ut ... q]uoad uiuerem, tribunicia potestas mihi [esset, per lege]m s[anctum est ...]' (RG 10, 1). This corresponds, in part, to Dio's words in § 6: 'from this time both he and succeeding emperors employed the tribunician power, as well as the rest, through a certain law' (ἐν νόμῳ δὲ τινί). As Augustus' imperium was made maius at the same time, however (§ 5), Dio is probably thinking of the Senate's vote when he refers to a νόμος, for tribunician power and imperium were not conferred together in the formal Comitia. In an earlier chapter of his memoir Augustus himself represents tribunicia potestas as being granted simply by the Senate: '[cuius potes]tatis conlegam et [ips]e ultro [quinq]uens a sena]tu [de]poposci et accepi' (RG 6, 2), though it is unlikely that the measure was not formally sanctioned, like his own, 'per legem'.

The right to lay the first matter, before anyone else, at any meeting of the Senate (ius primae relationis) was also conferred on the emperor in 23. It is mentioned in the second clause of the Lex de Imperio Vespasiani: 'utique ei senatum habere relationem facere remittere senatus consulta per relationem discessionemque facere liceat, ita uti licuit diuo Aug.' etc. In 22, by Dio's dating, he was granted the right to summon the Senate as often as he pleased—and, no doubt, when he pleased: for although both these rights were possessed by the Tribune, that magistrate was obliged to allow precedence in their exercise to Consuls and Praetors.

## CHAPTER SIX

13, 1 τὸ βουλευτικὸν ἐξήτασε : The years 23 - 19 were turbulent at Rome. Disorders had accompanied the consular elections of 22 and 20 in attempts to make Augustus Consul. Persons of note had been executed for conspiring against him: Caepio and Murena in 23 and 22, Egnatius Rufus and accomplices in 19. Augustus returned to Rome on the night of 12 October, 19 (E J, p. 53; Dio 54, 10, 4), with the new glory of his Parthian success added to his other laurels. The Senate and People offered him sweeping powers: 'ut cu[rator] legum et morum summa potestate solus crearer]' (RG 6, 1). He declined to accept any 'office not sanctioned by tradition' ('[nullum magistratum contra morem maiorum delatum]': Sattler [pp. 90-91] argues reasonably that, in sense, the prepositional phrase 'contra morem maiorum' must qualify 'magistratum', though in strict grammar modifying 'delatum'). On the other hand, he may well have taken certain powers: the equation of his imperium with that of the Consul is a likely measure, and a grant of censoria potestas has been suggested, despite the seeming denial by Augustus in RG 6 (Jones, Studies, chap. II). Dio relates a grant of τὴν ἐξουσίαν ... τὴν δὲ τῶν ὑπάτων διὰ βίου and of the position ἐπιμελητῆς ... τῶν τρόπων for five years, in addition (this is noteworthy) to that of censoria potestas (54, 10, 5); Suetonius declares, 're-

cepit et morum legumque regimen aeque perpetuum', connecting this with the three censuses the emperor held (D A 27, 5).

Augustus himself says he performed the three censuses either as Consul or 'consulari cum imperio' (RG 8, 2-4). The report of a 'cura' or 'regimen morum legumque' can be considered a misunderstanding by Dio and Suetonius of just what he did accept out of the many powers offered him. It could be argued that what Dio gives as two apparently separate positions or functions—ἐπιμελητὴς τῶν τρόπων and ἡ τῶν τιμητῶν ἐξουσία—are in fact the same thing. The first phrase is almost exactly that used in Res Gestae 6 (ἐπιμε]λητὴς τῶν τε νόμων καὶ τῶν τρόπων) where it renders the Latin 'cu[r]ator legum et morum': it could be, therefore, the title of the position, of which 'the power of the Censors'—Dio's second phrase—is the competence (Dio does not indeed appear to mean this, but he may, arguably, have misunderstood a source). This, however, does not prove that Augustus did actually receive a separate grant of censorial power.

But the conferment of some sort of consulare imperium is quite likely to have occurred. If Augustus could use it to hold a census, he could use it also to review the Senate. But since its use for such weighty concerns had not, in practice, taken place since the establishment of the Censorship, some kind of public declaration or recognition that consulare imperium was so competent may have been made in 29 B.C., thus prompting the Fasti Venusini to record that Octavian and Agrippa as Consuls 'censoria potestate lustrum fecerunt' (E J, p. 35, under 28 B.C.).

It is not essential to suppose that this public statement was repeated whenever the government decided to hold a lectio or census, but this may have been the case: shortly after recording the renewal of Augustus' imperium in A.D. 3 (55, 12, 3) Dio announces, under A.D. 4, that 'he assumed proconsular power to carry out the census' (ibid. 13, 5), which is quite incomprehensible as it stands, but could be explained as a confused misinterpretation of such a proclamation as suggested above. (See n. to 55, 13, 3.) Yet even if the proclamation never were repeated after 29, it could still account, together with the offer actually made to the emperor in 19, for Dio's allegation of a separate censoria potestas in the latter year.

Exactly what is meant by consulare imperium is another problem. Rather than a cumulation of various imperia, which would probably have sounded odd to Romans (cf. Grant, From Imperium to Auctoritas, pp. 419-20; Pelham, Essays, pp. 65-71), the same imperium may have been validated in 19 to cover Rome and Italy and equal that of the Consuls (Jones, Studies, p. 15). When used in Italy or Rome, it could then correctly be called 'consulare', as Augustus does. In this case we may view Dio's account in 53, 32, 5 as recording the simple grant of the right not to lose the imperium over his provinces when the Princeps was in the City. In A.D. 51 the young Nero was given 'proconsulare imperium extra urbem' (Ann. 12, 41, 1), a measure that would seem to support the idea of a single imperium that applied (at any rate from 19 B.C.) both to Italy and to the provinces.

(That it is called proconsular though it presumably applied to Italy as well need only indicate conciseness by Tacitus.) It also implies that the emperor himself held 'imperium intra urbem' (on this cf. Hammond, A Pr, pp. 32-33).

Augustus' position from the settlement of 27 to the year 23 was secured by his holding the Consulship annually. This gave him a certain, perhaps not clearly defined, superiority to Proconsuls:

... he possessed the vast and undefined powers of a consul, which he could stretch to include an ultimate control over all proconsuls; for according to that excellent republican jurist, Cicero, 'omnes in consulis iure et imperio debent esse prouincias' and to the consuls 'more maiorum concessum est uel omnes adire prouincias'

(Jones, Studies, p. 6). Mommsen observes that:

unter den Trägern des Imperium gilt der Dictator gegenüber allen andern, der Consul gegenüber dem Prätor als maior potestas, ebenso der wirkliche Magistrat gegenüber dem Promagistrat. ... Bis gegen das Ende der Republik tritt die Collision zwischen den verschiedenen Imperienträgern bei gleichem Amtkreis durchaus in der Form auf, dass der Dictator dem Consul, der Consul dem Prätor oder dem Proconsul gegenüber seine höhere Amtsgewalt zur Geltung bringt

(R Str, I<sup>3</sup>, 25). Cf. also Pelham, Essays, p. 67; Syme, R R, p. 330.

This superiority lapsed on the resignation of the supreme office in 23. It was at once confirmed, however, by declaring Augustus' imperium maius than other Proconsuls'. But the same resignation left him theoretically nothing higher than a Proconsul himself, and thus, theoretically again, open to the superior authority of a Consul—and even if the Consuls' prac-

tical authority in the late Republic had been limited to the capital and Italy (so, e.g., Salmon in Historia, V [1956], pp. 463-64), Augustus was normally resident in Italy in any case.

Such a consideration may have been an extra reason for journeying to the East in 22 - 19 (Augustus had maius imperium in the provinces)—and may explain the special care he seems to have had over the Consulships of these years: as Syme says, 'it almost looks as though, in each year, Augustus had filled one place with his own candidate, leaving the other for free elections' (R R, p. 371, n. 1). If one Consul each year was a reliable Caesarian, it could prevent any awkwardness.

But in 19 the Princeps returned to Italy, probably intending to stay there for a while (in fact, he did not journey abroad again until 16). The year 19 saw the candidacy of the disturbingly popular M. Egnatius Rufus for the vacant Consulship: his imminent success drove the other Consul, C. Sentius Saturninus, who was presiding over the election, to swear not to return him even if he was elected (Vell. 2, 92, 4). Such a person as Consul might have made Augustus' position difficult or delicate. If this was the situation, the extension to Rome and Italy of Augustus' imperium, and its perhaps necessary equalization with the Consuls' as a result (if indeed the first did not automatically entail the second), would have a fuller explanation. We do not hear of a specific exemption being granted Augustus from a consular veto, but then neither do we hear of one from the tribunician (though Mommsen suggests it, as Sattler observes [p. 70, n. 169]). If

the office of Consul had been enough for him in the years 27-23, the virtual restoration of that position in 19 (of which the honours recorded by Dio—twelve lictors and the curule chair between the Consuls—were the external signs) would satisfy him now.

(Levi, Tempo, p. 174, accepts the cura morum, under the style of praefectura, and assigns it to the tribunicia potestas.)

The revision of the Senate-list in 18 B.C. followed this adjustment of powers. It also followed or accompanied the social legislation of this year (on which see Dio 54, 16, 1-2 and n. to 53, 21, 3 [pp. 107-8]). It was ten years since the last and the years between had revealed strains in the Princeps' relations with some Senators (p. 125), as well as considerable popular restlessness at what seemed to be his abdication from supreme authority. From the absence of further public disturbance it may be inferred that the arrangements of 19—in particular the assumption of the outward symbols of the consular position, which would be calculated to impress and reassure the popular mind—quieted the restlessness. To deal with unwanted elements in the Senate, and to inaugurate the programme of national regeneration by starting at the very top of the social pyramid, Augustus reviewed the Senate.

The system originally set up, 'quo uir uirum legit', appears from Dio to have been peculiarly cumbersome. It would seem that a first group of thirty Senators, selected by the Princeps, chose five others apiece; that each group of five then cast lots, to determine which one of them should be a member of the new Senate; and that each of this second body of thirty, thus

chosen by the lot, then nominated a second set of five. Dio says no more, but some prearranged total must have been laid down as a goal, after which the process was to stop; otherwise the business might go on indefinitely.

According to Dio, Augustus had planned to limit the Senate to three hundred (14, 1)—a far too small figure, as Balsdon points out, comparing the poor attendance in the Ciceronian Senate of over six hundred (Balsdon in Gnomon, XXXIII [1961], p. 394, reviewing Sattler; cf. Syme, R R, p. 370). The arrangement adopted must obviously have led to lobbying and collusion between Senators—Dio soon remarks, ἐκκακουρήθη τινα (13, 4). Why was it adopted? It is possible that those Senators who felt themselves endangered by the imminent lectio managed to prevail on Augustus to permit it, as his direct control would be limited to the original thirty selectors, and the presumably impartial lot would play a part. More likely, Augustus (as Dio reports) 'did not want to incur blame again' (§ 2)—a noteworthy hint of the feelings aroused by the earlier lectio—and therefore devised the scheme to placate Senatorial feeling while having his intentions carried out. As nearly three-quarters of the Senate had been on his side in 31 (see n. to 52, 42, 1), and as a considerable or preponderant part of new accessions since then may be assumed to have been obedient to the regime, he could be confident that sheer numbers would ensure a favourable majority.

Equally important, the auctoritas of the emperor was exerted during the selection process, as the anecdote in Dio and Suet-



onius about Antistius Labeo indicates (54, 15, 7; Suet. D A 54). When Labeo nominated the ex-Triumvir Lepidus, Augustus challenged it and (in Dio's account) threatened to punish the recommender; to which Labeo made a quick retort. Open intervention of this sort in one case must have been accompanied by less publicized pressure and hints in others—not only from the emperor but from other masters of patronage, Agrippa, Taurus, Maecenas, Lollius and more. (A detailed discussion of the system is given by Sattler, pp. 96-98).

The scheme broke down all the same, after a number of persons had been chosen under it. The emperor had to complete the lectio himself: he brought the new Senate up to a total of six hundred (14, 1), then made still further adjustments (14, 2-3). Little is known of the Senators ejected. Dio gives two names, Licinius Regulus and Articuleius Paetus, of whom nothing more is known, though Paetus is probably connected with the family of a pair of second-century Consuls, Articuleius Paetus (A.D. 101) and Paetinus (A.D. 123): cf. Smallwood, Fasti, pp. 3 and 8—both ordinarii: on Paetus and Regulus see PIR<sup>2</sup> A 1175; de Laet, nos. 50 and 218. Dio's narrative leaves open the possibility that Licinius Regulus and Paetus' father were in fact afterwards re-entered on the roll by Augustus; and it is added that most of those struck off 'in time returned to the House' (14, 5), which is not impossible, as the emperor not only left them their other privileges but allowed them to stand again for office.

There is other evidence besides the incidents of Regulus

and Paetus for tension in this lectio. Suetonius relates that in Augustus' 'second' lectio, conducted 'arbitratu ... suo et Agrippae', he wore a breastplate and had a bodyguard of ten Senators. According to Cremutius Cordus even Senators were searched before being let in (D A 35, 1-2). Suetonius has confused the order of the two lectiones he mentions (cf. Levi and Adams ad loc.), and the events he describes must have occurred at the one 'quo uir uirum legit': Dio mentions Augustus' habit of wearing a breastplate for protection 'even when he entered the Senate', at the start of his narrative for 18 B.C. (12, 3). It looks as though the emperor actively feared an attempt on his life at this time: the difficulties of the lectio, and perhaps the accumulated restiveness of the past few years among malcontents, as it became obvious that Augustus was bent on consolidating his power over the State to an impregnable extent, must have caused his fear. Dio's account of the Senate review is followed by a report of accusations against many persons of plotting against the Princeps and Agrippa (the latter had received tribunicia potestas for five years early in 18: 12, 4 above). Some were executed. The historian does not give names nor even connect the defendants with the ejected Senators, but the sequence of events is suggestive.

It seems that Augustus got the better of all opposition—unorganized as it probably was, and without military backing—and was able to proceed fully on his own. Though protests (less political than social: principally from the Equites—56, 1, 2; Suet.

DA 34, 2) forced him to suspend for some years part, at least, of his law to regulate marriage (Dio 56, 7, 3; CAH, X, 453, cf. 442; that part was in force in 17 B.C. is shown by E J, no. 30, lines 55-57), the law remained on the books, as did the law against adultery. The *Ludi Saeculares*, inaugurating the New Age celebrated by fittingly inspired poets (cf. Vergil, Aeneid 6, 791 f. 'aurea condet / saecula qui rursus Latio'; Horace, Carm. 1, 12; 3, 6; 24; 4, 5; 15; Carmen Saeculare) were held in 17 (cf. E J, nos. 30-32 or ILS 5050). In the same year Augustus adopted the sons of Agrippa and Julia as his own (Dio 54, 18, 1), thus taking the first step in his new dynastic plan. It is with some truth that Levi speaks of 'la rivoluzione politica degli anni 19-18' (Tempo, p. 176; on the developments of 22-19 B.C. cf. Tempo, pp. 167-76).

+

17, 1 ἐν τῇ τοῦ σίτου διαδόσῃ. In 54, 1, 3, under date 22 B.C., Dio relates the offer of the Dictatorship and the corn commission to Augustus by the populace of Rome. He refused the former but, like Pompeius in 57 B.C. [39, 24, 1-2] (cf. Bender's Commentary, p. 32), agreed to handle the grain supply. As he himself then records: 'curatio[n]em an-[non]ae ... ita ad[mi]nist[raui], ut intra] die[s] paucos metu et periculo p[r]aesenti ciuitatem uni[uersam] liberarem impensa et] cura mea' (R G 5, 2). In 54, 1 Dio continues that, to supervise the distribution of the grain, he arranged for two ex-Prae-

tors annually to be selected from among those who had held that office at least five years earlier (1, 4). These officials were now (18 B.C.) increased to four, and eligibility extended to those who had been Praetors at least three years previously.

This was the cura frumenti populo diuidundi mentioned by Suetonius as one of Augustus' 'noua officia' (DA 37; E J, nos. 212, 215 where the title of the administrators is praefectus frumenti dandi). It was distinct from the task of supplying grain to the capital, which, under the Republic, and in the early Principate apart from the crisis of 22, was the concern of the Aediles (Caesar had created two aediles Cereales for the job: Dio 43, 51, 3). In A.D. 6 Augustus modified the cura frumenti diuidundi or dandi in consequence of a famine: two ex-Consuls were put in charge to make certain only a fixed amount was distributed to each person (55, 26, 2); the next year two ex-Consuls were made commissioners of the grain supply itself (55, 31, 4).

This was apparently another emergency measure. 'Praefecti frumenti dandi' (sometimes 'ex s(enatus) c(onsulto)', but quite often not) continue to be attested in Tiberius' reign (cf. the inscriptions already cited in E J), in the reign of Trajan (Smallwood, nos. 191, 197, 218), in the later first century (I L S 1109) and in the second (ibid. 1180, 1188): the phrase 'ex s. c.' may refer to the method of appointing them. Most appear to be ex-Praetors (against Rushforth, Latin Hist. Inscript., p. 31). The corn supply to the City is shortly found in the hands of a praefectus annonae, C. Turranius, an eques (Tac. Ann. 1, 7, 2 [A.D.

14]: he still held the post thirty-four years later, and was one of Claudius' 'potentissimi amici' [Ann. 11, 31, 1]. Cf. CAH, X, 202. In this way, by the end of Augustus' Principate, the Senate had lost control over this department of administration.

The creation of curae (it may be observed) was a marked tendency of Augustus' home administration. The cura uiarum has already been noticed (53, 22, 1 and n.). Suetonius' description is: 'quoque plures partem administrandae rei p. caperent, noua officia excogitauit: curam operum publicorum, uiarum, aquarum, aluei Tiberis, frumenti populo diuidundi ..., quotiensque opus esset' (DA 37). The 'cura operum publicorum' concisely mentioned is more fully 'cura aedium sacrarum et operum publicorum locorumque populi Romani'; it consisted of two members who sometimes divided the functions between them (an example of the fuller title: ILS 997 [= McCrum-Woodhead, no. 50]; of the division of functions: ILS 452—from the reign of Caracalla). The cura aquarum was established in 11 B.C. following the death of Agrippa, who had devoted a body of his own slaves to maintaining the aqueducts; three curatores were appointed, headed by the former Consul M. Messalla Corvinus, who held the post until his death in A.D. 13 (cf. the S.C. de aquaeductibus, EJ, no. 278, and the Lex Quinctia de aquaeductibus, no. 279: both from Frontinus, de Aquaed. 100-29; for activity by Augustus in repairing aqueducts, no. 281 [5-4 B.C.]). The cura ripae et aluei Tiberis, also cited by Suetonius, was not permanently established until A.D. 15, consisting of five ex-Consuls (Dio 57, 14, 7-8; cf. Tac. Ann. 1, 76, 1; ILS 5925).

Somewhat comparable to these boards, but not, it appears, of permanent duration, was the commission created in A.D. 6 to effect economies in public spending (Dio 55, 27, 6). On the cur-ae, cf. CAH, X, 179, 202-4.

17, 2 τὸν τε πολίτην τὸν ἐς τὰς ἀνοχὰς καθιστάμενον : On the office of the praefectus urbi see note to 52, 21, 1 above.

17, 3 ἅπασιν τοῖς δέκῃ μυριάδων οὐσίαν ἔχουσι : Cf. 26, 3 below. This sum, in drachmas here (Dio takes one drachma as equal to one denarius: cf. 57, 4, 2 with Tac. Ann. 1, 17, 5), works out as four hundred thousand sesterces. Suetonius gives the original qualification as eight hundred thousand (DA 41, 1). There need be less of a clash than is sometimes supposed. A fortune of at least four hundred thousand seems to have been required of a member of the equester ordo from the late second century B.C. (Mommson, R Str, II 1, 499-500; CAH, IX, 779, 894), and though no definite minimum was fixed for Senators, it is unlikely that any had less than this. In 214 B.C., during the Hannibalic War, Senators were expected to make the largest contribution of all towards equipping the navy: persons with over one million asses were required to provide seven sailors with twelve months' pay, while 'senatores octo nautas cum annuo stipendio darent' (Liv. 24, 11, 7-8: cf. Weissenborn-Müller ad loc.). Until a stated minimum was introduced, therefore, the equestrian census probably was the

minimum in practice—and this may be the kernel of fact behind Dio's words. Suetonius' account is: 'senatorum censum ampliavit ac pro octingentorum milium summa duodecies sestertium taxavit supplevitque non habentibus' (DA 41, 1). This need not be pressed to mean that the original minimum was 800,000 HS; but even if this were so, Dio's 400,000 (as just suggested) is not ruled out. Augustus, when it finally came to laying down a definite minimum qualification, will have fixed one higher than the equestrian to assure that men of substance alone could sit in the House. As Claudius Caesar said, 'sane nouo more et diuus Augustus auunculus meus et patruus Tiberius Caesar omnem florem ubique coloniarum ac municipiorum, bonorum scilicet uirorum ac locupletium, in hac curia esse uoluit' (IILS 212, col. II, lines 1-4).

There is more of a problem with the final figure. Dio definitely states that 250,000 drachmas, or one million sesterces, was the later minimum qualification. No less definitely, Suetonius gives 1,200,000. Now Tacitus records the gift of a million to M. Hortensius Hortalus by Augustus and to an impoverished ex-Praetor by Tiberius (Ann. 2, 37, 1; 1, 75, 3). This cannot be at once assumed to prove Dio's figure, unless we also assume that the beneficiaries were by then virtually penniless—not only without income but even without capital. If Hortensius had fallen into the 400,000 to one million sesterces range, a gift of one million would have replaced him in the senatorius ordo. Note that Nero made an annual gift of half a million to the grandson of Messalla Corvinus (Ann. 13, 34, 1): if we can

assume a return of some five per cent. on capital,<sup>1</sup> this annual sum would represent a capital (had it come from Messalla's resources) of ten million and so must have been a handsome income (which makes Tacitus' comment sound rather odd—'quibus paupertatem innoxiam sustentaret').

It is also to be noticed that Dio later records Augustus as both helping many young men of the Senatorial and Equestrian classes to make up their fortunes to 'the required amount' (τὸ τεταγμένον τίμημα), and also as making up the fortune of 'some eighty' to one million two hundred thousand sesterces (55, 13, 6). The size of the individual gifts is not stated, and obviously they must have varied.

Two final pieces of evidence may be put forward: an epigram of Martial, ' "si dederint superi decies mihi milia centum!" / dicebas nondum, Scaeuola, iustus eques' (1, 103, 1 f.: quoted by Mommsen, I, 498, n. 2 ad fin.); and a passage in Juvenal—if an eques' fortune does not satisfy, 'sume duos equites, fac tertia quadraginta' (Sat. 14, 326).

Juvenal is too vague to be useful and had better be dismissed. Martial may be more helpful, as the point seems to be the contrast between the equestrian rank Scaevola has yet to

---

<sup>1</sup> In Juv. 9, 140 f. Naevolus seems to long for the equestrian census when he talks of 'uiginti milia faenus / pigneribus positus'. This would indicate a five per cent. return. Pliny the Younger arranged to benefit Comum by paying thirty thousand sesterces per annum on land worth 500,000 (i.e. six per cent., but this may have been a high rate: see Sherwin-White on Epist. 7, 19, 4 [Letters, pp. 423-24]).



reach and the Senatorial he yearns for: but this is still too flimsy evidence by itself. On the whole it is more likely that Dio is right. The emperor's gifts of a million sesterces, as recorded by Tacitus, may well have been the size of the minimum qualification in order to ensure that the recipients were placed well above that level (especially, perhaps, as Hortensius was of distinguished descent, and the other beneficiary was of praetorian rank in the House). The eighty young men aided by Augustus beyond the million mark may have been specially under the emperor's benevolent eye, or of more aristocratic birth than the others, or otherwise distinguished. Suetonius' twelve hundred thousand might be accounted for by the latter incident, if he came across it on its own in a source and took it to signify a general increase to the higher sum.

The reason for establishing or increasing a fixed Senatorial census was partly a recognition of the upper-class character of the ordo, developed over the previous two centuries, and partly an acceptance by the government of the primacy of the higher economic classes among the supporters of the Principate. Syme observes picturesquely that 'the rich were in power—conspicuous in their serried ranks were hard-headed and hard-faced men like Lollius, Quirinius and Tarius Rufus. With such champions, property might rest secure' (R R, p. 452, cf. 351, 508). The reason for the increase to one million is probably that given by Dio: 'the passage of time and the acquisition of wealth' (26, 3).

There was perhaps the desire as well to keep out those with more than the minimum equestrian census but less than a million: when a shortage of candidates for office occurred, Augustus preferred to obtain Equites who possessed the million or more (54, 30, 2)—they were 'equites Romani senatoria dignitate' as Tacitus characterizes them (Ann. 16, 17, 1).

By καὶ ἄρχειν ἐκ τῶν νόμων δυναμένοις Dio is referring to those of legal age: see notes to 52, 20, 1 and 2 above.

+

26, 3 ἐξέτασις αὐθις τῶν βουλευτῶν ἐγένετο: This reported lectio,  
and the one briefly

announced under 11 B.C. (35, 1: see n. ad loc.) are the principal difficulties in Dio's account of the Augustan revisions.

The narrative looks suspicious indeed. The emperor pays no attention to those of Senatorial rank over thirty-five, and he exempts men under that age who have Senatorial qualifications but are physically handicapped (§ 8). It seems to resemble more a recognitio equitum as described by Suetonius than a lectio: Equites over thirty-five were allowed to surrender their equus publicus, and those 'senio uel aliqua corporis labe insignibus' to attend the trauectio on foot (DA 38, 3). Jones therefore suggests that Dio has confused a recognitio in 13 B.C. with a review of the Sen-

---

<sup>1</sup> This is one interpretation of Suetonius' language—some take the words in the opposite sense (after reading mallent for nollent). Contrast Levi and Adams ad loc., and see Henderson in JRS, LIII (1963), p. 66 and n. 38.

ate, and that the true review took place in 11 (Studies, p. 23).

Now at the opening of this account Dio states (§§ 3 ff.) that it was the increase in the Senatorial qualification to a million sesterces (from, he says, four hundred thousand) that discouraged 'sons and grandsons of Senators' from seeking to enter the House; adding that, when Augustus was still away, a senatus consultum was passed allowing the Vigintiviri to be chosen from Equites. Since Senators in any case held the Vigintivirate before gaining Senatorial rank, i.e. when holding Equestrian status (cf. McAlindon in JRS, XLVII [1957], pp. 191 ff.), this implies that the Equites now chosen were free to remain Equites after their term: Dio seems to realize this (cf. § 5 ad fin.; also 30, 2). The increase in the qualification probably took effect some years before, perhaps in or before 16 B.C. (Augustus left Italy then: 54, 19, 1), and if so this would give at least three years for a distinct shortage of new recruits to make itself felt (since twenty ex-Quaestors a year normally entered the Senate). This in turn would impel Augustus to try to remedy this, and it would be new blood he wanted: hence to concentrate on men below thirty-five would be natural—as also on the healthy and vigorous, particularly if many or most of the new entrants would shortly be required to hold the military tribunate. (Besides, an average number of young men would hardly include a large proportion of disabled: if there were only a few by comparison with healthy persons of the same class, the emperor could easily grant 'compass-

ionate exemption'). As Astin argues, Dio's description is not to be taken as that of the normal procedure in a lectio but only of Augustus' action in this instance (Latomus, XXII [1963], p. 228).

If one combines Dio and Res Gestae (52, 42 and 8, 2) it would seem that the first lectio and census occupied 29-28 B.C. (cf. n. to 52, 42, 1). Therefore Hammond may be right in suggesting that the lectio reported by Dio for 11 is merely the conclusion of that begun in 13 (A Pr, p. 93). If there is any value to be given to ἐκ δὲ τούτου in § 3, the lectio must have been started on or after 24 September, 13 B.C., as Dio has just recounted a show given in honour of the emperor's birthday (25, 2; cf. E J, p. 52 under 23 and 24 Sept.; also no. 98, lines 51-52; Suet. DA 5), and from late 13 to some time in 11 could well have been less than two years (cf. Astin, p. 229).

26, 5 τοὺς εἰκοσι κ.τ.λ. : On the Vigintivirate cf. CAH, X, 162 and n. 1; Hammond, A Pr, pp. 134,

139; A M, pp. 296-97. Among them, those who were IIIuiri monetales or Xuiri stlitibus iudicandis appear to have generally been the ones subsequently chosen to be candidati imperatoris, and IIIuiri monetales and IVuiri uiis in urbe purgandis to have been marked out for service in the emperor's provinces (cf. ILS 964, 1063; McCrum-Woodhead, no. 261; Smallwood, no. 190. Candidati imperatoris or quaestores Aug.: ILS 1017, 1070; McCrum-Woodhead, nos. 261, 299; Smallwood, nos. 212, 224, 225. Imperial governors: the trends are discussed by Birley in PBA XXXIX [1953], pp. 197-

214, esp. 201-6). On the role of the Vigintivirate in relation to army service in the early Empire, see McAlindon in JRS, XLVII [1957], pp. 191-95 (summarized in n. on 52, 20, 1).

Bender in his note on this section (Commentary, p. 150) states that the Equites who were to be appointed Vigintiviri were Senators' sons who had not yet attained the Quaestorship; but this can hardly be correct, as it was the reluctance of these very persons (who would have held the posts in the ordinary course of things) that drove the Senate to the measure: the equites therefore must be, as argued above, ordinary members of that class.

+

35, 1 ἀπογραφάς τε ἐποιήσατο : Another difficulty, as the date is 11 B.C. (32, 2) and as Dio does not mention the census which Augustus reports with the lustrum of 8 B.C. (RG 8, 3). Furthermore, Dio continues ... καὶ τὴν βουλὴν κατελέξατο . This has been accounted for above (not that the historian himself seems to have been aware of any possible continuity). Astin suggests that Augustus may have started, or obtained formal authorization for, the new census in 11, but was hindered from completing it earlier than 8 by having to perform it alone ('[s]olus': RG loc. cit.) and having to attend to other concerns (wars on the northern frontiers, which drew him away in 10 and in 9, for example): Latomus, XXII, pp. 230-31.

(Astin's argument would also be strengthened if the possibility be entertained that Dio has got his item in a year too

soon; he sometimes commits this error—apart from the disputed chronology of 23/22—cf. n. on 53, 12, 9 [annexation of Noricum: above, p. 81]; also notice the apparent dating of Augustus' becoming Pontifex Maximus to 13 B.C. [54, 27, 2: actually 12 B.C.—RG 10, 2]. In 11 and 10 one of the Consuls of either year was a Fabius Maximus: Paullus, then Africanus—which might aid an error.)

ibid. ἐν ἐλάττωσιν ἢ τετρακοσίοις γίνεσθαι: Our knowledge of the minimum legal attendance in the Senate of the Republic is limited. The senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus is an early example: 'dum ne minus senatoribus C adessent quom ea res cosoleretur' (ILS 18; cf. Lewis and Reinhold, I, 472-73). The Lex Cornelia de privilegiis of 67 B.C. set a quorum of two hundred for granting exemptions from legal restrictions to individuals (Asconius in Cornel. 51-52 [p. 59 C], cited by Hammond, A M, p. 255). See Mommsen, R Str, III 2, 989; Pauly-Wissowa, Supp. Vol. VI, 704.

That four hundred as the previous quorum was an arrangement of Caesar the Dictator is suggested by Mommsen (III 2, 990, n. 3). Dio later says that Augustus fixed a quorum according to the topic under discussion (55, 3, 2); according to Suetonius, he required only those chosen by lot to make up the necessary quorum, to attend in September and October, the unhealthy months in Rome (D A 35, 3; cf. Adams ad loc.). In a time of famine, the necessity of a quorum was suspended (Dio 55, 26, 2 [A.D. 6]; cf. Mommsen, loc. cit.).

## CHAPTER SEVEN

3, 1 τὰς τε τῆς γερονσίας ἔδρας ἐν ῥηταῖς ἡμέραις... Suetonius gives much  
the same information:

quo autem lecti probatique et religiosius et minore molestia senatoria munera fungerentur, sanxit ut prius quam consideret quisque ture ac mero supplicaret apud aram eius dei, in cuius templo coiretur, et ne plus quam bis in mense legitimus senatus ageretur, Kalendis et Idibus, neue Septembri Octobriue mense ullos adesse alios necesse esset quam sorte ductos, per quorum numerum decreta confici possent

(D A 35, 3: see also previous n.). Dio reports the preliminary offering in 54, 30, 1, adding that Augustus prohibited τὴν ἄφιξιν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, which Cary translates as 'their usual visit to him': in fact the context would suggest a practice of approaching the Princeps where he sat to pay one's respects. There had been no fixed days during the Republic on which the Senate must meet, but it could not assemble on a dies nefastus or on a day when the Comitia met (Mommsen, R S t r, III 2, 921-23).

The regulations Dio gives were contained in the Lex Iulia de senatu habendo of 9 B.C., the year to which this passage belongs (cf. 1, 1). The law also regulated the order of speaking sententiae according to rank: consuls-designate spoke first. Cf. Pliny, Ep. 2, 11, 19; 5, 13, 5; 8, 14, 9, and Sherwin-White's commentary (pp. 168, 340-41, 465); Gellius 14, 7, 8. This passage is also to be noted as an example of Dio's unconcern with technical precision: his words are ὁ δ' Ἀύγουστος . . . ἐκέλευσεν, and he only afterwards

shows that the regulations were enacted by a law (4, 1).

The fines for absence may have been large. Gellius (speaking of Varro's handbook on procedure) mentions that 'de pignore quoque capiendo disserit et multa dicenda' (14, 7, 10); the 'pignus' was a lien on property of the offender as security for the payment of the fine ('multa'). A Senator who was threatened with the law for non-attendance in the decuriae seemed quite alarmed to the younger Pliny (Ep. 4, 29): the impression made by the magistrate's zeal for propriety on this occasion suggests that by Pliny's day penalization for such absences had largely ceased (cf. Sherwin-White ad loc. and on 7, 3, 2 [ pp. 309, 405 ] ). Dio's statement that offenders were numerous (§ 3) is another indication of Senatorial apathy (for earlier ones, 54, 26, 3 f. and n.; 30, 2 — with which cf. Suet. D A 40, 1; note also a statement in 56, 27, 1 below that Augustus 'allowed the Equites to seek the Tribunate' [ A.D. 12 ] ).

A Senate resolution in the Republic had no legally binding force, but gained its effect through the auctoritas of that body and in practice, therefore, was binding (the best-known instance perhaps being the S.C. de Bacchanalibus in 186 B.C.). If vetoed it lost this force, but might still have an effect as the expression of the Senate's wish; in this case it was termed 'senatus auctoritas' (Cicero ad Fam. 8, 8: cited by Pelham in Smith et al., Dict. of Antiq., II, 630, col. 2). Dio speaks of the resolutions carried by less than the needed quorum as also having this auctoritas (§ 4), a very probable development (such resolutions would



also lack binding force, like the ones that suffered veto). Interestingly, Dio transliterates the Latin word, which he does not do in his reference to the emperor's auctoritas (53, 18, 2: cf. n. ad loc.); here of course he is being more precise in the use of the term than in the earlier passage.

The place of meeting in the Republic had to be in Rome or within one mile of the City, in a consecrated spot (Gell. 14, 7, 7); the Curia was the meeting-place reserved exclusively for it, but it might also assemble in a temple -- Suetonius recounts that Augustus laid down that the Senate debate 'de bellis triumphisque' in the Temple of Mars, consecrated in 2 B.C. (D A 29, 2; Dio 55, 10, 2).

In § 6 Dio says that the Praetors protested that they could present no proposal to the Senate, though (the context makes it obviously implied) the Tribunes could. This is a curious statement. The Praetors had the power to summon the Senate and lay matters before it, also to make proposals -- in A.D. 69 the Praetores Aerarii 'publicam paupertatem questi modum impensis postulauerunt' in the House (Tac. Hist. 4, 9, 1); on 1 January, 70, the Senate was summoned by the Praetor Urbanus, Julius Frontinus (ibid. 39, 1). Gellius, paraphrasing M. Varro, gives the magistrates who could summon the House, in their order of precedence: Dictator, Consul, Praetor, Tribune, Interrex, Praefectus Urbi. He adds, 'neque alii praeter hos ius fuisse dixit facere senatus consultum' (14, 7, 4). What then does Dio mean?

He may simply be mistaken. But it is hard to see how such an error could arise. More likely, the historian has failed to under-

stand fully a source. At the same time it is not easy to determine what actually was the situation thus conjecturally misinterpreted; but one of two possible explanations may be correct.

(1) In the later Republic, Praetors do not seem to have exercised their ius referendi except when the Consuls were away (Pelham in Dict. Ant., II, 628, col. 1). Tribunes, however, were not so restrained -- as the mutual disarmament proposal put by Curio in 50 B.C., and opposed by the Consul, C. Marcellus, shows (Syme, R R, p. 42). It may be that this custom had become an unbreakable rule through age, and that the Praetors of 9 B.C., or some of them, appealed to the emperor to have it abrogated.

(2) Alternately, consideration of Varro's description of the veto-power of magistrates over Senatusconsulta (as reported by Aulus Gellius) -- 'postea scripsit de intercessionibus dixitque intercedendi ne senatus consultum fieret ius fuisse solis qui eadem potestate qua ii qui senatus consultum facere uellent maioreue essent' (14, 7, 6) -- might suggest that the Praetors were trying to spike the Tribunes' veto over Praetors' relationes. However, apart from the fact that Dio must have greatly misunderstood his source if this was what the complaint was really about, the demand seems exceptionally sweeping (the Tribunes' veto, after all, was one of the principal weapons of that office). If moreover such a demand were made and (as Dio says) granted, it is strange to find no mention of similar immunity being given to the Consuls or demanded by them: that they too continued to be subject to tribunician veto appears from Tac. Hist. 4, 9, 2.

The first explanation may thus be nearer the mark; unless Dio is making a mistake, the origin of which is difficult to discover.

4, 1 τοῖς βουλευταῖς...ἀναγνῶναι ἐπέτρεψεν κτλ.: Augustus sometimes sought other opinions on proposed regulations and enactments, cf. 53, 21, 3 and n.; 55, 25, 4 -- where Dio adds that he accepted none of the suggestions he received (ib. 5).

+

13, 3 καὶ τούτων: The date is A.D. 4 (cf. mention of Tiberius' adoption, and grant of 'tribunicia potestas', § 1a above, with E J, p. 49, under June 26 or 27; Vell. 2, 103, 3).

ibid. διαλέξαι τὴν γερουσίαν αὐτοῖς ἡθέλησε: This was at least fourteen years after the previous 'lectio' (cf. n. to 54, 26, 3). The government may have felt it was time to scrutinize the records of members once more to see how useful, or otherwise, they had been in the intervening decade and a half. From A.D. 4, moreover, a large number of noui homines, and members of Senatorial families that had never got beyond the Praetorship hitherto, acquired the by now six-monthly Consulship -- men like C. Vibius Postumus (suff. in 5), Q. Poppaeus Sabinus (Cos. 9) and Q. Poppaeus Secundus (suff. 9): fourteen altogether out of twenty-nine Consuls between A.D. 4 and 11. (From 18 B.C. to A.D. 3 the proportion was fourteen out of fifty-two: Marsh, pp. 43-44, 67; Syme, R R, pp. 362-63; 372-73; 434-35; for a discussion of the reasons and methods of this increase,

cf. also P. A. Brunt in J R S, LI [ 1961 ], pp. 71-83.). Such men would have entered the Senate at least eight years, but usually an even longer period, before this lectio (the minimum age for the Consulship was thirty-three, but not everyone could expect to hold it so soon -- thirteen years divided the Quaestorship of Agricola, in A.D. 64, from his Consulship in 77). It is likely that the lectio of A.D. 4 was connected with this development, to some extent: the government could, for example, get rid of unwanted Senators and encourage proteges by reducing the number of rivals. Though Augustus left the work to a commission of three, its members were selected by lot from ten Senators whom he had nominated; and he could exert 'auctoritas' (cf. pp. 131-32 above).

The lectio may have been also connected with the census Dio reports in ss 4 ff. This was not a general census, as Augustus does not mention it in Res Gestae and as Dio says it was limited to those with 200,000 sesterces and upward (cf. Hammond, A P r, 91; Jones, Studies, p. 23). The historian's statement that Augustus 'assumed proconsular power in order to carry out the census' (s 5) is quite incompatible with his earlier references to this power: in 12, 3 above (Xiph. 103, 3-11; Zonar. 10, 36) its renewal for another decade has been announced under date A.D. 3. What may in fact have happened was the passing of a senatus consultum or a resolution by the Assembly acknowledging once more that the emperor's imperium was valid to hold such a survey: see also n. on 54, 13, 1 (pp. 84-85). Dio adds that the proconsulare imperium was also assumed 'to perform the καθάρσιον', i.e. lustrum, but this alleged lustrum is not recorded by Augustus.

tus (cf. R G 8, 3-4); Dio, or his source, appears to think that this registration of property was performed as a formal census, and so must have been accompanied by a lustrum.

On the 'triumviratum legendi senatus' cf. Suet. D A 37, 2. Levi (ad loc.) says it was 'sorteggiato . . . per le revisioni annuali dell' album senatorio', but there seems to be no evidence for this.

+

24, 9 δι' οὖν ταύτ' ἀπορῶν χρημάτων : The date is A.D. 5 (the account for 6 opens with ch.

25), and Dio has just been describing the army establishment, following a report on the increase in legionary and praetorian 'praemia missionis' (23 - 24, 8). He is more precise here than often -- Augustus, he says, 'brought a motion before the Senate'. For the taxes see below, 25, 2.

ibid. ἐπειδὴ τε μηδεὶς ἀγορανομῆσαι ἔκων ἤθελεν : The expense of the Aedile-

ship, now that the political rewards (in the shape of popular support for higher offices) were diminished by the Principate, discouraged candidates. In 36 B.C., Dio recorded, the Praetors and Tribunes had to carry out the Aediles' functions owing to lack of candidates for the magistracy (49, 16, 2). Even after the Civil Wars there were difficulties, although in 22 Augustus had the charge of all festivals committed to the Praetors, thus relieving the Aediles of a burdensome liability (54, 2, 3-4). In 29 the Praetor Urbanus and the Praetor Peregrinus had had to take over

the duties of the office (53, 2, 2), and in 19 an Aedile resigned because of poverty (54, 11, 1). Apathy also plagued the Tribunate, here rather because the emperor had taken over its principal activities, such as lawmaking; cf. 54, 26, 7 (ex-Quaestors appointed by lot to the office); ib. 30, 2 (Equites appointed, with permission to remain in the Equester Ordo afterwards if they chose, cf. Suet. D A 40, 1); 56, 27, 1 (Equites allowed to seek the office).

Curiously enough, though we continue to hear of the poverty of Senators in the Julio-Claudian age (for example, Tac. Ann. 2, 37, 2; 12, 52, 3; 13, 34, 1; Suet. Tib. 47; Nero 10, 1; Dio 57, 10, 3; 60, 11, 8), there is less word of reluctance to take on the Tribunate or Aedileship. In fact Vespasian secured the latter 'non sine repulsa sextoque uix adeptus loco' (Suet. D. Vesp. 2, 3); and we find Pliny the Younger worried about a protegee's chances of the Tribunate (Ep. 2, 9, 1-2). Perhaps, as the Principate became an accepted fact, young office-seekers resigned themselves to the limitation in the powers of these magistracies and applied themselves to the functions that remained (cf. Hammond, A P r, 137-39): for 'quotus quisque reliquus, qui rem publicam uidisset?'

25, 2 ἐσήμεκεν ὁ Αὐγούστος χρήματα... ἐς τὸ ταμιεῖον The sum was 170, -  
000,000 HS ( R G

17, 2). Dio states that both 'maintenace' and 'bonuses' were to be paid out of the fund (24, 9); Augustus that the purpose of the new aerarium was 'ex [ q ] uo praemia darentur militibus'. Since

in five years (between 7 and 2 B.C.) the cost of bonuses to time-expired veterans was four hundred million (R G 16, 2), the money given by Augustus and the returns from the new taxes were probably intended only to pay the bonuses, as the emperor says. In his memoir he also admits that bonuses were paid to 'militibus, qui uicena [ aut plu ] ra sti [ pendi ] a emeruissent' (17, 2), though the term of service was fixed in A.D. 5 at twenty years (Dio 55, 23, 1; cf. Ann. 1, 78, 2). The mutineers in 14 complained of 'tricena aut quadragena stipendia' (Ann. 1, 17, 2). The military treasury may have taken time to build up its funds, and while it was doing so it would have been a temptation to avoid paying off time-expired men by keeping them beyond their term -- but this was not the only reason, nor probably the main one, for stipendia of much longer duration than twenty years (in one case, thirty-eight) continue to be attested (cf. Furneaux on Tac. Ann. 1, 78, 2; G. Forni, Il reclutamento delle legioni . . ., Appendix A, Tab. II, 1). Apart from voluntary continuation by some veterans themselves, prudent economy, and the difficulties of recruitment (cf. Ann. 4, 4, 2), were no doubt the principal reasons for the practice. It seems that land, in lieu of money, often formed the bonus -- and here again unsatisfactory stuff might be foisted on a veteran ('uligines paludum uel inculta montium': Ann. 1, 17, 3; cf. also 14, 27, 2). Such land may have been cheaper than the cash bonus, a temptation to a government saddled with annual outlays of 160,000,000 HS (suggested by G. H. Stevenson in A Companion to Latin Studies, ed. [ Sir ] J. E. Sandys, § 517, p. 352) or 186,000,000 (Marquardt, II, 97) in army pay alone.

Of the new taxes, Dio mentions only the five per cent. levy on inheritances (uicesima hereditatum), laid down by the Lex Iulia de uicesima hereditatum (Pauly-Wissowa Vol. VIII a, 2, 2471). In later times this was administered by a procurator of its own (I L S 1330, 1342; McCrum-Woodhead, no. 328; Smallwood, no. 250; etc.). The theory that it was levied on estates of over 100,000 HS (e.g. Marquardt, II, 267) has been disputed by J. F. Gilliam (in American Journal of Philology, LXXIII [ 1952 ] pp. 397-405, especially pp. 402 ff.) -- among other pieces of evidence, an estate of less than two thousand sesterces appears subject to tax, and several soldiers are recorded paying it on the same day (it seems unlikely that they all could have possessed property worth a hundred thousand sesterces or more). This would strictly back up Dio's words on those exempted from the tax πλὴν τῶν πάντοτε συγγενῶν ἢ καὶ πενήτων (85). The other impost, not mentioned by Dio, was the centesima rerum venalium or one per cent. sales tax, of which Tiberius declared 'militare ac-rarium eo subsidio niti' (Tac. Ann. 1, 78, 2); it was lowered to one-half per cent. (ducentesima) on the annexation of Cappadocia (Ann. 2, 42, 4; cf. Furneaux ad loc.; Koestermann on 1, 78, 2; also Marquardt, II, 278; C A H, X, 648).

The Senate resented these new levies, or at any rate the uicesima (Dio 56, 28, 4 -- the populus disliked the centesima: Ann. 1, 78, 2). It fell only on Roman citizens, the first direct tax since the abolition of tributum in 167 B.C., and this, as well as the chronic inadequacy of reproduction suffered by Senatorial families (cf. Hammond, A M, pp. 250-51), must have produced annoyance, particularly in influential persons with large fortunes (like P. Sulpicius Quirinius, 'diues atque orbis': Tac. Ann. 3, 22,



1).

Augustus' assertion that he had found the uicesima in 'the memoranda of Caesar the Dictator' recalls the similar statements of Antonius in 44 B.C. (Dio 44, 53, 2-3; cf. 45, 23, 8). The emperor may have been telling the truth, especially if Dio's remark that the tax had been temporarily introduced at an earlier date is true (cf. Marquardt, II, 266-67).

The appointment of three ex-Praetors to administer the aerarium militare (§ 2) is on a par with the creation of other such boards (cf. 54, 17, 1 and n.). The aerarium populi Romani was variously administered under Augustus: by two praetorian praefecti appointed by the Senate, from 28 to 23 B.C. (Dio 53, 2, 1), then by two Praetors (ibid. 32, 2). Claudius entrusted it in A.D. 44 to two Quaestors (60, 24, 1-2). In 56 Nero appointed ex-Praetors to administer it (Tac. Ann. 13, 29, 2: for a summary of the earlier methods -- with the odd comment 'neque id diu mansit' for the sixty-six year control by Praetors -- ib. 29 passim). But in Hist. 4, 9, 1 Tacitus shows that in 69 Praetors were back at the aerarium, an arrangement apparently soon replaced by Nero's once more (Mommsen, R S t r. II 1, 559-60; C A H. XI, 422).

25, 6 διὰ τριῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπατευκότων: See n. on 54, 17, 1 (where also occurs a reference to 26, 2 below:

ἄνδρες ὑπατευκότες ἐπὶ τε τοῦ σίτου καὶ τοῦ ἄρτου κατέστησαν ).

26, 2 κύρια πάντα τὰ γιγνωσκόμενα . . εἶναι ἐκελεύσθη: On this, cf.

54, 35, 1,

and second n.

+

34, 1 The 'ciuilitas' of the Princeps towards the Senate is also marked by Suetonius (D A 53-55), who says that he made a point of greeting Senators by name on entering and leaving, and (as Dio states) scrupulously attended all its meetings until age prevented him; Suetonius then gives instances of independent speech in the House, including the anecdote about Antistius Labeo already referred to (D A 54; cf. Dio 54, 15, 7; and n. to 54, 13, 1) and the emperor's tolerance of anonymous libels (on which cf. also D A 51, 3).

Augustus' habit of sitting with magistrates as they tried cases was a foreshadowing of Tiberius' (Tac. Ann. 1, 75, 1), on which the annalist comments, 'sed dum ueritati consulitur, libertas corrumpitur' (ibid. 2). But we may perhaps infer that Augustus was more tactful than his outspoken successor from Dio's next words: 'when his companions on the bench disagreed with him, his vote was only counted as equal to that of any of the others.'

34, 2 τότε δὲ τῇ μὲν γερουσίᾳ καὶ ἄνευ ἑαυτοῦ κ. τ.λ. : The topic of

the jurisdiction of the Senate has been discussed in the n. to 53, 21, 6; for the emperor's, see 52, 33, 1 and n.

ibid. τῷ μὲν προτέρῳ ἐπειπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἄρξοντας αὐτὸς...ὥστεδείξει: The year

referred to was A.D. 7, as the date of this passage is 8 (33, 1).

As P. A. Brunt observes, 'referendes to "appointment" naturally do

not imply that the due formalities were not observed' (J R S, LI [ 1961 ], p. 78); cf. Levick in Historia, XVI [ 1967 ], p. 207). These are the first recorded electoral disturbances since 19 B.C. (54, 10, 1) and may well have been connected with the recurrent famine, and consequent shortage of food, that Dio records for A.D. 6-7 (55, 26, 1-2; 27, 1-3; 31, 3-4).

Dio says that Augustus henceforth posted bulletins to recommend the candidates he favoured. For his earlier practice of personally canvassing the Comitia to support them (suffragatio, as the term was), see Suet. D A 56, 1, and cf. 40, 2; see also n. on 53, 21, 7 (pp. 114 ff.). The bulletins did not recommend as many candidates for office as there were places, for Tiberius on his accession appealed to Augustus' practice to justify keeping the number of Praetors at twelve, then limited his commendatio to four candidates for that office, 'numerum ab Augusto traditum' (Tac. Ann. 1, 14, 6; 15, 2).

The troubles of A.D. 7 followed two years after the Lex Valeria Cornelia, a statute commemorated in the Tabula Hebana ( E J, no. 94a; cf. also 94b), which, in listing honours paid to the deceased Germanicus reveals the creation of ten centuriae named after C. and L. Caesar, 'de consulibus praetoribus destinandis'. The measure is interesting and important, because the centuriae so organized -- with five added to Germanicus after his death, and five more apparently in honour of Tiberius' son Drusus after his -- presumably acted as the old centuria praerogativa, chosen by lot among the centuriae of the first class, had done: that is, making a choice almost binding on the rest of the Comitia. No ancient literary

source mentions the arrangement; and Tacitus says the elections were transferred in 14 'e campo ad patres' (Ann. 1, 15, 1).

The purpose of the law has been much discussed. A. H. M. Jones has suggested that it was a painless means adopted by Augustus of getting new men from Italian upper-class families into principal magistracies (he shows that Equites -- who would be of the same social level -- must have predominated in the new 'centuriae Caesarum') to infuse new vigour into administration (J R S, XLV [ 1955 ], pp. 9 ff. = Studies, chap. III). P. A. Brunt argues that, though noui homines do come to the Consulship in increased numbers in the later part of Augustus' Principate, this was true of the period before the Lex Valeria Cornelia as well as of the one after; and nobiles were by no means put at any disadvantage as a result of this influx, even after A.D. 5 (J R S, LI [ 1961 ], pp. 71 ff.).

From 5 B.C. to A.D. 15 (as Brunt's tables show, p. 75), twenty-six nobiles secured the Consulship as ordinarii or suffecti; eighteen 'new nobiles' (i.e. sons of men who had gained the Consulship as noui homines after 49 B.C.) did so, and twenty noui homines. Between A.D. 5 and 15 (that is, the second half of the above period; this is Brunt's third period, cf. his p. 73) twelve nobiles and ten noui homines secured Consulships, which demonstrates that in the decade before the Lex Valeria Cornelia as many noui homines obtained the office as in the decade after. The most notable development after A.D. 5 is the increase in the number of 'new nobiles' reaching ordinary Consulships -- seven (plus one suffect -- but this too was a process starting in the previous decade (four ordinarii, as well as six suffecti). Brunt ex-

plains this by pointing out that such men had by then simply reached the legal age for the magistracy (p. 75).

In other words, the significance of the Lex was less than some believe. Brunt suggests that it was a measure, rather, to gratify the two principal classes by separating them from the crowd of lesser folk at elections and making their votes count for more by allowing them to destinare aspirants for the Praetorship and Consulship (pp. 76-77). That Augustus continued to recommend candidates to the Comitia, as Dio says here (and cf. Vell. 2, 124, 3-4), does not suggest an electorate left to its own devices by a government confident it would choose the men the Princeps wanted.

The account in Tacitus of the transfer 'e campo ad patres' is therefore not refuted. Syme suggests that the centuriae established by the Lex Valeria Cornelia were suspended in 14 by Senatusconsultum, to be revived on occasion (Tacitus, II, App. 67, pp. 759-60). Even this step is not an essential surmise: an arrangement whereby the candidacies would be decided on by the Senate and reduced to match the number of places available would leave the 'destinating' centuriae as well as the full Comitia with a mere cong  d' lire; and that this is what happened -- so that Tacitus in the passage quoted is dealing with realities and not technical precision -- is shown by Dio, whose description is:

Of the candidates for the other offices, he [ Tiberius ] selected as many as he wished and referred them to the senate, some with his recommendation, in which event they were chosen unanimously, but in the case of others conditioning their selection upon the merit of their claims, upon mutual agreement, or upon the lot. After that the candidates went before the people or before the plebs, according as they belonged to the one or the other,

and were duly elected; this was done in order to conform to time-honoured precedent, just as is done today, so as to produce the semblance of a valid election

(58, 20, 3-4: trans. Cary). Cf. Jones in J R S, XLV, pp. 19-20 (= Studies, pp. 46-8). A century later, Pliny the Younger refers to 'longum illud carmen comitiorum' (Panegyricus 63, 2, cited by Syme, p. 757). Dio's account also shows that a hundred years further on the Comitia continued to be employed as the formal electoral body. Tacitus sums up the later history of the honours paid to the deceased Germanicus: 'pleraque manent: quaedam statim omissa sunt aut uetustas oblitteravit' (Ann. 2, 83, 4).

The transfer of elections, in effect, from Comitia to Senate did not create a new trend in election results (Jones, in J R S, XLV, p. 20). The reason for it given by Tacitus seems sufficient: 'senatus largitionibus ac precibus sordidis exsolutus libens tenuit [ ius ]' (1, 15, 1). Even in the Comitia after A.D. 5, and even if the ten new centuriae did determine the election by their choice, much soliciting of Equites must have taken place. The latter do not seem to have complained of the developments of A.D. 14; it may be that attendance in the new centuriae was not very heavy and that Senators had managed, by exerting themselves, to dominate their decisions.

Contests in the Senate itself continued. In A.D. 17 Germanicus and Drusus backed one candidate for the Praetorship, while 'contra plerique nitebantur' (Ann. 2, 51); Dio speaks of some hotly contested praetorian elections later in Tiberius' reign (58, 20, 4; cf. Jones' remarks on this, p. 20); Suet. D. Vesp. 2, 3 (Vespas-

ian's hard time securing the Aedileship); Ann. 14, 28, 1 'comitia praetorum arbitrio senatus haberi solita . . . acriore ambitu exarserant' (A.D. 60); Pliny, Ep. 2, 9, 1-2 (anxiety over the prospects of a friend seeking the Tribune).

## CHAPTER EIGHT

28, 1 τὴν τε προστασίαν...τὴν δεκάτην τὴν πέμπτην: On the renewals of Augustus' power, see n.

to 53, 16, 2.

ibid. καὶ συμβούλους...εἴκοσιν ἑτησίους ᾗτήσασθε: A new development of the semenstre consilium, instituted several decades earlier (53, 21, 4 and n. (i) it became annuum; (ii) the numbers were increased to twenty and the Consuls-designate as well as the Consuls included (Dio does not mention the use of the lot to select members, nor the presence of one magistrate from each of the other colleges, as had prevailed in the old consilium, but both practices may have continued); (iii) Augustus' grandsons (Drusus and Germanicus, as Agrippa Postumus was banished in A.D. 7), as well as any others he might summon, were also to be on the consilium; (iv) this was now empowered to pass senatus consulta.

Dio gives the reason for the new arrangement as Augustus' age; this is a satisfactory enough explanation, for the emperor had given up personal canvassing of elections a few years before (55, 34, 2), and was now in the seventy-fifth year of a frail life (cf. Suet. D A 81-83). But the measure may have been politically significant also: Augustus must have realized he was near the end, and by creating a council which the principal members of the imperial house could attend, and vesting it with the power to



pass consulta, he set up a body that could act rapidly in an emergency and could be precisely counted on (and, if necessary, be packed) to perform as the ruler wished -- a useful instrument to aid a succession, and, in the meantime, to allow Tiberius to strengthen his control in the Senate (Crook, Consilium Principis, p. 15).

The new consilium appears to have been a combination of the previous probouleutic body with the emperor's own circle of amici whom he consulted over policy and, possibly, judicial decisions (cf. Josephus, Ant. Jud. 17, 229 and 301 on policy [ cited by Crook, p. 32 n. 2: cf. above p. 108 ]; Suet. D A 33, 2 on judicial use, cf. Dio 57, 7, 2; Hammond, A P r, 165-67). Had it continued, therefore, it might have developed into a powerful instrument independent of the Senate. But Dio's narrative (and subsequent developments -- see below) makes it fairly clear that it was established to serve the old age of Augustus, and did not become permanent.

Theories that the emperor's auctoritas devolved on this new body (Grant, From Imperium to Auctoritas, pp. 128, 453), or that auctoritas itself was now made legal and official (A. Magdelain, Auctoritas Principis, p. 89 f., cited by Crook, 16 n. 1) are improbable. The legalization of auctoritas is a difficult concept, and the arrangement of A.D. 13 does not seem as portentous as this view would have it (cf. Chilver in Historia, I [ 1950 ], p. 424; also 420-24 for discussion of Magdelain's thesis in general). The 'devolution' of auctoritas, a moral, and to some extent emotional, force, from one possessor to another (particularly to a specially created group) is similarly unlikely, and the consilium of A.D. 13 is to be regarded rather as being supported by the accumu-

lated auctoritas of the Princeps, Tiberius, Germanicus and other prominent members -- and indeed by that of the Senate itself, which voted for πάντ' ὅσα ἐν αὐτοῖς [κ.τ.λ.] δόξῃ, κύρια ὡς καὶ πάσῃ τῇ γερουσίᾳ ἀρέσαντα εἶναι (§ 3).

It is not clear whether the same sort of consilium was employed by Tiberius. Whatever Augustus may have planned his revised council to do in the event of his death, there is no mention of it in the days following the 19<sup>th</sup> of August, A.D. 14: Tiberius summoned the Senate at once, and in the summons itself outlined the agenda (Tac. Ann. 1, 7, 4-6; 8, 1-6). If the consilium played any part before the momentous session of that House on 17 September, it must have been simply probouleutic. Possibly the council lapsed with the death of the old man for whose convenience it had been created; possibly Tiberius regarded it at any rate as having lapsed. According to Suetonius he asked the Senate for a consilium: 'super ueteres amicos et familiares uiginti sibi e numero principum ciuitatis depoposcerat uelut consiliarios in negotiis publicis. horum omnium uix duo anne tres incolumes praestitit, ceteros alium alia de causa perculit' (Tib. 55). This has a familiar sound: twenty Senators plus intimates of the emperor. But the annually rotating character of Augustus' consilium does not seem to hold good for Tiberius', to judge by the biography, and the presence of magistrates on any systematic basis seems also to have ended: more important, the power to pass senatus consulta is not mentioned -- and in view of Tiberius' practice of bringing matters great and little before the

Senate itself (Suet. Tib. 30; Dio 57, 7, 2; Tac. Ann. 4, 4, 2-3; cf. 1, 26, 3) it is unlikely. Tiberius may have intended his change as a reform. But if it was the principes ciuitatis who formed the Senate's principal contribution to the new council, this left ordinary members of the House quite out of the picture (cf. Crook, p. 19). Given Tiberius' close relations with the Senate, this no doubt mattered less, but such closeness also diminished the council's importance as a probouleutic body. The council described by Suetonius probably (to judge from the mention of 'negotia publica') shared in forming the usual unofficial consilium of the emperor on questions of government -- some of its members, Seianus for example (whom Suetonius proceeds to cite after the extract quoted), certainly did (cf. Crook, pp. 36-39).

28, 4 ἐπὶ τῇ εἰκόστῃ : The five per cent. inheritance tax has been discussed above (55, 25, 2 and n.), where reasons for the Senate's hostility are suggested. It is noticeable that the prospect of a levy on land in Italy alarmed the Senate still more (cf. C A H, X, 195-96). That body by the close of Augustus' reign was drawn from all over Italy, and 'represented, not a region or a town, but a class, precisely the men of property, boni et locupletes' (Syme, R R, p. 365; cf. chap. XXIV as a whole).

That the emperor ἐπέμψεν ἄλλους ἄλλη τά τε τῶν ἰδιωτῶν καὶ τὰ τῶν πόλεων κτήματα ἀπογραφόμενους (8 6) strikes one, however, as unlikely solely as a measure to scare the Senate into yielding to the inheritance tax. Bearing in mind that the closing of the lustrum in any year, after a census, need not imply that every-

thing was carried out in that year alone, we may perhaps recognize here the beginning of Augustus' third census (R G 8, 4; cf. Astin in Latomus, XXII [ 1963 ], p. 231 and n. 1). In support of this view we can observe that the MS. of Dio has a lacuna from the middle of 28, 6 to late in 29, 3, and Xiphilinus does not appear to have included what followed after the sentence which he completes in 28, 6 (so Boissevain, II, 540 in app. crit.). Xiphilinus does not mention the alleged census of 11 B.C. (cf. comparative table in Millar, App. I, p. 203), nor the partial census of A.D. 4 (Dio 55, 13, 4 ff.; cf. Boiss., II, 498-99).

## APPENDIX

### A LIST OF SENATORS IN THE PRINCIPATE OF AUGUSTUS

mentioned by Dio in Books 52-56

---

THE names are followed by their numbers in de Laet, De Samenstelling, and (for nomina with initials A to H) in the available volumes of the Prosopographia Imperii Romani (2nd ed.). Notable references in Books 52-56 of Dio then follow.<sup>1</sup> A reference to Index signifies the Index consulum heading each Book, presumably the work of Dio (Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa, III, 1688).

1. SEX. AELIUS CATUS: de L. 7. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 157.  
54, 20, 3<sup>2</sup>; Index Bk. 55 [Cos. A.D. 4].
  2. L. AELIUS LAMIA: de L. 8. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 199.  
53, 29, 1-2 (MSS. Αἰμίλιος : see Boiss. ad loc.).
  3. L. AELIUS LAMIA: de L. 9. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 200.  
Index Bk. 55 [Cos. A.D. 3]; 58, 19, 5.
  4. Q. AELIUS TUBERO: de L. 12. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 274.  
54, 32, 3 [Cos. 11 B.C.] .
- 

<sup>1</sup> Interesting or important refs. in other books may also be provided.

<sup>2</sup> Boiss., III, p. xvii, reads Κάτος for Γάιος ad loc.

5. M'. AEMILIUS LEPIDUS:<sup>1</sup> de L. 14. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 363.  
55, 25, 2 [ Cos. A.D. 11 ].
6. M. AEMILIUS LEPIDUS: de L. 15. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 367.  
41, 36, 1 etc. [Triumvirate]; 53, 23, 2; 54, 15, 4-8;  
27, 2.
7. M. AEMILIUS LEPIDUS: de L. 16. PIR<sup>2</sup> Vol. I, p. 60,  
A 366/69, and II, add. no. 369.  
55, 25, 1 [ Cos. A.D. 6 ] ; 56, 12, 2-3.
8. PAULLUS AEMILIUS LEPIDUS: de L. 17. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 373.  
49, 42, 2; 54, 2, 1 [ Censor 22 B.C. ] ; 24, 3.
9. Q. AEMILIUS LEPIDUS: de L. 18. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 376.  
54, 6, 2-3 [ Cos. 21 B.C. sero ].
10. L. AEMILIUS PAULLUS: de L. 19. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 391.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. A.D. 1 ].
11. P. ALFENUS VARUS: de L. 23. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 523.  
55, 10a, 5 [ Cos. A.D. 2 ].
12. M. AMPUDIUS:<sup>2</sup> de L. 24. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 569.  
53, 20, 2-4 [ Tribune 27 B.C. ] .
13. M. ANTISTIVS LABEO: de L. 29. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 760.  
54, 15, 7-8.
14. C. ANTISTIVS VETUS: de L. 31. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 770.

<sup>1</sup> M. (Marcus) in Dio.

<sup>2</sup> Sex Pacuvius or Apudius in Dio. De L. also reckons, as no. 274, Sex. Pacuvius Taurus as Trib. in 27, with the same reference as he gives for Ampudius (i.e. 53, 20). See Boiss. ad loc.

- 47, 27, 2-4; 53, 25, 7-8.
15. C. ANTISTHIUS VETUS: de L. 32. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 771.  
55, 9, 1 [ Cos. 6 B.C. ].
16. IULLUS ANTONIUS: de L. 34. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 800.  
54, 26, 2 [ Praetor 13 B.C. ]; 36, 4 [ Cos. 10 B.C. ];  
55, 10, 15.
17. M. APPULEIUS: de L. 35. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 959.  
54, 7, 4 [ Cos. 20 B.C. ].
18. SEX. APPULEIUS: de L. 37. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 961.  
51, 20, 1 [ Cos. 29 B.C. ]; 54, 30, 4.
19. SEX. APPULEIUS: de L. 38. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 962.  
56, 29, 2; 5 [ Cos. A.D. 14 ].
20. L. ARRUNTIUS: de L. 46. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 1129.  
54, 1, 1 [ Cos. 22 B.C. ].
21. L. ARRUNTIUS: de L. 47. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 1130.  
55, 25, 1 [ Cos. A.D. 6 ]; 58, 27, 4.
22. ARTICULEIUS PAETUS maior: de L. 49. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 1174.  
54, 14, 3 [ removed from Senate 18 B.C. ].
23. ARTICULEIUS PAETUS minor: de L. 50. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 1175.  
54, 14, 3.
24. C. ASINIUS GALLUS: de L. 54. PIR<sup>2</sup> A 1229.  
55, 5, 1 [ Cos. A.D. 8 ]; 57, 2, 5-7; 58, 3, 1-6; 18, 4;  
23, 6.
25. Q. CAECILIUS METELLUS CRETICUS SILANUS: de L. 71.  
PIR<sup>2</sup> C 64.  
55, 30, 6 [ Cos. A.D. 7 ].

26. A. CAECINA SEVERUS: de L. 73. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 106.  
55, 29, 3; 30, 3-4; 32, 3.
27. C. CALPURNIUS: de L. 80. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 245.  
53, 33, 3.
28. CN. CALPURNIUS PISO: de L. 82. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 286.  
53, 20, 1-2 [ Cos. 23 B.C. ].
29. CN. CALPURNIUS PISO: de L. 83. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 287.  
55, 8, 1 [ Cos. 7 B.C. ]; 57, 15, 9; 18, 9-10.
30. L. CALPURNIUS PISO PONTIFEX: de L. 84. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 289.  
54, 21, 1 [ Cos. 15 B.C. ]; 34, 6-7; 58, 19, 5.
31. L. CALPURNIUS PISO: de L. 85. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 290.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. 1 B.C. ].
32. C. CALVISIUS SABINUS: de L. 88. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 353.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. 4 B.C. ].
33. P. CARISIUS:<sup>1</sup> de L. 93. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 422.  
53, 25, 8; 54, 5, 1-2.
34. NERO CLAUDIUS DRUSUS: de L. 102. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 857.  
48, 44, 4-5 etc.; 54, 10, 4; 19, 6; 22, 1-5 etc.
35. M. CLAUDIUS MARCELLUS: de L. 103. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 925.  
48, 38, 3; 51, 21, 3; 53, 26, 1; 27, 5 etc.
36. M. CLAUDIUS MARCELLUS AESERNINUS: de L. 104. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 926.  
42, 15, 2-5 etc.; 54, 1, 1 [ Cos. 22 B.C. ].
37. TI. CLAUDIUS NERO (later TI. IULIUS CAESAR): de L. 107.  
PIR<sup>2</sup> C 941.  
48, 15, 3-4; 44, 5; 53, 26, 1; 28, 3-4, etc.

---

<sup>1</sup> T. in Dio.



38. C. CLUVIUS: de L. 117. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1204.  
52, 42, 4.
39. L. CORNELIUS BALBUS: de L. 125. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1331.  
54, 25, 2.
40. CN. CORNELIUS CINNA MAGNUS: de L. 127. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1339.  
55, 14-22, 3 [ Cos. A.D. 5 ].
41. CN. CORNELIUS LENTULUS: de L. 131. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1378.  
54, 12, 4 [ Cos. 18 B.C. ].
42. CN. CORNELIUS LENTULUS AUGUR: de L. 132. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1379.  
54, 24, 1 [ Cos. 14 B.C. ]; 57, 24, 8.
43. COSSUS CORNELIUS LENTULUS GAETULICUS: de L. 133. PIR<sup>2</sup>  
C 1380.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. 1 B.C. ]; 55, 28, 3-4.
44. L. CORNELIUS LENTULUS: de L. 135. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1384.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. 3 B.C. ].
45. P. CORNELIUS LENTULUS MARCELLINUS: de L. 139. PIR<sup>2</sup>  
C 1396.  
54, 12, 4 [ Cos. 18 B.C. ].
46. P. CORNELIUS SCIPIO: de L. 144. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1438.  
54, 19, 1 [ Cos. 16 B.C. ].
47. CORNELIUS SISENNA: de L. 145. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1454.  
54, 27, 4.
48. L. CORNELIUS SULLA: de L. 149. PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1460.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. 5 B.C. ].
49. L. DOMITIUS AHENOBARBUS: de L. 163. PIR<sup>2</sup> D 128.  
48, 54, 4; 54, 19, 1 [ Cos. 16 B.C. ]; 55, 10a, 2-3.

50. M. EGNATIUS RUFUS: de L. 168. PIR<sup>2</sup> E 32.  
53, 24, 4-6.
51. AFRICANUS FABIVS MAXIMVS: de L. 170. PIR<sup>2</sup> F 46.  
55, 1, 1 [ Cos. 10 B.C. ].
52. PAULLVS FABIVS MAXIMVS: de L. 171. PIR<sup>2</sup> F 47.  
54, 32, 2 [ Cos. 11 B.C. ].
53. FANNIVS maior (father of no. 54): de L. 173. PIR<sup>2</sup> F 112.  
54, 3, 7.
54. FANNIVS CAEPIO: de L. 174. PIR<sup>2</sup> F 117.  
54, 3, 4-7.
55. C. FONTEIVS CAPITO: de L. 177. PIR<sup>2</sup> F 470.  
56, 26, 1 [ Cos. A.D. 12 ].
56. M. FURIIVS CAMILLVS: de L. 182. PIR<sup>2</sup> F 576.  
55, 33, 1 [ Cos. A.D. 8 ].
57. C. FURNIVS: de L. 183. PIR<sup>2</sup> F 590.  
48, 13, 6; 49, 17, 5 etc.; 52, 42, 4.
58. C. FURNIVS: de L. 184. PIR<sup>2</sup> F 591.  
54, 5, 1-2; 18, 1 [ Cos. 17 B.C. ].
59. C. IVLIVS CAESAR OCTAVIANVS AVGVSTVS (IMP. CAESAR AVGVSTVS):  
de L. 193.  
passim.
60. C. (IVLIVS) CAESAR: de L. 194.  
54, 8, 5; 18, 1; 55, 6, 4; 9, 1-2 etc.
61. DRVSVS IVLIVS (Ti. f.) CAESAR: de L. 195.  
55, 13, 2; 56, 17, 3; 25, 4 etc.
62. GERMANICVS IVLIVS CAESAR: de L. 196.  
55, 2, 3; 13, 2; 31, 1 etc.

63. L. (IULIUS) CAESAR: de L. 197.  
54, 18, 1; 55, 9, 1-5 etc.
64. C. IUNIUS SILANUS: de L. 199.  
54, 18, 1 [ Cos. 17 B.C. ].
65. L. IUNIUS SILANUS: de L. 202.  
54, 6, 2-3.
66. M. IUNIUS SILANUS: de L. 203.  
46, 38, 6-7 etc.; 53, 25, 3 [ Cos. 25 B.C. ].
67. D. LAELIUS BALBUS: de L. 208.  
55, 9, 1 [ Cos. 6 B.C. ].
68. M. LICINIUS CRASSUS: de L. 215.  
51, 4, 3 [ Cos. 30 B.C. ]; 23, 2-27, 1.
69. M. LICINIUS CRASSUS: de L. 216.  
54, 24, 1 [ Cos. 14 B.C. ].
70. A. TERENTIUS VARRO (L. LICINIUS ?) MURENA:<sup>1</sup> de L. 375.  
54, 3, 3-5.
71. A. LICINIUS NERVA SILIANUS: de L. 217.  
55, 30, 6 [ Cos. A.D. 7 ].
72. LICINIUS REGULUS: de L. 218.  
54, 14, 2-3.
73. LICINIUS (REGULUS ?) minor: de L. 219.  
54, 14, 2.
74. M. LIVIUS DRUSUS LIBO: de L. 224.  
54, 21, 1 [ Cos. 15 B.C. ].

---

<sup>1</sup> The identity of the conspirator with the consul ordinarius of 23 B.C. is here (with de Laet) assumed. See p. 61 and n. above.

75. M. LOLLIUS: de L. 225.  
54, 6, 2 [ Cos. 21 B.C. ]; 20, 3-6.
76. Q. LUCRETIUS VESPILLO: de L. 232.  
54, 10, 2 [ Cos. 19 B.C. sero ].
77. C. MARCIUS CENSORINUS: de L. 238.  
55, 5, 1 [ Cos. 8 B.C. ].
78. L. MUNATIUS PLANCUS: de L. 251.  
46, 29, 6; 50, 3-6 etc.; 54, 2, 1 [ Censor 22 B.C. ].
79. L. MUNATIUS PLANCUS: de L. 252.  
56, 28, 1 [ Cos. 13 B.C. ].
80. L. NONIUS ASPRENAS: de L. 259.  
55, 4, 3 (cf. Suet. D A 56, 3); 56, 22, 3-4.
81. SEX. NONIUS QUINTILIANUS: de L. 262.  
55, 33, 1 [ Cos. A.D. 8 ].
82. C. NORBANUS FLACCUS: de L. 265.  
53, 28, 1 [ Cos. 24 B.C. ].
83. M. PAPIUS MUTILUS: de L. 276.  
56, 10, 3 [ Cos. suff. A.D. 9 ].
84. L. PASSIENUS RUFUS: de L. 280.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. A.D. 4 ].
85. M. PLAUTIUS SILVANUS: de L. 291.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. 2 B.C. ]; 55, 34, 6-7; 56, 12, 2; 17, 2.
86. SEX. POMPEIUS: de L. 296.  
56, 29, 2; 5 [ Cos. A.D. 14 ]; 45, 2.
87. C. POPPAEUS SABINUS: de L. 301.  
56, 1, 1 [ Cos. A.D. 9 ]; 58, 25, 4-5.
88. Q. POPPAEUS SABINUS: de L. 302.

- 56, 10, 3 [ Cos. suff. A.D. 9 ].
89. M. PRIMUS: de L. 304.  
54, 3, 2-4.
90. P. QUINTILIUS VARUS: de L. 309.  
54, 25, 1 [ Cos. 13 B.C. ]; 56, 18-22, 1.
91. T. QUINCTIUS CRISPINUS: de L. 311.  
55, 1, 1 [ Cos. 9 B.C. ].
92. T. QUINCTIUS CRISPINUS: de L. 312.  
55, 10, 11 [ Praetor 2 B.C. ].
93. C. SENTIUS SATURNINUS: de L. 356.  
54, 10, 1-2 [ Cos. 19 B.C. ].
94. C. SENTIUS SATURNINUS: de L. 337.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. A.D. 4 ].
95. P. SERVILIUS: de L. 343.  
53, 27, 6 [ Praetor 25 B.C. ].
96. M. SERVILIUS NONIANUS: de L. 344.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. A.D. 3 ].
97. L. SESTIUS QUIRINUS ALBINUS: de L. 347.  
53, 32, 2 [ Cos. suff. 23 B.C. ].
98. C. SILIUS A. CAECINA LARGUS: de L. 353.  
56, 28, 1 [ Cos. A.D. 13 ]; 60, 31, 3.
99. P. SILIUS NERVA: de L. 354.  
54, 7, 4 [ Cos. 20 B.C. ]; 20, 1-2.
100. Q. STATILIUS: de L. 356.  
52, 42, 3.
101. T. STATILIUS TAURUS: de L. 358.  
49, 14, 6; 38, 4 etc.; 53, 23, 1 [ Cos. II 26 B.C. ];

- 54, 19, 6.
102. T. STATILIUS TAURUS: de L. 360.  
56, 25, 2 [ Cos. A.D. 11 ].
103. Q. SULPICIUS CAMERINUS: de L. 362.  
56, 1, 1 [ Cos. A.D. 9 ].
104. P. SULPICIUS QUIRINIUS: de L. 370.  
54, 28, 2 [ Cos. 12 B.C. ].
105. C. THORANIUS: de L. 381.  
53, 27, 6 [ Tribune 25 B.C. ].
106. M. VALERIUS MESSALLA BARBATUS: de L. 393.  
54, 28, 2 [ Cos. 12 B.C. ].
107. M. VALERIUS MESSALLA CORVINUS: de L. 395.  
47, 11, 4; 24, 5 etc.; 53, 27, 5.
108. M. VALERIUS MESSALLA MESSALLINUS: de L. 396.  
Index Bk. 55 [ Cos. 3 B.C. ] ; 55, 29, 1; 30, 1-4.
109. L. VALERIUS MESSALLA VOLESUS: de L. 400.  
55, 22, 3 [ Cos. A.D. 5 ].
110. C. VIBIUS POSTUMUS:<sup>1</sup> de L. 411.  
56, 16, 1.
111. M. VINICIUS: de L. 418.  
53, 26, 4.
112. P. VINICIUS: de L. 419.  
55, 10a, 5 [ Cos. A.D. 5 ].
113. M. VIPSANIUS AGRIPPA: de L. 420.  
48, 14, 1 etc.; 52, 1, 2-13, 7; 41, 2 etc.

---

<sup>1</sup> MSS. give Ποστούμιος . See Boiss. ad loc.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. Ancient Authors

#### (a) Used for references

- Appian: Bellum Civile, lib. I, a cura di Emilio Gabba. Firenze, La "Nuova Italia", [ 1958 ] .
- Augustus: Res Gestae, in Ehrenberg and Jones, Documents . . . (see Section II), pp. 2-31.
- Dio: Cassii Dionis Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt , ed. Ursulus Philippus Boissevain. 4 vols.; 2nd ed. Berlin, Weidmann, 1955.
- Festus: Sex. Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatu quae supersunt, cum Pauli epitome, ed. Wallace M. Lindsay. Hildesheim, Olms, 1965. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana)
- Frontinus: The Strategems and the Aqueducts of Rome. Text, with an English trans. by Charles E. Bennett. London, Heinemann: New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1925. (Loeb Classical Library)
- Gellius: Attic Nights. Text, with an English translation by J.C. Rolfe. London, Heinemann, 1927-28. (Loeb Classical Library)
- Juvenal: Satires (with Persius: Satires). Text, with an English trans. by G.G. Ramsay. London, Heinemann: Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1963. (Loeb Class. Lib.)
- Livy: Periochae (with Fragments, and Julius Obsequens). Text with English trans. by A.C. Schlesinger. Vol. 14 of the edn. in Loeb Classical Library: 14 vols.; London, Heinemann: New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1925-59.
- . Ab urbe condita, Vol. V (Books 24-26), ed. W. Weissenborn and M. Müller. 10 vols.; Berlin, Weidmann, 1962-63 (reprint of edn. of 1880-1924).
- Ovid: Fasti, with an English trans. by Sir James Frazer. London, Heinemann: Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, (Loeb Class. Lib.)

- Ovid: Tristia, ed. with an English trans. by A.L. Wheeler. London, Heinemann, (Loeb Class. Lib.)
- Pliny the Elder: Naturalis Historia. 7 vols.; Leipzig, Tauchnitz,
- Pliny the Younger: Epistulae, ed. R.A.B. Mynors. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Propertius: The Elegies of Propertius, ed. H.E. Butler and E.A. Barber. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Res Gestae diui Augusti: see Augustus.
- Suetonius: Opera, Vol. I. De vita XII Caesarum, recens. Maximilianus Ihm (ed. stereotypica editionis prioris [MCMVIII]). Stuttgart, Teubner, 1961.
- Tacitus: Agricola, ed. H. Furneaux; 2nd ed., rev. J.G.C. Anderson. Oxford, Clarendon Press, [ 1961 ].
- . Ab excessu diui Augusti [ Annales ], ed. Erich Koestermann. Leipzig, Teubner, 1960.
- . Historiae (Libri qui supersunt, Tom. II, Fascic. I), ed. Erich Koestermann. Leipzig, Teubner, 1961.
- Velleius Paterculus: Compendium of Roman History (with Res Gestae diui Augusti). Text, with an English trans. by Frederick W. Shipley. London, Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1961. (Loeb Class. Lib.)

(b) Other editions consulted

- Augustus: Res Gestae. Text with an English trans. by Frederick W. Shipley (see Velleius, above).
- Dio: Dio's Roman History, ed. and trans. Earnest Cary. 9 vols.; London, Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1914-27 (Vol. VI reprinted 1960; VII-VIII 1961).
- Suetonius: Divi Augusti Vita, ed. Michael Adams. London, Macmillan, 1963 (originally published 1939).
- . Divus Augustus, teste, introduzione, note e appendice a cura di Mario Attilio Levi. Firenze, La "Nuova Italia", [1951].
- Tacitus: The Annals of Tacitus, ed. Henry Furneaux. 2 vols. 2nd



edn.: Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896-1907 (Vol. II rev. H. F. Pelham and C.D. Fisher), reprinted 1962 (Vol. I), 1961 (Vol. II).

Tacitus: Die Annalen, Books I-VI. Commentary by Erich Koestermann. 2 vols.; Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1963.

## II. Inscriptions, Documents etc.

Dessau, Hermann (ed.). Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae. 3 vols. in 5. Berlin, Weidmann, 1892-1916.

Ehrenberg, V., and A.H.M. Jones (compilers). Documents illustrating the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. 2nd edn. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955; repr. 1963.

McCrum, M., and A.G. Woodhead (comps.). Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors, including the year of Revolution, A.D. 68-96. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1961.

Rushforth, G. McN. Latin Historical Inscriptions illustrating the history of the Early Empire. Oxford University Press: London, Humphrey Milford, 1930.

Smallwood, E. Mary (comp.). Documents illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1966.

## III. Modern Works

Astin, A.E. The Lex Annalis before Sulla. Bruxelles, Collection Latomus Vol. XXXII, 1958.

-----, 'Augustus and "censoria potestas"', Latomus, XXII (1963), pp. 226-35.

Atkinson, K.M.T. 'Legal and constitutional aspects of the trials of Marcus Primus and Varro Murena', Historia, IX (1960), pp. 440-73.

Augustus: studi in onori del bimillenario augusteo. Roma, Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1938.

Balsdon, J.P.V.D. Review of Sattler's Augustus und der Senat in Gnomon XXXIII (1961), pp. 393-96.

- Barnes, T.D. 'The Family and Career of Septimius Severus', Historia, XVI (1967), pp. 87-107.
- Bender, F. Boniface. A Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio 54. Diss. University of Pennsylvania, 1961.
- Béranger, J. Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat. Basel, F. Reinhardt, 1953.
- Birley, Eric. 'Senators in the Emperor's Service', Proceedings of the British Academy, XXXIX (1953), pp. 197-214.
- Bleicken, Jochen. 'Die politische Standpunkt Dios gegenüber die Monarchie', Hermes, XC (1962), pp. 444-67.
- Bowersock, Glen W. Review of Millar, A Study of Cassius Dio, in Gnomon, XXXVII (1964), pp. 469-74.
- Brunt, P.A. 'The Lex Valeria Cornelia', Journal of Roman Studies, LI (1961), pp. 71-83.
- , 'The "Fiscus" and its Development', Journal of Roman Studies, LVI (1966), pp. 75-91.
- Burn, Andrew Robert. Agricola and Roman Britain. London, English Universities Press, [ 1953 ].
- The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. IX: The Roman Republic, 133-44 B.C., ed. S.A. Crook, F.E. Adcock, M.P. Charlesworth. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1932; repr. 1952.
- , Vol. X: The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C.-A.D. 70 (edd. as preceding volume). Cambridge, at the University Press, 1934; repr. 1952.
- , Vol. XI: The Imperial Peace, A.D. 70-192 (edd. as above). Cambridge, at the University Press, 1936.
- , Vol. XII: The Imperial Crisis and Recovery, A.D. 193-324, ed. S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock, M.P. Charlesworth and N.H. Baynes. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1939.
- Chilver, G.E.F. 'Augustus and the Roman Constitution, 1939-50', Historia, I (1950), pp. 408-35.
- Crook, John. Consilium Principis. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1955.
- Degrassi, Attilio. Inscriptiones Latinae liberae Rei publicae. 2 vols. Firenze, Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, La "Nuova Italia", [ 1957 ].

- Forni, Giovanni. Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano. Milano e Roma, Bocca, 1953.
- Gilliam, J.A. 'The Minimum subject to the Vicesima Hereditatum', American Journal of Philology, LXXIII (1952), pp. 397-405.
- Grant, Michael. From Imperium to Auctoritas: a historical Study of Aes Coinage in the Roman Empire, 49 B.C.-A.D. 14. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1946.
- Greenidge, A.H.J. Roman Public Life. London, Macmillan, 1901.
- Hammond, Mason. 'The Significance of the Speech of Maecenas in Dio Cassius, Book LII', Transactions of the American Philological Association, LXIII (1932), pp. 88-102.
- . The Augustan Principate. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1933.
- . 'Hellenistic Influences on the Structure of the Augustan Principate', Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, XVII (1940), pp. 1-25.
- . The Antonine Monarchy. American Academy in Rome (Papers and Monographs: Vol. XIX), 1959.
- Henderson, M.I. 'The Establishment of the Equester Ordo', Journal of Roman Studies, LIII (1963), pp. 61-72.
- Holmes, T. Rice. The Architect of the Roman Empire. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928-31.
- Homo, Léon. Roman Political Institutions from City to State: Eng. trans. by M. Dobie. New York, Barnes and Noble, 1929; repr. 1962.
- Jerome, Thomas Spencer. Aspects of the Study of Roman History. New York, Capricorn Books, 1962 (first publ. 1923).
- Jones, A.H.M. 'The Aerarium and the Fiscus', Journal of Roman Studies, XL (1950), pp. 22-29 [ = Studies, chap. VI ].
- . 'The Elections under Augustus', Journal of Roman Studies, XLV (1955), pp. 9-21 [ = Studies, chap. III ].
- . Studies in Roman Government and Law. Oxford, Blackwell, 1960.

- de Laet, Siegfried J. De Samenstelling van den Romeinschen Senaat gedurende de eerste eeuw van het Principat (28 vóór Chr. - 68 na Chr.). Antwerp, de Sikkel, 1941.
- Levi, Mario Attilio. Il Tempo di Augusto. Firenze, La "Nuova Italia", [ 1951 ].
- Levick, B.M. 'Imperial Control of the Elections under the early Principate: Commendatio, Suffragatio and "Nominatio"', Historia, XVI [ 1967 ], pp. 207-30.
- Lewis, Naphtali, and Meyer Reinhold. Roman Civilization. 2 vols.; New York, Harper and Row, 1966.
- Marquardt, Joachim. Römische Staatsverwaltung. 3 vols. Darmstadt, Hermann Gentner, [ 1957 ].
- Marsh, Frank Burr. The Reign of Tiberius. Cambridge, Heffer and Sons, 1959. (Photographic reproduction of the original edn.: Oxford, University Press, 1931.)
- McAlindon, D. 'Entry to the Senate in the early Empire', Journal of Roman Studies, XLVII (1957), pp. 191-95.
- Millar, Fergus. 'The Fiscus in the first two Centuries', Journal of Roman Studies, LIII (1963), pp. 29-42.
- '. 'The Aerarium and its Officials under the Empire', Journal of Roman Studies, LIV (1964), pp. 33-40.
- '. A Study of Cassius Dio. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Mommsen, Theodor. Römisches Staatsrecht. 3 vols. in 5. Basel, Schwabe, 1952 (photographic reprint of 3rd edn., 1887).
- The Oxford Classical Dictionary. Ed. M. Cary, J.D. Denniston, J. Wight Duff, A.D. Nock, W.D. Ross, H.H. Scullard. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1949.
- Ogilvie, R.M. A Commentary on Livy Books I-V. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Pareti, Luigi. Storia di Roma e del mondo romano: Vol. IV (58 ante Cr. - 69 dopo Cr.). Torino, Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1955.
- Pelham, Henry Francis. Art. on Senatus in W. Smith, W. Wayte and G.E. Marindin, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities.

- 3rd edn.; 2 vols. London, Murray, 1890-91.
- Pelham, Henry Francis. Essays on Roman History. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Pflaum, H.G. Les Procurateurs équestres sous l'haut-empire romain. Paris, Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1950.
- Questa, Cesare. Studi sulle fonti di Tacito. 2nd edn. Roma, Edizione dell' Ateneo, [ 1963 ].
- Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung ... unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher fachgenossen hrsg. von G. Wissowa. (August Pauly, original ed.) Stuttgart, Metzler, 1894 — . (Cited in this thesis as Pauly-Wissowa)
- Reinmuth, Oscar W. The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian. Klio, XXXIVtes Beiheft, Leipzig, 1935.
- Salmon, E.T. 'The Evolution of Augustus' Principate', Historia V (1956), pp. 456-78.
- Sandys, [Sir] J.E. (ed.). A Companion to Latin Studies. 3rd edn. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1921.
- Sattler, Peter. Augustus und der Senat. Göttingen, Rupprecht and Vandenhoeck, 1960.
- Scullard, H.H. From the Gracchi to Nero. 2nd edn. London, Methuen, 1963.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. The Letters of Pliny: a historical and social Commentary. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Stevenson, G.H. Roman Provincial Administration till the age of the Antonines. New York, Stechert, 1939.
- Stockton, D. 'Primus and Murena', Historia, XIV (1965), pp. 18-40.
- Sumner, G.V. 'Germanicus and Drusus Caesar', Latomus, XXVI (1967), pp. 413-35.
- Syme, [ Sir ] Ronald. 'Who was Decidius Saxa?', Journal of Roman Studies, XXVII (1937), pp. 127-37.
- '. 'Caesar, the Senate and Italy', Papers of the British School at Rome, XIV (1938), pp. 1-31.

Syme, [ Sir ] Ronald. The Roman Revolution. Oxford, at the University Press, 1939; repr. 1960.

-----'. 'Consulates in absence', Journal of Roman Studies, XLVIII (1958), pp. 1-9.

-----'. Tacitus. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press, [1958].

Vrind, G. 'De Cassii Dionis Historiis', Mnemosyne, LIV (1926), pp. 321-47.