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ABSTRACT

The reign of the Emperor Gaius was a period of considerable significance in the history of the Roman world. The Augustan Principate had endured virtually unchanged for three generations, and for most of that time the myth of a regenerated Republic was maintained, despite the widespread suspicion and even fear that had clouded the last years of Tiberius' reign. Gaius' accession was greeted as the beginning of a new age, a return to the glory of the reign of Augustus. Yet by the time of his violent murder only four years later, the mood of the people had, according to our sources, changed completely: Gaius in the meantime had become an oriental monarch who delighted in debauchery, murder, and wasteful extravagance. The purpose of this study of Gaius' reign is to test the validity of those traditional charges levelled against the Emperor by hostile sources.

Any examination of this period of Roman history is hampered by the loss of the relevant books of Tacitus' *Annals*, a loss that makes even more important a critical analysis of the surviving accounts, particularly the chronological narrative of Cassius Dio. Augmented by the contemporary treatises of Seneca and Philo, and by the later works of Josephus and Suetonius, Dio's version of the events from A.D. 37 to 41 has been responsible for the perpetuation of the common tradition concerning Gaius. In this commentary on Book 59 of Dio's history--including a study of its similarity to and divergence from other accounts, its generalizations and anachronisms, and its indebtedness to Dio's own experiences as a senator in the later Empire--I have attempted a rational reconstruction of Gaius' Principate free from the prejudices that have coloured its interpretation until recent years.
The resulting picture of the Emperor is far different from that painted by our sources, whose own evidence can frequently be used to disprove their own interpretations. Such topics as his administration of the provinces, his campaigns in Germany and Gaul, his fiscal policy, and his behaviour in private and public are shown to be not immoderate but rather balanced and sensible, if subject to a certain immature rashness. Yet by seeing the Principate for what it really was—a monarchy based on military power, in the tradition of the eastern kingdoms of Alexander and his successors—and (after A.D. 39) by openly displaying his contempt for outmoded republican institutions, Gaius damned himself in the eyes of his biographers. His claim to divinity, prompted by the obsequiousness of his courtiers, was to revolt those Romans who still believed the violent propaganda used by Octavian against Antony; and his disregard of the Senate, however justified it may have been, was to prompt our aristocratic sources to consider him in the same light as Nero, Domitian, and Commodus.
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The edition of Dio used in this commentary is that of U.P. Boissevain (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895; rpt. 1955). I have accepted his readings in all cases except when otherwise indicated in the notes. The traditional division of Books 60 to 80, however, has been preserved, since it is still used more frequently than Boissevain's rearrangement.
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W. Henzen. *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*
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Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes
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H. Dessau, *ed.* Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae

**Maurer**

J.A. Maurer. *A Commentary on C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita C. Caligulae Caesaris* (chapters I-XXI)

**Merivale**

C. Merivale. *A History of the Romans under the Empire*

**OGIS**
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**PIR**
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**RE**
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**SIG**

G. Dittenberger. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*

**Smallwood**

E.M. Smallwood. *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius, and Nero*
τὸ τῆς βασιλείας πράγμα οὐκ ἀρετὴς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιστήμης καὶ συνθείας, εἴπερ τι ἄλλο, πολλῆς δεῖται, καὶ οὐχ οἶδ᾽ ὅπερ τέ ἐστιν ἀνευ ἐκείνων διαμενόν τινα σωφρονήσαι. πολλοὶ γοῦν ὅπερ ἐς ψυγος τι μέγα παρὰ λόγον ἀρθέντες οὐκ ἱνεγκαν τὴν μετεώρισιν, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτοὶ τε καταπεσόντες ὑπ᾽ ἐκπλήξεως ἐπταίσαν καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀρχομένων πάντα συνηλῆσαν.

Dio fr. 12.9
INTRODUCTION

Dio the Man

Cassius Dio Cocceianus--his praenomen, like that of Tacitus, is not known--was a native of Nicaea in the Roman province of Bithynia (76.15.3). Since he tells us himself that he was in Rome, and perhaps attending meetings of the Senate, by A.D. 180 (72.4.2), the traditional date for his birth has been fixed at A.D. 155: this would allow him to have been quaestor, and so a senator, by the normal age of 25. In fact, Dio's first clear reference to himself as a member of the Senate does not occur until A.D. 192 (72.16.3; cf. 72.18.3), and he was not praetor until A.D. 194 (73.12.2). Fourteen years is too long a gap between the quaestorship and the praetorship, even in the troubled times at the end of the second century. It is more likely, then, that Dio was born ca. A.D. 164; that he travelled to Rome before A.D. 180 and there attended meetings of the Senate after assuming the toga virilis, a common practice for senators' sons; and that he held the quaestorship in A.D. 188 or 189.

The name Cocceianus suggests that he may have been a descendant of Dio Cocceianus of Prusa, although the connection must have been a distant one. Dio once refers to the philosopher, but strangely does not name him (69.3.6). His father was Cassius Apronianus, a Roman senator and consul, and later governor of Cilicia and Dalmatia (69.1.3; 49.36.4; cf. IGRR 3.654). Thus Dio inherited two countries and two cultures: like Aelius Aristides before him, he considered both Asia Minor and Italy as his homelands (fr. 1.3; 80.5.2), and we must assume that he was as fluent in Latin as he was in his native Greek.

It is, however, impossible to discover what form of early education Dio received, although it is obvious from his writings that he had been thoroughly
trained in the rhetorical schools so popular in the second century, while his social position would suggest an upbringing similar to that of a Pliny. After accompanying his father to Cilicia (72.7.2), he travelled to Rome where he witnessed the accession of Commodus in A.D. 180. Once he had entered the Senate, he shared in that body's universal hatred of the Emperor, and once described him as "ἀπόντων νοσημάτων καὶ ἀπόντων κακουργημάτων χαλεπώτερος 'Ρωμαίοις" (72.15.1). But just as Seneca had survived Gaius, and Tacitus Domitian, so Dio endured Commodus, and in A.D. 193 was designated as praetor for the following year by his successor, Pertinax (73.12.2). After less than three months' rule Pertinax was replaced by Didius Julianus, an Emperor who caused Dio much anxiety, since he had often successfully been prosecuted by Dio in court (73.12.2). The new Emperor proved surprisingly lenient, however, in the short time before he was condemned by the Senate and was succeeded by Septimius Severus (73.17.4). It was in the first year of Severus' reign, then, that Dio assumed his post as praetor.

Dio felt a great admiration for Septimius Severus, and it was to him that he dedicated his first book, an account of the dreams and portents that had appeared to Severus in anticipation of his rise to power (72.23.1). This little pamphlet, parts of which were later included in the Roman History (cf. 74.3), is significant in its revelation of Dio's close relationship to the new Emperor, since he must have heard the details of these omens from Severus himself. It also indicates an interest in the supernatural that will plague much of Dio's later, more serious work. A second book, describing events from the death of Commodus to the accession of Severus, he wrote after being advised in a dream to devote his efforts to the recording of history (72.23.1-2). When this work, too, received high praise, especially from the Emperor himself, Dio was inspired to compose a complete history of Rome (72.23.3).
So the Ρωμαϊκὴ ἱστορία was conceived. Dio apparently did much of his research and writing while resident at Capua (76.2.1), but still near enough to the capital to be a witness of events during the reigns of Severus and Caracalla. With a candor unusual among ancient historians, he tells us that he spent ten years collecting his material from all available sources—a practice that would have compelled him to take extensive notes—and another twelve years reshaping this material into an annalistic history of the Roman people from the arrival of Aeneas in Italy to the death of Septimius Severus and beyond (72:23.5). His purpose, as he explained it, was "συγγράψαι πάνθε' ὅσα τοῖς Ῥωμαϊοῖς καὶ εἰρηνοῦσι καὶ πολεμοῦσι αξίως μνήμης ἔπραξεν, ὡστε μηδὲν τῶν ἀναγκαίων μὴτε ἐκείνων τινὰ μήτε τῶν ἄλλων ποθῆσαι" (fr. 1.1).

Dio played little part in the awkward political affairs of his day. His two earlier pamphlets had doubtless secured his safety with Severus, and despite his subsequent hatred of Caracalla, which he obviously could not have revealed until after that man's death, he was still regarded highly enough to be asked to accompany the Emperor on a trip to the East in A.D. 216 (77.16.7-18.4). Sometime after his praetorship in A.D. 194 he had probably been sent abroad as a propraetorian governor of a minor province; and he was appointed suffect consul, probably during the reign of Severus (76.16.4). At this time it seems that he was also a member of the imperial consilium (75.16.4; 76.17.2).

Appointed curator of Pergamum and Smyrna by Macrinus, successor to Caracalla (79.7.4), he seems to have remained at that post from A.D. 219-221. After the accession of Alexander Severus, and following a short visit to his native Bithynia, Dio went to Africa as its proconsular governor (80.1.3). On his return thence to Italy, he was sent as a legatus Augusti first to Dalmatia and then to Upper Pannonia (49.36.4; 80.1.3). When governor of
this last province he incurred the displeasure of the troops with his strict discipline, by ruling them ἐγκρατῶς, as he says (80.4.2). Alexander Severus removed him—honourably—from the post and appointed him his colleague as consul ordinarius for A.D. 229 (80.5.1). Because Dio was not a wealthy man (cf. 73.3.4), the Emperor relieved him of all the expenses of his magistracy; and because of the antagonism of the soldiers, particularly of the Praetorian Guard, he was allowed to spend his term of office outside Rome (80.5.1). Soon afterwards he retired to Bithynia because of medical problems with his feet (80.5.2). Since his narrative ends at this point, he must have died within a few months.

Dio the Historian

In composing the eighty books of his Roman History, Dio says that he was trying to preserve for future generations all that happened to the Romans—in times of peace as well as in war—all, at least, that was worth being remembered (fr. 1.1). The fragmentary condition of the introduction to his work has made it impossible to recover the details of his stated purpose, of the underlying themes that he intended to weave throughout his narrative. Yet even the most cursory reading of the extant portions—Books 36 to 60—reveals that Dio's attitude to historical writing differs little, in intent if not in successful application, from that of his predecessors in the field. Past events and characters, both good and evil, can be an invaluable aid in the formation of an individual's moral temperament. It was with this purpose in mind that Thucydides, whom Dio took as his model (Phot. Bibl. 71; cf. Lucian Hist. Conscr. 2; Dio 55.12.4-5), had written of the conflict between Athens and Sparta; so, too, had Livy recorded the degeneration of the Roman spirit, with the hope that the old virtues could be resurrected.
Even closer to Dio's view of historiography is the philosophy of Tacitus, that history is a basis for contrasting the morally good and evil with specific reference to the behaviour of the ruler. Tacitus' theme, like that of Livy, is the decline of moral standards; and Tacitus found this decline in the perverse flattery and hypocrisy of the Senate and in the potentially limitless evil inherent in complete power that was concentrated in one individual. Like Plato, Tacitus sees the individual reflected in the State; but while he is the moral philosopher, Dio is more the political analyst: Both historians, however, shared in the almost universal acceptance of the Principate as a satisfactory if not ideal form of government. Their concern, then, was not so much with the system of administration as with the behaviour of the individual in control of that system; and this concern was to influence greatly their approaches to the writing of imperial history.

There is no doubt that Tacitus' *Annals* are more successful in exploiting this theme than are the imperial books of Dio's *Roman History*. Explanations for this are not difficult to find. In the first place, although he once speaks of reasoning from the facts that he has recorded and of drawing some universal significance from them (46.35.1), Dio seldom does interpret events, their causes, or effects. More often he takes the bare facts, adorns them perhaps with rhetorical and dramatic devices, and presents this mixture as factual and significant history. As a result, much of his work is a vague, almost meaningless series of events and of naive comments on human nature.

Dio's rhetorical training, too, is much more obvious than that of Tacitus. This is particularly evident in his fondness for tragic descriptions and for succinct summaries of men's accomplishments inserted when he records their deaths. In his eagerness to make contrasts more obvious, Dio sometimes sacrifices accuracy in favour of an antithetical, dramatic account (cf. 59.3).
While Tacitus' rhetorical background is evident in his ability to evoke human emotions, the attitude of the two authors to such evocative detail is quite different: Tacitus concentrates on arousing sympathy, fear, and indignation, while Dio, like Suetonius, has a fondness for more gruesome and scandalous descriptions.\textsuperscript{17}

The insertion of speeches into an historical narrative is a typical rhetorical device of ancient authors, but Dio's productions are even more imaginative than usual.\textsuperscript{18} While Tacitus follows the practice of Thucydides (cf. Thuc. 1.22.1) in using fictional speeches in a truly dramatic fashion, to inform his readers not only of matters of state but also of the hidden character of the Princeps, Dio uses the device to convey his own political philosophy, and the result is sometimes anachronistic. So Maecenas' advice to Augustus (52.14-40) and the warnings delivered to Gaius by Tiberius' ghost (59.16.5-7) are in fact intended by Dio to convince his Severan masters to rule in the best interests of the entire state. This is not to deny that Tacitus' personal judgement intrudes into his speeches; Dio is only less clever and so more obvious.

Perhaps more attention than is necessary has been paid to Dio's belief in the supernatural. Livy felt it necessary to apologize for describing omens, but he did not dismiss their importance (Livy 43.13.1-2). Tacitus shows enough interest in such prodigies as the phoenix that we should label him a sceptic rather than a disbeliever (Ann. 6.28; cf. Hist. 2.50; 4.26). Although Dio introduces portents throughout his history, they are used not exclusively as statements of actual occurrences, but for dramatic effect as well, affording as they do a particularly suitable relief from the monotony of his narrative. Dio himself was well aware that his recording of supernatural events in no way affected the facts that he was discussing, and could be disregarded as not prejudicial to his historical judgement (fr. 57.22).
Finally, mention must be made of the accuracy of Dio's chronology.\textsuperscript{19} The \textit{Roman History} is annalistic in form, although Dio was willing to violate this strict organization if events in one region could best be treated as a whole.\textsuperscript{20} This arrangement changes somewhat after 31 B.C. Thereafter the books are not strictly annalistic, but more biographical. Dio begins each reign, for example, with an analysis of the Emperor's character, using the opening chapters to set the moral theme around which the rest of the chronological material will be organized (cf. 59.3-5).\textsuperscript{21} Dating is, as usual, by consuls, the names of the \textit{ordinarii} being introduced at the beginning of each new year.\textsuperscript{22} Dates within a year, however, are normally not indicated, with the exception of the Battle of Actium on 2 September 31 B.C. (51.1.1). From this point on Dio's chronology on the whole becomes more specific: he is careful to give the exact length, usually to the day, of each Emperor's reign from his \textit{dies imperii} until his death. At the end of his account of Vespasian's reign, for example, he is careful to distinguish between the date of the practical beginning of his rule and the date on which the general was hailed Emperor, from which point Vespasian himself reckoned the length of his reign (66.17.3-5). Such striving for accuracy does not suggest that Dio was ignorant of the complications of imperial chronology. It is all the more surprising, then, that we find him so greatly mistaken about the dates of Tiberius' death and of Gaius' accession.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Dio and his Sources}

It is a common complaint that no ancient historian made full use of the sources available to him, and that he seldom acknowledged those on which he did depend.\textsuperscript{24} In this respect Dio is typical, although he does say at the beginning of his work: "\'ονέγησιν μὲν πάντα ὡς εἰπεῖν τὰ περὶ καθότων τίς
He has given us a hint, but he has still not made it easy to discover his sources. His statement, as it forms two parts, likewise presents two problems. First, even if he could consult every appropriate author in his ten years of research, he clearly did not make extensive notes of all of them, but relied now on one, now on another, according to the period and topic being treated. Secondly, when he does indicate more than one source for a particular piece of information, he may give some details about the opposing views but he never explains his criteria for preferring one over another (cf. 59.2.6). Yet the very fact that he did apply some critical judgement to his selection, however frustrating it may be for modern commentators, does show that Dio was not the mere copyist he is so often thought to have been.

Roman history, as Dio himself explained, was divided into three separate parts distinguishable not only by their constitutional and social differences but primarily, from the historian's point of view, by the differences in the form and reliability of sources available for each. Of the republican period he comments that, since everything was public, information could be verified by consulting various writers and public documents (53.19.2). With the establishment of the Principate, however, "τὰ μὲν πλείω κρύφα καὶ δι' ἀπορρήτων γίγνεσθαι ἦργατο, εἰ δὲ ποῦ τινα καὶ δημοσιευθείς, ἀλλὰ ἀνέλεγκτα γε ὁντα ἀπιστεῖται· καὶ γὰρ λέγεσθαι καὶ πράττεσθαι πάντα πρὸς τὰ τῶν ἀεὶ κρατουσίων τῶν τε παραδυναστευόντων σφίσι βουλήματα ὑποπτεύεται" (53.19.3). Dio promises to report faithfully whatever was public knowledge, whether true or not, and to add wherever possible his own opinion about the validity of τὸ θρυλομένον. Dio's third period, in the events of which he himself was a participant (72.18.4), falls outside the scope of this study.

We must assume that Dio consulted published, official documents during the ten years spent in research: in 53.19.2 he refers to public records as
useful for the composition of history. Yet there are only a few definite traces in his work of such documents as the *acta senatus*, which we know were consulted by both Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.74.3) and Suetonius (*Aug.* 5), or at least by their sources. D.R. Stuart, in an otherwise invaluable article on the subject of Dio's attitude to epigraphic sources, has concluded that Dio saw both the *Res Gestae* of Augustus and the consular *Fasti* at Rome, but that he preferred to depend on literary sources, an attitude that may seem rather illogical to us. In fact I find that the evidence gathered by Stuart with regard to the *Fasti* argues very strongly for Dio's direct use of these documents. Out of the thirty-two instances when parallel portions of Dio and the *Fasti* are extant, the list of Dio differs in only eight cases: in three of these cases (46-44 B.C.) the historian miscalculates by one year the number of Caesar's dictatorships and consulships; in four other instances (60 B.C., 49 B.C., A.D. 9, A.D. 13) Dio simply reverses the order of the consuls' names as they appear in the *Fasti*; and finally, for the eponymous consuls of 23 B.C. Dio follows the tradition of all the *Fasti* except the *Fasti Capitolini* in recording Augustus and the suffect Cn. Piso rather than Augustus and Murena. Such discrepancies are minor and easily explicable; they certainly do not indicate that Dio ignored an available source of information that would greatly simplify his task of listing the *ordinarii* at the beginning of each year. I might add that, for the consuls of Gaius' reign, Dio and the extant inscriptive evidence are never at variance.

As for the identification of Dio's literary sources, the usual difficulty is encountered: in most cases it is impossible to determine whether an author made direct use of an earlier historian, even if he mentions him by name, or rather obtained information about that historian's writings from an intermediate source. Dio claims to have read "almost everything" that pertained to Roman
history; but of all these possible authors, he mentions only eight by name: Livy (67.12.4), Cicero (40.54.2), Sallust (40.3.4; 42.52.2; 43.9.2-3), Augustus (44.35.3), Plutarch (fr. 40.5; fr. 107), Hadrian (66.17.1; 69.17.3), Arrian (69.15.1), and Septimius Severus (75.7.3; 75.15.2). From Dio's own comments in these passages, however, all we can say with some certainty is that he had read Cicero, Augustus, Hadrian, Severus (as we should expect), and perhaps Plutarch (although references to him occur only in the Excerpts, from the tenth or eleventh century).

The difficulty in identifying Dio's sources for the period of the early Empire is compounded by the small proportion of their writings still extant. Those whom he might have consulted, but of whose works little or nothing survives, include Gaius' sister Agrippina, Lentulus Gaetulicus, M. Servilius Nonianus, Aufidius Bassus, the Elder Pliny (his historical work, that is), Cluvius Rufus, and Fabius Rusticus. We are on more sure ground when trying to detect Dio's dependence on Seneca, Philo, Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius. That our historian did use more than a single source for his description of Gaius' reign is evident from his comments in Chapters 2.6; 12.2; 22.1; and 25.5; this assumes, of course, that he did not lift these varying accounts from another--single--author.

With regard to the first category--those works that no longer survive--the following brief remarks will suffice to show the futility of trying to draw some significance from a paucity of evidence.

1. The memoirs of Agrippina Minor were used by the Elder Pliny (HN 7.8.46) and by Tacitus, whose description of them suggests that they were not well known even by the beginning of the second century (Ann. 4.53.3). It seems unlikely that such personal commentaries, published no doubt in very small quantities, would have survived another hundred years. Dio, who makes no mention of Agrippina's literary ability,
might have encountered vestiges of them in another source; if so, his account of Gaius' campaigns in Germany and Gaul may owe something of its bias to a tradition begun by the Emperor's sister.  

2. Lentulus Gaetulicus had referred to Gaius' birthplace, presumably in one of his poems. Suetonius seems to have read these verses (Gaius 8.1-2), but again there is no evidence that Dio had even heard of them.  

3. M. Servilius Nonianus, the consul of A.D. 35, was both an orator and an historian. Tacitus was acquainted with his work in both fields, and describes him as "summis honoribus et multa eloquentia" (Ann. 14.19; cf. Dial. 23.2). The same verdict had earlier been pronounced by Quintilian, who added that Nonianus was "minus pressus quam historiae auctoritas postulat" (10.1.102-103). Neither author, however, has given any hint of Nonianus' attitude to the Principate or of the period treated by his history. A vague comment in Suetonius (Tib. 61.6: "annalibus suis vir consularis inseruit ...") has been taken as proof that it did encompass the reign of Tiberius.  

4. We know somewhat more about the writings of Aufidius Bassus, whom Tacitus (Dial. 23.2) and Quintilian (10.1.102-103) rank with Nonianus as one of the great writers of the Julio-Claudian period. In addition to a history of Rome's wars against the Germans (under Augustus and Tiberius?), he wrote a history of his own times. This latter work must have begun in the late Republic, since we know from Seneca Rhetor (Suas. 6.18; 23) that Bassus had declared himself an admirer of Cicero; but the terminal date of his history is a matter of dispute. A letter of the younger Seneca (Ep. 30.1) proves that Bassus was still alive in A.D. 60; and there is no evidence that Pliny the Elder's continuation of Bassus' work (see below) contained any material earlier than
A.D. 55. Some, however, argue that Bassus' history ended in Tiberius' reign, perhaps with the fall of Seianus in A.D. 31.  

5. Bassus' work was continued in thirty-one books by Pliny the Elder (Pliny Ep. 3.5.6), who once refers to the work as "temporum nostrorum historiam" (HN praef. 20). If Pliny's history, of which nothing significant remains, included the reign of Gaius, then it was perhaps the source of Suetonius' comment on the birthplace of Gaius (Gaius 8.1). Although the work is mentioned three times by Tacitus (Ann. 13.20.3 [A.D. 55]; 15.53.4 [A.D. 65]; Hist. 3.28 [A.D. 69]), who clearly made use of it for events during Nero's reign and the subsequent civil wars, there is no firm evidence that it dealt with Gaius or even with Claudius.

Pliny also wrote a complete history of the Roman wars in Germany (Pliny Ep. 3.5.4). Since Tacitus cites this monograph when discussing Germanicus' campaigns in A.D. 15 (Ann. 1.69.3), it seems most likely that Suetonius had consulted it for Pliny's views on the birthplace of Gaius. It should be noted here that any correspondences between Dio and Pliny's surviving Historia Naturalis are too vague and insignificant to be attributed to direct borrowing.

6. Cluvius Rufus, who had held the consulship before A.D. 41 and was still an active senator under Nero and Vitellius (Jos. AJ 19.1.13 [91]; Suet. Nero 21.2; Plu. Otho 3; Tac. Hist. 4.43), is mentioned once by Dio, but in a context that does not suggest that our author was aware of his historical work (63.14.3). We know from a letter of Pliny (Ep. 9.19.5) that Cluvius held strong views about an historian's duty to the truth, and from Tacitus (Ann. 13.20.3; 14.2.1) that he wrote of Nero's reign and at least part of the subsequent civil wars (cf. Hist. 3.65).
Although there is no specific suggestion that his history began as early as Gaius' reign, Mommsen thought that Cluvius was the source for Josephus' long account of Gaius' assassination, primarily because the anecdote told about Cluvius in *AJ* 19.1.13 (91-92) must have come from the man himself, and through a written work rather than by oral comment.\(^3\) Mommsen's view was taken up by Charlesworth, who assigned the style of this section of Josephus (since it is more metaphorical than usual) to Cluvius as Josephus' Latin source.\(^3\) Unfortunately we have no idea of Cluvius' style, since only a few minor fragments of his history are extant.\(^3\) Momigliano has gone one step farther by claiming that Cluvius' account of Gaius' assassination was the main source of Josephus, Suetonius, and Dio.\(^3\) The question of Dio's dependence on Cluvius is further complicated—it is, in fact, made impossible to answer—because his account of Gaius' murder is extant only in the epitomes of Zonaras and Xiphilinus.\(^4\)

7. The Spaniard Fabius Rusticus wrote a history of his own period, but again we know only that it treated the reign of Nero (*Ann.* 14.2.3). Tacitus praises his style and eloquence, but adds that he was too partial to his patron, Seneca (*Ann.* 13.20.3; *Agr.* 10.3). His account of Agrippina Minor may have been used by Suetonius (*Nero* 28).

8. Finally, there is no evidence at all that Gaius ever wrote a journal like the personal diaries (*commentarii Principis*) kept by many of the Emperors, including Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 61.1) and Claudius (Tac. *Ann.* 13.43.4).

Of greater significance and value are the fairly close parallels that exist between passages of Dio and the extant writings of Seneca, Philo, Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius. As the following comparisons and comments will serve to show, direct dependence of Dio on any of these authors is
impossible to prove. What can be said with some certainty is that Dio, if he
had not read and made notes of their works, at least relied heavily on some
intermediate sources (the ἐκατονταετία of Appian is a likely possibility) in
which anecdotes from those earlier historians had been repeated in words very
similar to the original.

1. Dio three times refers to the compositions of Seneca: in 59.19.7
he mentions his early speeches (unless he is talking of Seneca
Rhetor instead); in 60.35.3 the Apocolocyntosis; and in 61.10.2
the Consolatio ad Polybium. None of these passages, however, proves
that Dio had necessarily read those works. Yet a comparison of Dio
59.11.5 with Sen. Cons. Polyb. 17.5 suggests that Dio might in fact
have done so. One must remember, of course, that such anecdotes
based on rhetorical antithesis are memorable on their own and would
appeal to later epitomists. If we accept the verdict of F. Préchac,¹
who seems to have proved conclusively that Dio used Seneca's treatise
on alementia when composing his political-philosophical speech between
Livia and Augustus in Book 55, then it is just as likely that he was
familiar with the philosopher's other works as well.

2. Perhaps the most notable omission from Dio's account of Gaius' reign
is any comment whatever on the Jewish problem. In the missing chapters
at the end of Book 59 some mention may have been made of the Jewish
embassy from Alexandria and of Petronius' difficulties in Judaea, but
it is odd that the epitomes show no evidence of this. What Tacitus
in his missing books made of the situation can only be guessed at,
but it is remarkable that even he otherwise devotes very little
space--Histories 5.9-10--to the story of Rome's relations with the
Jews from Pompey to Vespasian.²
Dio's silence about the Jews would in itself indicate that he had not read Philo's *In Flaccum* or *Legatio ad Gaium*, and a comparison of anecdotes found in both authors supports this conclusion. There are, for example, some similarities in their descriptions of the Emperor's contradictory nature, but these reflect the same common tradition about Gaius' erratic behaviour as we have already noticed in Seneca. On the other hand, there is no doubt that Dio's description of Gaius' impersonation of deities (59.26.5-8) has much more in common with the varied and detailed account in *Leg.* 11.78-15.113 (557-561) than with the abbreviated version in Suetonius (*Gaius* 52). Since these anecdotes seem to have appealed more to the Greek Jew than to the Roman sceptic (Seneca, for example, does not mention them), they might well have been passed on to posterity by Philo alone among Gaius' contemporaries.

3. Josephus' apparent indebtedness to Cluvius Rufus has already been mentioned. All that can be added here is that Dio does mention Josephus once, in an anecdote about the Jewish general's prophecy that Vespasian would become Emperor (66.1.4). The passage echoes the same story in *BJ* 3.8.9 (399-408) closely enough to indicate that Dio might well have read the *Bellum*.

4. Dio's account of the reign of Gaius is, it must be admitted, small compensation for the lost books of Tacitus. While it is impossible to determine how much of Tacitus' material has reappeared in Dio's Book 59, an analysis of the two accounts of Tiberius' reign allows us to say with some assurance that the two historians at least had a common, anti-Tiberian source for the period, but often enough followed different traditions. The lengthy German campaigns recounted throughout *Annales* 1-2, for example, are compressed by Dio into part of one
chapter (57.18.1); while the funeral of Augustus, barely touched on in *Ann.* 1.10.8, is expanded by Dio into seventeen chapters (56.31-47). On the other hand, the interchange between Tiberius and Gallus that took place in the Senate after Augustus' death is almost identical in the two authors." Another notable similarity in reported speech occurs in the two accounts of the revolt of the Rhine legions in A.D. 14, when Germanicus threatened to commit suicide rather than be hailed Emperor by his troops. Of the soldier who insolently offered the general his own sword, Dio says: "'τούτο ἔφη ἀλβÆ· τούτο γὰρ δεύτερον ἐστιν'" (57.5.2); compare Tacitus' words: "Calusidius strictum obtulit gladium, addito acutiorem esse" (*Ann.* 1.35.6). Such a comment is memorable in any case, and need not indicate direct borrowing; and it is important to notice that Dio and Tacitus then give quite different explanations of Germanicus' failure to carry out his threat. A common source is perhaps implied for some of these details, then, but it would be safe to assume that for Tiberius' reign Dio did not use Tacitus directly, or at least not impartially and certainly not exclusively."

5. The large number of close parallels in wording between Suetonius and Dio leads to the very strong suspicion that Dio was quite familiar with the imperial lives of that biographer. From the reign of Augustus onwards Suetonius was clearly a major source of anecdotes. The biographical format of the *Vitae Caesarum* fitted in well with Dio's intention to treat the history of the Empire as a history of its rulers. Indeed, since Tacitus had managed to do this while preserving a strictly annalistic arrangement, one wonders if Dio altered his earlier chronological organization as a direct result of heavy dependence on Suetonius. There are, however, so many details present
in one author but not in the other that we must assume the existence of other sources as well, for which Dio had an equal preference. The following list of some of the more notable correspondences between the two will serve as proof of these conclusions:

compare Suetonius Aug. 97.3. with Dio 56.29.4

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
101 & 56.33.1 \\
Tib. 26.2 & 57.8.1 \\
Gaius 17.1 & 59.24.2 \\
19 & 59.17 \\
27.1-4 & 59.10.3-4 \\
41.1 & 59.28.11 \\
55 & 59.14 \\
56.1 & 59.25.8; 59.29.1 \\
Vesp. 5.3 & 59.12.3 \\
\end{array} \]

**Dio and the Principate**

As a Roman senator under the Severan dynasty Dio was faced with the conflict, already discernible a century earlier in Tacitus' *Annals*, between the rights of his order on the one hand and, on the other, support of the Principate as the only workable form of rule for that period. So Dio emphasizes the necessity of a favourable relationship between the Princeps and the Senate; he scorns opposition to the monarchy; and he has little use for the common people.\(^{46}\)

Dio was well aware of the anarchy that had prevailed during much of the last century of the Republic (cf. fr. 83.4), and with the benefit of hindsight could declare that in 27 B.C. a restoration of the earlier democracy or oligarchy was impossible, that only under the rule of one man could Rome hope to become a stable and secure state once again (53.19.1).\(^{47}\) Of the Augustan
settlement he comments: "Διὰ τε οὖν ταῦτα, καὶ οὗτ οὔν μοναρχίαν τη
δημοκρατία μέξας τὸ τε ἐλευθερίαν σφίσιν ἐτήρησε καὶ τὸ κόσμιον τὸ τε ἃσφαλὲς
προσμετασκέψασεν, μέσον μὲν τοῦ δημοκρατικοῦ θράσους ἐξω δὲ καὶ τῶν
τυραννικῶν ὑβρεών ὅντας ἐν τε ἐλευθερία σωφρόνι καὶ ἐν μοναρχίᾳ ἄδεει γεῖν,
βασιλευομένους τε ἀνευ δουλείας καὶ δημοκρατουμένους ὡνεύ διχοστασίας,
δεινωσ αὐτὸν ἐπίθεουν" (56.43.4).

Here, as frequently elsewhere, Dio is accused of introducing anachronistic
remarks into his description of the political scene in the early Empire. There
is no doubt that he did apply to that period constitutional practices that date
only from later times, but his reasons for doing so are intelligible when one
realizes that Dio saw the Principate as a static organism. He realized per­
fectly that the republican constitutionality of Augustus' settlement was a
myth, and he could see that the many apparent changes in the system attributed
to later Emperors were little more than revelations of previously hidden facts.
From 29 B.C. onwards he equates the Principate with a monarchy (52.1.1):
certainly Augustus' dynastic plans suggest that it was. In the fictitious
and much discussed speech of Maecenas, Augustus' minister first stresses the
value of maintaining the traditional, outward forms of the Republic (52.20.2-3),
and ends by assuring Augustus that he will be king in all but name (52.40.1);
in fact, none of the subsequent Emperors, from Tiberius to Nero and even beyond,
assumed to themselves any more of the old republican powers than the first
Emperor had possessed. Was Dio wrong in interpreting Augustus' division of
provincial administration as a way of keeping in his own hands the military
forces of the Empire, on which the stability of his position rested (53.12.3;
cf. 53.17.3)?

Sir Ronald Syme has called Dio "a fervent advocate of monarchical
rule," a description that is perhaps too simplistic. Dio rather believed that
peace and security were more desirable than what he saw as the anarchy of the late Republic. Yet he was not unaware of the negative side of rule by a single man: he observes, for example, that free speech is lost in a monarchy and that his sources for the imperial period change from frank statements of verifiable fact to accounts written according to the wishes of the man in power (53.19.3). A comparison of Dio with Tacitus in this regard is inevitable; but to differentiate between the two historians by saying that Dio is a monarchist and Tacitus a republican not only makes the problems presented by their political views too simple, but suggests a wider difference between their opinions than actually existed. The difference lies primarily in the nature of the two historians: Dio was a frankly admitted opportunist who regarded the Principate with optimism, while Tacitus, either concealing or expressing shame for his political dependence on the Emperors, took a pessimistic and cynical view of the monarchy. Tacitus longs for a restoration of the Senate's supremacy as it had been under the Republic, Dio as it was under Augustus. It is this very distinction between the two attitudes of men who were otherwise quite similar that makes the combined study of Dio and Tacitus a necessity for a proper understanding of the early Empire.

As a political theorist Dio favoured the compromise view so typical of imperial senators who owed their positions to an individual rather than to any hereditary republican principle. It was an ideal that was to be resurrected much later in Mommsen's concept of a diarchy. Like Tacitus before him, Dio felt that the dignitas of the Senate should be closely guarded. Although he and most other senators realized that after 200 years of the Principate their republican hegemony was hopelessly lost, they nevertheless eagerly fought to maintain some of their former influence, modified though it had to be. The speech that Maecenas delivers to Augustus is important in this respect: with the establishment of the Principate in 27 B.C. the Senate, while it had lost
its traditional powers, still maintained its *dignitas* as a body to be consulted by the ruler. It is a return to this Augustan attitude, however idealistic it might have been, that Dio pleads for through Maecenas (cf. 52.31-32). In this he follows the political ideals set down by his namesake, Dio Cocceianus Chrysostomus, in his four discourses *περὶ βασιλείας*: the Emperor should be responsible to the supreme god; he should view his power as his duty; he is the patron rather than the master of his subjects; and he must share the administration of the Empire with a group of advisors. This is a theme that is found throughout Dio's history, from the first ominous moment when he has Romulus comment to his patrician senators: "ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς, ἢ πατέρες, ἔξελεξάμην οὖχ ὑμέις ἔμοι ἔχομε, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἐγὼ ὑμῖν ἐπιτάττομι" (fr. 5.11). The Emperor Gaius, however well he began his reign, was to be in Dio's mind another Romulus. More specifically, just as the oppressive rule of Domitian had been applied by Tacitus to his portrait of Tiberius, so Dio was to paint a picture of Gaius' behaviour that owed much of its detail and many of its judgements to the author's own experiences under Commodus. 

The bitterness and hatred that were so universal among the senatorial class during the despotism of Domitian and Commodus had been partly soothed by the promise of better things to come under their successors, Nerva and Septimius Severus. It is the view of both Dio and Tacitus that if the Emperor is a good man, then *principatus ac libertas* are easily attainable, and this combination can produce benefits for the common good (cf. Tac. *Agr.* 3.1). If, on the other hand, the Emperor is unworthy and incapable, *dominatio* takes the place of *principatus*, and *libertas* no longer exists (cf. Dio fr. 12.9).

The maintenance of republican forms in the Principate would provoke any man who studied history to make a comparison of the two forms (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.4). Augustus had been able to maintain the fiction that the Senate played an equal role with himself in the government of the Empire. His successors,
and particularly Gaius after A.D. 39, lacked this tact and diplomacy, and made the senators aware that the Princeps was their master and that they no longer had any real authority (cf. Tac. Ann. 4.19). Under these circumstances a senator who wished to serve the state had to forget the past, curb his ambition, and obey the ruler. It was not easy to steer a safe middle course between the two extremes of absolute freedom and absolute slavery; but, like Agricola and Tacitus himself under Domitian (cf. Tac. Agr. 42), Dio managed to do so under Commodus and Severus. His experiences had taught him that a responsible monarchy was preferable to any other kind of imperial government.

It is when this monarchy seems no longer responsible, particularly with regard to the rights of the Senate, that Dio loses the detached perspective of an honest historian and represents the Emperor as more of a tyrant than he really was. The reign of Tiberius is a significant period in the histories of both Dio and Tacitus, since the capable administration of his first five years was in the minds of both the manner in which a Princeps should govern. The rapid change to what was for them a supreme example of degenerate rule afforded the historians an admirable contrast of good and evil, a contrast of which both took full advantage. With Gaius' accession there was a revival of hopes for a new order, but in the style of tragic drama these delusions were to be shattered by the revelation that the new Emperor was not concerned with maintaining what seemed to him outmoded republican traditions. Because Gaius had little respect for the Senate—however justified his suspicions of that body were—our imperial historians have placed him in the same category as Nero and Domitian.

This commentary on Dio's history of Gaius' reign is intended to indicate the worth of that judgement.
Since all our information about Dio's life comes from the historian himself, parenthetical references in this section of the introduction refer only to his *Roman History*.

Cf. Suet. Aug. 38.2; see on Chapter 1.2 εἰς τὸ βουλευτηρίαν.

For arguments favouring these dates, see G. Vrind *de Cassii Dionis Vocabulis* pp. 164-65; F. Millar *A Study of Cassius Dio* pp. 13-14; cf. P. Lambrechts *La composition du Sénat* p. 171, nos. 1148-49.

Cf. Millar op. cit. p. 11; for other Cassii in Bithynia see *BCH* 24 (1900) 407-408, nos. 90-92.


Cf. Millar op. cit. p. 120, n. 1.


Cf. Millar op. cit. p. 17, who refers to a rescript from Severus to a certain Dio, a provincial governor (*Digest*. 50.12.2 [Paulus]: the reference should read "50.12.7").

Millar (op. cit. pp. 204-207) accepts the orthodox view by dating Dio's first consular appointment to A.D. 205 or 206. Others, however, have suggested a date during the reign of Alexander Severus, ca. A.D. 222, thus reducing the otherwise extraordinarily long period between his consulship and his proconsulship in Africa. To account for the quarter of a century between Dio's praetorship and consulship in this case, supporters of this view have invented an animosity between Dio and Severus caused, they claim, by the historian's criticism of some of the Emperor's acts. Of course, there is no proof that this late part of the *Roman History* was published or even written before Severus' death; and we know that Dio, like most senators of the period, could successfully hide his true feelings from his ruler.


Cf. Millar op. cit. p. 23.


Cf. Thuc. 1.22.4: "όψις δὲ βουλήσανται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφῆς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὕτης κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιοῦτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι, ὥσπερ κρίνειν αὕτη ἀκρυβῶς ἔξει."

Cf. Livy praef. 10: "hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in illustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaque rei publicae quod imitere capias; inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod vites."
15 Cf. Ann. 4.33.2: "sic converso statu, neque alia re Romana quam si unus imperitet, haec conquiri tradique in rem fuerit, quia pauci prudentia honesta ab deterioribus, utilia ab noxiis discernunt, plures aliorum eventis docentur"; cf. Ann. 3.65.1; Agr. 1.1.

16 For tragic description, see 59.29.6-7 (the murder of Gaius); for res gestae, see 56.35-41 (Tiberius' funeral eulogy of Augustus) and 57.18.6-8 (on the death of Germanicus).

17 Compare the parallel accounts of the execution of Seianus' family (Dio 58.11; Tac. Ann. 5.9).

18 For Dio's use of speeches, see F. Millar MH 18 (1961) 11-22.

19 This topic has been admirably treated by W.F. Snyder in Klio 33 (1940) 39-56.

20 Dio relates, for example, Caesar's final conquest of Gaul from 53-50 B.C. (40.31-44), and then returns to 53 B.C. to describe events in Rome (40.45 ff.). In a similar way he delays discussion of Lucius Vitellius' campaign against the Parthian Artabanus, which took place at the end of Tiberius' reign, to the place where he describes his recall to Rome in A.D. 40 (59.27.2-4).


22 Regarding the authenticity of the consular lists appended to the beginning of most of the surviving books, see note on the Index to Book 59.

23 See on Chapters 1.1 δεδεξατο; 30.1 εν ετεσι.


25 Compare the following comment of Tacitus: "Tiberii Gaive et Claudii ac Neronis res florentibus ipsis ob metum falsae, postquam occiderant, recentibus odiis compositae sunt" (Ann. 1.1.5; cf. Hist. 1.1).

26 For the acta see on Chapter 18.2 ὁλως.

27 University of Michigan Studies 1 (1904) 101-47.

28 Cf. Dio 51.20.7. Copies of the original inscription in Rome had been set up at the provincial temples of Augustus and Roma, including no doubt that in Bithynian Nicomedia near Dio's home.

29 Dio's error, it should be noted, begins with the year in which Caesar caused unending confusion for historians by introducing his reform of the calendar and adding eighty days to the year 46 B.C. (cf. Macr. Sat. 14.3).

30 Dio's rearrangement of the consuls' names may in fact be more significant than it first appears: see the article by L.R. Taylor and T.R.S. Broughton in Historia 17 (1968) 166-71.
See on Chapter 21.2 πολλοῦς.

See on Chapter 22.5 Παντούλικον.

Cf. CAH 10.867.


Cf. Townend loc. cit.

T. Mommsen Hermes. 4 (1870) 295-325.

M.P. Charlesworth Cambridge Historical Journal 4 (1933) 116.

Cf. H. Peter Historicorum Romanorum Reliquae 2.114.

A. Momigliano RAL 8 (1932) 305.

Cf. P. Fabia Les Sources de Tacite pp. 169-83; Townend loc. cit; AdPh 85 (1964) 337-77.

Seneque: de la Clémence p. lvi.

Dio elsewhere (37.16.5-17.4) shows considerable ignorance of Jewish history and little interest in their theology. Equally odd is his total silence about Christians: they are mentioned three times by name, but all in the epitome of Xiphilinus (70.3.1-2; 71.9.3-5; 72.4.7); and in two other passages they are apparently identified with the Jews (67.14.1-2; 68.1.2). Xiphilinus implies (71.9.6) that Dio purposely failed to mention the Thundering Legion of Christians under Marcus Aurelius; but his motive for omitting them is obscure. Dio's reticence about this religion is all the more remarkable since his homeland was a focal point for the spread of Christianity.

Compare Dio 59.4.5-6 with Leg. 43.339-340 (595).

Compare Dio 57.2 with Ann. 1.12.

Other parallels can be found between Dio 58.19.3-4 and Ann. 6.8; Dio 58.23.3 and Ann. 6.46.8.

The best analysis of Dio's attitude to the Principate can be found in Millar op. cit. pp. 92-118; some of Dio's anachronistic interpretations of the Augustan and Julio-Claudian constitution are also discussed there.

Compare the similar views of Tacitus in Hist. 1.1; 2.38.

Tacitus p. 272.

It is rather surprising that Dio saw only democracy as an alternative to monarchy, ignoring the possibility of a restored senatorial oligarch. We must regret the loss of that portion of his history which treated the third and second centuries B.C., the acme of senatorial supremacy. Anti-democratic sentiments appear throughout the surviving portion of his work (fr. 110.2; 44.2.1-4; 47.39.1-5; 54.6.1; cf. App. BC 4.133).
Notice the following anecdotes told of Commodus: his predecessor advised the praetorian prefect to desert the setting for the rising sun (71.34.1); he was the slave of his associates (72.1.1); he murdered senators (72.5) and men who were wealthy or learned, to replenish his treasury or out of jealousy (72.7.3; 72.16.2-3); he used poison for these murders (72.4.1); he once murdered a man whose identity had been mistaken (72.6.3); he murdered his commander of the Praetorian Guards (72.9.1-10.1); he participated himself in chariot-racing (72.9.1; 72.10.2-3; 72.17.1) and as a gladiator (72.17.2-3; 72.19-20); he imitated several deities (72.17.4), particularly Hercules (72.7.2; 72.15.2; 72.20.2); he is referred to by Dio as "this Hercules, this god" (72.16.1).

Cf. R. Syme in *Histoire et historiens dans l'antiquité* pp. 198-99: "On the face of things, Tacitus might be claimed a Republican .... One layer deeper and he is revealed like so many others as an opportunist, advocating the middle path in politics and hoping that chance or destiny would bring forth some ruler who might be better than the worst." See also T.A. Dorey *G&R* 7 (1960) 66-71.

Cf. Balsdon *Gaius* p. 156.
The authenticity of the brief outlines and consular lists appended to the beginning of most of the surviving books (37 to 57, and 59) is doubtful. Not only is Dio careful to mention the names of the eponymous magistrates in the text itself, whenever he begins a new year, but in some cases there is a discrepancy between the names in the index and those in the text (compare, for example, the name Γαίου/Ἀκερρωνίου in the index to Book 59 with its earlier appearance in the text as Γαίου [58.27.1]). Further, the selection of topics mentioned in the outlines is quite arbitrary and does not always accord with what Dio in the text emphasizes as important. On these points, see further Sturz 7,535.
Consuls of A.D. 37 to A.D. 41

A.D. 37

ordinarii
Cn. Acerronius Proculus (PIR² A 32) 1 Jan. - 30 June cf. Ch. 6.5
C. Petronius Pontius Nigrinus (PIR¹ P 218)

suffecti
C. Caesar Augustus Germanicus I (PIR² I 217) 1 July - 31 Aug. cf. Ch. 6.5; 7.9
Ti. Claudius Nero Germanicus I (PIR² C 942)
A. Caecina Paetus (PIR² C 103) 1 Sept. - (?) 31 Dec. cf. Ch. 7.9
C. Caninius Rebilus (PIR² C 393)

A.D. 38

ordinarii
M. Aquila Iulianus (PIR² A 982) 1 Jan. - 30 June cf. Ch. 9.1
P. Nonius Asprenas (PIR¹ N 95)

suffecti
Ser. Asinius Celer (PIR² A 1225) 1 July - (?) 31 Dec. cf. Ch. 9.1
Sex. Nonius Quintilianus (PIR¹ N 116)

A.D. 39

ordinarii
L. Apronius Caesianus (PIR² A 972) 1 Jan. - 30 June
A.D. 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUFFRIGI</th>
<th>Q. Sanquinius Maximus II (<em>PIR</em>(^1) S 136)</th>
<th>31 Jan. - 30 June</th>
<th>cf. Ch. 13.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUFFRIGI</td>
<td>(? Cn. Domitius Corbulo (<em>PIR</em>(^2) D 141)</td>
<td>1 July - ca. 2 Sept.</td>
<td>cf. Ch. 20.1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFRIGI</td>
<td>Cn. Domitius Afer (<em>PIR</em>(^2) D 126)</td>
<td>ca. 5 Sept. - (?) 31 Dec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.D. 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDINARIUS</th>
<th>C. Caesar Augustus Germanicus III</th>
<th>1 Jan. - 13 Jan.</th>
<th>cf. Ch. 24.2, 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Seius Veianus (<em>PIR</em>(^1) S 249)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFRIGI</td>
<td>C. Laecanius Bassus (<em>PIR</em>(^2) L 30)</td>
<td>before 13 Mar. - (?) 30 June</td>
<td>cf. Ch. 24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Terentius Culleo (<em>PIR</em>(^1) T 54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.D. 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDINARIUS</th>
<th>C. Caesar Augustus Germanicus IV</th>
<th>1 Jan. - 7 Jan.</th>
<th>cf. Ch. 29.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORDINARIUS</td>
<td>Cn. Sentius Saturninus (<em>PIR</em>(^1) S 296)</td>
<td>1 Jan. - (?) 30 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFRIGI</td>
<td>Q. Pomponius Secundus (<em>PIR</em>(^1) P 564)</td>
<td>7 Jan. - (?) 30 June</td>
<td>cf. Ch. 29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

1.1 διεδέξατο δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Γαίος; Tiberius died on 16 March A.D. 14 (Tac. Ann. 6.50.7; Suet. Tib. 73.1; Fasti Oetienses = E&J p. 43). Dio (58.28.5) wrongly gives the date as 26 March, a mistake that is clearly his and not that of a copyist, for he goes on to say that Tiberius ruled 22 years, 7 months, and 7 days, which, computing from the death of Augustus on 19 August A.D. 14, also places Tiberius' death on 26 March. That the date could not have been the 26th is confirmed by the Acta Arvalium (CIL 6.2028c = 32346e, 10-14 = Smallwood no. 3), which give Gaius' dies imperii as 18 March. M.P. Grenade (BEL 33 [1955] 54-55) has suggested that Dio's mistaken date is not the result of a simple error, but of an unwillingness to allow a hiatus of twelve days between reigns. According to Grenade, Dio's source mentioned the two-day interval between Tiberius' death and Gaius' accession, but suggested that Gaius' dies imperii coincided with his entry into Rome on 28 March, a day whose importance is perhaps exaggerated by both Dio and Suetonius (see note on Chapter 1.2 ἐστὶ συνέδριον). Concerning the part attributed to Gaius in his predecessor's death, see on Chapter 10.6 τῶν ἐκείνου ..., and Seager Tiberius pp. 244-45).

Gaius officially became Emperor, then, on 18 March, although he had probably been first acclaimed, at the instigation of Macro, by the Praetorian Guards stationed at Misenum (cf. Pareti Storia 4.763-764); he was hailed as imperator by a meeting of the Senate on that day, presumably immediately after news of Tiberius' death had arrived from Capreae (see on Chapter 1.2).

His accession was greeted throughout the Empire as the beginning of a new age, a return to the glory of the reign of Augustus. Public rejoicing seems to have been universal. People saw him as the son of Germanicus, and on this his initial popularity was based (Suet. Gaius 13-14.1). In
Alexandria, according to Philo (Leg. 2.8-13 [546-547]), all were astonished at the prosperity which Gaius inherited from his predecessor: a full treasury, strong military force, and empire over the entire civilized world had been granted to a young man of glorious family and exemplary character: it seemed to some a return to the Age of Saturn (see also Leg. 32.231 [580]; 45.356 [598]; in Flacc. 12.97-101 [531-532]). In a decree of Cyzicus on his accession, he is called ὁ νέος Ἡλίος (SIG 798 = Smallwood no. 401); with equal flattery the decree of Assos in the Troad records that "οὐδὲν δὲ μέτρον χαρᾶς εὑρηκένων ὁ κόσμος" (SIG 797 = Smallwood no. 33); the Council of Achaeans, Boeotians, Locrians, Phocians, and Euboeans asked permission to erect statues to the new Emperor (ILS 8792 = Smallwood no. 361; see on Chapter 4.4 εἰκόνας); and throughout the Empire more than 160,000 sacrifices were said to have been made to him in the first three months of his rule (Suet. Gaius 14.1). For oaths of allegiance to Gaius taken by provincials, see Josephus Ant. 18,5,3 [124] (Judaea); ILS 190 = Smallwood no. 32 (Lusitania); and SIG 797 = Smallwood no. 33 (Asia). A similar oath taken by the Cypriots on Tiberius' accession is described by T.B. Mitford in JRS 50 (1960) 75-79.

1.1 ὁ τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ καὶ τῆς Ἀγριππίνης παῖς: Gaius was the last surviving son of Germanicus and Agrippina. Of their nine children, two died in infancy and a third in childhood; the other two sons, Nero and Drusus, died in A.D. 31 and 33 respectively; and Gaius' three sisters, Agrippina, Drusilla, and Julia were to play important roles in Gaius' brief reign (Suet. Gaius 7; see on Chapter 3.5). For the children of Germanicus and Agrippina who died at an early age, see Rosborough pp. 11-12; for the family in general, T. Mommsen Hermes 13 (1878) 245-65.
1.1 Καλιγόλαον: He was given the name as a mark of affection by his father's troops on the Rhine frontier, where he was brought up, because he often wore a small pair of caligae or military boots instead of sandals (Dio 57.5.6; Suet. Gaius 9; Tacitus [Ann. 1.41.3] follows the erroneous idea given by Pliny the Elder that Gaius had been born in the legionary camp [see on Chapter 7.2]; cf. Suda, s. καλιγόλαος; Sen. Const. Sap. 18). Tacitus (loc. cit.) adds that Gaius wore such military clothes "ad concilianda vulgi studia," and in Annals 1.69.5 states more definitely that Agrippina encouraged the use of the name "Caligula" by the soldiers as a means of showing loyalty to Germanicus, and that Seianus caused Tiberius concern by suggesting that the boy was too close to the soldiers. Despite Suetonius' statement (Gaius 52) that Gaius sometimes wore speculatoriae caligae even while Emperor, it is clear from Seneca's comment (loc. cit.) that Gaius considered such a sobriquet unbefitting his station, and punished a centurion for using it. This is understandable, perhaps, since caligae were normally worn only by common soldiers up to the rank of centurion (Suet. Aug. 25.3; Vit. 7.3; Pliny HN 7.43.135; Sen. Ben. 5.16.2: "C. Marius ad consulatus a caliga perductus"). It is interesting, and perhaps not irrelevant to Gaius' dislike of the name, that in 41 B.C. the party of Fulvia and Lucius Antonius made fun of the veterans by calling them βουλημένοι καλιγάται (Dio 48.12.3).

The name "Caligula" appeared on no coins, and the only epigraphic evidence for it is a single inscription—a forged one—from Gallipoli (CIL 3.28*), which begins "C. Caligula imp. August. p. p. p. max." (see Rosborough, p. 46, for an account of its "discoverer," André Thevet [ca. 1575]).
1.1 Ἐὐφραῖος Ἐὐγγόνος: Twin sons were born to Drusus and Livilla in A.D. 19, very shortly after the death of Germanicus (Tac. Ann. 2.84.1). Hirschfeld (Hermes 25 [1890] 363-73) argues that they could not have been born until A.D. 20 since, by the time of Tiberius' death, Gemellus had not yet assumed the toga virilis, which (he says) usually happened by the eighteenth year. In fact, the ceremony took place at the beginning of puberty (Gaius Inst. 2.113), but at least by the age of 17, when boys became liable for military service (see Sherwin-White on Pliny Ep. 1.9.2). Yet Gaius himself did not assume the toga virilis until his nineteenth year (Suet. Gaius 10), and there is no evidence to suggest that Tiberius would have acted differently in regard to his grandson Gemellus (see Willrich Caligula p. 108, n. 2; Furneaux on Ann. 2.84.1). The twins were named Germanicus and Tiberius Gemellus (cf. ILS 170): the former died at the age of four in A.D. 23 (Tac. Ann. 4.15.1; Dio [57.14.6] apparently records his death four years before his birth). On the date of Gemellus' birth, see further Dessau (p. 104), who cannot decide between A.D. 19 and 20; and Smallwood. Legatio p. 172, who hesitantly favours a date later than A.D. 19.

Little is known of Gemellus in his youth, except that he was hated by his grandfather, who suspected that he was not the son of Drusus (Suet. Tib. 62.3); Dio (57.22.4b) suggests that this suspicion was planted in Tiberius' mind by Seianus as early as the time of Drusus' death in A.D. 23, but there is no evidence to suggest that Livilla was unfaithful to Drusus until her affair with Seianus; so Tiberius could not have believed Gemellus to be a bastard until A.D. 31, when Seianus' wife Apicata revealed the liaison (Dio 58.11.6; on Apicata's letter to Tiberius, see J.P.V.D. Balsdon CR 1 [1951] 75). Cf. Marsh Tiberius p. 281; Seager Tiberius p. 180, n. 5.
Gaius, too, it must be remembered, was Tiberius' legal grandson, since his father Germanicus had been adopted by Tiberius in A.D. 4 (Dio 55.13.2; Tac. Ann. 4.57.5; Suet. Tib. 15.2; Gaius 4; cf. Tac. Ann. 6.46; Suet. Tib. 54.1; Gaius 14.1).

1.1 τὴν αὐτορρχίαν κατέλιπεν: Cf. Suet. Tib. 76. There is no doubt that Augustus wished Germanicus and his family to rule. Not only had he forced Tiberius to adopt Germanicus as his heir, but in his will he had named the three sons of Germanicus "Caesares" (Dio 57.18.11. On the significance of the title Caesar, cf. Dio 53.18.2: it carried no powers, but showed "τὴν τοῦ γένους οἰκῶν διαδοχήν." The title had come to Gaius and Lucius through their adoption by Augustus [e.g., E&J 76; cf. Dio 55.9.7]). Tiberius' dilemma was whether to follow Augustus' intent in this case as closely as he had in all other matters of imperial importance, or to advance the interests of his natural son, Drusus (on this point, see particularly Seager Tiberius pp. 118-22). All the evidence suggests that Tiberius in A.D. 20 considered Germanicus' son Nero to be his successor (Tac. Ann. 3.29). But with the elimination of Nero and the young Drusus by A.D. 33 (see on Chapter 3.5 τά τε ὅστα), the problem of succession was again raised: Their brother Gaius, now 21 years old, was the sole surviving member of Germanicus' family, and Tiberius Gemellus, aged 14, was the only other possible contender as successor to the imperial power. Tiberius was once again faced with deciding between Augustus' wishes and the desire to be succeeded by a direct descendant. Without certain evidence to the contrary, there can be no reason to assume that he had changed his habit of adhering to Augustus' precepts. On Tiberius' attitude to the succession, see particularly Marsh Tiberius pp. 160-90; Smallwood Legatio pp. 169-71.
The evidence presented by the sources in this matter is contradictory. Philo calls Gemellus "κοινωνών ἐν τῆς ἀρχής" (in Flacc. 3.10 [518]; cf. Leg. 4.23 [549]); and according to Suetonius (Gaius 19.3), Tiberius never definitely decided which of the two would be his successor, but inclined towards his grandson Gemellus. In support of this view it can be pointed out that Seianus had clearly thought that Gemellus would be declared Tiberius' heir, since he asked the Emperor for permission to marry Livilla, the boy's mother, in hopes of being appointed regent (Tac. Ann. 4.39; see Marsh Tiberius p. 168; Seager Tiberius pp. 195-98). This in itself is not sufficient proof of Tiberius' intent: Seianus, it was later shown, could easily be deceived by the Emperor (Dio 58.9-10); and we know also that Seianus felt it necessary to dispose of Gaius before the accession of Gemellus could be guaranteed (Tac. Ann. 6.3).

Tacitus says that Tiberius hesitated between Gemellus and Gaius: the former was not yet an adult, while the latter was popular and so "apud avum odii causa"; even Claudius was considered, but was dismissed because of his instability; finally, "incertus animi, fesso corpore, consilium, cui impar erat, fato permisit" (Ann. 6.46.1-8). Clearly Tacitus thought that to declare joint heirs was to appoint joint successors (Willrich's suggestion [Caligula p. 112] that Gaius' contemporaries believed that the Empire could be bequeathed is certainly true of the so-called Gemellusparteri). Josephus follows the same tradition as Tacitus, adding that Tiberius wanted to designate Gemellus as his successor, but proposed to let the gods decide by way of augury: and the gods showed him Gaius instead (AJ 18.6.9 [211-212; 219]; see also 18.6.6 [188], where it is taken as a sign that Tiberius intended Gemellus to be his heir, when he asked Herod Agrippa to watch over and counsel him; one of the reasons why Agrippa was jailed was that he
ignored these orders and paid court to Gaius instead (see on Chapter 8.2 ΑΥΡ[ΠΙΝΑΚΑ]).

Dio himself, on the other hand, gives several indications that Tiberius looked to Gaius as his successor: not only was Gaius "Caesar" after A.D. 14 (Dio 57.18.11), but his creation as pontifex in A.D. 31 was accompanied by indications from Tiberius that he would be the next Emperor, indications welcomed by the populace because of Gaius' parentage (58.8.1-2; ILS 189). The Emperor's intent was shown again in A.D. 33 when Gaius was appointed quaestor and was granted permission to hold other offices five years before the legal age (58.23.1-2; cf. CIT 12.1848, 1849). The same honour of holding the quaestorship five years early had been granted to Tiberius himself (Dio 53.28.3-4; cf. Suet. Tib. 9.3), but he was not then considered Augustus' successor, since at the same time Marcellus was allowed a ten-years' advance (cf. Tac. Ann. 12.41).

We can reject with some confidence the notion that Tiberius intended Gemellus to succeed him, at least directly: the boy's age was against him, as both Dio and Tacitus agree; Willrich (Caligula p. 105) compares this to the situation in 23 B.C. when the ailing Augustus indicated Agrippa rather than the young Marcellus as his successor. At most, it might be admitted that by Tiberius' will Gaius was forced to adopt Gemellus, as Tiberius himself had adopted Germanicus. Nor was it in keeping with Tiberius' careful administration of imperial affairs to leave the choice of successor up to the gods or to the youths themselves, despite the arguments of both R. Villers (REL 28 [1950] 249-50) and L. Lesuisse (Les études classiques 30 [1962] 43-44). The most acceptable evidence suggests that Tiberius considered Gaius, if not the best, at least the only suitable person to succeed him. It was, after all, Gaius and not Gemellus who was summoned to Capreae, probably before August A.D. 32, despite the statement by
Suetonius (Gaius 10) that it was in his nineteenth year (his chronology throughout this section is faulty; we know, for example, that Gaius was pontifex two years before his marriage to Claudilla [Dio 58.8.1; Tac. Ann. 6.20.1], yet Suetonius reverses the order of these events [Gaius 12.1; for Claudilla, see on Chapter 8.7; for the problem of dating Gaius' move to Capreae, see Furneaux and Koestermann on Tac. Ann. 6.20.1]).

It now remains to explain why, given that Tiberius saw Gaius as his only possible successor, he did not express his wishes more clearly, but instead left what now seems to have been an ambiguous will. Part of the answer lies in the realization that Gaius, "als leiblicher Urenkel des Augustus, des Stifters der Dynastie" (Dessau p. 104), had a much stronger claim to the succession than Gemellus, a claim that was recognized by the Romans (cf. J. Béranger REL 17 [1939] 175: "Caligula, descendant direct d'Auguste, ..., succéda à Tibère. Ce dernier ne l'avait pourtant pas désigné formellement et on lui a reproché de ne rien décider et de s'en remettre au destin. Nous inferons, au contraire, du silence de Tibère, que la succession était réglement tacitement"). It must be remembered, too, that Tiberius, although 77 years old in A.D. 37, expected to live several years longer (Dio 58.27.3; Suet. Tib. 62). By August of A.D. 37 Gaius would be 25 years old and legally able to hold a praetorship (cf. Dio 52.20.2; 58.23.1-2; Willrich Caligula pp. 104-5; Abbott Roman Political Institutions p. 375; Mommsen Staater. 1.555, n. 3). After his praetorship it would have been suitable for him to be granted proconsular imperium and perhaps even tribunician power, the two symbols by which Augustus had designated Tiberius as his successor (Dio 56.28.1; Tac. Ann. 1.3; Suet. Tib. 21.1; Vell. 2.121.1). With such powers bestowed upon him by the Senate, Gaius would not have been threatened by Gemellus' position as co-heir in Tiberius' will (it should be
noticed here that there is really no similarity at all between the relationship of Gemellus to Gaius in A.D. 37 and that of Germanicus to Tiberius in A.D. 14). But the Emperor's belief in his longevity was ill-founded.

Dio is the only source so bold as to state that Tiberius actually bequeathed the Empire to his heir or heirs. Although Suetonius did think that the Empire could be bequeathed (cf. Gaius 24.1), J. Béranger (op. cit. p. 171, n. 3) has shown that he did not consider the succession to be the same as the inheritance of property. In fact, the one always accompanied the other, as Tacitus realized when he had Galba comment "unius familiae quasi hereditas fuimus" (Hist. 1.16). Inheritance of the Empire is, of course, nonsense, for while a will bequeathing a patrimonium would doubtless influence the decision of those selecting a successor, it could by no means include the imperial power: this remained, at least in theory, under the control of the Senate. Dio made the same error when speaking of Caesar's adoption of Octavius, "Ὦς καὶ τοῦ δυνάματος καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τῆς τε μοναρχίας διάδοχον καταλείψων" (45.1.2; cf. 45.2.7; App. BC 3.2.19), about which Villers (op. cit. p. 241) has made the reasonable observation that "la filiation adoptive de César ne lui donnait qu'un ascendant moral, sans le moindre droit à la dictature de son père adoptif." Augustus' will, for example, naming Tiberius and Livia as his heirs, was never considered to include the imperial powers (Dio 56.32.1; Tac. Ann. 1.8.1; Suet. Aug. 101.2). See Marsh Tiberius p. 217 and Venturini p. 66, both of whom argue that Tiberius by his will was passing on to others the apparently insoluble problem of succession; while Kornemann (Doppelprinzipat pp. 47-48) considers Gemellus' inclusion as joint heir to be proof of Tiberius' realization that the institution of a dual monarchy was a necessity. On bequeathing the Empire to heirs, see Mommsen Staatsr. 3,1,448-451; Greenidge Roman Public
Life p. 361. For the problems connected with succession in the Julio-Claudian period in general, see particularly Hammond *Augustan Principate* pp. 74-76.

1.2 ἐσ τὸ συνέδριον: The chronology of the period immediately following Tiberius' death is somewhat confused. We know from the *fasti* (= E6J p. 43) and the *Acta Arvalium* (*CIL* 6.2028c = 32346e = Smallwood no. 3) that Tiberius died on 16 March; that at a meeting of the Senate on 18 March Gaius was proclaimed imperator; and that Gaius arrived in Rome on 28 March. When was the will annulled? Many assume that a meeting of the Senate was held on 28 March (e.g., Pareti *Storia* 4.764) or shortly after (e.g., Balsdon *Gaius* pp. 25-26), at which time the will was read by Macro and declared invalid by the senators. The fact that Gaius was declared Emperor more than ten days before the contents of Tiberius' will were officially published either confirms Dio's statement (59.1.5) that many knew ahead of time who were his heirs (and were already prepared to ignore the claims of Gemellus), or that the choice of successor was obvious to the senators and had probably been agreed upon beforehand. It would, then, be in the Senate's interest to annul the will, to prevent any later dispute by Gemellus or his supporters (see Willrich *Caligula* p. 112; evidence for the existence of a "party of Gemellus" can be found in the note on Chapter 8.1 ἔγκλημα). From Dio's statement here, it seems unlikely that Gaius himself was present at this part of the meeting (despite Willrich *Caligula* p. 111 and Balsdon *Gaius* p. 25) although later that day he addressed the Senate (see Chapter 6.1). The problem of chronology created by Suetonius' comment (*Gaius* 14.1) "ingressoque urbem ... inrita Tiberi voluntate ... ius arbitriumque omnium rerum illi permissum est," which seems to reverse the
order of events and to compress them into a single day, can be resolved if
the *ius arbitriumque omnium rerum* refers not to his proclamation as Emperor
on 18 March, but to his assumption of the formal imperial titles late in
March or early in April. Lesuisse *(AC* 30. [1961] 420-21) sees the Senate's
acclamation of Gaius as *imperator* on 18 March as distinct from the actual
investiture of imperial power which he places on 28 March: the title
*imperator*, he claims, merely designated Gaius as Tiberius' successor, but
did not make him Emperor or give him imperial power; and it was because it
conferred no actual power that Tiberius, Gaius, and Claudius could all refuse
to include it among their other titles (cf. M.P. Grenade, *REL* 33 [1955] 54).
This explanation, however, fails to account for the fact that 18 March was
Gaius' *dies imperii*, which must at this period of the Empire be taken to
mean his investiture with full imperial powers.

1.2 *διὰ τοῦ Μάκρων*: Macro's full name appears on a recently discovered
inscription *(AE* 1957.250) as Q. Naevius Cordus Sutorius Macro (cf. Dio 58.9.2: Ναεύιος Σερτωρίου Μάκρων. For a full
commentary on the inscription, see F. de Visscher in *Mélanges à André
Piganiol* [Paris, 1966] pp. 761-68). The same inscription shows that some-
time before A.D. 31 he was *praefectus vigilum*: in this position he must have
shown ability and loyalty to the Emperor since, also before A.D. 31,
Tiberius appointed him commander of the imperial bodyguard (Dio 58.9.2),
probably at the same time assigning Laco to the vacant prefecture of the
night watch (Dio 58.9.3). It was Macro who delivered to the Senate Tiberius'
"wordy letter" that was to cause Seianus' destruction (Dio 58.9.2; Tac. *Ann.*
6.48.4; Philo *Leg.* 6.37 [551]). For his part in this scheme he was offered
the rank of praetorian by the Senate, but he tactfully refused it, no doubt
mindful of the fate of Seianus (Dio 58.12.7). At this time Macro replaced Seianus as praetorian prefect (Tac. Ann. 6.15.5, where he is first mentioned by Tacitus, whose section dealing with the fall of Seianus is, of course, lost): in this position he was judged by Lucius Arruntius as being even worse than his predecessor (Tac. Ann. 6.48.4. A full biography of L. Arruntius can be found in the article by R.S. Rogers in CPh 26 [1931] 31-45; cf. Colin in Latomus 13 [1954] 402; P.Y. Forsyth, Phoenix 23 [1969] 204-7). For Macro's assistance in securing Gaius' accession, see on Chapter 10.6 τῶν ἐκείνου ἐδεργητημάτων; on a freedman's presence in the Senate, see on Chapter 16.3 διὰ τῶν ἀπελευθέρων.

1.2 παραφρονησαντος: Cf. Gaius Inst. 2.145 ("de inofficioso testamentō"): "alio quoque modo testamenta iure facta infirmantur, velut cum is, qui fecerit testamentum, capite diminutus sit." For a similar situation, see Sall. Jug. 11.5.

1.2 παιδίō: Born in A.D. 19 (see above on Chapter 1.1 τὸ Τίβερίω), Gemellus was now 18 years old, but had not yet assumed the toga virilis (cf. Suet. Gaius 14: "praetextatum adhuc"). Tradition forbade praetextati to enter the Senate (Val. Max. 2.1.9; Gell. 1.23; Pliny Ep. 8.14.5), but Augustus had allowed the sons of senators to attend meetings "quo celerius rei publicae adsuescerent" (Suet. Aug. 38.2).

1.3 τῆς ἀρχῆς παρέλυσε: See on Chapter 1.2 ἐς τὸ συνέδριον. The annulment of the will could not have been an attempt to deprive Gemellus of half the throne, since Gaius had already been declared sole Emperor. Willrich (Caligula p. 112) suggests the existence of a party
supporting Gemellus, and that it was in order to shatter the hopes of this party and to avoid possible civil war that the Senate found it necessary to reject Tiberius' testament. Balsdon, on the other hand, tries to show that the Senate was unwilling to allow a minor to inherit so much money (Gaius p. 26). The right answer seems to lie in Suetonius' comment "heredes aequis partibus reliquit Gaium ex Germanico et Tiberium ex Druso nepotes, substituitque invicem" (Tib. 76): that is, if either was to die, the survivor would be sole heir. The clause "substituitque invicem" could obviously prove a source of personal danger to the new Emperor; also, it was hardly fitting for a ruler to share half his predecessor's estate with another. Augustus had been careful to bequeath Tiberius two-thirds of his estate and Livia only one-third (Dio 56.32.1; Suet. Aug. 101.2). Nero, faced with a problem similar to that of Gaius, had Claudius' will suppressed, either to avoid popular displeasure at his preferment over Claudius' true son, Britannicus (Tac. Ann. 12.69.5), or because Claudius might have mentioned Britannicus favourably in his will (Suet. Claud. 44; Dio 61.1.2 is noncommittal about the reason). The difference between the actions of Nero and Gaius is that the latter published the contents of the will before the Senate annulled it. (cf. L. Lesuisse. Les études classiques 30 [1962] 47).

1.3 πολιτείαν ἄφαντος ἀπέκτεινε: See Chapter 8.1-2.

1.3 ὁ Τιβέριος: According to Dio, Tiberius foresaw that Gaius would murder Gemellus, and once commented to him "σὺ τε τοῦτον ἀποκτενεῖς καὶ σὲ ἄλλοι" (58.23.3; cf. Tac. Ann. 6.46.8: "occides hunc tu, inquit, et te alius").
Tiberius not only had refused to pay Livia's bequests after her death, but also rejected a suggestion that she be deified (Dio 58.2.1-3a). See on Chapter 2.4 τὰς Λιούιας διαθήκας.


Tiberius had written his will two years earlier and, presumably for secrecy, had it witnessed by humillimi (Suet. Tib. 76.1). If he followed Augustus' example (Suet. Aug. 101.1), it was then deposited at Rome with the Vestal Virgins. Dio's statement seems so unlikely that Boissevain's suggested emendation of αὕτα to αὐτάς is appealing: certainly people knew of the existence of a will (αὐτάς) before Tiberius' death, but to have allowed one's heirs to know of its contents (αὕτα) would have been foolish and even dangerous, as Julius Caesar had realized (Suet. Caes. 83.1).
CHAPTER TWO

2.1 τοὺς τε ἄλλους: That is, he paid Tiberius' bequests to everyone except Gemellus. I reject Reiske's suggestion, followed with some hesitation by Boissevain, that a phrase such as καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις is necessary to complete the sense.

2.1 τοὺς τε οὖν δορυφόρους: The occasion was commemorated on the coinage of A.D. 37-38: a sestertius (BMC Imp. 1.151, no. 33) shows on its reverse Gaius standing on a platform and addressing five soldiers, four of whom are carrying standards, and with the inscription ADLOCVT COH. It is significant that, although the Senate was present at the ceremony and had the power to mint bronze coinage at Rome, the coin was not issued S.C.: Gelzer (RE "Julius" col. 386) suggests that the coin may have been struck by Gaius himself for the special purpose of paying the donative; Rosborough (p. 20) quite wrongly assigns the coin to the northern campaign of A.D. 39-40.

Tiberius, too, had inspected the Praetorians in company with the Senate: his intention, according to Dio (57.24.5), was to instil in the Senators a fear of those troops and incidentally of his own power. Although the Praetorians played no great part in influencing affairs until the accession of Claudius, their presence just outside the city from A.D. 20 or 23 onwards (Dio 57.19.4; Tac. Ann. 4.2.1; cf. Suet. Aug. 49) was doubtless considered proof of the military basis of the Principate.

2.1 κατὰ πεντῆκοντα καὶ διακοσίας δραχμὰς διένειμε: In the time of Tiberius there were nine praetorian cohorts (Tac. Ann. 4.5.4; Dio 55.24.6 says ten in A.D. 5), each
numbering a thousand men (Dio loc. cit.; cf. Tac. Hist. 2.93.3); thus the expense of paying them Tiberius' bequest and his own additional donative would amount to 18 million sesterces. Augustus had also left 250 drachmae to each man of the Praetorian cohorts (Dio 56.32.2; Suet. Aug. 101.2), but it is most significant that Gaius added a donative on his own initiative, a practice that is usually supposed to have begun under Claudius, probably because that Emperor's gift was much larger (15,000 sesterces for each man) and was in gratitude for the part played by the Praetorians in his accession (Suet. Claud. 10.4; Josephus' claim [AJ 19.4.2 (247)] that he gave them each 20,000 sesterces and promised a like amount to every legionary is an obvious exaggeration); Claudius also awarded them an annual donative of 100 sesterces on the anniversary of his accession (Dio 60.12.4). Nero, not so dependent on the Praetorians, reduced the donative to Gaius' figure of 2000 sesterces a man (Tac. Ann. 12.69.3).

2.2 ὁδήμω ...: Under Augustus' will the populus Romanus had received 40 million sesterces (Dio 56.32.2; Suet. Aug. 101.2): since the total citizen population of the Empire in A.D. 14 stood at 4,100,900 (Fasti Ostienses = E&J p. 40; but cf. RG 8.4), the bequest must have been limited to the plebs urbana. The extra 5 million sesterces bequeathed by Tiberius would suggest that in the matter of his will, as on so many other occasions, he followed the precedent set by Augustus by leaving the same amount as his predecessor to each recipient, allowing for a reasonable 12 1/2% increase in the population of that group over a period of 23 years.
When Gaius' brothers, Nero and Drusus, came of age, Tiberius had held a *congiarum* in their honour (Suet. *Tib.* 54.1); but no such largesse accompanied Gaius' *dies tivocinii* (Suet. *Gaius* 10.1). In compensation, this *congiarum* mentioned by Dio was held on 1 June A.D. 37 (*Fasti Ostienses* = Smallwood no. 31). Gaius followed the precedent set by Julius Caesar in adding interest for the interval between the promise and the actual donative (Suet. *Caes.* 38.1: "pro mora"). Another *congiarum* of the same amount, but not mentioned by Dio, was given on 19 July of the same year (*Fasti Ostienses* = Smallwood no. 31; cf. Suet. *Gaius* 17.2); and in addition to these, there were two more distributions of gifts or money to the people in Gaius' short reign: in A.D. 38, perhaps to celebrate the return of the elections to the people (see Chapter 9.6), and in A.D. 40 on his return from the north (see Chapter 25.5); both these were random distributions rather than organized *congiaria*. The two *congiaria*, totalling 600 sesterces for each recipient, must have reached about 250,000 people (cf. RG 15.1-2), amounting to an expense of some 150 million sesterces. When this is combined with the 45 million sesterces bequeathed the people by Tiberius, a total of almost 200 million sesterces was paid out to the *plebs urbana* in the first four months of Gaius' reign (cf. Balsdon *Gaius* p. 183, where a slightly lower figure is estimated).

A gift of *HS 300 vititim* was a common amount: the same was distributed by Augustus (Suet. *Aug.* 41.2; cf. RG 15, where *congiaria* of 400 and 240 sesterces are recorded as well), Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 20; Tac. *Ann.* 2.42.1; cf. Ann. 3.29), Claudius (Dio 60.25.7; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 12.41 and Suet. *Claud.* 21.1: "congiaria populo saepius distribuit"), Vespasian (*Chron.* 354, p. 146.10), Domitian (Suet. *Dom.* 4.5: three *congiaria*), and Nerva (*Chron.* 354, p. 146.21).
2.3 τοῖς τε γὰρ ὀστικῶις: Again, Tiberius followed the lead of Augustus in bequeathing 500 sesterces a man to the city troops (Dio 56.32.2; Suet. Aug. 101.2). There were three urban cohorts in the city itself, a fourth being stationed at Lugdunum (Tac. Ann. 3.41.2), with about 1500 men in each cohort (Dio 55.24.6; Tac. Ann. 4.5.5). The 4500 eligible troops, then, received a total of 2,250,000 sesterces under the provisions of Tiberius' will.

2.3 τοῖς νυκτοφύλαξι: The vigiles were originally organized by Augustus in A.D. 6 as a temporary measure to control the frequent fires that struck the city; but they proved so valuable that they became a permanent force (Dio 55.26.4-5). Because they were exclusively freedmen, they were not at first considered part of the military (cf. Tac. Ann. 4.5.5 and Furneaux ad loc.), and were not therefore listed among the beneficiaries of Augustus (cf. Suet. Aug. 101.2). They proved, however, to be a valuable force in the overthrow of Seianus (Dio 58.9), and it was doubtless because of this loyalty that Tiberius included them in his will. There were seven cohorts of 1000 men each (CAH 10.200, 234-235; Lanciani Ruins and Excavations, p. 338), each cohort being responsible for fire-protection in two of the city's fourteen regions. Under the terms of Tiberius' will, 2,100,000 sesterces were paid to them.

2.3 ἐκ τοῦ καταλόγου: "From the list for service" (cf. Dio 40.18.1; Thuc. 6.43; Mason Greek Terms p. 59): that is, the regular legionary soldiers. After the loss of three legions under Varus in A.D. 9 (Dio 56.18-21; Tac. Ann. 1.60.4; 2.25.2; 2.41.1), Augustus established the regular number at twenty-five (Dio 55.23.2; Tac. Ann. 4.5.2-5), the
total strength of each amounting to about 5000 men (Furneaux I.123; Webster Army pp. 114-16). An outlay of 37,500,000 sesterces was necessary to pay Tiberius' bequests to these 125,000 regular troops. By Augustus' will as well, the legionaries had received 300 sesterces a man (Dio 56.32.2; Suet. Aug. 101.2), but Tiberius had been forced by Germanicus to double that amount because of the revolts of the legions on the northern frontiers (Dio 57.5.3; 57.6.4; Tac. Ann. 1.36.4; Suet. Tib. 48.2). It is surprising that Gaius, who must have remembered those earlier disturbances of the legions in Pannonia and on the Rhine (in the drama of which he himself had played a part), did not pay the army an immediate bonus, as he had in the case of the Praetorians. For although his command of the frontier armies was not as insecure as that of Tiberius in A.D. 14, yet the reforms of the terms of service promised at that time had not been implemented (Dio 57.6.5). Gaius did give donatives to the frontier troops, as one would expect, in A.D. 39/40 while he was in Germany and Gaul (see Chapters 22.7; 25.3).

2.3 ἐν τοῖς μικρότεροις τείχεσιν: See Burmann apud Sturz 6.311. Dio normally uses the term τείχος as the equivalent of legio (cf. 53.15.2; 79.7.1; Mason Greek Terms p. 92), but in this instance it must refer either to frontier posts garrisoned by semi-retired legionaries or to colonies settled by veterans. The former, called vexillarii (Tac. Ann. 1.36.4), who were often quartered apart from the legions (Tac. Ann. 1.44.6), seem to have numbered about 500 for each legion (Tac. Ann. 3.21.2), amounting in all to some 12,500 men who would have received a total of 3,750,000 sesterces as Tiberius' legacy. If, as seems less likely, the phrase refers to the colonists mentioned by Augustus in
his *Res Gestae* as numbering about 120,000 (*RG* 15.3), the expenditure would have reached some 37 million sesterces.

2.4 τὰς τῆς Λιοβίας διαθήκες: Livia had died in A.D. 29, after having been virtually ignored by her son since his retirement to Capreae three years earlier (Dio 58.2.1; Tac. *Ann.* 5.1.1; Suet. *Tib.* 51.2). Since Tiberius had refused to attend her funeral, the oration was delivered by Gaius, her great-grandson on both his father's and mother's sides, and her nearest living male relative after the ignored Claudius (Tac. *Ann.* 5.1.1). Tiberius, quite sensibly, refused to allow her to be deified (Dio 58.2.1), and had her will declared invalid (Dio 58.2.3a; Tac. *Ann.* 5.1.6; Suet. *Tib.* 51.2). It remained for Gaius to pay out her bequests, which he did "cum fide ac sine calumnia" (Suet. *Gaius* 16.3), despite the fact that she had left Galba, the future Emperor, a legacy of 50 million sesterces (Suet. *Galba* 5.2: the figure *quingenties* is generally accepted by all but Casaubon). Gaius is said to have called Livia "Ulixem stolatum" (Suet. *Gaius* 23.1), a phrase used by Suetonius to show that Gaius despised her low-birth. But her great-grandson's willingness to pay her perhaps exhorbitant legacies suggests a certain admiration for his "Ulysses in skirts," perhaps because of Livia's ability to suffer in silence (cf. Seneca *Cons. Marci* 3), or, more likely, because of her craftiness and determination to play an active part in men's affairs (Dio 56.31.1; 56.47.1).

It is impossible to determine the amount of Livia's bequests, but it is worth noting that, under the terms of Augustus' will, she must have received less than 50 million sesterces (Suet. *Aug.* 101.1, 3).
2.4 καὶ τοῖς ἰδιώταις: Claudius was listed among the heirs of the third degree in Tiberius' will, by which he would have received two million sesterces (Suet. Claud. 6.2). Willrich (Caligula p. 111, n. 1) and Gelzer (RE "Julius" col. 387) must be wrong in suggesting that the bequest was actually paid to Claudius, who would qualify for it only if the heirs of the first two degrees were unable to collect their shares.

2.5 ἐς ὀρχηστάς: By the time of Tiberius riots in the theatre had become commonplace (cf. Tac. Ann. 1.54.3; 1.77.1). At first Tiberius had tried to control the licentiousness of the actors by severely restricting their income (Suet. Tib. 34.1), but when this proved insufficient to curb their increasing immorality and disturbances, he had them banished from Rome in A.D. 23 (Dio 57.21.3; Tac. Ann. 4.14.4; Suet. Tib. 37.2). After the recall of the actors in A.D. 37, Gaius began to associate closely with one of their number, Mnester. That the Emperor should include an actor among his favourites was considered undignified and even abnormal, so rumours of sexual perversions were spread to account for their intimacy (Dio 60.22.3-4; Suet. Gaius 36.1: "Mnesterem ... dilexisse fertur commercio mutui stupri"). It is ironic that shortly before Gaius' assassination, Mnester danced in a tragedy portending his death (Suet. Gaius 57.4; see on Chapter 29.4 ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ). Actors continued to be a source of trouble to the Emperors: Nero is said to have encouraged feuding among their factions, until in A.D. 56 it became so serious that he too was compelled to banish them (Tac. Ann. 13.25.4; cf. Dio 61.8.1-4).

2.5 καὶ ἐς ἵππους: Cf. Suet. Gaius 18.3: "edit et circenses plurimos a mane ad vesperam." See Chapters 5.2; 7.3-4; 10.1-5; etc.
2.5 καὶ ἔκεινα ἐπεμφορίσει: I.e., he paid the legacies of Tiberius and Livia.

2.6 ὥσ δὲ ἔτεροι: Such a phrase, indicating Dio's comparison of three or more sources, occurs three other times in this book: ὥσ γε τινὲς φοινί (12.2) on the use of silk awnings in the Forum; ὥσ δὲ τινὲς φοινί (22.1) on the number of troops collected for his northern campaigns; and ὥσ φοινὶ τινὲς (25.5 = Xiphilinus) on the mixing of iron with coins in a congiarium.

2.6 τεθησαυρισμένας: Dio seems to use the term θησαυρός indiscriminately of the public treasury (Aerarium Saturni), the imperial accounts (fisci), and even perhaps of the Emperor's patrimonium (cf. Dio 53.22.3; Mason Greek Terms p. 54). To which of these singly, together, or even in conjunction with the Aerarium militare, Dio is here referring is impossible to discover. On the complicated question of the aerarium and fiscus in the early Empire, see: H. Last, JRS 34 (1944) 51-59; C.H.V. Sutherland, AJPh 66 (1945) 151-70; A.H.M. Jones, JRS 40 (1950) 22-29; F. Millar, JRS 53 (1963) 29-42; JRS 54 (1964) 33-40; P.A. Brunt, JRS 56 (1966) 75-91.

It is generally agreed, however, that Tiberius kept the imperial finances in extremely good condition, especially when compared with their state in A.D. 14 (cf. Suet. Aug. 101 and Philo Leg. 2.9 [547]; see Balsdon Gaius pp. 181-82; Marsh Tiberius pp. 156, 227-28). Some of this wealth came from convictions and the subsequent confiscations of property (cf. Tac. Ann. 6.17.1), the rest from a competent administration of provincial finances. Suetonius' figure of 2,700,000,000 sesterces in the treasury at the time of Tiberius' death (Gaius 37.3) does not agree with either of the amounts
recorded here by Dio: for this reason Xylander suggested reading ἔξα, for πέντε in line 7, which would make Dio's first figure the same as that of Suetonius. But both the ambiguity of Dio's word ἑπιθυμωρίσμενας and the record of one other widely differing amount suggest the possibility, even the likelihood, that there was no agreement about the exact sum even among contemporary historians of Gaius' reign. Thus Willrich (Caligula p. 111; 428) includes the patrimonium in the total sum, while Gelzer (RE "Julius" col. 395) does not. See on Chapter 9.4 τοὺς τε λογισμούς.

2.6 οὐδὲ ἐσ τὸ τρίτον ἔτος μέρος ἀπ' αὐτῶν τι διέσωσεν: Suetonius disagrees, saying that Gaius exhausted the treasury "non toto vertente anno" (Gaius 37.3). To have Dio agree more closely with Suetonius, Lipsius (de Magnitudine Romae 2.14) preferred to read ἔτος, a genitive after μέρος; but such a phrase as "the third part of the year" is awkward even for Dio, and both Xiphilinus and Zonaras confirm ἔτος. Dio himself records that it was not until A.D. 39 that Gaius was forced to resort to exactions because he was in need of money (see Chapters 18 and 21.1-2; the statement in 10.7, under the year A.D. 38, that the treasuries had been emptied is part of the section on Gaius' evil actions, the whole of which is too general to be chronologically reliable). This date of A.D. 39 is confirmed by Josephus, who admits that Gaius ruled well for two years (AJ 18.7.2 [256]), while the incredible statement in the Suda (s. Τάιος) that he spent all of Tiberius' bequests in a single day no doubt refers only to the paying out of Tiberius' legacies. Finally, although it is impossible to estimate accurately Gaius' expenses during the first year or two of his reign (cf. Willrich Caligula p. 111, n. 1), it is at the same time difficult to imagine how he could spend between
two and three billion sesterces in that short time. Tiberius' legacies, together with his own donatives and congiaria, amounted to less than 300 million sesterces; Livia's bequests and Gaius' generous gifts to actors and gladiators could hardly have accounted for an equal amount. Even with the expense of the bridge at Baiae in the summer of A.D. 39 (see Chapter 17), one suspects that the treasuries could not have been depleted at any time in Gaius' reign of four years, particularly since they continued to be replenished in the normal way by taxation and income from the provinces.

The charge of exhausting the funds, then, must be seen as no more than the normal accusation levelled against one who was considered a tyrant by his biographers. That he did spend freely, however, is not doubted. Tenney Frank (AJPh 56 [1935] 336-41) has shown that Tiberius' frugality might well have caused the financial crisis of A.D. 33, indicated by the extremely high interest rates at that time, and suggested further that Gaius' prodigality may have been encouraged by those who feared a repetition of that economic crisis.
CHAPTER THREE

3.1 δημοκρατικῶτατος: Many of our sources agree that on his accession Gaius was popular (e.g., Philo Leg. 4.22 [549]: "ό σωτηρ καὶ εὐδεργῆς εἶναι νομισθεὶς") or at least that he tried to win the favour of the populace (e.g., Suet. Gaius 15.1: "incendebat et ipse studia hominum omni genere popularitatis"), but Dio is the only one to call him "democratic." While the adjective is justified in part because of Gaius' initial rejection of imperial titles, his refusal to control the courts, and his attempt to restore the magisterial elections to the people (Suet. Gaius 16.2; see Chapter 9.6), Dio here uses it primarily to point out the contrasts in Gaius' behaviour. Chapters 3 and 4 are in fact little more than a series of rhetorical antitheses reflecting Dio's rather shallow appreciation of human nature. He begins his history of Tiberius' reign in a similar but more expanded passage— that Emperor, too, was δημοτικός (57.8.3), at least until the death of Germanicus removed his only rival (57.13.6).

It is significant that both δημοκρατικῶς and δημοτικός are used frequently to describe Augustus as well (e.g., 53.12.1; 55.4.2). For Dio they signify the same attribute, something between a desire to maintain Republican forms and the levitas popularis that Z. Yavetz applies to several of the Emperors (Plebs and Princeps pp. 98-100).

3.1 μὴ τῷ δῆμῳ ἢ τῇ γε βουλῇ γράψαι τι: Since Tiberius had transferred all the powers of making initial decisions to the Senate, there was no reason why Gaius should correspond with the δῆμος. Nor was he legally able to summon the Senate, as Tiberius had done after Augustus' death by virtue of his tribunician power (cf. Tac.
Ann. 1.7; cf. Willrich Caligula p. 109). Gaius was forced to wait upon the Senate for the granting of imperial powers. Josephus' comment (A.J 18.6.10 [234]) that immediately on the death of Tiberius Gaius wrote the senators informing them of his accession shows a misunderstanding of legitimate procedure: someone who was present at Misenum (perhaps Macro, acting as Gaius' lieutenant) probably informed the Senate by letter of Tiberius' death (see Balsdon Gaius p. 25), and at the same time wrote the City Prefect to ensure the loyalty of the urban cohorts.

3.2. Ἐν μία ἡμέρᾳ λαβεῖν: This probably took place at the first meeting of the Senate after Gaius' arrival in Rome (see on 1.2 ἐσ τὸ συνέδριον), and served merely to confirm the powers that he unofficially possessed after being hailed imperator by the Senate on 18 March (see on Chapter 1.1). It was at this meeting, too, that he must have delivered his speech recorded in Chapter 6.1 (cf. Balsdon Gaius pp. 26-27).

The granting of all the imperial powers and most of the titles on a single day cannot be considered irregular. The problem of succession had been encountered only once before, and it must be remembered that on Augustus' death Tiberius already possessed imperium proconsulare and tribunicia potestas, which assured his accession (Dio 56.28.1; Suet. Tib. 21.1; Tac. Ann. 1.3.3; Vell. 2.121.1; cf. R. Villers. REL 28 [1950] 244-45). Since Gaius had not been given these powers during Tiberius' lifetime, it was of course necessary for the continuance of the Principate that he assume both immediately. Because of the brevity of Gaius' reign it is impossible to determine whether these powers were conferred on him for life or for stated periods of time. The distinction is perhaps academic, since
imperium was automatically renewed every five or ten years (Dio 53.16.2; his subsequent statement that Emperors after Augustus were appointed for life ("ἐσ πάντα καθάτακτο τον βίον ἀποδεικνύμενο") could well be a reflection of even later practice); and tribunician power was considered "annual and perpetual" (Dio 53.17.1; 53.32.5; cf. Mommsen Staater. 2.795, n. 1).

Gaius' immediate assumption of the powers and titles enjoyed by his predecessor established the custom for those who followed, from Claudius to Vespasian (Claudius: Dio 60.3.2; Nero: Tac. Ann. 12.69.3; Otho: Tac. Hist. 1.47.2; Vitellius: Tac. Hist. 2.55.3; Vespasian: Tac. Hist. 4.3.4). The lex de imperio Vespasiani (ILS 244 = E&J 364) is the earliest proof that all the honours were granted by one decree rather than by separate enactments in a short period (although some doubt that imperium was included in the lex: cf. Hammond Augustan Principate. p. 26). This practice continued until at least the time of Dio himself (cf. Dio 53.18.4). For an excellent survey of the imperial titles and powers employed by Augustus and his successors, see Hammond op. cit. pp. 25-113.

In addition to the powers mentioned above, there were three important titles used (though not invariably) by the early Emperors: the praenomen imperatoris, Augustus, and pater patriae. Suetonius claims that Gaius used others, such as pius, castrorum filius, pater exercituum, and optimus maximus Caesar (Gaius 22), but there is little inscriptional evidence to support this (see Rosborough p. 35, who refers to CIL 2.150*; for pius, see on Chapter 3.3 CIL 2.150*).

A distinction must be made between the nomen imperatoris, which could be won by the Emperor any number of times through the victories of his legati in the field (see Chapter 22.2), and the praenomen imperatoris, which early became a perpetual part of Augustus' titles and originally seems to
have signified his permanent command of the troops (Octavian appears to have first used the title in 40 B.C.; cf. Degrassi Fasti Capitolini p. 109; Hammond Augustan Principate pp. 48-50. See also Dio 43.44.2). Although the praenomen imperatoris was eventually to be considered the equivalent of princeps (cf. Mason Greek Terms p. 119), it was not so by the time of Tiberius, who consistently refused to allow it to be used except by the soldiers (Dio 57.2.1; 57.8.1-2; Suet. Tib. 26.2). Gaius, too, avoided using it, or perhaps never accepted it outright despite the decree of the Senate on 18 March A.D. 37 (see on Chapter 1.1), for it is absent on all but provincial inscriptions (see Rosborough p. 19; Mommsen Staater. 2.769). In this he was followed by Claudius (Suet. Claud. 12.1). See further Mason Greek Terms pp. 12, 29, 117-21.

Although Augustus had intended to bequeath the name Augustus to his successor (Suet. Aug. 101.2; Tib. 17.2), both Dio and Suetonius say that Tiberius never used it, except when dealing with foreign monarchs (Dio 57.2.1; 57.8.1; Suet. Tib. 26.2). The fact that the title Augustus (Σεβαστός in Greek) is attached to Tiberius' name in inscriptions from the East does not contradict our sources, for provincials commonly made errors regarding the proper titles of Emperors (see, e.g., IGRR 4.206 = E&J 93, from Ilium: "... τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος Τιβερίου Σεβαστοῦ ύπο ςεβαστοῦ"; for a lengthy list of provincial errors, see Seager Tiberius p. 142, n. 2). But Augustus appears in inscriptions and on coinage from Italy as well, within a few years after the beginning of Tiberius' reign, something which would not have been tolerated if the name had not eventually become part of Tiberius' official titles (see, e.g., BMC Imp. 1.130, no. 176; 1.131, no. 79, 81; ILS 159 = E&J 83-85, 87. I cannot accept Scott's unconvincing defence of the statements of Dio and Suetonius concerning Tiberius' refusal
of the title *Augustus* [CFK 27 (1932) 43-50]). If Tiberius had at first hesitated to use the name with its religious and (by then) divine connotations, Gaius did not, for it appears as part of his titles from the first months of his rule (cf. *ILS* 180 and 183 = Smallwood 84-85; *BMC* Imp. 1.152, no. 36 and 38 = Smallwood 86 and 81).

*Pater patriae*, the third of the prominent imperial titles, was first given to Cicero (Juvenal 8.244), and was afterwards used by Julius Caesar and Augustus (cf. Dio 53.18.3). Although it was several times offered to Tiberius, he always refused it (Dio 57.8.1-2; 58.12.8; Tac. *Ann.* 1.72.2; 2.87.2; Suet. *Tib.* 26.2). Dio’s claim that Gaius assumed the title *OuK es μακρόν* is confirmed by a sestertius dated A.D. 37-38, with the following inscription on the reverse: *SPQR PP OB CIVES SERVATOS* (*BMC* Imp. 1.152, no. 38 = Smallwood 81; cf. *ILS* 193, dated to A.D. 39). Claudius, too, rejected it at first (Dio 60.3.2), but accepted it within a year of his accession (cf. *CIL* 6.4032).


3.3 *γυναῖκα μίαν μὲν ἐκδιδομένην ἄνδρὶ δοτάσας*: I.e., Cornelia Orestilla, during her marriage to C. Calpurnius Piso. See on Chapter 8.7 ἔγιμε.

3.3 *ἄλλας δὲ συνοικούσας τισιν ἄποστάσας*: Gaius is said to have forced Memmius Regulus, the husband of Lollia Paulina, to betroth her to him (see Chapter 12.1). The plural *ἄλλας* would suggest that Dio includes in this category Milonia Caesonia, Gaius’ fourth wife, although he nowhere mentions that she had previously
been married (but cf. Suet. *Gaιus* 25.3; see on Chapter 23.7 Μιλωνίας).

Gaius was also accused of having seduced his sister Drusilla from her first husband, L. Cassius Longinus (Suet. *Gaιus* 24.1; see on Chapter 11.1 Māρkos Λέπιδος).

Those who claim that Gaius modelled his rule on that of the pharaohs of Egypt would see in this habit the traditional behaviour of those eastern monarchs (see, for example, Colin Latomus 13 [1954] 408-9; cf. A. Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt* [New York, 1894 (1969)] p. 155).

3.3 αὐτὸς πλὴν μίας ἐμίσησε: Gaius divorced at least two of his wives, Cornelia Orestilla in A.D. 37 or 38 (Chapter 8.7), and Lollia Paulina in A.D. 39 (Chapter 23.7), while the fate of his first wife, Junia Claudilla, is uncertain (see on Chapter 8.7 Ἰὴν τε Θυγατέρα). He loved only Milonia Caesonia, whom he married in A.D. 39 (Chapter 23.7) and to whom he remained devoted until his death (Suet. *Gaιus* 25.3)--there seems little justification for Dio's statement that he would have grown to hate her as well, a remark which Ferrero (*Women* pp. 208-13) apparently accepts as valid.

3.3 Ἐὐσεβῶς: His piety was depicted on coins: BMC Imp. 1.153, no. 41, minted for the dedication of the Temple of Augustus and inscribed on the reverse PIETAS (A.D. 37-38); BMC Imp. 1.156, no. 58, with the same inscription (A.D. 39-40). It does not seem likely that Ἐὐσεβῶς or Πίος was used by Gaius as part of his name, despite Suetonius' claim to the contrary (*Gaιus* 22). The only epigraphic evidence for it occurs in an inscription from the East and dated to the visit of Germanicus' family there in A.D. 18, when Gaius was only six (*ICRR* 4.1022; cf. Rosborough p. 35).
On *pietas* as an attribute of Emperors, cf. M.P. Charlesworth *JRS* 33 (1943) 1-10. For Gaius' early propaganda on behalf of the whole imperial family, cf. Meise *Untersuchungen* pp. 97-98.

3.4 ταύτινα τε γὰρ Ἀὐγουστάν ...: Cf. Suet. *Gaius* 15.2: "Antoniae aviae, quidquid umquam Livia Augusta honorum cepisset, uno senatus consulto congressit." In A.D. 14, after her husband's death, Livia had been appointed priestess of Augustus and had been given the name *Augusta* (Dio 56.46.1-2). Suetonius (Claud. 11.2) says that Antonia refused Gaius' offer of the *cognomen Augustae*, and that it remained for her son, the Emperor Claudius, to bestow it on her posthumously (cf. also Dio 60.5.1; *BMC* Imp. 1.180, no. 112, dated to the beginning of Claudius' reign and showing on the obverse a bust of Antonia with the words ANTONIA AUGUSTA, and on the reverse the inscription SACERDOS DIVI AUGUSTI). It is, however, clear from the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* (Smallwood no. 3; cf. Henzen pp. xliii, 52) that Antonia accepted the title from Gaius, for a sacrifice on 31 January A.D. 38 was carried out "Antoniae Augustae." On the priesthood of Augustus given to Antonia, cf. Kornemann *Doppelprinzipat* pp. 51-52; her position is confirmed by *CIL* 6.921.

3.4 ὅσα τάς θειαρθένοις ὑπάρχει: In 42 B.C. the Triumvirs had granted the Vestals permission to use one lictor each (Dio 47.19.4): this right was later given to Livia in her position as priestess of Augustus (Dio 56.46.2). Among the other rights of the Vestals, also granted to Livia, was permission to occupy special seats in the theatre and at public games (Suet. *Aug.* 44.3; Tac. *Ann.* 4.16.6). Association of imperial women with the Vestals became almost customary: Ovid
refers to Livia in company with them (Trist. 4.2.13-14; Pont. 4.13.29), and Claudius later assigned a seat in their area of the theatre to Messalina (Dio 60.22.2).

3.4 ἐὰν τὴν ὀμτὴν προεδρίας: See Chapter 7.4 for an instance.

3.5 τάς τε εὐχὰς ... καὶ τοὺς ὁρκούς: Cf. Suetonius Gaius 15.3: "de sororibus auctor fuit ut omnibus sacramentis adicerentur: 'neque me liberosque meos cariores habebo quam Gaium habebo et sorores eius;' item relationibus consulium: 'quod bonum felixque sit C. Caesari sororibusque eius:'" This honour paid to Gaius' sisters is hardly irregular, since it was customary practice to include the Emperor's family in prayers and decrees (cf. Suet. Aug. 58.2: "quod bonum, inquit, faustumque sit tibi domuique tuae, Caesar Auguste!"). In A.D. 24 Gaius' brothers had been quite naturally included in the annual prayer for Tiberius' health, and it was only that Emperor's growing fear that caused him to suspect Agrippina's influence (Tac. Ann. 4.17; Suet. Tib. 54.1). The oath taken by the citizens of Assos on Gaius' accession, before the Emperor could have insisted on the inclusion of his sisters, reads in part: "ὦμνυμεν ... εὐνοήσειν Γαίῳ Καίσαρι Σεβαστῷ καὶ τῷ σύμπαντι οἴκῳ αὐτῷ" (SIG 797 = Smallwood no. 33; cf. T. Mommsen. "Iusiurandum in C. Caesarem Augustum." Ges. Schrift. 8.461-466). It is hardly surprising, then, that at the beginning of A.D. 38 the annual oaths and prayers included mention of Gaius' three sisters (cf. Chapter 9.2, and the oath recorded in the Acta Fratrum Arvalium for 12 January A.D. 38; as restored by Mommsen and Henzen [CIL 6.2028b = 32344 = Smallwood no. 2 = Henzen p. xlii]).

Nor was it an innovation for Gaius to include living imperial women on his coinage, as on the sestertius of A.D. 37-38 showing on the reverse
Agrippina, Drusilla, and Julia representing Securitas, Concordia, and Fortuna (BMC Imp. 1.152, no. 36). Tiberius earlier had issued coins on the reverse of which Livia was shown as Pax (BMC Imp. 1.124, no. 30; cf. p. cxxx, where the coin is dated to A.D. 16-21). The reverse was always considered secondary to the obverse (cf. M. Grant, *Roman Imperial Money* [London, 1954] pp. 141-43), and it was not until Claudius’ reign that the portrait of a living imperial woman was portrayed on the obverse of a coin (BMC Imp. 1.176, no. 82: Agrippina Minor, A.D. 51-54). For the coin showing Gaius’ three sisters, see U. Kahrstedt, *Klio* 10 (1910) 295; G.G. Belloni in *Aufstieg und Niedergang* 2.1.1045-1046.

3.5 τά τε ὀστὰ τά τε θῆς μητρὸς καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ἀποθανόντων:

After the death of his own son Drusus in A.D. 23, Tiberius entrusted to the Senate the two older sons of Germanicus, Nero and Drusus, in language that made it quite clear that they were to succeed him (Dio 57.22.4a; Tac. *Ann.* 4.8.8. On this meeting of the Senate, cf. G. Kampff *Phoenix* 17 [1963] 53-57). Yet within four years they and their mother Agrippina were suspected of treason by the Emperor. Tiberius had by then fallen under the influence of Seianus, who found it easy to play on the old man’s fear of Agrippina’s ambition and arrogance (cf. Willrich *Caligula* p. 94). According to Suetonius (*Tib.* 55), Seianus was given the power to rid Tiberius of the family of Germanicus and to ensure that Tiberius Gemellus should become Emperor. This is difficult to believe of Tiberius, since Gemellus was only eight years old in A.D. 27, when the persecution of Agrippina and her sons began in earnest (Tac. *Ann.* 4.67.6). It is more likely that, by forcing Tiberius to put Nero and Drusus out of the way, and at the same time by plotting privately against Gaius (see on Chapter 16.4 καὶ τῶν
Seianus was paving the way for Gemellus' accession with himself as regent (see Marsh Tiberius p. 194 and n. 3). At the instigation of the prefect, then, Agrippina and her family were followed by soldiers who noted all their words and actions. They were encouraged to flee to the German legions or to seek sanctuary at the statue of Augustus, and although they refused, they were nonetheless considered to have contemplated such moves (Tac. Ann. 5.3 and Suet. Tib. 53.2, both of whom consider the charges fabricated).

Tacitus assumes that Livia acted as a bulwark against Tiberius attacking Agrippina, since after Livia's death in A.D. 29 Tiberius and Seianus denounced Agrippina and Nero publicly, charging them, not with treason as might be expected, but Nero with "amores iuvenum et impudicitiam" and Agrippina with "adrogantiam oris et contumacem animum" (Tac. Ann. 5.3.3-4. Suetonius [Gaius 10.1] suggests that Agrippina was tried and banished before the death of Livia: on this chronological difficulty, which has not yet been satisfactorily explained, see M.P. Charlesworth CPh 17 [1922] 260-61; Gelzer RE "Julius" col. 382; the problem was not noticed by Maurer). For an analysis of the charges against Agrippina and Nero, see particularly Rogers Criminal Trials pp. 98-103, where it is suggested that the family of Germanicus was guilty of conspiracy, but that dummy charges were laid against them to avoid open revolt on the part of their supporters (see also Rogers' article in TAPhA 62 [1931] 141-68; the most recent treatment of the treason trials is R.A. Bauman Impietas in Principem [Munich, 1974]). Instead of being prosecuted along with his mother and brother, Drusus was used as a tool against Nero: Seianus played on his jealousy of his older brother, encouraging him to hope for the succession if Nero were disposed of (Tac. Ann. 4.60.4-6).

Since Tacitus is not extant for the trial and conviction of Agrippina and Nero in A.D. 29, and Dio only in bare fragments that are chronologically
imperfect, it is impossible to reconstruct those events. We do know that
one of the accusers was Avillius Flaccus, later the prefect of Egypt, whose
treatment of the Alexandrian Jews was to cause Gaius considerable problems
(Philo in Flacc. 3.9 [518]; on Flaccus' responsibility for the Alexandrian
after the trial of Agrippina and Nero, Tiberius took great precautions to
prevent them being seen by the populace—proof, if any is needed, of the
popularity of Germanicus' family (Suet. Tib. 64). Nero was exiled to the
island of Pontia, where in A.D. 31 he committed suicide. His remains were
scattered, but not successfully enough to prevent their burial (Suet. Tib.
54.2; the date is inferred from Tib. 61.1). Agrippina was imprisoned on
Pandateria (Suet. Tib. 53.2), where her mother Julia had also been in exile
(Tac. Ann. 1.53.1; Suet. Aug. 65.3).

Drusus, no longer of any use to Seianus, was convicted on an unknown
charge and imprisoned in the basement of the palace (Suet. Tib. 54.2),
probably late in A.D. 30 (his trial must have taken place after the publica-
tion of Velleius' work in that year: cf. Furneaux 1.624, n. 2). According
to Tacitus (Ann. 6.24.2), while in prison Drusus acted the part of a madman
("[alienationem mentis simulans], quasi per dementiam"). However, part of
this statement appears to be an interpolation (cf. Furneaux ad loc.), and
Marsh is no doubt correct when he says that "it seems extremely probable
that during his imprisonment the prince became actually insane, and that
Tiberius at length concluded that his death was a grim necessity of state"
(Tiberius p. 208). The following year, during the overthrow of Seianus,
there was a rumour that in an emergency Macro was to release Drusus and
"place him at the head of the people" ("ducem populo imponere": Tac. Ann.,
6.23.4-6). But instead he was allowed to starve to death two years later,
surviving his last eight days by eating the stuffing of his mattress (Tac. Ann. 6.23.4; Suet. Tib. 54.2). His remains, too, were scattered without burial (Dio 58.22.5). Responsibility for the deaths of the two princes, as Suetonius points out with considerable insight (Tib. 61.1), must rest solely with Tiberius and not Seianus (cf. Seager Tiberius pp. 233-34).

Agrippina died soon after Drusus, on 18 October A.D. 33 (Tac. Ann. 6.25.5), but not before she had thoroughly denounced the Emperor (Suet. Tib. 53.2). Tacitus is in doubt about the manner of her death, whether her starvation was voluntary or enforced, but Suetonius describes it as suicide. Tiberius, quite naturally in the circumstances, refused to allow her to be buried in Augustus' Mausoleum at Rome (Dio 58.22.5).

3.5 αὐτὸς τε πλεύσας καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοχειρίᾳ ἀνελόμενος: According to Suetonius (Gaius 15.1) the journey was made during bad weather, "quo magis pietas emineret" (cf. M.P. Charlesworth Camb. Hist. Journ. 4 [1933] 108-9). Dio is, of course, wrong to suggest that Gaius here collected the remains of both his brothers, since Drusus had died at Rome.

Pandateria and Pontia are two small but moderately populated islands lying in the Bay of Puteoli opposite Formiae, about 250 stades from the mainland (Strabo 2.5.19; 5.3.6; Pliny HN 3.6.82). The former was a favourite place of exile for women of the imperial family: in addition to Augustus' daughter Julia, two of Gaius' sisters were imprisoned there (see on Chapter 3.6 ἐ is νῆσον), and Nero's wife Octavia was later to be confined and executed on the island (Tac. Ann. 14.63.1; [Sen.] Octavia 970-972.
3.5 ἔσ τὸ τοῦ Ἀὐγούστου μνῆμα κατέθετο; For the Mausoleum of Augustus, see Platner and Ashby pp. 332-35. The funerary inscriptions of Agrippina and Nero are both extant (*ILS* 180 and 183 = Smallwood no. 84a and 85a), but there is no record of that of Drusus. Since Suetonius does not mention that he, too, was buried in the Mausoleum, perhaps his remains could not be found in the palace (so Balsdon *Caes* p. 30). There is evidence, however, that memorials were erected to him outside Rome (e.g., *ILS* 187, an inscription from Gallia Transpadina).

Gaius' piety towards his mother's memory did not stop with her burial. He destroyed the villa at Herculaneum where she had been imprisoned (*Sen. de Ira* 3.21.5; see K. Scott, *AJPh* 60 [1939] 459-62) and declared annual circus games in her honour (*Suet. Caes* 15.1; cf. *BMC* Imp. 1.159, no. 180). Her birthday, which Suetonius says had been declared *necassus* at the instigation of Tiberius (*Tib.* 53.2), was now made the occasion of an annual sacrifice of a bull by the Arvals (*CIL* 6.32346 = Smallwood no. 9; the figures of the date are unclear, and could signify either 25 or 26 October).

3.5 ὃπερ ἐν ἐπινικίωσ κοσμηθεῖσ: Suetonius (*Caes* 15.1) adds further that the remains were carried from Ostia to Rome on two *ferula*, vehicles normally used for carrying spoils of war in a triumphal procession (cf. *Suet. Caes.* 37.2; *RE* "ferculum" col. "2206-7"). and were accompanied by *equites* in procession. It is tempting to see a planned similarity between this procession and that of Magna Mater in 204 B.C. (cf. Ovid *Fasti* 4.291-348); Maurer (p. 58) goes so far as to suggest an intentional emphasis of the divinity of Gaius' family; but it would be more likely that the Emperor was drawing attention to the *pietas* of his ancestress, Claudia Quinta (*Livy* 29.14.12).
For a discussion of the Tiberian prosecutions of Agrippina's supporters, see Marsh: *Tiberius* pp. 166-88; Seager *Tiberius* 187-94; 206-8. The concept of a "party" loyal to Agrippina and Germanicus was first devised by F.B. Marsh (Am. Hist. Rev. 31 [1925/1926] 233-50), who suggests that it was supported by the "lesser" nobility, while the "party" of Tiberius and (earlier) his son Drusus was favoured by the higher aristocracy; Marsh's views were slightly modified by W. Allen, Jr., in *TAPA* 72 (1941) 1-25. For a brief discussion of the prosecution of some of Agrippina's supporters, see on Chapter 19.1. 

Both Dio and Suetonius accuse Gaius of maltreating his grandmother and of causing her death. It appears that Antonia several times tried to interfere in imperial decisions, as when she attempted to restrain Gaius from releasing Herod Agrippa immediately on Tiberius' death (Jos. *AJ* 18.6.10 [236]; cf. Suet. *Gaius* 29.1; on this point, see Meise *Untersuchungen* pp. 99-100). Perhaps it was because of this attitude of hers that after her death he neglected to pay her such honours as he had bestowed upon his mother (cf. Dio 60.5.1; Suet. *Claud.* 11.2). The charges brought against Gaius by our sources, that he provoked her death and perhaps even hastened it with poison, and that he refused to attend her funeral but watched it instead from the palace (Suet. *Gaius* 23.2), bear a striking similarity to those accusations levelled against Tiberius and Livia in the case of Germanicus' death (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.3). What is more, Antonia herself had taken no part in the funeral of Germanicus, her own son and Gaius' father (ibid.).
Nor does inscriptive evidence support the statements of Dio and Suetonius. Antonia died on 1 May A.D. 37 (Fasti Ostienses = E&J p. 43), only six weeks after Gaius' accession and not after October of that year, as Suetonius suggests by placing the event in his section on "Gaius the Madman" (cf. Garzetti L'Impero pp. 88-89). Further, the following year her birthday was celebrated by the Arvals (CIL 6.2028c = Smallwood no. 3), which would hardly have been wise if Gaius had truly hated her (cf. Charlesworth Camb. Hist. Journ. 4 [1933] 108-9).

3.6 τωσας διαφθείρας: At the time of Gaius' accession, his three sisters were married, Agrippina to Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (Tac. Ann. 4.75.1; cf. Suet. Nero 6.1), Julia to M. Vinicius (Tac. Ann. 6.15.1; Dio 58.28.1), and Drusilla to M. Lepidus (cf. Chapter 11.1; she had previously been married to L. Cassius Longinus [Tac. Ann. 6.15.1; Dio 58.28.1]). This rather traditional charge of incest is made against Gaius only by Dio (cf. Chapter 22.6-7, where it is joined with an accusation of homosexuality), Josephus (AJ 19.2.5 [204]), and Suetonius (Gaius 24.1), while no mention is made of it by Tacitus, Philo, or (most significantly) Seneca (Gelzer [RE "Julius" col. 392] notes that Seneca makes no mention of incest where one would most expect it, in his description of Gaius' grief at the death of Drusilla [Cons. Polyb. 2.17.4]; cf. Willrich Caligula p. 291). It is tempting to accept the suggestion of Balsdon, who explains these stories of improper relations between Gaius and his sisters in the same way as he does those of Tiberius' obscenities on Capreae: Gaius' devotion to his family was as exceptional as Tiberius' desire for seclusion, and so some base explanation needed to be found for them (Gaius pp. 41-42).

I am not convinced by the arguments of Colin (Latomus 13 [1954] 408ff.) that Gaius' incest with Drusilla, together with his last three marriages, is
a reflection of his devotion to the cult of Isis, or by his suggestion that it was a royal dynastic marriage ("Ce n'était pas le prince romain qui gouvernait l'Egypte; c'était le roi d'Egypte qui commandait à Rome" [p. 408]). Most would now dismiss the charge of incest as an ugly rumour (e.g., Meise Untersuchungen p. 99, n. 46; Charlesworth Camb. Hist. Journ. 4 [1933] 118; Willrich Caligula pp. 291-92); but a few accept the traditional account (e.g., Ferrero Women pp. 184-207; Kornemann Doppelprinzipat p. 53).

As an extension to the charge of incest, H. Mazel has suggested in a fascinating but absurd article (Mercure de France 1.5 [1913] 212-16) that the future Emperor Nero was Gaius' own son by Agrippina. He bases his theory not only on physical resemblances, but particularly on what he sees as "moral" similarities: "tous deux sont cabotins, plaisantins, roquentins, dépensiers à outrance et débauchés au delà de toute mesure" (p. 213); they both possess "la salacité exaspérée, les moeurs contre nature, le goût des incestes, le penchant à verser le sang et à faire longuement souffrir, etc." (p. 214). As his final argument he notes the significance of the nine months from Tiberius' death to the birth of Nero, as if Gaius had been prompted to action on the day of his accession. The moral resemblances show the ancient historians' penchant for types more than any real similarities, and Mazel fails to mention the most damaging piece of evidence of all: when asked by Agrippina what name he would suggest for her new son, Gaius showed his affection for the boy and his mother by proposing that he be called Claudius, "quod tum Claudius inter ludibria aulae erat" (Suet. Nero 6.2).

3.6 ἐς νῆσον τὰς δύο κατέκλεισαν: Agrippina and Julia were exiled to the Pontian islands in A.D. 39, ostensibly because of improper relations with Lepidus (Chapter 22.8-9; Suet. Gaius 29;
Nero 6.3), whose wife Drusilla had died the previous year (Chapter 11). The true cause of their banishment was realized by Suetonius (Gaius 24.3) and unwittingly guessed by Philo (Leg. 12.87 [558])—they were suspected of having taken part in Lepidus' conspiracy against Gaius (for the conspiracy, see on Chapter 22.5 Γαίτουλικοῦ). They were later recalled by Claudius (Dio 60.4.1).

3.7 πάππου προσωνύμαξε: Tiberius had adopted Gaius' father, Germanicus (Dio 55.13.2).

3.7 τῶν αὐτῶν τῷ Ἀὔγουστῳ τιμῶν: Cf. Dio 56.46.3-4. The principal honour was deification, together with its attendant distinctions such as temples and priests, despite Tiberius' frequent claim that he disliked the thought of being considered divine (cf. Tac. Ann. 4.38). Dio's ordering of these events is questionable, since it is unlikely that Gaius would have requested Tiberius' deification before his actual funeral (cf. Tac. Ann. 1.10.8, of Augustus: "ceterum sepultura more perfecta, templum et caelestes religiones decernuntur"; Ann. 13.2.6, of Claudius: "Claudio censorium funus et mox consecratio"; and HA "Marcus" 18.3: "denique, priusquam funus conderetur, ut plerique dicunt, quod numquam antea factum fuerat neque postea, senatus populusque ... propitium deum dixit"). Normally, too, some visible proof of the elevation of the dead Emperor was required (cf. Dio 56.42.3; 56.46.2; Suet. Aug. 100). It appears, however, that some officials at the mint in Rome thought to anticipate Tiberius' deification by issuing coins on the reverse of which was pictured the late Emperor's head radiate with a star on either side, indicating the two divi, Augustus and Tiberius (BMC Imp. 1.146, no. 1' = Smallwood no. 124).
Later an almost identical coin was minted without the two flanking stars (cf. H. Mattingly JRS 10 [1920] 37; G.G. Belloni in Aufstieg und Niedergang 2.1.1043-1044).

3.7 νυκτὸς τε ἐς τὴν πόλιν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἐξαγαγών: Dio's brevity on this point suggests that Gaius was dishonouring the memory of Tiberius by bringing his body into Rome under cover of darkness. Suetonius fortunately gives enough detail to disprove this: "itaque ut a Miseno movit quamvis lugentis habitu et funus Tiberi prosequens, tamen inter altaria et victimas ardentisque taedas densissimo et laetissimo obviorum agmine incessit" (Gaius 13). The body was carried into Rome at night, as is clear from Suetonius' phrase ardentis taedas. This explains the confusion of dates found in inscriptions: the Acta Fratrum Arvalium (CIL 6.2028) record the date as 28 March, while the Fasti Ostienses (E&J p. 43) give 29 March. Clearly the night of the 28th and early morning of the 29th are meant (cf. Degrassi Inscriptiones Italiae xiii.1.219-220; Garzetti L'Impero p. 84; Charlesworth Camb. Hist. Journ. 4 [1933] 107-8).

3.8 ἐποιήσατο μὲν γὰρ καὶ λόγους ἐπ' οὖτῳ: Again Dio suggests by the briefness of his description that Tiberius' funeral was performed with improper haste (cf. Charlesworth Camb. Hist. Journ. 4 [1933] 107-8). Yet it did not take place until 3 April, five days after the body arrived in Rome (Fasti Ostienses = E&J p. 43: "III non. Apr. f(unere) p(ublica) e(latus) e(st)"). The burial, too, was a splendid affair carried out in the old Roman manner amid tears and with a suitable eulogy (Suet. Gaius 15.1; Jos. AJ 18.6.10 [236]; cf. Dio 58.28.5.
For comments on the rhetorical ability of Gaius, see on Chapter 19.3-5). Tiberius' body was placed in the Mausoleum of Augustus; his simple epitaph (ILS 164) no longer survives.

3.8 καὶ τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ τὸν θάμον ἀναμιμνήσκων: Germanicus had always been a hero of the populace; Suetonius calls him vulgo favorabilis (Gaius 4), and adds that it was the memory of his father that made it easy for Gaius to assume imperial power. (Gaius 13; according to Josephus [AJ 18.6.8 (206-210)] Gaius' parentage made him particularly popular with the army). Apparently Gaius tried to change the name of the month of September to "Germanicus" in imitation of the honours given to Julius and Augustus (Suet. Gaius 15.2). Meise (Untersuchungen p. 94, n. 23) notes the importance of choosing September as the month to bear the name of Gaius' father: following July and August, it would indicate clearly the dynastic succession that Gaius wanted to emphasize (it should be noted that there had earlier been a proposal to rename September "Tiberius" [Dio 57.18.2]). There is, however, no evidence that the change was ever popularly accepted (cf. Rosborough pp. 26-27; Maurer pp. 60-61).

Of related interest is the Grand Cameo of Paris, dated to early in Gaius' reign by Curtius (RM 49 [1934] 119-56) and Gagé (REA 37 [1935] 165-84), who view it as portraying this same dynastic order. Their interpretation is by no means universally accepted, however; cf. Balsdon (JRS. 26 [1936] 152-60) and Hohl (Klio 31 [1938] 273-82).
4.1 πρὸς πάντα ἐναντίον ἐπεφύκει: This assessment of Gaius’ character is the traditional one, although details vary. Philo (Leg. 43.339-341 [595]) gives a similar analysis of his temperament. ("... ἰν μέντοι καὶ πρὸς τ’ ἄλλα πάντα τὴν φύσιν ἀπιστος ...") and then, like Dio, lists a number of examples illustrating how the Emperor could change from one extreme to the other (see further 6.34 [551]). Both Dio and Philo view Gaius’ reign as a constant mixture of good and evil actions from beginning to end. As early as March-April A.D. 37, for example, he showed his autocratic spirit by assuming all the imperial powers (cf. Chapter 3.1), while even late in A.D. 40 his conduct was at times admirable (cf. Chapter 26.4). Suetonius, on the other hand, catalogues Gaius’ behaviour in two distinct periods—"hac­tenus quasi de principe, reliqua ut de monstro narranda sunt" (Gaius 22.1) --which are for the most part separated by the Emperor’s illness in October A.D. 37, although as we have seen in the case of Antonia’s death (Chapter 3.6) the chronological division is by no means exact.

With comparable rhetorical antitheses Dio introduces the character of Tiberius in Book 57: "οὔτε γὰρ ἑν ἐπεθύμει προσποιεῖτο τι, καὶ ὅν ἐλεγεν οὐδὲν ἦς εἰπεῖν ἐβούλετο... ὁμ ήξίου τὸν αὐταρχόντα κατάδηλον ὅν φρονεῖ εἶναι" (57.1.1-2). While Tiberius is consciously deceitful, Gaius is fickle, wilful, and perverse.

4.1 οὐ μόνον ἐξήλωσεν ἄλλα καὶ ὑπερέβαλεν: In the same way, and with almost the same words, Dio compares Nero to Gaius; "πρὸς τὸν Γάιον ἔτεινεν. ὥς δ’ ἡπαξ ἐξήλωσεν αὐτὸν ἐπεθύμησε, καὶ ὑπερεβάλετο ..." (61.5.1).
4.2 πρώτος τε ὑβρίστας αὐτῶν ...: According to Dio, for the first two years of his reign Gaius made no attempt to honour the memory of his predecessor, preferring instead to join in the popular hostility felt towards him (cf. Chapter 6.7). In A.D. 39, however, his attitude to Tiberius is said to have completely changed: instead of criticizing his actions, Gaius now showed sympathy for his difficulties and admiration for his behaviour (see on Chapter 16.1-8).

4.2 ὡς ἔχορος τοῦ Τιβερίου: For examples of this behaviour, cf. Suet. Gaius 28; 30.2.

4.3 τά τε τῆς ἀδεβείας ἐγκλήματα παύσας: Gaius abolished the charge of maiestas immediately on his accession (see on Chapter 6.2 τά τε ἐγκλήματα), but restored it two years later (see Chapter 16.8).

4.3 τὰ γράμματα αὐτῶν καταφλέξας: He supposedly burned the incriminating letters early in his reign (see on Chapter 6.3 τὰ γράμματα). In A.D. 38, however, he produced the original copies as evidence against those who had been involved in the prosecution of his family (see Chapter 10.8). Others were used the following year to prove the Senate's responsibility in trials for maiestas (see Chapter 16.3).

4.4 εἰκόνας τε ἀμαγορεύσας κατ' ἀρχὰς μηδένα αὐτῶν ἱστάναι: That this statement is untrue is shown by an inscription recording a letter from the Emperor himself, written on 19 August A.D. 37 (ILS 8792 = Smallwood no. 361). In reply to
an embassy bringing congratulations from certain Greek states and asking
permission to erect several statues to him, Gaius, with a certain modesty
as well as concern for the purse of the provincials, gave them leave to
set up statues only at Olympia, Nemea, Delphi, and Isthmia (the sincerity of
the delegation is unnecessarily questioned by Gelzer [RE "Julius" col. 386]).
The choice of sites shows no particular desire for divine glory, since an
Emperor could allow statues of himself at such panhellenic sites without
being accused of immodesty (see also Willrich Caligula p. 116). Rather than
preventing the erection of any statues at all, Gaius more likely forbade
precincts to be dedicated to him, precincts which would include statues to
him as a god. Tiberius had begun with the same prohibition (Dio 57.9.1;
Suet. Tib. 26.1), but like Gaius he later gave in to the desire of some to
worship him (see on Chapter 26.5 τῶν μὲν ἡρωῶν).

4.4 νοαοὸς ένωτ novelist: Cf. Suet. Gaius 22.2-4. For the charge against Gaius
of erecting temples to himself, see Chapters 28.1-4.

4.5 τὰ τε χρήματα novelist: Cf. Suet. Gaius 38.1: "exhaustus igitur atque egens
ad rapinas convertit animum vario et exquisitissimo
calumniarum et auctionum et vectigalium genere." Josephus (AJ 19.2.5 [207])
accuses Gaius of "ἡ περὶ τὰ ἄχρετα σπουδή καὶ τὸ δαπανώντα εἰς ἡδονάς" (cf.
Suet. Gaius 37 for a list of these extravagances). The best example of
wasteful extravagance followed by rapacious exactions was thought to be
the incident of the bridge at Baiae and its aftermath in A.D. 39 (see on
Chapters 17-18); and the next year Gaius was suspected of arranging his
German expedition as a means of exploiting the western provinces (see on
Chapter 21.1-2).
According to Tacitus (*Ann. 1.10.6*), people had suspected that Augustus chose Tiberius as his successor partly at least because of the latter's unfavourable character, which would enhance the memory of Augustus in retrospect. Suetonius rejects this belief (*Tit. 21.2-3*)—it depends, after all, on hindsight—but nonetheless it became a kind of motif for moral historians, and was applied by Dio to Tiberius' choice of Gaius as his successor: "ἂςμένως, ἔν τῇ ἀρχῇ αὐτῷ ἔδωκεν, ὅπως τά τε ἐκείνου τῇ τοῦ Γαίου ὑπερβολὴ συγκριόθη" (58.23.4).

Gaius is once accused of kissing actors in plain sight of everyone (Chapter 27.1).

Apelles (*PIR² A 907*) was a tragic actor from Ascalon on the coast of Judaea, a town noted for its hatred of the Jews (see Smallwood *Legatio* pp. 255-56). He was originally a prostitute, and turned to acting only when his charms had faded (Philo *Leg. 30.203-206 [576]*)). He was not always the favoured companion of Gaius: Philo adds that he was tortured at the Emperor's orders. This is no doubt the same incident as that mentioned by Suetonius (*Gaius 33*), when Gaius had Apelles whipped for hesitating to agree that the Emperor was greater than Jupiter. There is no evidence that he died under this punishment, although it is unlikely that an Apelles mentioned as a tragic actor in the reign of Vespasian (*Suet. *Vesp. 19.1*) is the same person (cf. Petr. *Sat. 64*).
5.2 καὶ ἐν τῷ δημοσίῳ: δημοσίῳ seems an odd word in the circumstances. Dio normally uses τὸ δημόσιον as the equivalent of respublica or aerarium (cf. Chapter 15.5; Mason Greek Terms p. 35), neither of which is appropriate here. The sense, however, is clear: Apelles accompanied him "even while he was conducting public business."

5.3 ἕτη πάση προσέπει ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 18.2: "scaenicos ludos et assidue et variī generis ac multifariam fecit" (cf. also Gaius 20). In his love of games and shows, Gaius was no different from Augustus (cf. Suet. Aug. 43.1: "spectaculorum et assiduitate et varietate et magnificentia omnes antecessit"; also 43.2-45.4). Venturini is hardly right when, in a passage full of exaggeration, he accepts Dio uncritically and attributes to Gaius an uninterrupted and atrocious series of games, banquets, and public entertainments "d'una enormità unica" (Caligola pp. 88-89). There is no doubt that the Emperor was infatuated with public games and particularly with theatrical performances, in both of which (like Nero) he was an active participant. For the number of days devoted to public entertainment under the Julio-Claudians, see Balsdon Life and Leisure pp. 244-48.

5.4 ὥσπερ τις ἐκ τοῦ δήμιου ὅν: Gaius' love of games and the theatre was in noticeable contrast to the reluctant attendance of Tiberius, who refused to favour one faction over the other and was prevented by his austerity from enjoying theatrical shows. (Dio 57.11.5; Tac. Ann. 1.54.3-4).
5.4 οὐκ οὔχ ἦσαν τι τῶν ἀντικαθητηκόσιν: The spectators' lack of enthusiasm for Gaius' favourites at spectacles often caused him considerable anger; see Chapter 13.5.

5.4 ἐσ ἀγώνισμα πολλῶν προσήλθεν ...: Suetonius (Gaius 54.1) gives an almost identical list of Gaius' athletic and theatrical performances. His active participation in games and shows was later emulated by the Emperor Nero (cf. Dio 63.26.1).

5.5 ἀφρήσατο: The incident, according to Suetonius (Gaius 54.2), involved three senators of consular rank, who answered the summons in fear for their lives; "deinde repente magno tibiarum et scabellorum crepitu cum pallia tunicaeque talari prosiluit ac desaltato cantico abiit." Nero is said by Dio to have acted in a way so similar that both incidents might well be apocryphal (63.26.4). Some (e.g., J. Crook Consilium Principis p. 39) see this incident as a summoning of the Emperor's consilium (τῶν πρώτων τῆς γερουσίας = primores viri): if so, it is one of only a few instances that point to the existence of a consilium at this time.
CHAPTER SIX

6.1 ΠΑΡΟΝΤΩΝ ἙΝ ΤῪ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΩ ...; Cf. Suet. Gaius 14.1; "ingressoque urbem, statim consensu senatus et irrumpentis in curiam turbae, ... ius arbitriumque omnium rerum illi permissum est."

This speech of Gaius, then, was delivered at his first meeting with the Senate late in March or early in April, the same meeting at which he was granted the imperial titles (see on Chapter 1.2 ἐς τὸ συνεδρίον; 3.2).

By personally receiving the imperial titles from the Senate when the equites and plebs were present—though the latter may not have been invited, if we accept Suetonius' word irrumpentis literally—Gaius was perhaps intentionally basing his claim to power on the same foundation as Augustus had claimed earlier: per consensum universorum (cf. RG 34.1; see further M.P. Grenade REL 33 [1955] 53-54).

6.1 ΠΟΛΛΑ ἘΚΟΛΩΧΕΙΣΕ: In his early relations with the Senate Gaius was careful to follow the precedents set by Augustus and Tiberius. Although that body had in effect lost all but its advisory powers, yet by continuing to respect its dignitas and auctoritas the Emperors could, with notable exceptions, win its co-operation, if not its devotion (cf. Merivale 5.411; Hammond Augustan Principate pp. 121-31).

There is no evidence in our sources to support Venturini's suggestion (Caligola p. 76) that from the beginning of his reign Gaius planned to govern according to the concept of absolute oriental monarchy based, not on any extraordinary power, but simply on the auctoritas of his own family. On the contrary, every historian, despite his antipathy towards Gaius, is agreed that for the first six months or even two years of his principate he ruled tolerably well (see on Chapter 8.1 νοσήμας). As for his treatment of senators after this period, see Chapter 23.3.
6.1 ἀγαθὸς καὶ τρόφιμος αὐτῶν: As a young boy in the military camps of the north, Gaius had been called legionum alumnus (Tac. Ann. 1.44.1): his reference to himself now as senatus alumnus shows great tact that belies the rashness of which he is often accused. The people as well as the army were fond of calling him by affectionate epithets; even when he had become Emperor (cf. Suet. Gaius 13). He soon became understandably sensitive to these, however, thinking them both undignified and critical of his youthfulness (see on Chapters 3.2 ἐν μία ἡμέρᾳ; 13.6 νεανίσκε). 

6.2 ἦγε δὲ πέμπτον καὶ ἐκκοστοῦνέτος ...: Gaius was born on 31 August A.D. 12 (see on Chapter 7.2 τὰ γενέθλια). Assuming inclusive reckoning for the period of four days mentioned by Dio, we are given the date of Gaius’ first speech as 28 March, the day when he first arrived in Rome and most probably when Tiberius’ will was overturned (see on Chapter 1.2 ἐσ τὸ συνέδριον). 

6.2 τοὺς ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρῷ ὄντας ἀπέλυσεν: No doubt the first person he freed was Herod Agrippa (see Chapter 8.2). Among others released at this time (cf. Dio 58.27.2-3) were probably Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus and Vibius Marsus who, together with Lucius Arruntius, were imprisoned early in A.D. 37 for impiety towards the Emperor; Arruntius had already committed suicide because, he said, he could not endure Tiberius’ successor (Tac. Ann. 6.47-48). At the same time Gaius allowed the circulation of works by Titus Labienus, Cremutius Cordus, and Cassius Severus, works whose publication had previously been banned by Augustus and Tiberius because of their libellous or republican character.
(Suet. *Gaius* 16.1; cf. Seneca *Contr.* 10.pr. 5 [Labienus]; Dio 57.24.2-4 and Tac. *Ann.* 4.35.5 [Cordus]; Dio 56.27.1 and Tac. *Ann.* 1.72.4 [Severus]).

This general amnesty of Gaius at the beginning of his reign was necessary to prevent any hostile alliance of those who may have feared his revenge: in Meise's words, "dies waren 'populäre, geschickte und zugleich auch politisch notwendige Massnahmen" (*Untersuchungen* p. 117).

6.2 ΚΥΙΝΤΟΣ ΠΟΜΠΩΝΙΟΣ: There is quite clearly a confusion of names here, as well as what must be an outright mistake on Dio's part. The man freed at this time was not Quintus Pomponius (*PIR*¹ P 564), but his brother P. Pomponius Secundus (*PIR*¹ P 563); and his release could not have taken place before his consulship.

The account of the accusations and proceedings against P. Pomponius Secundus is found in Tacitus (*Ann.* 5.8; cf. Rogers *Criminal Trials* p. 125 for a summary). In A.D. 31, during the aftermath of Seianus' overthrow, Publius was accused by Considius Proculus of friendship with a certain Aelius Gallus, without doubt the son or nephew of Seianus; but, supported by his brother Quintus and by his own admirable character, he managed to survive Tiberius.

In A.D. 33 Publius' brother Quintus undertook the prosecution of Proculus' sister, Sancia, as part of an attempt to ingratiate himself with the Emperor and so mitigate Publius' ordeal (*Tac.* *Ann.* 6.18.2). The efforts were in vain, and Publius remained in prison until his release in A.D. 37, recorded here by Dio (whose phrase "seven whole years later" should be taken as rhetorical overstatement. Cf. Garnsey *Social Status* pp. 147-48).

Despite Dio's comment that Pomponius was jailed μεθ' ὑπατείαν, neither of the brothers held the consulship until after the death of Gaius: Quintus
as *consul suffectus* for Gaius in A.D. 41 (*CIL* 6.20141; cf. Smallwood p. 2; Chapter 29.5), and Publius in A.D. 44 (*CIL* 10.6638; 11.3806; cf. Smallwood p. 3). Because Boisseyeain cannot believe that Dio not only confused one brother with the other but also erred in their consulships, he suggests that Dio here must be referring to a completely different Pomponius. There are, indeed, two other Pomponii whose consulships would qualify them: C. Pomponius Graecinus, *consul suffectus* in A.D. 16 (*Fasti Consulares* = EGJ p. 40); and his brother, L. Pomponius Flaccus, consul in A.D. 17 (Dio 57.17.1; Tac. Ann. 2.41.2; *Fasti Consulares* = EGJ p. 41; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 42.1). Flaccus, however, died in Syria in A.D. 33 (Tac. Ann. 6.27.3). As for Graecinus, nothing more is known of him except that he was a friend of Ovid (*Pont.* 4.9). It might be suggested that Dio's phrase μὲθ' ὑπατείαν indicates, if it is to be accepted, that his Pomponius was imprisoned shortly after his consulship; if it were merely his consular status that was intended by the phrase, the more traditional ὑπατευκός would have sufficed. Graecinus, then, who held his consulship fifteen years before A.D. 31, is hardly suitable.

Although no plausible explanation of Dio's apparent error about the consulship has yet been offered, the error itself must be accepted. In this case we must assume, with little reservation, that Dio intended P. Pomponius Secundus (cf. Furneaux and Koestermann on Tac. Ann. 5.8). He was, it seems, a poet and tragedian of some worth, whose biography was written by the elder Pliny (Tac. *Dial.* 13.3; Pliny *Ep.* 3.5.3-4; 7.17.11), although certain critics praised his erudition more highly than his compositions (Quint. 10.1.98); as a hobby he is said to have collected autographs of famous republicans (*Pliny* *HN* 13.26.83).
6.2 ἐπὶ τὰ ὀλοις ἔτεσιν ἐν τῷ ἀικήματι: Tiberius often procrastinated when trying prisoners. (cf. Jos. Ant. 18.6.5 [170]; "δεσμωτῶν ἀκροάσεως ἀπερίοτητος ἤν"). Dio (58.27.2-3) tells of how, after Thrasyllus had falsely predicted that Tiberius should live another ten years, the Emperor was in no hurry to pass sentences against those who had been convicted—a negligence that saved the lives of some. Delays were not always due to the Emperor, however, as in the case of a certain Lampo whose trial itself dragged on for two years (Philo in Flacc. 16.128-129 [536]). On custodia as a form of punishment, see Garnsey Social Status pp. 147-52.

6.2 τὰ τε ἐγκλήματα τῆς ἁμαρτίας: Cf. Suet. Gaius 15.4: "pari popularitate damnatos religatosque restituit; criminum, si quae residua ex priore tempore maneant, omnium gratiam fecit."

The capital charge of maiestas (cf. Mason Creek Terms p. 27), considered by our sources to be the most pernicious aspect of Tiberius' reign, is defined by Dio as: "τὸ γε ὑψηλότατον πρὸς τινὸς ἢ καὶ τὸ ἡσυχεῖσθαι πρὸς τινὸς" (57.9.2). More specifically it was said to include any improper word or action directed against Augustus, Tiberius, or Livia (Dio 57.19.1). In effect, according to R.S. Rogers, trials for maiestas under Tiberius were of two types: there were 24 cases of "lesser" maiestas or lèse majesté; and 82 cases of perduellio or high treason, including sedition in the provinces and military mutinies (cf. Rogers Criminal Trials p. 190). It is the charge of lèse majesté that attracted Roman historians, and particularly Tacitus, who created the impression of a growing cancer methodically destroying the best of the Roman state. In fact, of the 24 attested cases of lesser maiestas—on average of one each year throughout Tiberius' principate—only six resulted in
convictions. It was this overdrawn charge of lèse majesté that Gaius abolished at the beginning of his rule. Within two years he was forced by circumstances to reinstate it (see Chapter 16.8).

For general surveys of maïestas under Tiberius, see Rogers Criminal Trials pp. 190-96; Marsh Tiberius pp. 289-95; Seager Tiberius pp. 151-62; Bauman Impietas in Principem. For more specific studies, consult the notes on Chapter 16.8.

6.3 τὰ γράμματα: These letters, which incriminated certain witnesses and delatores who had co-operated in the prosecution of Gaius' mother and brothers as well as in cases of maïestas, he collected in the Forum and burned, after calling the gods to witness that he had not read them (Suet. Gaius 15.4). Deceitfully, but perhaps wisely, he had made copies and kept the originals, which he would later find useful (Chapters 10.8; 16.3). Gaius' conduct in this matter was not without precedent. After Actium Augustus had discovered damning correspondence in Antony's strongboxes; he supposedly burned the letters, but actually kept some and did not hesitate to make use of them (Dio 52.42.8). Claudius later found the letters preserved by Gaius and destroyed them, but only after showing them to the Senate and to those who were implicated by them (Dio 60.4.5).

6.4 τὰ τε Κρόνια: The festival of the Saturnalia derives its name from the god (Varro LL 6.22) and was celebrated in December, beginning on the day when the Temple of Saturn had been dedicated at Rome (Festus, Pauli Exerpta 476 [325]; cf. Livy 2.21.2; Macr. Sat. 1.8.1). The celebrations were originally held on a single day, but when Julius Caesar
added two days to December, the festival was increased accordingly. Apparently it was always unofficially longer, for Augustus was forced to limit by an edict its duration to three days, beginning on 17 December (Macr. Sat. 1.10.23). A fourth day was added sometime in the early Principate, and the fifth by Gaius, who called it the *Iuvenalis* (Suet. *Gaius* 17.2; Gelzer [RE "Julius" col. 389] errs in suggesting that Gaius added only the fourth day). Sometime after A.D. 37 this fifth day was abolished, only to be reinstated by Claudius in A.D. 45 (Dio 60.25.8).

Macrobius mentions that the festivities often continued unofficially for seven days (Sat. 1.10.24), a practice that is reflected in two poems of Martial (14.72; 79): these two extra days were devoted to the giving of *sigillaria*, the *eikovna* mentioned here by Dio (cf. Fowler *Roman Festivals* pp. 268-72).

6.4 ὁβολὸν παρ' ἐκάστου κ.τ.λ.: The Greek drachma of six obols was the equivalent of the Roman denarius of sixteen asses. If Dio is being accurate, then, Gaius reduced the traditional gift from a denarius to a sestertius (2 1/2 asses). It is equally possible that he uses ὁβολός, the smallest Greek coin, as the equivalent of the smallest Roman coin, the *as*. Two other passages (46.31.3; 64.2.1) do nothing to clarify his use of the word.

6.4 τῶν τὸ σιτηρέσιον φερόντων: In 2 B.C. there were more than 200,000 recipients of the grain dole in the city (RG 15.4). There were perhaps a quarter of a million people eligible by A.D. 37 (see on Chapter 2.2 ἐπὶ τῇ ...).
6.5 καταλυθέντων ...; For the phrase, cf. Chapter 20.1: "τῶς τότε ἀφοθόντως καταλύωσας." The consulship of Cn. Acerronius Proculus (PIR² A 32) and C. Petronius Pontius Nigrinus (PIR¹ P 218) is referred to also in Suet. Tōb. 73.2 and Dio 58.27.1.

6.5 κατ' ἔτος ὑποτευέσθ; In refusing to hold an annual consulship Gaius was following the practice established by Augustus, who, from 23 B.C. until his death in A.D. 14, was consul only twice (Dio 53.32.3; RG 4.4; 14.1). Augustus held his consulships of 5 B.C. and 2 B.C. solely to introduce Gaius and Lucius Caesar to public life as his intended successors. Tiberius followed the same custom for his three consulships, taking as his colleagues Germanicus in A.D. 18, Drusus in A.D. 21, and Seianus in A.D. 31 (Drusus being honoured not as a successor, but as the potential regent for the sons of Germanicus; and Seianus as part of the Emperor's plan to inflate him with hope before destroying him). By taking as his colleague his uncle Claudius, an object of ridicule, Gaius was not so much indicating him as the only possible heir to the monarchy, as avoiding the danger of inspiring in someone else the hope for succession (see also on Chapter 6.7 ὑπάτευον). Meise (Untersuchungen p. 101) is correct in pointing out that Gaius' attitude to his uncle Claudius and his nephew Domitius (the future Emperor Nero) disproves any idea that the Emperor considered either as a potential successor. As for Claudius in particular, Gaius must have expected to outlive him by many years.

Despite his rejection of the annual magistracy at this time, Gaius was consul in every year of his reign except A.D. 38.
6.5 αὐτὸς ὑπάτευς: Gaius took office as consul suffectus on 1 July

(Suet. Gaius 17.1; Acta Arvalium = E&J p. 43; Fasti Ostienses = Smallwood p. 2; cf. CIL 10.796). For the length of his consulship, see on Chapter 7.9 δύο τε μήνα.

6.6 ἐν τῇ τοῖς ἱππέουσι: For the phrase, cf. Plu. Pomp. 14.6. Despite the neglect shown him by his own family, Claudius was always held in great honour by the equestrians, who were accustomed to rise whenever he entered the theatre (Suet. Claud. 6.1). Because of the dignity attached to even the most overlooked member of the imperial family, he was several times chosen to represent the equestrian order before the Emperor. Suetonius mentions two other occasions (Claud. 6.1): once, when the equites requested permission to convey Augustus' body from Nola to Rome on their shoulders; and again when Tiberius was being congratulated for the overthrow of Seianus. In A.D. 39 he was again chosen as a member of an equestrian embassy and was sent to Gaul to offer Gaius compliments for quashing the conspiracy of Lepidus (Chapter 23.2-5).

6.6 τότε πρώτον: As a child Claudius had suffered from various physical ailments, remnants of which remained with him throughout his adult life (E.F. Leon [TAPhA 79 <1948> 79-86] attributes Claudius' infirmity to cerebral palsy). Because of these, his family considered him physically and mentally incapable of a public career (Suet. Claud. 2.1). Although Augustus was once tempted to allow him to enter on the imperial cursus honorum he apparently thought better of it and advanced him no farther than an augural priesthood (Suet. Claud. 4.7). Claudius himself, however, had some ambition, and once asked his uncle Tiberius to suggest
his name for the consulship; his request was refused, and a later motion from the Senate that he be given the honour of voting among the consulars was also rejected (Suet. Claud. 5-6). Until A.D. 37, then, he remained in obscurity; a knight, though head of the Claudian house.

6.6 ἐκλίγα καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἐτη βεβιωκᾶς: He was born in Gaul on 1 August 10 B.C. (Suet. Claud. 2.1; cf. Fasti Consulares = EJ p. 37).

6.7 ὑπάτευσεν: Cf. Suet. Gaius 15.2. Suetonius is no doubt partially right in seeing Gaius' choice of Claudius for his colleague as a bid by the Emperor to win the support of the equestrian order (Claud. 7.1). The position, however, involved Claudius in a certain amount of danger, for he seems still to have been held in contempt: Suetonius gives several examples of jokes played by Gaius at his expense (Gaius 23.3; Claud. 8; Nero 6.2). He was almost removed from office for being dilatory in letting contracts for statues of the Emperor's brothers (Suet. Claud. 9.1). All these stories appear genuine, if somewhat exaggerated: in Willrich's words, Gaius treated Claudius "für einen vollendeten Trotte" (Caligula p. 290). It is probably true, too, that Gaius once allowed a slave to bring a capital charge against Claudius (Jos. AJ 19.1.2 [13]); but when Josephus adds that Gaius was disappointed when unable to sentence his uncle to death, such a claim to knowledge of the Emperor's thoughts is as unacceptable from him as it is from Tacitus.

6.7 πολλα ἑπαγγελόμενος: He no doubt repeated much of what he had said in his inaugural speech to the Senate three months earlier (Chapter 6.1). For his criticism of Tiberius, see on Chapters 4.2; 16.1-8.
6.7 καὶ ἐτος αὐτὰ αναγινώσκεθαι: The motive of fear attributed by Dio
to the senators is hardly required.

It was a custom to read certain speeches of Augustus and Tiberius at the
first meeting of the Senate in the new year (Dio 60.10.2). The decree
that this speech of Gaius should be included was no more than a continuation
of this practice. Cf. also Dio 61.3.1 (Nero).
CHAPTER SEVEN

7.1 το ἡρόου το τοῦ Αὔγουστου: The temple was dedicated on 30-31 August A.D. 37 (see below, sections 2-3; Gelzer [RE "Julius" col. 388] suggests that the celebrations for the dedication began on 19 August, the anniversary of Augustus' death, but none of the evidence supports this date). Livia and Tiberius had undertaken to erect the shrine soon after Augustus' death (Dio 56.46.3), but there is some doubt whether Tiberius saw the work through to completion. Dio records that this temple was the only entirely new building erected by Tiberius (57.10.2), and Tacitus adds that he completed it but did not dedicate it "contemptu ambitionis an per senectutem" (Ann. 6.45.2; but cf. 2.49). Suetonius, on the other hand, claims that the building had to be finished by Gaius (Tib. 47; Gaius 21). Even if Tiberius did not actually complete the temple, he must almost have done so, since it was ready for dedication only five months after his death.

The approximate site of the Temple of Augustus is known only from a passage of Suetonius (Gaius 22.4), who describes the uniting of the Palatine and Capitoline by a bridge passing over the temple. Until recently it was identified with the building at the foot of the northwest slope of the Palatine, between the Temple of Castor, the vicus Tuscus, and the clivus Victoriae. This structure, however, is now recognized as an atrium of Domitian's palace, while the Temple of Augustus is thought to be buried farther west, behind the Basilica Iulia and near the present piazza della Consolazione (cf. Lugli Il Centro Monumentale pp. 185-95; Lanciani Ruines and Excavations pp. 121-23).

Because of the complete lack of archaeological evidence and the scarcity of literary references, any description of the temple is dependent
entirely on the evidence of coins. Here, too, there is some uncertainty. If it is to be identified with the temple on a coin of Tiberius (BMC Imp. 1.137, no. 116), then it was Corinthian hexastyle with sculpture above the pediment and a high curved wall behind. Mattingly (BMC Imp. 1, pp. cxxxviii; cxlvi) has convincingly disproved this identification, on the grounds that this coin was issued too soon before the dedication. More likely the temple is that represented on a coin of Gaius (BMC Imp. 1.153, no. 41; cf. p. 157, no. 69), and was Ionic hexastyle decorated with sculpture in the pediment and a quadriga on the fastigium (cf. G.G. Belloni in Aufstieg und Niedergang 2.1.1044-1045). See Lugli, loc. cit.; Platner and Ashby Topographical Dictionary pp. 62-65.

7.1 ἡν ἐπινίκιον στολὴν ἐνδύσ: Gaius was fond of wearing triumphal dress, even before he was legitimately able to do so following his campaign in the North (cf. Suet. Gaius 52; see below, section 4).

7.1 ὁσοὶ γε καὶ ἀμφιθαλεῖς ἦσαν: I.e., both parents of each child had to be living; cf. the Scholiast to Aristophanes' Aves 1735: "ἁμφοτέροις τοῖς γονεῖσι δύσλων καὶ μηδενὸς ἀφαιρεσίμως." The same requirement had been made of those youths and maidens who were to sing Horace's Carmen Saeculare in 17 B.C.: "puer. [X]XVII quibus denuntiatum erat patrimi et matrimi et puellae totidem carmen cecinerunt" (Acta Sacrorum Saecularium = ILS 5050 = E&J no. 32). See also Chapter 16.10.

7.1 καὶ ἡ βουλή ...: He repeated this banquet in A.D. 39, on the occasion of Drusilla's birthday (Chapter 13.9). Suetonius is no doubt correct when he says that these meals were provided to the
senatorial and equestrian orders (*Gaius* 17.2). If the common people were included, as Dio suggests, then it must have been as recipients of an extra ration of food rather than as participants in any formal meal (cf. Suet. *Gaius* 18.2; "panaria cum obsonio viritim divisit"; and Jos. *AJ* 19.1.16 [130]). These banquets obviously proved of some value in winning for Gaius the support of Rome's upper classes, for Claudius, who must have been present at them, repeated the custom in the first year of his own reign (Dio 60.7.4). For such distributions, see H. Kloft *Liberalitas Principis* (Vienna, 1970).

7.2 τῇ δὲ ὑστέρᾳ καὶ τετταρακοντάκις: The MS reading is τετράκις, which Boissevain emends to τετταρακοντάκις on the grounds that the occasion demanded a doubling of the number of races held the previous day.

Tiberius' birthday had been celebrated in A.D. 31 with the running of only ten contests, which seems to have been the normal number at that time (Dio 58.12.8; 60.23.5; see below, section 3). We know that Gaius was fond of all-day racing interspersed with other amusements (Suet. *Gaius* 18.3), but forty heats in one day seems an extreme number even if he was consciously trying to outdo his predecessor. Certainly forty races could be run in a day: Martial mentions thirty heats without comment (8.78.13); Domitian could fit a hundred races into a day by reducing the number of laps for each from the normal seven to five (Suet. *Dom.* 4.3); and Commodus once held thirty races in two hours (Dio 72.16.1).

Yet I cannot accept Boissevain's rather tenuous reason for rejecting the MS reading of τετράκις, a figure which makes perfect sense. Reimar perhaps had the right idea in suggesting the insertion of a second εἰκοσάκις;
I suspect, however, that it should be placed before the καὶ, which otherwise might be anomalous. This, then, would be the first occasion on which twenty-four races were held, a number that thereafter became customary (Dio 60.27.2). See Balsdon Life and Leisure p. 320.

7.2 τὰ γενέθλια αὐτοῦ: Gaius was born on 31 August A.D. 12 (CIL 6.2298 and 2300 = EJ p. 51; Suet. Gaius 8.1; cf. Dio 56.26.1). There is an interesting but insignificant story that someone once pointed out to the Emperor Commodus that his birthday was the same as that of Gaius; for this insult the man was thrown to the beasts (HA "Commodus" 10.2; cf. 1.2).

The place of his birth was disputed even by contemporary historians. Lentulus Gaetulicus said that he was born at Tibur, but he mistook for Gaius his older brother of the same name, who had died in boyhood (Suet. Gaius 7-8.2). It was commonly believed that he had been born in the legionary camp of his father, a view rather surprisingly held by Seneca (Const. Sap. 18.4), Pliny the Elder (cf. Suet. Gaius 8.1), and Tacitus (Ann. 1.41.3; cf. Suda s.v. Καλλιγόλας). This was, as Suetonius noted (Gaius 8.1-5), impossible, since Germanicus was not in Germany until after his consulship in A.D. 12. The mistake was perhaps an easy one to make, since in epigrams popular at the time of his accession Gaius was said to have been born in castris (Suet. Gaius 8.1; for these verses, see A. Taylor AJPh 66 [1945] 408-10). Suetonius, who alone seems to have consulted the acta publica on this problem, found that Gaius had been born at Antium, a town thirty miles south of Ostia (Gaius 8.2).
7.3 ἔσ που καὶ ἔδοξεν οὕτως: For example, Suet. Gaius 18.3; "(sc. circenses) commissit et subitos, cum c Gelotiana apparatus circī prospicientem pauci ex proximis Maenianis postulassent."

7.3 ὀρκτοὺς τετρακοσίας: In honour of Drusilla's birthday in A.D. 39, 500 bears and 500 Libyan beasts were slain (Chapter 13.9; cf. 60.7.3). Libycae ferae are most commonly lions (Ov. Fasti 5.178; cf. Suet. Gaius 18.3; Pliny HN 8.18.45-47), although the term here perhaps refers to a variety of beasts from northeast Africa.

7.4 τὴν Τροίαν ἱππευσαν: The fullest description of this traditional display of mock cavalry charges is to be found in Vergil's Aeneid 5.553-603, where it is associated with the funeral games in honour of Anchises. The game was probably of pre-Roman origin, for Ascanius is said to have revived it when he established Alba Longa, whence it was borrowed by the Romans (Verg. Aen. 5.596-601). Historically, the game is first mentioned in the time of Sulla (Plu. Cat. Mi. 3.1), and thereafter it occurred regularly at least until the time of Claudius (Suet. Claud. 21.3). On its origin, see R.D. Williams Aeneid V pp. 145-47.

The pageant was performed by the young sons of patrician (or perhaps noble) families (Dio 43.23.6; 49.43.3; Tac. Ann. 11.11.5). They were divided into two turmae, one of maiores and the other of minores (Suet. Caes. 39.2; Aug. 43.2; Tib. 6.4); Vergil's reference to three troops (Aen. 5.560) has led to some uncertainty about the game's organization under Augustus (cf. Balsdon Life and Leisure p. 327; RE "Lusus Troiae" col. 2059-2067).

Its origin seems to have been at least partly religious, for it was usually performed at the dedication of a temple (e.g., Dio 51.22.4; Temple
of Caesar) or at sacred games (e.g. Dio 48.20.2: ludi Apollinares).

Augustus, however, saw it as a custom useful for introducing young nobles to the public (Suet. Aug. 43.2), and it inevitably added to the dignity of the Julian gens, which claimed descent from the Trojan royal house (e.g., Dio 54.26.1; dedication of the Theatre of Marcellus). See also Dio 53.1.4; 55.10.6; 59.11.2.

7.4 τὸ ἄρμα τὸ πομπικόν: For the expression, cf. Mason Greek Terms p. 77; RG 2.9 (Greek); Dio 56.34.2. It was normal for only four horses to draw the triumphal chariot (cf. Versnel Triumphus p. 56 and notes). Traditionally the magistrate presiding over Circensian games wore the triumphal tunica palmata (Livy 5.41.2). For the relation between the pompa triumphalis and the pompa circenses, see Versnel op. cit. pp. 101-15.

7.4 τοῖς Ἑλλήσοις ἀπεσέμηνεν: Under the Empire it was the privilege of a praetor or consul to drop a mappa as the starting signal for the chariots (Suet. Nero 22.2; Juv. 10.36-42; 11.193-195). During his consulships Gaius often relinquished this honour to one of the other magistrates; in this case it was perhaps his colleague, Claudius, who performed the duty (Suet. Gaius 18.1; Claud. 7).

7.4 μετὰ τῶν συνιερέων τῶν Ὁγοιοτείων: Together with Seianus and his son, Gaius was made a priest by Tiberius in A.D. 31 (Dio 58.7.4). Since there is no evidence of his holding any other priesthood, we must assume that he was then made one of the sodales Augustales, a college that had been established in A.D. 14 (Dio 56.46.1). For the terms συνιερέως and θιασώτης (= sodalis), see Mason
Greek Term p. 117. Dio uses Αὐγοῦστειοι elsewhere only of a corps of specially selected soldiers of Nero (61.20.3).

7.5 καὶ γὰρ ἡ σαλάλλε δεινώσ: According to Suetonius (Gaius 55.1), Gaius was particularly sensitive to distractions during performances by Mnester; "si qui saltantē eo vel leviter obstreperet, detrahi iussum manu sua flagellabat."

7.5 καὶ πρὸ τοῦ καθήκοντος χρόνου: Gaius' suspension of mourning did not in fact violate the intent of the law regarding the remarriage of widows. The regulation that a woman could not remarry within ten months of her husband's death was simply a precaution to ensure that she was not pregnant by him (Digest 3.2.11; 5.9.1; cf. Cod. Theod. 3.8.1, where the interval before remarriage was extended to twelve months). Dio's phrase "διὰν γέ μὴ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχωσιν" shows that the purpose of this law was maintained, even if traditional decorum was not.

7.7 ἀνυποδήτοις: Gaius' own choice of footwear was said often to be disreputable: "ac modo in crepidis vel coturnis, modo in specularia caliga, nonnumquam socco muliebri" (Suet. Gaius. 52). To wear almost anything but the normal Roman calcei in public was considered foreign affectation: Germanicus attracted attention in Egypt by travelling "pedibus intectis et pari cum Graecis amictu" (Tac. Ann. 2.59.2).

7.7 ὑπὸ ποῦ Αὐγοῦστου ἐν ταῖς θεριναῖς πανηγύρεσι: The πανηγύρεις were the ludi publici (cf. Wissowa Religion und Kultus pp. 568-93). It is surprising that Augustus
would go barefoot, since he is said to have favoured high-soled shoes to increase his height (Suet. Aug. 73).

7.8 τὰ τε προσκεφαλαία: These were pulvini, soft seat-cushions which first appeared at the Circus Maximus in the pulvinar or "royal box" erected by Augustus (Suet. Aug. 45.1; RG 19.1).

7.8 πῖλους: The pileus was commonly worn at festivals and entertainments (see Smallwood Legatio p. 194; cf. Suet. Aug. 82.1).

7.8 εἴγε ποτὲ ἐς ὑπερβολὴν ἐπέφελεξ: According to Suetonius, Gaius was known rather for his cruelty in this respect: "gladiatorio munere reductis interdum flagrantissimo sole velis emitti quemquam vetabat" (Gaius 26.5).

7.8 τῷ διριβιτωρίῳ: Construction of the Diribitorium, where the votes were counted after an election, was begun by Agrippa and completed in 7 B.C. by Augustus. Its roof, supported by beams of larch 100 feet long, had the widest span of any building in Rome before A.D. 230 (Dio 55.8.3-4; Pliny HN 36.24.102). It was seriously damaged by the fire of A.D. 80, and its magnificent roof was never rebuilt (Dio 66.24.2). It would have been most suitable for performances before small crowds.

Until 1934 it was thought that the Diribitorium was the second storey of the Saepta, where the actual voting took place (cf. Dio 53.23.1). This theory was rejected when a newly discovered fragment of the Forma Urbis Romae showed the building adjacent to the south end of the Saepta, between

7.8 ἰκριωμένης: "Fitted with benches." Cf. Dio 43.22.3: "θέατρον τι κυνηγετικόν ἰκριωμας."

7.9 δύο τε μησί καὶ ἡμέραις δώδεκα: Dio errs in the length of Gaius' consulship. He resigned it, as perhaps was to be expected, on his birthday, 31 August, two months exactly after entering on it (Suet. Gaius 17.1; Claud. 7; Acta Arvalium = E&J p. 43; Fasti Ostienses = Smallwood p. 2; no. 31).

7.9 τοῖς πρωτοδεξειμένοις ἐς αὐτήν: The two suffecti who took office on 1 September were A. Caecina Paetus (PIR² C 103) and C. Caninius Rebilus (PIR² C 393) (Fasti Ostienses = Smallwood no. 31). Colin's theory (Latomus 13 [1954] 403-4) that Paetus was chosen consul by Gaius because his father had fought under Germanicus on the Rhine is untenable, since Dio here states clearly that these suffecti had already been appointed by Tiberius. For Paetus, cf. Dio 60.16.6; for Rebilus, cf. Tac. Ann. 13.30.3.
8.1 οὐδὲς μὲν οὐκ ἀπέθανεν. Philo says that Gaius was struck with a φυσικὴ νόσος in the eighth month of his rule, October A.D. 37 (Leg. 2.14. [548]). He attributes the illness to the Emperor's habits of over-indulgence, hot baths, and debauchery with boys and women, a theory which has found supporters among several Italian scholars. Venturini refers to "i vizi innominabili" (Caligola p. 97), and Garzetti sees Gaius' sudden illness as a result of inherited delicate health combined with the constant dissoluteness of a man who was "debole, senza principî morali" (L'Impero pp. 87-88; so, too, Gelzer [RE "Julius" col. 389-390]: "Der Körper brach unter den ihm zugemuteten Genüssen und Ausschweifungen zusammen"). T.S. Jerome would explain this sickness and all of Gaius' apparently senseless acts as the result of "alcoholic intoxication" (Aspects of the Study of Roman History pp. 419-21). Dio, who could hardly be expected to make an accurate diagnosis from the vague symptoms recorded by earlier writers, avoids the problem by using the word ἀπωστιὰ, applicable to anything from ennervation to a serious malady.

There is considerable evidence that Gaius suffered from a minor, though potentially damaging, form of epilepsy. Suetonius records that he often considered going into retirement "to cleanse his brain" (Gaius 50.2), a statement that suggests the typical, recurrent attacks of that hereditary nervous disease, called comitialis morbus by the ancients (Fest. de Sign. Verb., s.v. "prohibere comitia"), and whose symptoms were exhibited by many of the Julian gens from Julius Caesar down to the adolescent Gaius (Suet. Caes. 45.1; Gaius 50.2; cf. Marañón Tiberius p. 33; "Drusus I's son, Germanicus, had fits suspiciously like epilepsy; and Germanicus' son, Caligula, was an undoubted epileptic"). It is likely that this inherited
weakness, combined with the sudden weight of unaccustomed responsibility, led to a more serious nervous collapse than he had hitherto experienced.

J. Lucas (AC 36 [1967] 159-89) admirably discusses the evidence for Gaius' epilepsy, but I cannot agree with his conclusion that the Emperor was psychopathic as well. Willrich (Caligula, p. 118) takes the middle position by attributing the illness to a combination of the strains of unaccustomed power with excessive celebrations at the beginning of his reign. The rumour that his illness was a result of a love potion administered to him by Caesonia (Suet. Gaius 50.2; cf. on Chapter 23.7 Μυλωνας) --a surprising statement about one whose sexual appetite was supposedly as strong as it was varied--is chronologically improbable, for it is unlikely that she was his mistress so early. Two recent attempts to diagnose Gaius' illness are: R.S. Katz CW 65 (1971/1972) 223-25; M.G. Morgan CW 66 (1972/1973) 327-29.

News of Gaius' sickness caused great consternation throughout the Empire. At Rome crowds kept a nightly vigil outside the palace (Suet. Gaius 14.2), while in the provinces grief was mixed with anxiety: even the Jews saw the survival of the Emperor as necessary for their own salvation (Philo Leg. 3.15-21 [548-549]). As tidings of his recovery spread, the relief and rejoicing were immeasurable, and sacrifices were offered in gratitude (Philo Leg. 45.356 [598]).

It is often assumed that this illness marked the change in Gaius' character and that, as with Tiberius, his mask of hypocrisy was now stripped away to reveal the Monster (e.g., Venturini Caligola p. 97: "una infermità che lo ridà al potere, pazzo furioso, avido di sangue e di vendette crudeli e forsennate"). In fact, Philo is the only authority to make such a claim (Leg. 4.22 [549]: "μεταβαλων πρὸς τὸ ἀτίθασιν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἡν συνεσκίαζεν ἀγριότητα τῷ πλάσματι τῆς ὑποκρίσεως ἀναφήνας"), but he contradicts himself
a short time later (*Leg.* 8.59 [554]). Neither Dio nor Suetonius sees any necessary temporal break in Gaius' behaviour: the latter does attribute the conflicting nature of his conduct to mental infirmity, but not to this specific incident in October (*Gaius* 51.1). Moreover, Josephus dates what he considers the change in Gaius' character to late in A.D. 38 or early in A.D. 39 (*AJ* 18.7.2 [256]). Dio, on the other hand, in his desire for effective antithesis, suggests that Gemellus' death, occurring as it did shortly after Gaius' recovery, was in some way a result of the Emperor's illness. For this assumption there is no proof (see Pareti *Storia* 4.767-768).

8.1 ἡς νεότητος προκριθέντα: The normal Greek translation of the Latin phrase *princeps iuventutis* is *πρόκριτος ἡς νεότητος* (*Dio* 78.17.1; cf. 57.8.2). Gaius Caesar in 5 B.C. and his brother Lucius in 2 B.C. were the first princes of the imperial family to be appointed to this new honorary position (*Dio* 55.9.9-10; *Tac.* *Ann.* 1.3.2; *RG* 14.2; *ILS* 107, 139, 140 = E&J no. 61, 68, 69; cf. also E&J no. 63a, 65, 66, 67, 75). The appointment was a significant one, for it was interpreted, albeit informally, as an indication of the Emperor's choice of successor (cf. Greenidge *Roman Public Life* p. 356). It is significant for Tiberius' attitude to the succession that there is no evidence that Gaius' brothers, Nero and Drusus, or that Gaius himself were ever appointed to the position (cf. J.P.V.D. Balsdon *JRS* 26 [1936] 152-60; Meise *Untersuchungen* p. 97, n. 40).

8.1 ἐκσωποιθέντα: Gaius had early declared to the Senate his intention to adopt Gemellus, probably during his first meeting with that body shortly after his arrival in Rome (*Philo Leg.* 4.27 [549]). Suetonius records that Gemellus assumed the *toga virilis*, was appointed
princeps iuventutis, and was adopted by Gaius all on the same day (Gaius 15.2). Again, ever since Augustus adopted his grandsons, Gaius and Lucius, in 17 B.C. ('αυτόθεν διαδόχους τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀποδέξας, "νῦν ἐπιβουλεύεται," according to Dio 54.18.1), such a distinction was taken to indicate the intended successor. It must have been so in this case (so, too, Willrich Caligula p. 113). Philo's statement (Leg. 5.28-29 [550]) that the adoption was a clever ploy, since "ἡ γὰρ υἱὸς πάντελής ἐξουσία κατὰ τοὺς τῶν Ῥωμαίων νόμους ἀνάκειται πατρί," shows only a misunderstanding of an Emperor's powers: Gaius could—and indeed did—dispose of Gemellus without recourse to patria potestas (on the legal aspects of the adoption, cf. Jolowicz and Nicholas Roman Law pp. 119-20). Certainly the simultaneous receipt of these two honours immediately after his formal recognition as an adult elevated Gemellus to a position of great eminence, and there is no reason to suspect that Gaius was motivated in this matter by any consideration other than his desire to ensure the stability of the Principate by avoiding any struggle among potential aspirants to power.

That the adoption occurred only a short time before Gemellus' death is indicated by the absence of any mention of it on inscriptions (cf. Rosborough pp. 27-28): it was perhaps formally annulled after Gemellus' suicide (cf. Willrich Caligula p. 289).

8.1 ἀνεχρῆσατο: In words that later became notorious, the Emperor Tiberius once predicted to Gaius that he would murder Gemellus: "'occides hunc tu,' inquit, 'et te alius!'" (Tac. Ann. 6.46.8); "'οὐ τε τοῦτον ἀποκτενεῖς καὶ οὐ άλλοι!'" (Dio 58.23.3). Since it was considered imprudent, if not irreverent, for another to kill a member of the imperial family (since a soldier would thereby violate his oath to the Imperial
House [cf. Willrich *Caligula* p. 289]), Gemellus was ordered to commit suicide; but he lacked any experience with death. In a passage full of pathos, Philo tells how the youth asked the official witnesses sent by Gaius where he should stab himself, and when shown the spot he plunged in the sword (Leg. 5.30-31 [550]; cf. in Flacc. 3.10 [518-519]).

The date of Gemellus' death, which is of considerable importance in any analysis of Gaius' behaviour, cannot be determined with any accuracy. It must have occurred between the Emperor's illness in October A.D. 37, and 24 May A.D. 38, when another was co-opted in Gemellus' place among the Arvals (CIL 6.2028c = E&J no. 3; Willrich *Caligula* pp. 290-91) must be wrong in placing Gemellus' death before Gaius' illness). He was probably buried in the Mausoleum of Augustus, for his epitaph was found nearby (ILS 172 = Smallwood no. 88).

8.1 Ἐγκλῆμα αὐτῶ ἐπομαγών ὃς ...: Philo, too, comments that the official explanation of Gemellus' enforced suicide was the part he played in a conspiracy against the Emperor, but he dismisses the reason as fabricated on the grounds that Gemellus was too young to be involved (Leg. 4.23 [549]). If there was a conspiracy, however, the recent honours paid to Gemellus would make him the candidate most suitable to take Gaius' place on the throne. Indeed, the enforced suicides of four of Gaius' close associates within a brief period--Gemellus, Silanus, Macro, and Ennia--suggest that they all may have been part of a plot to replace him with his newly adopted son. On the existence of a party of Gemellus from the beginning of Gaius' reign, see Meise Untersuchungen pp. 116-17; Willrich *Caligula* p. 112. With the exception of Avillius Flaccus, none of its adherents can be identified, but they probably included many
who had acted against Agrippina. Of its failure to win Gemellus a share of the Empire on Tiberius' death, Meise comments "lag dies nicht am Charakter der Erbregelung, sondern allein an der Machtlosigkeit der 'Gemelluspartei,' der Jugend ihres Kandidaten und dem geschickten Vorgehen Macros" (p. 116).

Reflections of a suspected conspiracy, however embryonic, are found in Suetonius as well. Gaius grew suspicious of Gemellus when he detected on his breath what he thought to be an antidote against poison (Suet. Gaius 23.3; 29.1), and by October A.D. 37 he so little trusted his son that during his illness he named Drusilla his heir instead, of his power as well as his property, according to Suetonius (Gaius 24.1; when Eutropius [7.12] says that he made his daughter his heir, he is confusing Gaius' sister Drusilla with his daughter by Caesonia, born almost two years later [cf. Chapter 28.7]). This is taken as a revolutionary procedure both by Kornemann, who sees it as an example of a woman having a direct share in the Principate (Doppelprinzipat pp. 51-53; Kornemann makes the credible suggestion that Drusilla's position was only a temporary provision until she should have a son, or until Gaius himself should become a father), and by Hammond, who attributes it to Gaius' imitation of eastern customs (Augustan Principate p. 243, n. 76). Whatever the appearances and implications of his actions, it is clear that Gaius' suspicions, which may have hastened an already impending nervous breakdown, caused him to fear everyone but Drusilla, who was to remain his favourite even after her death. See Balsdon Gaius p. 37; Venturini (Caligola pp. 100-101) makes the plausible suggestion that there was no organized conspiracy, but that Gemellus and his supporters were hoping that Gaius' illness would prove fatal and were preparing the ground for the succession (cf. Dio's words "διὸ καὶ τὴν ἀφρωστικὴν αὐτοῦ ἐφεδρεύσας"); but his inclusion of Drusilla in this intrigue is absurd.
Whether the conspiracy existed in fact or simply in Gaius' imagination, he obviously felt that Gemellus was a threat to his safety and so forced his death. The matter of the adoption was understandably suppressed and was not recorded on the prince's epitaph (ILLS 172 = Smallwood no. 88; cf. Rosborough pp. 27-28; Hirschfeld *Hermes* 25 [1890] 366). The Roman Emperors had been quick to adopt the eastern practice of eliminating relatives as potential competitors for the crown: Tiberius had set the precedent 23 years earlier with the execution of Agrippa Postumus (Tacitus' *primum facinus novi principatus* of Ann. 1.6.1; cf. J. Béranger REL 17 [1939] 174; L. Lesuisse *Les études classiques* 30 [1962] 39). Claudius was spared by Gaius only because of his supposed stupidity; but Claudius' son Britannicus, like Gemellus a victim of his direct imperial ancestry, was to be murdered by Nero, whose claim to the throne appeared less strong (Dio 61.7.4; cf. Hammond *Augustan Principate* p. 243, n. 75; Garzetti *L'Impero* p. 89; Pareti *Storia* 4.768).

8.2 Ἄντιόχου τε τῶ Ἀντιόχου: By his decision to restore certain client kingdoms, Gaius showed considerable appreciation of the problems of imperial administration. Augustus had preferred wherever possible to depend on the co-operation of semi-independent princes rather than assume the immense expense of garrisoning new provinces (*RG* 27.2), but he always considered these kingdoms as integral parts of the Empire (Suet. *Aug.* 48). For Tiberius' attitude to client kingdoms, and his provincial administration in general, see W. Orth, *Die Provinzialpolitik des Tiberius* (Munich, 1970); a valuable analysis of the Empire's relationships with eastern monarchs can be found in M. Pani, *Roma e i re d'Oriente da Augusto a Tiberio* (Bari, 1972).
C. Julius Antiochus IV (*PIR*² I 149), Gaius' friend and advisor, was the son of Antiochus III, who had ruled Commagene until his death in A.D. 17 (Tac, *Ann.* 2.42.7). The following year the kingdom was constituted a province under a praetorian governor (Tac. *Ann.* 2.56.5), and it remained so until A.D. 37. When Antiochus received back his paternal realm from Gaius, he also acquired the honorary title of *amicus Caesaris* (*IGRR* 4.940) and was given all the taxes collected by Rome while Commagene was a province, amounting to some 100 million sesterces (Suet. *Gaius* 16.3).

Antiochus appears to have ruled Commagene for only a short while before Gaius deprived him of it and gave him yet another kingdom, although which one is not known (cf. Jos. *AJ* 19.5.1 [276]). In A.D. 41 he received his original land back from Claudius, who, for some time at least, followed Gaius' policy of preserving client kingdoms (Jos. loc. cit.; Dio 60.8.1). As dependent monarch of Commagene for the next 31 years, Antiochus proved himself a valuable ally of Rome. In A.D. 53 he helped subdue wild Cilician tribes who had besieged Anemurium on the coast of Cilicia Tracheia (Tac. *Ann.* 12.55), and later aided Rome against the Parthians (Tac. *Ann.* 13.7.1; 13.37.2). In the civil wars he supported Vespasian (Tac. *Hist.* 2.81), and gave assistance to Titus in the war with the Jews (Tac. *Hist.* 5.1). It is, then, surprising to discover that in A.D. 72 he was deposed and his kingdom made a province once again. He had been accused by Caesennius Paetus, governor of Syria, of planning to revolt from Rome; such an accusation is difficult to believe, and Josephus comments that he is not certain that the charge was based on fact (*BJ* 7.7.1-3 [219-240]).

8.2 Ἀγρίππα τοῦ Ἑρωδου ἔγγονος; M. Julius Agrippa (*PIR*² I 131), the son of Aristobulus and Berenice, and a grandson of Herod the Great, was educated at Rome with the children
of the imperial family. His friendship with Drusus, the son of Tiberius, brought him considerable influence in the capital, but after Drusus' death in A.D. 23 he returned to the East (Jos. AJ 18.6.1-2 [143-147]). His well-known ambition (e.g., Jos. AJ 19.8.2 [352]) made it impossible for him to live in Galilee, the tetrarchy of his brother-in-law, Herod Antipas, and he returned to Rome in A.D. 36 (Jos. AJ 18.5.3 [126]). There he continued his habit of borrowing large amounts of money, most of which he spent to win the favour of Gaius, whom he saw as the next Emperor (Jos. AJ 18.6.4 [167]). An unfortunate comment which he once made to Gaius—that the sooner Tiberius died, the sooner Gaius would be ruler—was overheard and reported to the Emperor, who had Agrippa imprisoned for treason (Jos. AJ 18.6.5 [168]; 18.6.6 [184-194]; BJ 2.9.5 [178-180]). There he remained for six months, until freed by Gaius shortly after his accession (Jos. AJ 18.6.10 [228-236]).

Despite Dio's comment here, it was several years before Agrippa gained control of all of his grandfather's territory. In A.D. 37 he was given a third part of Herod's kingdom, the tetrarchy of Philip, who had died three years earlier (Jos. BJ 2.9.6 [181]; Philo in Flacc. 5.25 [520]). The tetrarchy consisted of Trachonitis, Gaulanitis, and Butanaea (cf. Jos. AJ 18.2.1 [28]; 18.4.6 [106]; notice the error in Philo Leg. 41.326 [593]); added to this was Abila, previously ruled by Lysanias (AJ 18.6.10 [237]; Eusebius Eccl. Hist. 2.4.1; but cf. AJ 19.5.1 [275]). The tribute which had been collected since the death of Philip had been held on deposit, and the accumulated amount was probably now given to Agrippa (Jos. AJ 18.4.6 [108]; Suet. Gaius 16.3). Because he held Roman citizenship through his grandfather, he was eligible to receive from the Senate praetorian honours (Philo in Flacc. 6.40 [523]).
In the second year of Gaius' reign, probably in the autumn of A.D. 38 (but cf. Merivale 5.388-389), Agrippa obtained permission to leave Rome for his kingdom, promising to return as soon as possible (Jos. AJ 18.6.11 [238]; on Agrippa's trip to his new kingdom, via Alexandria, cf. Smallwood Legatio pp. 17-19). But his new role as king aroused the envy of the tetrarch Herod Antipas, who travelled to Rome to ask for a kingship as well. Instead, Gaius exiled him to a town in the Pyrenees (cf. Willrich Caligula pp. 299-304; Balsdon Gaius p. 120) and gave his lands to Agrippa (Jos. AJ 18.7.2 [245-256]; BJ 2.9.6 [181-183]). For Herod Antipas, see the well-documented biography by H.W. Hoehner (Herod Antipas [Cambridge, 1972]): Appendix II (pp. 277-90) treats the thorny problem of the boundaries of his tetrarchy.

Agrippa was fortunate to be back in Rome early in A.D. 41 (for the date of his arrival, cf. on Chapter 24.1 ὅσπερ ...), for the help he gave Claudius in securing the throne was rewarded with the addition to his kingdom of Judaea, Samaria, and the mountains of Lebanon: he now held all the lands of his grandfather (Dio 60.8.2; Jos. AJ 19.5.1 [274-275]). At his death in A.D. 44, his kingdom was made a province (Jos. AJ 19.9.2 [362]; Tac. Hist. 5.9.5), and five years later was incorporated into Syria (Tac. Ann. 12.23.2). M.P. Charlesworth (Five Men: Character Studies from the Roman Empire [Cambridge, 1936] ch. 1) gives the only reliable continuous account of the life of Julius Agrippa.

8.2 τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ: Both Philo (Leg. 12.87 [558]; cf. Smallwood ad loc.) and Suetonius make the same error (Gaius 15.2; 23.3; 29.1), as if Tiberius' will, by naming Gaius and Gemellus joint heirs, also suggested their joint adoption. They were, in fact, cousins, since Germanicus had been adopted by Tiberius (cf. Philo Leg. 4.23 [549]).
8.3 ΠΟΤΙΤΩΣ δὲ ΑΦΡΑΝΙΟΣ ΠΟΤΙΤΩΣ: Cf. Suet. Gaius 27.2: "alterum, qui se peritum ea de causa voverat, cunctantem pueris tradidit, verbenatum infalatumque votum reposcentes per vicos agerent, quoad praecipitaretur ex aggere." On beating as a penalty, see Garnsey Social Status pp. 136-41: although it was a more normal punishment for poor criminals, it "is found as an alternative to other punishments, relegatio and opus ... and the fine" (p. 138).

8.3 ἈΤΑΝΙΟΣ τε τὸς ΞΕΚΟΥΝΔΟΣ: Suetonius records what seems to be the same story, but without naming the victim: "votum exegit ab eo, qui pro salute sua gladiatoriam operam promiserat, spectavitque ferro dimicantem nec dimisit nisi victorem et post multas preces" (Gaius 27.2). If this incident does refer to Atanius, then Dio is exaggerating when he says that both men died. There were others besides Atanius, however, who offered to fight as gladiators "pro salute aegri" (Suet. Gaius 14.2). Such servile dedications were not new: a similar promise of devotio was made to Augustus (Dio 53.20.2-4, where it is mentioned as a Spanish custom: cf. Val. Max. 2.6.11). Gaius found what must have been the most effective way of preventing any further ill-considered obsequiousness.

On vows made for an Emperor's recovery, see R. Lugand REA 32 (1930) 9-10, who refers to Dio's belief that Antinous died in a sacrifice pro salute imperatoris and was so honoured by Hadrian for this reason (69.11.3). The two incidents, though intriguing, are hardly parallel. For devotio in the later Empire, cf. M.P. Charlesworth PBA 23 (1937) 124-25.

8.4 δὲ δὴ πενθερὸς αὐτοῦ ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΣΙΛΑΝΟΣ: M. Junius Silanus (PIR² I 832), consul suffectus in A.D. 15 (CIL 10.6639 = E&J p. 40), seems to have excelled in flattery of Tiberius,
once proposing that monuments should be dated by the holders of *tribunicia potestas* rather than by the consuls (Tac. *Ann.* 3.57.2). He does seem to have had some influence with that Emperor, for when his brother went into voluntary exile because of adultery with Julia, Augustus' granddaughter, Silanus successfully intervened with Tiberius on his behalf (Tac. *Ann.* 3.24).

His position as Gaius' father-in-law involved him in the same danger as that faced by Gemellus: any attempt to replace the Emperor would invariably include him, either as participant or as victim. Nor did Silanus improve his situation by treating Gaius as his own son and, like Antonia, trying to improve his character and conduct (Phil. *Leg.* 9.62-65 [554-555]). His downfall came, according to Suetonius, when he refused to follow Gaius on a sea-voyage and so was suspected of plotting revolution (*Gaius* 23.3). This incident, whatever its significance, must have occurred during Gaius' voyage to Pandateria and Pontia, several months before Silanus' suicide; but if it was not the immediate cause of his death, it at least gave Gaius grounds for suspicion (cf. Balsdon *Gaius* p. 38).

It is most likely that Silanus, rightly or wrongly, was implicated in a suspected conspiracy together with Gemellus and Macro. Gaius asked Julius Graecinus to bring forward a charge against him, but Graecinus refused (Tac. *Agr.* 4.1: Tacitus is wrong in seeing his refusal as the cause of his death, for Graecinus was alive when his son Agricola was conceived in A.D. 39 or 40; cf. *AE* 1946.94). Silanus, however, realized the hopelessness of his case and committed suicide by cutting his throat (Suet. *Gaius* 23.3; cf. Sen. *Apocol.* 11.2). The populace, says Philo, were unwilling to admit any injustice in Gaius' administration, and justified the death of Silanus by saying that he had no right to claim any influence over one who had been his son-in-law (*Leg.* 10.66-73 [555-556]). As with
Gemellus, the date of Silanus' death is unknown (cf. Smallwood *Legatio* p. 188); and likewise, his successor as an Arval was appointed on 24 May A.D. 38 (*CIL* 6.2028c = Smallwood no. 3).


8.5 ἐκκαλητῶν ποτὲ ἅπαντὸς δικαίας: Among the privileges voted to Augustus in 30 B.C. was that of exercising appellate jurisdiction (*Dio* 51.19.7; cf. 52.33.1). Tiberius, on the other hand, always discouraged appeals to the Emperor in civil cases, a practice that was followed by Gaius (*Suet. Gaius* 16.2: "magistratibus liberam iuris dictionem et sine sui appellatione concessit"). For a discussion of *appellatio* under the Julio-Claudians, see Mommsen *Staater.* 2.106-108; Hammond *Augustan Principate* p. 183; Greenidge *Roman Public Life* pp. 382-85; Jolowicz and Nicholas *Roman Law* pp. 400-401.

8.5 χρυσότων αὐτοῦ πρὸβατον ὄνομάζειν: Gaius made the remark, not of his father-in-law, but of M. Junius Silanus, consul in A.D. 46 and proconsul of Asia in A.D. 54 (*PIR* 2 I 833; cf. *Tac. Ann.* 13.1.1). The epithet was given out of scorn for his apathy rather than as a mark of respect, although it had originally been applied to Q. Fabius Maximus on account of his gentle disposition (*Plu. Fab.* 1.3; *Aur. Vict. Vir. Ill.* 43).

8.6 ἐν τῇ τάξει τῆς ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ ἔργαν ἀποφαίνεσθαι: Augustus had often ignored seniority of rank during voting, not only to keep the senators alert (*Suet. Aug.* 35.4), but also
that he might obtain a less biased opinion by not casting his own vote first (Dio 54.15.6). Dio suggests that the practice was in fact an insult to Lepidus, who was always asked for his vote last. Suetonius gives this same explanation of Gaius' decision to revert to the old procedure of voting according to priority of office: it was an insult to Claudius, who thereby would speak last (Suet. Claud. 9.2). The important point is, of course, that Gaius, too, could if he wished be held by the law to vote after all the other consulars, and so would not sway them by his own opinion. In similar attempts to avoid sycophancy and to preserve the illusion of free speech, Tiberius had often delayed voicing his sentiments in meetings of the Senate (Dio 57.7.4; cf. Tac. Ann. 1.74.5-7).

8.7 ἡν τε θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ ἑκβαλὼν: There is no agreement among our sources concerning Gaius' first marriage, to Junia Claudilla, the daughter of M. Silanus. Dio records the marriage as taking place in A.D. 35 at Antium, with Tiberius present (58.25.2), and we know from Tacitus that the Emperor was on the mainland at the time (Ann. 6.39.2). Tacitus, however, has already mentioned the union in A.D. 33 (Ann. 6.20.1), and Suetonius claims that Gaius was married before he became pontifex in A.D. 31 (Gaius 12.1). It is likely that either Tacitus or Suetonius is referring to the betrothal, and that the wedding took place two or four years later, in A.D. 33 or 35. It is impossible to be more specific (but cf. Balsdon Gaius p. 15; Willrich [Caligula p. 104], Dessau [p. 105], and Gelzer [RE "Julius" col. 383] all favour A.D. 33).

Dio is the only authority to suggest that the marriage ended in divorce. Tacitus mentions that Claudilla was dead before Gaius' accession (Ann. 6.45.5), and is supported in this by Suetonius, who adds that her
death occurred during childbirth (*Gaius* 12.2). Philo, however, seems to contradict these two when he says that Silanus died not long after his daughter (*Leg.* 9.63 [555]). The weight of the evidence suggests that Dio is wrong about the divorce; perhaps only for the sake of uniformity he assumes for Claudilla the same fate suffered by Gaius' next two wives.

8.7 ἔγραψε Κορνηλίαν Ὀρεστίλλαν: Suetonius, who calls her Livia Orestilla, gives two slightly different versions of how Gaius took her from her husband (*Gaius* 25.1). Balsdon rightly sees these as later embroideries of the probable fact that Orestilla was willing to terminate her engagement to Piso in order to marry the Emperor (*Gaius* p. 40). Gaius' comment on the occasion, that his marriage was in the style of those of Romulus and Augustus (*Suet.* loc. cit.), would equally well have suited his fourth marriage, to a pregnant Milonia Caesonia (see Chapter 23.7). This is the same C. Piso who was involved in the conspiracy against Nero in A.D. 65 (*Tac.* *Ann.* 15.48; and Furneaux ad loc.).

8.7 ἀπὸ τειχοῦ: Dio abbreviates the actual events. The marriage was dissolved after only a few days, but it was not until after June A.D. 40 that Piso and Orestilla were banished, allegedly for maintaining illicit relations (*Suet. Gaius* 25.1; *CIL.* 6.2028-2048 = Smallwood no. 4-10: Piso is listed among the Arvuls from 24 May A.D. 38, when he was co-opted to take the place of M. Silanus, until the *Acta* break off early in June A.D. 40). It is difficult to accept such an accusation, since neither Orestilla nor Piso was, as far as is known, married at the time of their banishment, and so could hardly be charged with adultery. Meise (*Untersuchungen* p. 104) is perhaps correct when he says that Gaius forbade the couple to have
sexual relations with each other, so that the Emperor would not be reproached if Lollia later should have a child.

Piso returned to Rome under Claudius and subsequently held a consulship (Scholiast on Juv. 5.109): the year is unknown, but it must have been a suffect consulship since all the ordinary under Claudius are accounted for. Ironically, he married a low-born woman whom he took from her husband. Implicated in the conspiracy against Nero, he cut the veins in his arms without waiting for the Emperor's executioners (Tac. Ann. 15.59).

8.8 δέκα δοῦλοι: Augustus normally allowed exiles twenty slaves or freedmen to accompany them (e.g., Dio 56.27.3). See Garnsey Social Status pp. 150-52.
CHAPTER NINE

9.1 ὑπατοί: See on Index. For Asprenas' role in the successful conspiracy of A.D. 41, see on Chapter 29.1 συνάμφορον. Colin (Latomus 13 [1954] 404-405) has pointed out the connections by blood or friendship that existed between the suffecti of this year and the family of Germanicus.

9.1 οἱ ὀρκοὶ ...: The custom of magistrates swearing a formal oath to uphold the acta of a ruler is first mentioned in 45 B.C., during the dictatorship of Caesar (App. BC 2.106 [442]). The oath was repeated, posthumously, on 1 January 42 B.C. by the Triumvirs (Dio 47.18.3), and thereafter became standard practice under the Empire. Oaths to the acts of Augustus during his lifetime are mentioned only in 29 B.C. (Dio 51.20.1) and again in 24 B.C. (Dio 53.28.1), although they had probably become an annual event by this time. Tiberius always required magistrates when entering on their offices to swear to observe the acta of Augustus, yet he allowed no oaths to be taken to his own acts, past or future (Dio 57.8.3-4; Tac. Ann. 1.72.2; Suet. Tib. 67.3).

After Gaius' death his acta, too, were ignored in the annual ceremony (Dio 60.4.6). Because the omission of these two Emperors from the oath was not the result of an official decree, this form of censure was not as grave as a damnatio memoriae, and did not prevent Tiberius from being mentioned in the lex de Imperio Vespasiani (ILS 244 = E&J p. 164). See Greenidge Roman Public Life p. 363.

9.1 ἐὰς τὴν τῆς οἰκείας νόμισιν: Reimar is probably correct in reading ἐὰς τὴν τῆς ὀρκίας νόμισιν. The suggestion of Naber (ἐὰς τὴν ὀρκυμοσίαν) is less satisfactory, presupposing as it does...
a more serious error, but does at least have the support of Dionian usage (cf. 37.30.3).

9.2 ἐμόοςαν; Cf. the oath taken by the Aryals on 12 (?) January A.D. 38 (CIL 6.2028b = 32344 = Smallwood no. 2). See on Chapter 3.5 τὰς τε εὐχὰς.

9.2 τὰς τε εὐχὰς: Such prayers were traditionally delivered on 3 January (Piu. Cic. 2.1). See Chapter 24.6.

9.3 ἐπὶ τε τὴν κλίνην τοῦ Δίος τοῦ Καπιτωλίου: The κλίνη was the couch (lectus or lectulus) on which the image of the god was laid during a lectisternium (cf. Val. Max. 2.1.2).

9.4 ἐπαίνου τε ἄξια τάδε: This section of Chapter 9 has always presented a problem to those scholars who would see Gaius as a demented madman after his illness of October A.D. 37 (cf. the comment of Quidde [Caligula p. 6]: "Die Haupttriebfeder seiner Handlungen war nicht der Wunsch, Gutes zu schaffen, sondern der Ehrgeiz, als Förderer populärer Bestrebungen bewundert zu werden und als grosser Mann auf die Nachwelt zu kommen"). There are many ways by which Gaius' decent administration of A.D. 38 has been explained away, the four most plausible of which have been summarized by Venturini (Caligola pp. 107-108): Gaius was trying to correct the appearance of despotism resulting from the recent executions of his close associates; there was a slight hiatus in his madness; he was desperately attempting to acquire popularity; or his few praiseworthy actions were
deliberately exaggerated by the sources to afford a marked contrast with his pernicious behaviour of the previous year. No such ingenious distortions of reality are necessary, however, if Gaius' earlier conduct was, as the evidence suggests, creditable.

9.4 τούς τε λογισμοὺς τῶν δημοσίων χρημάτων: In this matter, as in his publication of the names of condemned men (Chapter 18.2), Gaius showed his aversion to the kind of concealment that had caused so much discontent under his predecessor. It was probably after his retirement to Capreae that Tiberius had abandoned the custom, initiated by Augustus, of publishing regular reports of the imperial accounts (Suet. Gaius 16.1). The format of these reports was perhaps based on the accounts of the Empire and of imperial revenues and expenditures compiled by Augustus first during his serious illness in 23 B.C. (Dio 53.30.1-3; Suet. Aug. 28.1), and later just before his death (Dio 56.33.1-2; Suet. Aug. 101.4). Such statements were probably the source of the information found in Tac. Ann. 4.4 (Tiberius) and Jos. BJ 2.16.4 [365-387] (Nero) (see Venturini Caligola p. 108). When Gaius first published these accounts, almost a year after his accession, he perhaps included a statement of expenditures during those months: this might well explain the existence of two sets of figures for the amount Tiberius had left in the treasury (see on Chapter 2.6 οὐδὲ ...).

9.4 ἐπηρέασε τοῖς ζημιωθέσι: Cf. Suet. Gaius 16.3: "multis incendiorum damna supplevit." Restitution for damage caused by fires in Rome involved frequent and costly expenditures from the imperial purse. Tiberius was twice obliged to rebuild parts of the city
destroyed by fire (Tac. Ann. 4.64.1 [A.D. 27]; 6.45.1 [A.D. 36]). This fire mentioned by Dio is probably the same as that recorded in the Fasti Ostienses for 21 October A.D. 38 (Smallwood no. 31), as having destroyed the Aemiliana, a suburb of Rome north of the Campus Martius (cf. Varro RR 3.2). Gaius' behaviour during this incident does nothing to support Suetonius' claim that he longed for some sort of public disaster—"exercituum caedes, famem, pestilentiam, incendia, hiatum aliquem terrae"—to make his reign memorable (Gaius 31).

9.5 τοῦ τε τέλους τοῦ τῶν ἱππεῶν διαγκοροῦντος ...: In order to make a revision of the orders, it was not necessary for the Emperor to hold the censorship or be invested with potestas censoria. Augustus frequently made use of his consulship or his imperium proconsulare to conduct a census or a lectio senatus (cf. RG 8.1-2). Revision of the lists for the decuriae equitum was, under the Republic, the responsibility of the praetors (Cic. Clu. 43.121), but early became a function of the Emperor (Pliny HN 33.1.30; Suet. Aug. 32.3). Augustus revised the ranks of equites several times (Suet. Aug. 38.3; Dio 55.31.2), eventually establishing a board of ten senators to aid him in examining the eligibility of individual knights (Suet. Aug. 39). In order to increase membership, since he relied heavily on the knights for recruits for the imperial civil service, he encouraged leading citizens of the Italian municipalities to be enrolled as equites, if they possessed the requisite financial and ancestral qualifications (Suet. Aug. 46; cf. Hammond Augustan Principate pp. 95-96; T.P. Wiseman Historia 19 [1970], 67-71).

To avoid the charge of debasing Rome's upper classes, Tiberius restricted membership in the equestrian order to free citizens of the
third generation (Pliny *HN*. 33.8.32); but in the last years of his reign he
allowed registration in the order to lapse (Suet. *Tib*. 41). It was primarily
for this reason that Gaius found it necessary to bolster its ranks with new
members. Also, by his own meticulous but reasonable revision of the order,
he had struck several knights from the rolls and had to fill their places
with others (Suet. *Gaius* 16.2; 30.2). It was no doubt this severity towards
miscreants that gave rise to the belief that the Emperor purposely devised
attacks upon the *equites* as a means of getting possession of their wealth
(Jos. *AJ* 19.1.1 [3]).

Membership in the equestrian order, despite its sometimes heavy
financial obligations (cf. Suet. *Aug*. 38.3), was still sought by many. In
connection with his scrutiny of the list of knights, Gaius also revised the
jury system by adding a fifth *decuria* of equestrian judges, setting 200,000
sesterces as the property qualification (Suet. *Gaius* 16.2; Augustus had
previously added a fourth *decuria* with the same qualification [Suet. *Aug.*
32.3]). The new panel was necessary, says Pliny (*HN* 33.8.33), in order to
satisfy the ambition of those aspiring to positions of distinction. See
Greenidge *Roman Public Life* pp. 403-404.

A useful survey of the development of the *decuriae* from the late
Republic to this revision by Gaius is given by McFayden "Jurisdiction"
pp. 223-26—but he errs in describing such service as an *onerous* lifetime
duty, at least for this period. T.P. Wiseman (*Historia* 19 [1970] 71-83)
has written a valuable summary of the arguments regarding the identification
of *equites equo publico* in the late Republic and early Empire.

9.5 ἐξ ἀπάσης καὶ τῆς ἐξω ἀρχῆς; "... from the whole Empire, even from
the provinces." ἀρχῆ is frequently used
in the sense of a geographical rather than a purely administrative *provincia*
(cf. Dio 47.20.2; αἱ ἓξω ᾳχαί), and here takes the place of ἵγεμονία to mean *imperium Romanum* (cf. *IGRR* 4.566). See Mason *Greek Terms* pp. 110-11; Vrind *De Cassii Dionis Vocabulis* pp. 47-67.

9.5 *κατελέξατο*: The verb is the equivalent of the Latin *adlectere* (cf. Dio 72.5.1; Mason *Greek Terms* p. 59). By his privilege of *adlectio*, the Emperor could elevate a man to any of the grades of the senatorial or equestrian *cursus honorum*. The intervening magistracies were omitted, but the normal qualifications of property and ancestry were still necessary. See Greenidge *Roman Public Life* p. 365; Abbott *Roman Political Institutions* pp. 354, 382.

9.5 ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς βουλείας ἐλπίδαι: Sons of senators were formally considered *equites* until they came of age (Isid. *Orig.* 9.4). At that time they were given the privilege of wearing the *latus clavus* as a symbol of their expectations (Suet. *Aug.* 38.2), but still had to qualify for the Senate by holding the quaestorship. If they failed to advance this far, they remained in the equestrian order (although Claudius often deprived them of this rank as well [Suet. *Claud.* 24.1]). While it was the Emperor's privilege to grant the *latus clavus* to any promising young man outside the senatorial order, as Gaius did, it was traditionally limited to those whose citizenship extended back four generations (Suet. *Claud.* 24.1). This advancement, based on merit and ignoring old class distinctions, was established as a policy by Augustus, who frequently projected equestrians into the senatorial order by *adlectio*, in order to make up deficiencies in that group (Suet. *Aug.* 40.1). See Balsdon *Gaius* p. 157; Greenidge *Roman Public Life* pp. 399-400.
9.6 τὰς ἀρχαίες; Cf. Suet. Gaius 16.2: "temptavit et comitiorum more revocato suffragia populo reddere." Serious infringement of the power of the people to choose their own magistrates began in the dictatorship of Julius Caesar, whose policy it was to divide the candidates for all magistracies except the consulship between himself and the popular assemblies (Suet. Caes. 41.2). Augustus restored the elections to the comitia (Suet. Aug. 40.2), but controlled most of the results by nominating or commending candidates whom he favoured (Suet. Aug. 56.1). By a lex Valeria Cornelia of A.D. 5, preliminary selection of candidates for the consulship and praetorship was given over to a board of senators and members of the equestrian decuriae, a list of whose nominees, the destinati, was sent to the comitia for (automatic?) confirmation (cf. P.R. Brunt JRS 51 [1961] 71-83). In other areas, too, the people lost much of their former power: they retained the right to suggest changes in the legislation brought before them—and sometimes Augustus did alter laws in accordance with their wishes—but they were deprived of any legal jurisdiction (Dio 53.21.3; 56.40.4).

The final and inevitable step was taken by Tiberius in the year he became Emperor; magisterial elections were transferred entirely from the comitia to the Senate, apparently evoking little complaint from the people but giving considerable relief to the senators, who were thus freed from the expense of campaigning (Tac. Ann. 1.15.1-2). Tiberius himself controlled the appointment of consuls (although some think that the consular elections remained in the hands of the people; cf. Greenidge Roman Public Life p. 372; but both Tac. Ann. 1.81 and Vell. 2.126.2 suggest strongly that the new arrangements applied to all magistrates); as for the other magistrates, those whom he recommended to the Senate were chosen automatically, while
selection among others of his nominees was left to the Senate or the lot. The completed slate was then presented for automatic ratification to the comitia centuriata or the comitia tributa, depending on the status of the magistracy (Dio 58.20.3-4). For the complex and still unsolved problems of elections under Tiberius, and of the significance of nominatio, commendatio, and destinatio, see W. K. Lacey Historia 12 (1963) 167-76; D. C. A. Shotter CQ 16 (1966) 321-32; B. M. Levick Historia 16 (1967) 207-30; and A. E. Astin Latomus 28 (1969) 863-74.

By returning the elections to the popular assemblies after 24 years, Gaius stood to win some popularity without losing the control of the magistracies of which his own privileges of nominatio and commendatio assured him. There was no more danger of popular government now than there had been in the time of Augustus, despite Dio's comment that of ἐμφορεὺς expressed uneasiness.

Coins from A.D. 39-41, depicting the pileus or cap of liberty, indicate the revival of popular elections (BMC Imp. 1.155, no. 56; 156, no. 61; 158, no. 79). Gaius' attempt to preserve the outward forms of democratic freedom, however, was a failure, and he was later forced to deprive the people of suffrage once again (see on Chapter 20.3-5).

9.6 ὁ τέλος τῆς ἐκατοστῆς κατέλυσε: When Augustus established the aerarium militare in A.D. 6 as a permanent fund to supply rewards to discharged soldiers, he himself contributed to it 17 million sesterces from his own patrimony (RG 17.2). For its perpetual income the aerarium was partly supported by confiscated property (e.g., that of Agrippa Postumus [Dio 55.32.2]), but depended primarily on the newly devised 5% inheritance tax, the vicesima hereditatum.
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(Dio 55.24.9-25.6), and on the centesima rerum venalium, which had been introduced in Italy after the civil wars (Tac. Ann. 1.78.2).

Despite public demands in A.D. 15 to abolish this sales tax, Tiberius insisted that it was a necessary subsidy for the aerarium militare (Tac. loc. cit.). Two years later, on the death of its king, Cappadocia was made a province, the income from which allowed the Emperor to reduce the tax from 1% to 0.5% (Tac. Ann. 2.42.6). Faced with a shortage of funds in A.D. 31, however, Tiberius was forced to increase this ducentesima to centesima once again (Dio 58.16.2).

It is a compliment to Gaius' careful administration of imperial finances that he was able to abolish the tax completely in A.D. 38. It seems, however, that either he or Tiberius had earlier reduced it to 0.5% once more, for Suetonius says "ducentesimam auctionum Italiae remisit" (Gaius 16.3), and coins from A.D. 38 onward are stamped RCC, an abbreviation of remissa ducentesima (BMC Imp. 1.156, no. 61; 158, no. 79). It is possible that the tax was reintroduced during the financial difficulties of A.D. 40 (Chapter 28.8; 28.11). See Mattingly BMC Imp. 1, p. cxlvii; Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. "Centesima"; Marsh Tiberius p. 151, n. 1; Willrich Caligula p. 424; J.F. Gilliam AJPh 73 (1952) 397-405; A.H.M. Jones Roman Economy p. 189.

9.6 σύμβολα διέρρυψε: Cf. Suet. Gaius 18.2: "sparsit et missilia variarum rerum et panaria cum obsonio viritim divisit." An unofficial, random public distribution of money, food, and clothing was first made by Agrippa when aedile in 33 B.C. (Dio 49.43.4). The practice seems to have been abandoned until this largesse of Gaius, which was repeated in A.D. 40 (Chapter 25.5; cf. Suet. Gaius 26.5). Thereafter the custom was followed by Nero (Dio 61.18.1), Titus (Dio 66.25.5), Domitian (Dio 67.4.4), and Hadrian (Dio 69.8.2).
9.7 αἱ τε εἰδικαὶ πρόσοδοι: These must refer to specific forms of public revenue, or vestigalia, as opposed to the money already on hand in the treasuries (τὰ ὑπά). Cary's translation of the phrase ("private sources of income") hardly suits the context of the passage.
CHAPTER TEN

10.1 πλείστους ὁσούς ὄπλομοις ἔποιησε: This comment probably refers to Gaius' habit of allowing magistrates to exhibit more gladiators than was permitted by law (cf. Chapter 14.3). It is often inferred from this passage that Gaius forced senators and knights to fight as gladiators, but Dio mentions only one such incident (Chapter 10.4). If the statement in Chapter 10.2, that he had twenty-six knights killed, refers to their deaths in gladiatorial combat—and it need not—then Gaius was suiting the punishment to the crime, for some were accused of participating in the games. See below, section 2.

10.2 ἐξω τοῦ νενομοθετημένου: Cf. Dio's comment in 53.18.1, based no doubt on his knowledge of the later Empire, when the Princeps' exemption from laws was more readily admitted although no more substantial: "λέγει τούτο εἶστιν ἐλεύθεροι ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνοικαίας νομίσματος εἰσὶ καὶ οὐδενὶ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐνέχονται" (cf. 58.28.2). Such immunity was guaranteed in the Digest (1.3.31 [Ulpian]): "Princeps legibus solutus est." It was, however, Gaius' habit to request from the Senate special dispensation from the laws (cf. Chapter 15.1).

On the legal exemption of Emperors, see Hammond Augustan Principate pp. 114-16. McFayden ("Jurisdiction" p. 186) draws attention to a passage (53.28.2) in which Dio describes a decree of the Senate that (temporarily?) removed certain restrictions over Augustus' power in 24 B.C.; he is perhaps correct in saying that Dio took this decree as signifying complete freedom from laws thereafter. Assuming that the early Emperors had no guaranteed immunity from legal restrictions, C. Wirszubski (Libertas as a Political
Idea at Rome pp. 133-35) comments that "it is true the Princeps was not yet exempted from all laws; on the other hand, there were no effective means of coercing him to obey the laws .... The laws, although not invalidated, proved de facto powerless against the overwhelming power of the Princeps. And if such power ... happened to be combined with depravity, the awareness that prohibitions were ineffective might easily inspire the belief that everything was permissible." Such a statement throws considerable light on our understanding of the development of Gaius' attitude to the Principate, despite Wirszubski's inaccuracies in his interpretation of that Emperor.

10.2 άποκτείνα τῶν τὲ ἀλλων πολλοῦς: Because the imperium of the Emperor was undiminished within the pomerium (Dio 53.32.5; cf. 54.10.5: "τὴν ἡξουσίαν ... τὴν δὲ τῶν ὑπάτων διὰ βίου ἔλαβεν"; A.H.M. Jones Studies in Roman Government and Law pp. 13-17; H. Last JRS 37 [1947] 157-164), it was within his power to order the execution of any Roman citizen, including senators and knights (cf. Dio 53.17.6: "... ἢστε καὶ ἐντὸς τοῦ πομηρίου καὶ τοὺς ἵππεας καὶ τοὺς βουλευτὰς θανατοῦ δύνασθαι"). This power was not illegal, as McFayden suggests ("Jurisdiction" p. 254: McFayden is right in pointing out that the Emperor's proconsular imperium was suspended within the city [cf. pp. 233-34], but he fails to mention his consular prerogatives which must be the basis of his jurisdiction at Rome), but its use was shunned by most Emperors to avoid resentment from the upper classes (cf. Dio 52.31.3-4; 52.32.2). Often the very prospect of being brought to trial before the Princeps caused the accused to anticipate what he considered the inevitable verdict (e.g., Tac. Ann. 6.10.2). Augustus' private criminal court is mentioned several times (e.g., Suet. Aug. 33; 51).
Tiberius, on the other hand, avoided wherever possible the responsibility of judging men of rank, as when he referred the case of Cn. Piso back to the Senate (Tac. Ann. 3.10.6). Less concerned with appearances, Gaius did not hesitate to hear criminal trials on his own, but was always careful to make public the names of those whom he condemned (Chapter 18.1-2). Senatorial disapproval of the Princeps' right to sit in judgment on equites and senators was not loudly voiced until the reign of Domitian, when the Senate resolved that one of their number could be condemned only by his peers (Dio 67.2.4). Although this principle was rejected by Domitian, it became established practice from the time of Nerva (Dio 68.2.3; cf. 68.5.2 [Trajan]; HA "Hadrian" 7.4; "Marcus" 10.6; "Severus" 7.6). See McFayden "Jurisdiction" pp. 249-54; Greenidge Roman Public Life pp. 386-89; A.H.M. Jones Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate pp. 94-95; for Claudius' execution of senators, cf. D. McAlindon AJPh 77 (1956) 113-32.

10.2 τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἄλλως διπλωματίαν ἔσκινατας: The law forbidding senators and knights to participate in gladiatorial combats and theatrical presentations under penalty of disenfranchisement seems seldom to have been enforced (cf. Dio 48.43.3). Augustus himself was a spectator at such displays (Dio 56.25.7-8), and Tiberius, while disapproving of them, neglected to initiate prosecutions (Dio 57.14.3). If Dio is here suggesting that Gaius punished knights who had broken this law by forcing them to fight again, perhaps until they were killed, then Claudius in A.D. 41 was simply copying his predecessor's methods (Dio 60.7.1). By A.D. 59, however, members of the orders were again battling in public (Dio 61.17.3), and Vitellius was compelled to forbid such behaviour once more (Dio 65.6.3).
On the Emperor's criminal jurisdiction in regard to equestrians, see Garnsey *Social Status* pp. 85-90.

10.2 τῶν τε φόνων αὐτῶν ὑπερέχαρε: Suetonius is particularly fulsome in his descriptions of Gaius' cruelties (cf. *Gaius* 26-33).

10.3 ἐπιλιπόντων ποτὲ ...: Cf. Suet. *Gaius* 27.1: "cum ad saginam ferarum muneris praeparatarum carius pecudes compararentur, ex noxiis laniandos adnotavit." This suspicious story related by Dio seems to be a misrepresentation of Suetonius' more believable statement. For *damnatio ad bestias*, see Garnsey *Social Status* pp. 129-31.

10.4 των τε ἱππέων τινὰ ἐπιφανῶν ...: The basis for this and the previous incident is found in Suetonius (*Gaius* 27.3-4): "multos honesti ordinis ... aut ad bestias condemnavit aut bestiarum more quadripedes cavea coercuit.... parentes supplicio filiorum interesse cogebat.... equitem Romanum obiectum feris, cum se innocentem proclamasset, reduxit abscisaque lingua rursus induxit." If Dio did indeed use Suetonius as his source for these events--and his account is almost a parody of the earlier historian--then we are forced by his misstatements and exaggerations here to distrust his credibility elsewhere. The story is apparently chronologically misplaced, since it presumes the reintroduction of *maiestas* and *delatores*.

10.4 γαλεῖγραφαν: Such a cage was commonly used to restrain prisoners (cf. Plu. *Phoc.* 33.5; App. *Pisr.* 1.4).
10.5 *tous aygounas touitous;* Lack of connection between this and the preceding sentence suggests a lacuna here. The sense demands some previous mention of *naumachiae.*


Construction of the Saepta was first contemplated by Julius Caesar in 54 B.C. (Cic. *Att.* 4.16.14), but it was completed and dedicated by Agrippa in 26 B.C. (Dio 53.23.2). It was designed to accomodate the *comitia* during voting, but from the time of Augustus it was also used to exhibit gladiatorial games and *naumachiae* (Dio 55.10.7; Suet. *Aug.* 43.1; Claud. 21.4; *Nero* 12.4). How the enclosure was flooded is not known.

Remains along the via Lata, on the west side of the present via del Corso, were originally thought to belong to the Saepta. Fragments of the *Forma Urbis Romae* found in 1934, however, placed the building between the Pantheon and the Temple of Isis (see on Chapter 7.8 *tou diphmitropoi).* See Nash *Pictorial Dictionary* 2.291-293; Lugli *Monumenti* 3.96-105; Platner and Ashby *Topographical Dictionary* pp. 460-61.

10.5 *ikria peggamevos;* Gaius began to build his amphitheatre near the Saepta in the Campus Martius. It was not completed by the time of his death, however, and construction was abandoned by Claudius (Suet. *Gaioe* 21). Among the structures removed to make way for his new building was a section of the arches of the Aqua Virgo (*ILS* 205 = Smallwood no. 308b).

Dio fails to mention several other construction projects undertaken by Gaius. He completed Tiberius' rebuilding of the *soaena* of Pompey's
theatre, which had been destroyed by the fire of A.D. 22 (Tac. Ann. 3.72.4; 6.45.2; Dio 60.6.8; Suet. Gaius 21; Vell. 2.130). To meet the ever-increasing demand for water in the capital, he began an aqueduct from the neighbourhood of Tibur (Suet. Gaius 21). It was left unfinished at his death, but Claudius began work on it again in A.D. 47 and dedicated it in A.D. 52 (Suet. Claud. 20.1; Tac. Ann. 11.13; CIL 6.1256). Pliny considered it the finest aqueduct in the world (HN 36.24.122-123; cf. Frontin. de Aq. 13-15).

The practical utility of this structure was to be surpassed by two other projects planned by Gaius to assist trade from the eastern Mediterranean: creation of a harbour near Rhegium to handle the grain supply from Egypt (Jos. AJ 19.2.5 [205-206]: such a harbour must have been planned to supply grain to southern Italy, or to Rome only in emergencies, since the cost of land-transportation was at least twenty times that by sea [cf. R. Duncan-Jones The Economy of the Roman Empire pp. 367-68]; Willrich [Caligula p. 420] is probably correct when he calls the proposed port a Zufluchthafen); and excavation of a canal through the isthmus of Corinth (Suet. Gaius 21; Pliny HN 4.4.10). Although his assassination brought a quick end to these plans, their importance was realized by his successors. Claudius was to construct a harbour for off-loading grain at Ostia, a location far less suitable than Rhegium because of silting from the river Tiber (Dio 60.11.1-5; Tac. Ann. 15.18.3; Suet. Claud. 20); and Nero again began work on the canal at Corinth (Dio 63.16; Suet. Nero 19.2; Jos. BJ 3.10.10 [540]).

10.5 το γάρ του Ο Ταύρου Θέατρου: In 30 B.C., at the urging of Augustus, Statilius Taurus built the first permanent amphitheatre at Rome (Suet. Aug. 29.5; Dio 51.23.1; Tac. Ann. 3.72.2). The fact that it was destroyed in the fire of A.D. 64 and never rebuilt
suggests that at least the seats of the building must have been of wood
(Dio 62.18.2; cf. Lanciani Ruins and Excavations pp. 368-69; Platner and
Ashby Topographical Dictionary p. 11).

10.6 τοῦ ταύτης ἔρωτος: Many of our sources are agreed that Gaius was
involved in an affair with Ennia, the wife of
Macro. Dio suggests that the liaison was contrived by Macro himself
(προαγωγείας γὰρ ἐγκλημα), as does Tacitus, who adds that the prince was
even willing to marry her as long as his accession was guaranteed (Ann.
6.45.5). Suetonius, on the other hand, accuses Gaius of instigating the
affair, as a means of insinuating himself with Macro through the aid of
his wife (Gaius 12.2). Philo, the source nearest the event, was not con­
vinced that there was an affair: there was, he says, a widespread rumour
(ἀν σά τῶν πολλῶν λόγος) that Ennia encouraged Macro to court Gaius' 
favour (Leg. 6.39-40 [551-552]); as for Ennia being Gaius' mistress, his
only comment is that "ποτὲ νομισθείσα διὰ συνηθεῖας αὐτῶ γενέσθαι" (Leg.
8.61 [554]).

Macronem, ipsam Enniam, adiutores imperii: quibus omnibus pro necessitudinis iure proque meritorum gratia cruenta mors
persoluta est." For Macro's appointment as praetorian prefect under Tiberius,
see on Chapter 1.2 διὰ τοῦ Μάκρωνος; for his possible participation in a
conspiracy, see on Chapter 8.1 ἔγκλημα.

Philo is particularly specific about Macro's influence over Gaius.
The prefect, he says, tried to dispel Tiberius' suspicions of Gaius by
praising him, claiming particularly that he was devoted to Gemellus; and
it was Macro more than anyone who put Gaius on the throne and kept him there (in Flacc. 3.11-13 [519]). After helping Gaius obtain his sovereignty, he then openly advised and even admonished him, trying like Silanus to restrain his youthful excesses. In return Gaius began to ignore and ridicule him, finally making "false charges" against him (Leg. 6.32-8.69 [550-554]; cf. Quidde Caligula p. 6). The real reason for his death was that he was now considered "ός περιττὸν ἄχθος καὶ παρενόχλημα" (in Flacc. 3.16 [519]).

It could be said of Macro, as it later was of Agrippina Minor, that "οὐ γάρ ἐπίστατο ὅτι πᾶσα ἰσχὺς αὐταρχος, παρ᾽ ἰδιώτου δοθεῖσα τῷ, τοῦ τε θόντος αὐτὴν εὐθὺς ἀπαλλάττεται καὶ τῷ λαβόντι κατ᾽ ἐκείνου προσγίνεται" (Dio 61.7.3).

Tiberius had not been unaware of Macro's patronage of Gaius. In imitation of Pompey's warning to Sulla about the inconstancy of popularity (Plu. Pomp. 14), Tiberius once commented to his praetorian prefect that he seemed to be deserting the setting in favour of the rising sun (Dio 58.28.4; Tac. Ann. 6.46.6; cf. the statement of Marcus Aurelius on his death-bed: Dio 71.34.1). It was inevitable, then, that Macro should be implicated in any insinuation that Tiberius' death was hastened by foul play. Stewart, on the other hand (AdjPh 74 [1953] 75-76), does not consider the possibility of a conspiracy at this time, but sees the death of Macro (and of his friends, such as Flaccus) as a sign of the reascending influence of former friends of Seianus, men like L. Apronius Caesianus, consul-designate for A.D. 39.

Suetonius records four accounts of the death of Tiberius (Tib. 73.2). The first, that he was given poison by Gaius, was the one apparently favoured by Suetonius himself (Gaius 12.2: "insinuatus Macroni veneno Tiberium adgressus est, ut quidam opinantur"; cf. Oros. 7.4.18: "hic ambiguis signis veneni oblit"). Others said that the Emperor was refused food or was.
smothered with a pillow by Macro; both these are accepted by Dio as being accurate accounts (58.28.2-3), but Tacitus reports only the story of death by suffocation (Ann. 6.50.9). The fourth explanation, that Tiberius died solely of natural causes, had the support of Seneca Rhetor. Because Seneca is the only contemporary source of the many conflicting accounts whom Suetonius names, one is tempted to accept his belief as accurate; but it must be remembered that he was writing during the reign of Gaius. It is significant, however, that Philo does not accuse Gaius or Macro of complicity in Tiberius' death (cf. Gelzer RE "Julius" col. 384; Smallwood Legatio pp. 173-74). Certainly, the universal popularity of Gaius on his accession indicates that the hostile accounts found in our sources evolved after A.D. 37.

10.6 τὴν Ἀἴγυπτον οἷς προστάξας: By elevating Macro shortly before enforcing his suicide, Gaius seems to have been imitating Tiberius' behaviour towards Seianus (Willrich, however [Caligula p. 288], sees Macro's new appointment as a demotion). As prefect of Egypt Macro would have replaced the infamous Flaccus, whom Gaius would at any rate have been anxious to eliminate since he had participated in the prosecution of Agrippina (cf. Philo in Flaccio. 3.9 [518]; Gelzer [RE "Julius" col. 384] rather surprisingly calls Flaccus "trefflichen damaligen Praefectus Aegypti"; so, too, Willrich Caligula p. 112; and Brunt [Historia 10 <1961> 208-209] has found no evidence of maladministration during his tenure). It is worth noting at this time that Macro, Flaccus, and Lepidus, Gaius' brother-in-law, were all friends (Philo in Flaccio. 3.11 [519]; 18.151 [539]). If H.I. Bell's reconstruction of a damaged papyrus (BM no. 1.2785) is correct, then Macro was also a friend of the Emperor's uncle, Claudius (cf.
APP 10 [1932] 5-6). However, he never took up his office as prefect of Egypt, and is not definitely mentioned as such in any papyrus (on Flaccus and Macro, see O.W. Reinmuth. Prefects of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian [Klio Beiheft 34 <1935>] pp. 132, 158; and his article in BASF 4 [1967] 79-80).

After Macro's death Gaius appears to have replaced him temporarily with only one praetorian prefect (Chapter 11.2). By A.D. 40, however, Gaius had realized the danger of placing a single prefect in command of the troops in Rome, and appointed two prefects instead (cf. Chapter 25.7-8; Suet. Gaius 56.1; Balsdon Gaius p. 40, n. 1. Note the speech of Maecenas in Dio 52.24.1, influenced no doubt by Dio's own memory of Plautianus: "τῶν δὲ δὴ ἵππεων δύο τούς ἀρίστους τῆς περὶ σὲ φρουρᾶσ ἀρχεῖν· τὸ τε γὰρ ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆν ἐπιτρέπεσθαι σφαλερόν")

10.7 πρόφασιν μὲν ...: Only the previous year he had promised such people immunity from prosecution (Chapter 6.3). Suetonius agrees that Gaius denounced those involved in his family's persecution, but says nothing of their trial and condemnation (Gaius 30.2).

10.7 διὰ τὰς οὐσίας: Dio is quite wrong, for the property of those condemned was normally sold at a public auction. It was so extraordinary when Gaius later received the property of Flaccus that a few pieces were not included, "ὅπερ τὸν μὴ παραβιάσθηναι τὸν ... νόμου" (Philo in Flacc. 18.150 [539]). Although the evidence is sketchy, it seems most likely that the proceeds from confiscated property were paid into the aerarium (cf. A.H.M. Jones JRS 40 [1950] 22-29 = Studies ch. 6; Balsdon Gaius pp. 185-187).
10.8 ἐκ τῶν γραμμάτων: Cf. Suet. Gaius 30.2; "prolatis libellis, quos crematos simulaverat." For the burning of copies made from these documents, see Chapter 4.3 and 6.3; for another example of his use of the letters, see Chapter 16.3.

10.8 ἐκολάζετο: Cf. Suet. Gaius 24.2: "eadem defuncta iustitium indixit, in quo risisse lavisse cenasse cum parentibus aut coniuge liberisve capital fuit." For the iustitium, see on Chapter 11.5 τὰς πανηγύρεις.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

11.1 Μάρκος Λέπιδος: The marriage of Drusilla to M. Aemilius Lepidus (PIR² A 371), perhaps the son of the consul of A.D. 6 (PIR² A 369), probably took place soon after the accession of Gaius. Drusilla had earlier been married to L. Cassius Longinus (Tac. Ann. 6.15.1-5; Dio 58.21.1; see on Chapter 29.3 Γάιον Κόσσιον), but the union was dissolved by her brother, probably because Cassius had initiated the prosecution of Gaius' brother Drusus (Dio 58.3.8; Suet. Gaius 24.1). Following the death of Gemellus, Gaius frequently declared Lepidus to be his successor, and he presumably wanted to make his selection more official by the traditional method of bringing his successor into the imperial family. Lepidus was later accused of complicity in a conspiracy against the Emperor, and was executed in A.D. 39 (see Chapter 22.5-7).

According to Cicero (Att. 6.1), the Lepidi usually lived up to the sense behind their name, and our member of the family seems to have been no exception. On his ancestry, cf. R. Syme JRS 45 (1955) 33 (Syme's suggestion that his sister married Galba is surprising in view of Lepidus' connection with Gaetulicus, Galba's predecessor on the Rhine); Z. Stewart AJPh 74 (1953) 74 and n. 34 (an attempt to disprove the belief that Lepidus and Gaius were cousins).

11.1 παιδικά τε ὅμα αὐτῷ καὶ ἐραστῆς ἦν: The phrase first appears in Plato's Symposium 178e: "στρατόπεδον ἐραστῶν τε καὶ παιδικῶν." Cf. Suet. Gaius 36.1: "M. Lepidum ... dilexisse fœtus commercio mutui stupri." Gaius' virility had been questioned as early as A.D. 32, but perhaps then only because of his late assumption of the toga virilis (Tac. Ann. 6.5.1; cf. Balsdon Gaius p. 19).
11.1 οὐκ ἦν δὲ καὶ ὁ Γαίος: Gaius was accused of having had sexual relations with all his sisters, but most particularly with Drusilla: they were said once to have been caught in bed together by their grandmother, Antonia. Even Suetonius admits that these stories were hearsay (Gaius 24.1; cf. Aur. Vict. Caes. 3.10), and both Seneca and Philo were apparently unaware of any irregularity in Gaius' conduct towards his sisters. See on Chapter 3.6 πῶς αὐτήν ἔμεινεν.

11.1 δημοσίας δὲ ταφῆς ὁ ἀνδρόμος ἔζησεν: Gaius was not present at his sister's funeral: overcome with grief, he had left the city for Campania and Sicily, where he spent some time in mourning (Suet. Gaius 24.2). Seneca's accusation, that he was unable to show the proper grief and passed his days in gambling (Cons. Polyb. 17.4-6), is disproved by Suetonius' comment that during his absence from Rome he cut neither his hair nor his beard, a traditional display of grief (for the journey, cf. Gelzer RE 'Julius' col. 396).

The date of Drusilla's death is fixed by the Fasti Ostienses (= Inscr. It. 13.1.190-191; 220 = Smallwood no. 31) to 10 June A.D. 38; cf. Philo in Flacc. 8.56 [525].

11.2 οἱ ταφῆς τὸ τέλος: Ordo equester: cf. Dio 55.7.4; 56.42.2. See on Chapter 9.5 τοῦ τε τέλους. For the tradition of a decursio around the pyre, cf. E. Bickermann Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 27 (1929) 11.

11.2 τὴν Ῥοῖαν: The manoeuvres had last been performed at the dedication of the Temple of Augustus the previous year: see on Chapter 7.4 οἱ τε εὐγενεῖς.
Although the Senate had decreed many honours to Livia after her death, Tiberius allowed few of them to be ratified (Tac. Ann. 5.2.1). In the end, the Senate ordered a period of one year of mourning (during which, however, public business could be conducted), an arch, and some statues; Tiberius on his own account granted her a public funeral (Dio 58.2.1-2). It remained for her grandson, Claudius, to order her deification in A.D. 41 (Dio 60.5.2). While Gaius imitated Livia's honours in all other respects, there is no evidence that he built an arch in honour of his sister.

Drusilla, who not surprisingly had been worshipped in the East during her lifetime (e.g., IG 12.2.172), was the first woman officially to be deified by the Romans. The date of her apotheosis—23 September A.D. 38—is supplied by Henzen's restoration of a fragment of the Acta Fratrum Arvalium (Henzen p. xlvi = CIL 6.2028 = Smallwood no. 5; cf. Eph. Epig. 8.320.4; ILS 195; Hirschfeld WS 3 [1881] 267). It is remarkable that there is no reference to Drusilla's consecration on coins from the West. See Bickermann Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 27 (1929) 1-34.

The temple must be that of Venus Genetrix in the Forum Iulium (cf. Dio 43.22.3). There was already a statue of Cleopatra standing next to that of the goddess herself (App. BC 2.15.102). The association of Drusilla with Venus should not be taken as a reflection of her sexuality, since as a member of the Julian gens she traced her descent from that goddess. There is no evidence of a shrine in Rome dedicated to Drusilla herself. See A.D. Nock HSPh 41 (1930) 31.
11.3 οὖν ὑπόστι: According to Suetonius (Gaius 24.2), Gaius himself followed
the practice of publicly swearing by the numen of his
deified sister. Claudius was later to grant Livia the same posthumous
honour among women taking oaths (Dio 60.5.2).

11.3 ἐν τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτῆς ἔορτῃ: The date of Drusilla's birth is not
known. Suetonius (Gaius 7) says that
she and her two sisters were born in the space of three years ("continuo-
triennio"), and we know from Tacitus that Julia, the youngest, was born in
A.D. 18 (Ann. 2.54.1), while Agrippina, the eldest, was born on the Rhine
sometime between A.D. 14 and A.D. 16 (cf. Tac. Ann. 12.27.1). Drusilla's
birthdate, then, must be placed late in A.D. 16 or in A.D. 17 (cf. Mommsen
Hermes 13 [1878] 245-365). It was celebrated in A.D. 39 (Chapter 13.8)
and again in A.D. 40, when it was further voted that it should be celebrated
in a manner similar to that of Augustus (Chapter 24.7).

11.3 τοῖς Μεγαλησίοις: The festival in honour of Magna Mater, held annually
on 4 April, included games and the bearing of gifts
in a procession to the goddess' temple on the Palatine (Livy 29.14.4; Lucr.
2.624 ff.).

11.3 ἐν πάσαις τοῖς πόλεσίν: Her deification is recorded on inscriptions
from throughout the Empire: for examples,
see ILS 197 (Biturigum in Gallia Celtica); ILS 196 (Tibur); IG 4.2.600
(Epidauros, where she was honoured with a priestess); and IGRR 4.1098 (Cos).
In both Cyzicus and Miletus she was called νέα Ἀφροδίτη (IGRR 4.145 = Small-
wood no. 401; IGRR 4.78b = Smallwood no. 128b), while in Samos she was νέα
Xártta (IGRR 4.1721). The Egyptians temporarily gave her name to one of their months (cf. A.E.R. Boak in Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 13 [1927] 185-86).

11.4 Αἰουλίος τῆς Γεμινίας: Cf. Seneca Apocol. 1.3: "in senatu iuravit se Drusillam vidisse caelum ascendentem et illi, pro tam bono nuntio, nemo credidit." His name should probably be Geminus rather than Geminius (PIR² L 296). In A.D. 14 the same reward had been granted to another senator, Numerius Atticus, for having witnessed Augustus' ascent to heaven (Dio 56.46.2; cf. Suet. Aug. 100.4).

11.5 τὰς πανηγύρες: That is, he instituted a iustitium (cf. Suet. Gaius 24.2), during which it was customary for the lower magistrates to be suspended, the aerarium closed, meetings of the Senate postponed, sales prohibited, and festivals celebrated merely with the rituals necessitated by convention (cf. Venturini Caligola p. 116). Even in Alexandria, the Jews closed their shops as a sign of mourning (Philo in Flacc. 8.56 [525]). Such public mourning had previously been decreed on the deaths of Gaius or Lucius Caesar (CIL 6.895); of Augustus (Tac. Ann. 1.16.6; 1.50.1); of Germanicus (Tac. Ann. 2.82.4: "sumpto iustitio, deserentur fora, clauderentur domus"; cf. 3.7.1); and of Tiberius' son Drusus (Suet. Tib. 52.1). See further Mommsen Staater. 2.315; RE "iustitium" col. 1339-1340.

11.5 Ἡσιόδου; The text as it stands makes little sense. Cary's emendation of the word to Ἡσιέθους makes good the antithesis between the two phrases.

11.6 τὸν γὰρ πωλῆσαι τὴρμὸν ὑδρον: The reference is to hot water used in mixing wine, the sale or consumption of which was apparently prohibited during a iustitium (cf. G. Hermansen, "The Roman Inns and the Law" in Polis and Imperium pp. 145-66). Such a restraint was perhaps introduced by Tiberius with his other restrictions on the public sale of foodstuffs, designed to limit excessive luxury (Suet. Tib. 34.2; cf. Nero 16.2). In A.D. 41 Claudius permanently abolished the sale of hot water (Dio. 60.6.7; cf. Amm. Marc. 28.4.4).

As for the incident mentioned here by Dio, the illegality of the man's actions is not open to question. It is difficult, however, to see how the charge of maestas could be applied to his case, unless his action was taken as an insult to the deceased member of the imperial house. Balsdon's suggestion (Gaius p. 43) that the man's prosecution did not result in his execution does nothing to solve the difficulty. Further, if we accept Dio's later statement that the charge of maestas was not restored until A.D. 39 (Chapter 16.8), we must assume that the seller of hot water was tried on some lesser charge (cf. Willrich Caligula p. 295).
CHAPTER TWELVE

12.1 Ἐγγέλεις Λολλίαν Πουλίναν: Cf. Suet, Gaius 25.2: "Lolliam Paulinam,
C. Memmio consulari exercitus regenti nuptam,
facta mentione aviae eius ut quondam pulcherrimae, subito ex provincia
evocavit ac perductam a marito coniunxit sibi" (cf. J.H. Oliver [Hesperia
35 <1966> 150-53] who suggests, from a restoration of IG 2².4176, that
the marriage of Memmius and Lollia was not a formal Roman one, but a form
of the Greek ἐγγύης: he was more her guardian than her husband). Some,
on the other hand, found it tempting to see this as a marriage of convenience,
by which Gaius could obtain the wealth inherited by Lollia from ancestors
who had milked their provinces (cf. Pliny-HN 9.58.117-118). There is,
however, no evidence that Gaius was in any need of funds so soon after he
had abolished the tax on sales (see on Chapter 9.6 τὸ τέλος). It must
always remain a possibility that he felt an almost desperate need for an
heir (cf. Willrich Caligula p. 296).

12.1 Μέμμιον Ρήγουλον: P. Memmius Regulus (PIR¹ M 342), although not of
a family prominent in imperial politics (cf. Tac. Ann. 14.47.2), was consul in A.D. 31. He apparently gave his support as
magistrate to Macro rather than Seianus (Dio 58.9.3), although he was later
accused by his colleague, Fulcinius Trio, of tardiness in prosecuting
Seianus' supporters (Tac. Ann. 5.11.1). He was made an Arval, probably in
this year (Smallwood no. 22): Henzen (p. xliiv, n. 3; li, n. 4) inserts
Memmius' name in a co-option of Arvals on 24 May A.D. 38, since his name
is not found in the Acta before this lacuna but often after; while Balsdon
(Gaius p. 47) rather imaginatively suggests that Memmius became an Arval
in October A.D. 38, as compensation for losing his wife. Memmius' reputation for probity combined with competence remained undiminished until his death in A.D. 61 (Tac. Ann. 14.47.1).


Merivale (5.388, n. 1) suggested that Lollia was prohibited from marrying again so that Gaius would not be compelled to return her dowry. Such an explanation could equally well be applied to the case of Gaius' second wife, Cornelia Orestilla (cf. Jolowicz and Nicholas. Roman Law pp. 236-238). The marriage must have taken place in September or October of A.D. 38, shortly after Drusilla's consecration.

The date of Gaius' divorce from Lollia is a matter of conjecture. According to the Acta Arvalium (Smallwood no. 8), a sacrifice was performed on an imperial birthday between 6 and 12 February A.D. 39: it was probably that of Lollia (see Eph. Epig. 8.322.5), although the birthdates of two of Gaius' sisters have not been fixed (see on Chapter 11.3 ἐν τοῖς γενεσίοις; the Fasti Antiates [CIL 12, p. 249 = E&J p. 54] and the Acta Arvalium [= Smallwood no. 19] give Agrippina's birthdate as 6 November). The divorce is mentioned again by Dio (Chapter 23.7), in a context that suggests a date immediately before his marriage to Caesonia but after the detection of Gaetulicus' conspiracy in October A.D. 39. Such a time is impossible, since Gaius was by then in Germany and could hardly have married Caesonia there (a date in the winter of A.D. 39/40 is, however, accepted by Gelzer [RE "Julius" col. 404], Merivale [5.347-348], and Charlesworth [CAH 10.663]). His daughter, born a month after the marriage, might have been consecrated to Minerva on the Capitol after Gaius' return to Rome in the
autumn of A.D. 40 (see Chapter 28.7); but if she had been born in Germany, one might well expect some mention of the fact that she was brought up in castris, as her father was mistakenly thought to have been. It is best to assume that the statement in Chapter 23.7 is misplaced, and to assign Gaius' divorce and fourth marriage to the summer of A.D. 39, at least a month before his departure for Germany in September (so Linnert Beiträge p. 81; Willrich Caligula p. 296; Balsdon Gaius p. 48; Meise Untersuchungen pp. 106-108 [who errs in claiming from Suet. Gaius 25.4 that Drusilla was able to speak before her murder early in A.D. 41]). Clearly the divorce from Paulina was not arranged εὐθείας.

Lollia Paulina was to survive Gaius. On the death in A.D. 48 of Claudius' infamous wife, Messalina, she was suggested along with Agrippina Minor as a possible successor to the Emperor's affections (Tac. Ann. 12.1.1-3; Suet. Claud. 26.3). For this she incurred the hatred of her successful rival, at whose suggestion Claudius at first exiled her and later caused her to be executed on a charge of consulting magicians and an oracle regarding the Emperor's marriage (Dio 60.32.4; Tac. Ann. 12.22). Her ashes were brought back to Rome ten years later by Nero, whose action was interpreted as a conscious insult to his mother (Tac. Ann. 14.12.5-6).

12.2 Σοαίμω μὲν τὴν τῶν Ἰτυραίων τῶν Ἀράβων: When Pompey reorganized Syria, the kingdom of Iturea in the vicinity of Damascus was given some autonomy (App. Mithr. 10.499); as was the principality of Arca, also ruled by Ituraean princes (cf. Pliny HN 5.16.74). It was this latter area, his ancestral realm, that must have been given to Sohaemus by Gaius at this time (cf. Jos. Vita 11.52: "Σοαίμου τοῦ περὶ τῶν Λίβανον τεταρακόντων"; ILS 8958; see particularly A.H.M. Jones
Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces pp. 258, 456-57). The former kingdom of Ituraea had been granted by Antony in 36 B.C. to one of his children by Cleopatra (Dio 49.32.5), later passed to Herod the Great, and afterwards became part of the tetrarchy of Philip (Jos. AJ 15.6.5 [185]); by A.D. 38, then, it was ruled by Julius Agrippa (see on Chapter 8.2 Ἔγγριππαν). When Sohaemus died in A.D. 49, his realm of Arca was included in the Roman province of Syria (Tac. Ann. 12.23.2). See PIR I.3.251.

12.2 Κότυι ...: The history of the client kingdom of Thrace under Augustus and Tiberius is summarized in Tac. Ann. 2.64-67. The country was ruled at first by Rhoemetalces I (Dio 55.30.6; Vell. 2.112.4). On his death, sometime before A.D. 12 (the date is obtained from Ovid, who in that year addressed one of his epistles [Pont. 2.9] to Cotys as joint-ruler of Thrace: cf. Mommsen in Eph. Epig. 2.250-251), Thrace was divided, the richer part being granted to his son Cotys, with the wilder areas going to Rhescuporis, the brother of Rhoemetalces I. The two ruled in some harmony while Augustus was still alive; but after A.D. 14 Rhescuporis began to encroach openly on Cotys' territory, and eventually had his nephew imprisoned and killed (A.D. 19). For this Tiberius banished him to Alexandria, where he died attempting to escape (Suet. Tib. 37.4; Vell. 2.129.1).

Heedless of the potential troubles inherent in a jointly ruled kingdom, Tiberius chose to follow Augustus' precedent and again divided Thrace, this time between Rhoemetalces II (the son of Rhescuporis) and the three sons of Cotys (Rhoemetalces III, Polemo, and Cotys II). Since the latter were under age, they were represented in Thrace by a regent, the ex-praetor Trebellenus Rufus (Dio is wrong when he says [54.20.3] that they were placed under the protection of their "uncle" Rhoemetalces II). The three
boys were brought to Rome, where they stayed with Antonia and were educated with children of the imperial family, including Gaius (cf. SIG 798 = Smallwood no. 401; "συνεργούσ καὶ ἑταῖροις ἔκμυτῶ") Mommsen Eph. Epig. 1.270-276; 2.256-261; Dessau Eph. Epig. 9.691-696). There were further, though minor, troubles in Thrace in A.D. 21 (Tac. Ann. 3.38-39) and A.D. 26 (Tac. Ann. 4.46-51).

For Rhoemetalces II, see E§J no. 168.

By A.D. 38 Gaius was in a position to bestow favours on his boyhood friends. Augustus had given Armenia Minor to Artavasdes, the Median prince. On his death in 20 B.C. it passed to Archelaus, king of Cappadocia (Dio 54.9.2), who ruled it until A.D. 17 when, summoned by Tiberius to Rome, he appeared before the Senate on some vague charge of treason and anticipated the verdict by dying. His kingdom, probably including Armenia Minor, was then made a province (Tac. Ann. 2.42.2-6; cf. 2.56.4). In accord with his practice of supporting client kingdoms in the East, Gaius now awarded Armenia Minor to Cotys II, who continued to hold it under Claudius (Tac. Ann. 11.9.3; Jos. AJ 19.8.1 [338]). In A.D. 54 he was succeeded by Aristobulus, the son of Herod of Chalcis (Tac. Ann. 13.7.2; Jos. AJ 20.8.4 [158]).

For Rhoemetalces III Gaius arranged an archonship at Athens (IG 2 2.2292), and gave him his paternal kingdom of Thrace, Rhoemetalces II having died in the meantime (E&J no. 169; BMC "Thrace" p. 210; cf. Neubauer Hermes 10 [1875] 145-52; Mommsen Eph. Epig. 2.256). Gaius' decision to abandon the former practice of creating joint rulers of the country seems to have been well taken, since Thrace was quiet for the next eight years. Rhoemetalces' rule was short, however, for in A.D. 46 the kingdom was made a Roman province (cf. Tac. Ann. 12.63.3 and Furneaux ad loc.).

Polemo, the third brother, was made king of Pontus and the Bosporus at the same time (cf. Tac. Hist. 3.47.1). Dio is wrong in calling him the
son of the former ruler, for the Polemo who had been king of Pontus at the end of the Republic was in fact his grandfather (Dio 49.25.4; cf. Mommsen Eph. Epig. 2.259; A.H.M. Jones Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces pp. 169-70). Dio errs again when he claims that our Polemo exchanged the Bosporus for part of Cilicia in A.D. 41 (60.8.2), since Josephus makes it clear that it was another Polemo who ruled Cilicia (AJ 20.7.3 [145]; for details, see D. Magie Roman Rule in Asia Minor p. 1407, n. 26. Balsdon [Gaius p. 201] gives the opposing view, as does the CAH 10.752,.774). Polemo ruled the kingdom of Pontus until A.D. 64, when he was removed and his domain annexed to the province of Galatia (Suet. Nero 18; for the date, see CAH 10.774, n. 1).

For a valuable summary of the confused events surrounding the sons of Cotys I, see Willrich Caligula pp. 302-303; Seager Tiberius pp. 163-65.

12.2 ἐν δίφρῳ: δίφρος = sella curulis inaurata (Mason Greek Terms p. 39).

In 9 B.C. a curule chair between the consuls had been voted to Augustus (Dio 54.10.5). Claudius later continued to make use of it while presiding at trials (Dio 60.16.3).

12.3 τοῦ Οὐστασιανοῦ τοῦ Φλαουίου: Dio seems to have borrowed the report of the incident almost verbatim from Suetonius (Vesp. 5.3): "mox, cum aedilem eum C. Caesar, succensens curam verrendis viis non adhibitam, luto iussisset oppleri congesto per milites in praetextae sinum, non defuerunt qui interpretarentur, quandoque proculcatam desertamque rem publicam civili aliqua perturbatione in tutelam eius ac velut in gremium deventuram." Gaius' hint must have been as effective as it was appropriate, for late in A.D. 39 Vespasian was
making moves to ingratiate himself with the Emperor (Suet. Vesp. 2.3; cf. on Chapter 23.2 τὰ ἑπινίκια.

12.3 ἀγορανομοθύτος; According to the lex Julia municipalis (ILS 6085, lines 50, 69), both the aediles and four of the vigintiviri were responsible for keeping the streets of Rome clean (cf. Dio 54.26.6).

13.1 τὸν μὲν τῷ Δίος ἱερέα: It was always considered contrary to divine law (nepas) for the Flamen Dialis to swear any oath (cf. Fabius Pictor ap. Gell. 10.15; Livy 31.50). Plutarch (Quaest. Rom. 44) suggests four reasons for such a prohibition, all of which seem equally plausible: that the priest should not be subject to a test; that he is beyond distrust; that he could not speak the concluding curse on perjury; or that, if he did perjure himself, he would thereby harm the State. It need not be assumed from Dio's statement here that Tiberius had required the Flamen Dialis to swear formally to uphold the acta of Augustus, but rather that Gaius thought it necessary to reaffirm the priest's right not to participate in the general oath which, since it usually encompassed the acts of Emperors past and present, was considered a declaration of loyalty required of all magistrates, senators, and servants of the State. See on Chapter 9.1 οἱ ὀρκοὶ.

13.1 οὐσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ Τίβερίου: Before A.D. 32 it had been customary for one senator to take the oath in the Senate on behalf of the whole body, but that year the senators of their own accord began the practice of swearing individually (ἐδίκει: Dio 58.17.2). Tiberius had required all to take the oath on 1 January, but consistently refused to allow his own acts to be included in it (Dio 57.8.4-5; see on Chapter 9.1 οἱ ὀρκοὶ).
13.1 οὖτος ἐς ...; In his Panegyricus (chapter 65), Pliny praised Trajan for doing the same: "in rostris quoque simili religione ipse te legibus subiecisti, legibus, Caesar, quas nemo principi scripsit .... itaque et abiturus consulatu iurastite nihil contra leges fecisse."

13.2 τριάκοντα δὲ ὣς ἡμέρας: The length of his consulship is confirmed by Suet. Gaius 17.1: "consulatus quattuor gessit, ... secundum ex Kal. Ian. per XXX dies."

13.2 Δουκίς Απρονίς: L. Apronius Caesianus (PIR² A 972) was the son of L. Apronius, suffect consul in A.D. 8 and legatus of Germanicus during the German campaign of A.D. 15, for his service in which he won triumphal insignia (Tac. Ann. 1.56; 1.72.1; cf. J. Colin Latomus 13 [1954] 405). When the elder Apronius was appointed to the command against Tacfarinas in A.D. 20, his son, still a praetextatus (cf. CIL 10.7257), served under him and was instrumental in turning the Numidians back from the sea to the desert (Tac. Ann. 3.21; cf. EJno. 209a, a coin struck in commemoration of this successful campaign). During his praetorship in A.D. 32, L. Apronius Caesianus attracted the attention of Tiberius not only by his friendship with Seianus, but because he once ridiculed the Emperor's baldness. Apronius was excused by Tiberius on both counts, but his jest was remembered and thereafter bald men were called Caesiani (Dio 58.19.1-2; see on Chapter 22.3 ἣτο τοῦ φαλακροῦ).

13.2 Σαγκινίους Μάζιμος: Little is known of Q. Sanquinius Maximus (PIR¹ S 136). He was a consular in A.D. 32 (Tac. Ann. 6.4.4), but he can hardly be identified with the consul suffectus of A.D. 23
(cf. *CIL* 10.905 and Mommsen ad loc.); nor could he be the Sanquinius who participated in the accusation against Arruntius between A.D. 29 and 31, as Sturz thought (Tac. *Ann.* 6.7.1; Sturz 6.330, n. 153). He was appointed governor of Lower Germany, probably by Claudius, and when he died there in A.D. 47 was replaced by Corbulo (Tac. *Ann.* 11.18).

This suffect consulship in A.D. 39 made Sanquinius the first man in over fifty years to have held the magistracy twice (with the exception, of course, of Emperors). J. Colin (*Latomus* 13 [1954] 405-409) thinks he owed this honour to Memmius Regulus, whom he had defended in the Senate during the accusations following Seianus' overthrow (Tac. *Ann.* 6.4.4). This theory assumes that Regulus had some influence with Gaius, while all the evidence points to the opposite (cf. Chapter 12.1 and notes).

13.2 δὴ αὐτὰ ἐκείνα ...: Cf. Philo *Leg.* 43.340 [595]: "δεσμώτας ἐλυσεν ἐνίους ἐπὶ ναόμετι προφόσει, πάλιν ἐδησε βαρυτέραν τῆς προτέρας ἐπαγαγὼν συμφοράν, τὴν ἐκ δυσελπιστίας." Our sources do not identify by name any individual who was punished by Gaius after being released from prison. Dio and Philo are perhaps generalizing from a single incident, although it cannot be from the chequered career of P. Suillius Rufus, as Rogers has suggested (*Criminal Trials* pp. 83-84, 188), since after he was recalled from banishment (probably by Gaius) Suillius was still active under Claudius and was not again exiled until A.D. 58 (Tac. *Ann.* 4.31.5-6; 11.1-6; 13.42-43).

13.2 μονομαχόντες; See Chapter 10.2.
For lengthier descriptions of this "reign of terror," see Suet. Gaius 27-32 and Sen. de Ira 3.18.3-19.5.

Once again Dio seems to have made a generalized statement out of a single known incident, found in Suet. Gaius 35.2: "erat Aesius Proculus ... hunc spectaculis detractum repente et in haerenam deductum Thraeci et mox hoplomacho comparavit, bisque victorem constringi sine mora iussit et pannis obsitum vicatim circumduci ac mulieribus ostendi, deinde iugulari." Suetonius adds that Gaius' behaviour was prompted by his envy of Proculus' good looks.

Suetonius (Gaius 18.2) is not so critical of such behaviour: "scaenicos ludos ... fecit, quondam et nocturnos accensis tota urbe luminibus."

Sensitive about his youthfulness, Gaius was always alert for remarks that might be interpreted as critical. For another example, see Chapter 19.2-3.

Suetonius 30.2). This was the best remembered of Gaius' many caustic remarks, and was often used to epitomize all his brutalities (cf. Oros. 7.5; "hic, ut breviter magnitudinem crudelitatis eius expromam, exclamasse fertur utinam populus Romanus unam cervicem haberet").
13.7 τούς συκοφαντοῦντας: Such a public demonstration against the delatores must naturally have occurred after the reintro-
duction of the charge of maiestas, on which the informers depended for their prosperity. See Chapter 16.8 and note.

13.7 ἐς Καμπανίαν ἀπῆρε: Dio has probably here misplaced Gaius' journey to Campania following the death of Drusilla the previous year (see on Chapter 11.1 ὁμοσίας ὑὲ ταφης).

13.8 τὰ τῆς Δρουσίλλης γενέσια: See on Chapter 11.3 ἐν τοῖς γενεσίοις.

13.8 ἁγαλμα τε αὐτῆς ὑπ' ἐλεφάντων ἐν ἀρμασίῳ: Boissevain's emendation of the MS reading ἐπ' to ὑπ' must be correct. The vehicle used was a kind of carriage (cf. Hdt. 7.41.1), hardly appropriate to be mounted on an elephant's back; and we know that during the procession into the Circus it was customary for elephants to draw the chariot bearing the image of Augustus (Dio 61.16.4). This same honour had earlier been granted by Gaius to his mother (Suet. Gaius 15.1), and was later given to Livia by Claudius (Suet. Claud. 11.2).

13.8 ἤρκτοι ...: Cf. Chapter 7.3.

13.9 παγκρατισταί: The pancratium was a sport involving a combination of wrestling and boxing. See H.A. Harris, Sport in Greece and Rome pp. 25-26.
13.9 ὃς δήμος εἰςτιάθη...: See on Chapter 7.1 καὶ ἡ βουλὴ, and Suet.

Gaius 18.2: "panaria cum obsonio viritim divisit." Gaius had given a similar banquet in the summer of A.D. 37, during the dedication of Augustus' shrine. His conduct here hardly agrees with Dio's earlier claim that Gaius "οὐδὲ τῷ πλῆθει ἔτι τι ἔχαριζετο" (section 3).

13.9 δωρεὰ δοθῆ: Details are supplied by Suetonius, who says that togas (forensia) were given to the men and scarves (fasciae) to the women and children (Gaius 17.2; both Rolfe in the Loeb edition and Graves in the Penguin translation have misconstrued the phrase "posteriore epulo").
14.1 ἑφόνευε; Quite clearly there is a gap in the text at the end of
Chapter 13. Naber has proposed that the MS reading ἑφόνευε
should be ἐχώνευε, suggesting that Gaius was melting down household gold
and silver which was then cast into money. Boissevain, however, rightly
observes that such an emendation is hardly necessary, since it too assumes
a previous lacuna. Nor is the idea of Gaius murdering for money at this
point in his reign inappropriate in Dio's account (cf. Chapters 10.7 and 18.1).


14.2 δύο γὰρ στρατηγοὺς: Under the Republic two aediles had normally
been responsible for arranging gladiatorial
games (the cura ludorum: cf. Livy 23.30.16-17; 27.6.19; Cic. Verr. 5.14.36;
Dio 43.48.3), although the praetor urbanus presided over the Ludi Apollinares
(Cic. Att. 15.2). In 22 B.C. Augustus reassigned supervision of the games
to the praetors, who could draw their expenses from the state funds (Dio
54.2.3). This assistance was withdrawn in A.D. 7 (Dio 55.31.4), although
the Emperor on occasion might give financial help to a praetor who could not
afford the expense (see Balsdon Life and Leisure pp. 262-63). In A.D. 14
the tribunes received permission from Tiberius to stage the Ludi Augustales,
which had been established in 19 B.C. (Dio 54.10.3); but soon after, this
responsibility too fell to one of the praetors, the peregrinus (Tac. Ann.
1.15.3-5). Gaius on this occasion reverted to the former practice of
allotting the cura ludorum to two praetors chosen from the college by lot.
They were also to be responsible for staging games on the Emperor's
birthday, a custom that was forbidden by Claudius in A.D. 41 (Chapter 20.1; Dio 60.5.6).

14.2 πάντως ἐπιτιμῶν ἀπεδίδοτο; Cf. Suet. Gaius 38.4: "exquirens per se pretia et usque eo extendens, ut quidem immenso coacti quaedam emere ac bonis exuti venas sibi inciderent." All the purchasers were not so unlucky. Suetonius adds the story of a certain Aponius Saturninus, who awoke during an auction to discover that his sleepy nods had been considered bids, and that he had unwittingly bought thirteen gladiators at a cost of nine million sesterces (the price is exhorbitant and probably fictitious, since an entire munus would cost no more than HS 200,000 [cf. Duncan-Jones Economy p. 245]). For a similar sale held by Gaius while in Gaul, see Chapter 21.5-6.

14.3 ὑπὲρ τοῦ νόμου: Limitations were several times placed on the size of gladiatorial games in both Rome and the provinces, either because of fear of a possible uprising in the city of armed men trained in combat (as was the case during Caesar's aedileship in 65 B.C. [Suet. Caes. 10.2]), or in an attempt to curb the traditionally excessive expenditure of both public and private funds. So Augustus set the limit in Rome at two games a year with a maximum of 120 gladiators participating each time (Dio 54.2.4). Although Tiberius further reduced the number of combatants (Suet. Tib. 34.1), such restrictions were apparently ignored by his successors (see Chapter 10.2); one wealthy aficionado exhibited one hundred pairs of gladiators to celebrate Gaius' victories in Germany (Pers. Sat. 6.43-49); in A.D. 58 the Senate allowed Syracuse to exceed the legal number for provincial contests (Tac. Ann. 13.49.1); and as many as 30 or 35
pairs contended in the amphitheatre of a relatively small town such as Pompeii (CIL 10.1074). On the costs of munera in Italian towns, see Duncan-Jones Economy pp. 200-201; 235; 245-46.

14.5 ὑστικῶς ἐπεξεργασία: Suetonius gives a single example of such behaviour:

"Columbo victori, leviter tamen saucio, venenum in plagam addidit, quod ex eo 'Columbinum' appellavit" (Gaius 55.2). Is Dio once again generalizing from an individual incident? Willrich (Caligula p. 438) gives an imaginative explanation behind the story of Columbus: a gladiator by that name died of blood poisoning from a wound; later a poison called Columbinum was found among Gaius' belongings, and the false connection was made. The story, says Willrich, is a richtiger Dienstbotenklatsch.

Claudius is said to have discovered Gaius' box of poisons among his effects (Dio 60.4.5; Oros. 7.5.10). When he had them cast into the sea, their potency was revealed by the number of dead fish that appeared on the surface (Suet. Gaius 49.3).

14.6 τὴν βατραχίδα: The Greens were the favourite factio of many Emperors, including Nero. (Suet. Nero 22.1; Pliny HN 33.27.90). Juvenal wrote some sharp lines on the subject (11.197-201):

... fragar aurum

percutit, eventum viridis quo colligo panni.

nām si deficeret, maestam attonitamque videres

hanc urbem veluti Cannarum in pulvere victis

consulibus ....
Gaius was so attached to the Greens that he spent much of his time in
their company. He was the particular patron of one of their drivers, a
certain Eutychus (hardly the same Eutychus who, as driver of Herod Agrippa's
chariot, had overheard and reported to Tiberius the unfortunate remark
which Agrippa had made to Gaius concerning the Emperor [Chapter 8.2]), to
whom he once gave a reported two million sesterces as well as stables
specially built by the army (Suet. Gaius 55.2; Jos. AJ 19.4.4 [257]).

14.6 Γαίοννόμ: In Region XIV, on the right bank of the Tiber, Gaius con­
structed both this Gaianum or practice track (see Platner
and Ashby *Topographical Dictionary* p. 246), and the Circus Vaticanus, on
the *spina* of which he erected an obelisk imported from Egypt and bearing
the modest inscription "divo Caesari divi Iulii f. Augusto, Ti. Caesari
divi Augusti f. Augusto sacrum" (*CIL* 6.882; cf. Suet. *Claud.* 21.2; Pliny *HN*
p. 114; Jordan *Topographie* 1.3.662). That the two structures, although
similar in purpose, are not in fact the same is clear from the fourth
century topographical lists of the *Curiosum* and *Notitia*, where they are
mentioned separately.

14.7 Ἠγκισκόντον: Suetonius (Gaius 55.3) gives somewhat different details,
listing among Gaius' gifts to his horse "equile marmoreum
et praesaepes eburneum praeterque purpurea tegumenta ac monilia e gemmis
domum etiam et familiam et supellectilem." More significantly, he admits
that Gaius' intention to make Incitatus a consul was a rumour (*traditur*).
In A.D. 40 Incitatus was appointed priest of Gaius, an honour that may
indicate the seriousness with which the Emperor viewed his own divinity (see Chapter 28.6).

Pliny (HN 8.64.154-155) mentions other famous and intelligent horses that were honoured by their owners: the steeds of Julius Caesar and Augustus; and, most notably from Gaius' point of view, Alexander's Bucephalus.

14.7 χρυσάς τε οὕτῳ κριθάς: In the same way Gaius is said to have presented to some human guests loaves of bread and cuts of meat fashioned from gold (Suet. Gaius 37.1). He is called avidissimus auri by the elder Pliny, who tells of his unsuccessful scientific experiments to extract gold from auripigmentum (HN. 33.22.79).
CHAPTER FIFTEEN

15.1 πρότερον μέν ἐψιστὸ: The amount of income received under such a measure was probably not large, for Tiberius had had an admirable attitude towards receiving bequests: "neque hereditatem cuiusquam adiit nisi cum amicitia meruisset: ignotos et allis infensos eoque principem nuncupantes procul arcebat" (Tac. Ann. 2.48.2; in this matter he was later imitated by Claudius; cf. Dio 60.6.3). Gaius' proposal was no doubt aimed at strengthening the concept of a continuous and hereditary Principate as well (cf. R.S. Rogers TAPhA 78 [1947] 147, 153). In this regard it is interesting that a similar measure was decreed during the reign of Antoninus Pius a century later: "quod principi relictum est, qui ante, quam dies legati cedat, ab hominibus ereptus est, ex constitutione divi Antonini successorii eius debetur" (Gaius in Digest 31.56; cf. HA "Antoninus" 8.5; 12.1).

15.1 μὴτε γυναῖκα ...: It is natural to assume that these decrees were issued after Lollia Paulina had been discarded, and before Gaius' marriage to Milonia Caesonia (see on Chapter 12.1 καὶ έκείνην). Unfortunately Dio's phrase πρότερον μέν is too ambiguous to allow them to be dated with any confidence, for they might even have been proposed any time after the death of the Emperor's first wife.

15.1 δύνατα τι προέθετο: As part of his legislation directed at moral improvement, Augustus in 18 B.C. introduced his lex Iulia de maritandis ordinisibus. This law, among its many other regulations, imposed penalties on unmarried men and women, including a restriction
preventing such people from inheriting property (Ulpian 22.3 [Scott Corpus Juris Civilis 1.241]; cf. Dio 54.16.1-2; Suet. Aug. 34.1-2]. Augustus quite naturally found it difficult to enforce these new regulations, particularly in the case of those who had been widowed (Suet. Aug. 34.1). As a result, probably in A.D. 4, he allowed a period of three years' grace before remarriage; this he seems later to have extended to five years (cf. Dio 56.7.3). This section of the law was obviously still unpopular, but a demand of the Knights in A.D. 9 that it be repealed went unheeded (Dio 56.1.2). It seems likely that the benefit of three or five years' grace was either a temporary expedient or, if officially decreed, was later repealed, since Gaius would otherwise hardly be restricted by the law regulating inheritances. On the problem of dating certain sections of Augustus' marriage legislation, see T. Rice Holmes Architect of the Roman Empire 2.151-152; the most recent discussion can be found in P.A. Brunt Italian Manpower pp. 558-66.

The word δογμα can refer either to a senatus consultum or to an edict issued by a magistrate possessing imperium (cf. Plb. 6.13.2; D.H. 2.45.4; 8.87.3; Jos. AJ 14.10.19 [240]; Mason Greek Terms pp. 128-30). In this case it probably combines both senses. The Emperor could propose a senatus consultum personally or through a regular magistrate, but since the Senate was still advisory rather than legislative, its motion would then have to be included in a formal magisterial edictum, in this case probably that of a praetor, since the issue involved interpretation of a law (cf. lex de Imperio Vespasiani, lines 3-6 = ILS. 244 = E&J 364; Jolowicz and Nicholas Roman Law pp. 356-59, 367; Greenidge Roman Public Life p. 378).
15.2 ēv δὲ τῶν παρόντων ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 38.2: "testamenta primipilarium, qui ab initio Tiberii principatus neque illum neque se heredem reliquisserunt, ut ingrata rescidit." On 26 May A.D. 17 Germanicus celebrated a triumph in honour of his successful campaigns in Germany (Tac. Ann. 2.41.2; Vell. 2.129.2; Str. 7.1.4; Fasti Ostienses = EQJ p. 41). Since the centurions (or, more likely, the primipilares) had materially benefited from the spoils of Germanicus' wars, Gaius considered them to be under an obligation to show gratitude to their commander or his family. B. Dobson (Aufstieg und Niedergang 2.1.392-399) has recently shown that on retirement a primus pilus also received a large grant of money and elevation to the rank of eques: "not only were the primipilares the most experienced soldiers; they owed everything to the emperor" (p. 397).

15.3 Γαύος Δομίτιος Κορβούλων: Corbulo (PIR² D 141) began his prosecutions of culpable highway commissioners as early as A.D. 21 when, it would seem, the guilty curatores were forced to make the necessary road-repairs at their own expense, even if this necessitated the sale of their personal property (Tac. Ann. 3.31.7). Rogers (Criminal Trials pp. 57-58) has suggested that negligent commissioners were liable under the lex Iulia de Residuis if they had a balance of public money remaining at the end of their term of office (cf. Digest 48.13.2, 5). Presumably Gaius later imposed an additional fine, to be paid into the public treasury.

15.4 ἐπιστάται τῶν διδῶν: During the Republic a senatorial board (cura) had been responsible for the maintenance of roads in Italy. When Augustus was created προστάτης (i.e., praefectus)
ifiv  Την Φώμιν δόσω in 20 B.C. (Dio 54.8.4), he reorganized this board, assigning the actual supervision of the roads to a group of ex-praetors chosen by himself (cf. Suet. Aug. 37). The inefficiency attacked by Corbulo was due as much to the graft of those who had been granted public contracts as to the mismanagement of the curatores viarum themselves (cf. Dio's "καὶ ἑκείνους τε καὶ τοὺς ἔργολαθησαντάς τι παρ' αὐτῶν" and Tacitus' "fraude mancipum et incuria magistratum" [Ann. 3.31.7]).

15.5 τότε μὲν υπάτευσεν: Corbulo was appointed suffect consul either on 1 July, when L. Apronius and Sanquinius Maximus retired, or at the beginning of September, after the deposition of the original suffecti (see on Chapter 20.3 ἑκείνους μὲν). In A.D. 43 Claudius instigated an inquiry into Corbulo's conduct, and returned to the commissioners the fines which he and Gaius had exacted (Dio 60.17.2).

There is no evidence to suggest that this Corbulo be identified with the consul Corbulo mentioned by Pliny (HN 7.5.39) as being the brother or step-brother of Caesonia. Colin (Latomus 13 [1954] 409-10) identifies our Corbulo as the father of the famous general of the same name, who in turn was half-brother of Caesonia on his mother's side; but this is no more than speculation.

15.6 ζωντάς τε ἓξεκαρποῦτο...: Gaius revived Augustus' practice of accepting from wealthy citizens apparently voluntary donations of money (Dio 60.6.3). Suetonius (Gaius 38.2) emphasizes the Emperor's eagerness for inheritances with the famous, if incredible, comment: "cum iam et ab ignotis inter familiares et a parentibus inter liberós palam heres nuncuparetur, derisores vocabat, quod post nuncupationem
Suetonius tells the same story of Domitian (Dom. 12.2); he clearly uses it to indicate the absolutist tendencies in both these Emperors (cf. R.S. Rogers, TAPA 78 [1947] 147, 151, 156).

In fact, we know of only one legacy received by Gaius: he acquired the entire estate of Domitius Ahenobarbus, although he had been named co-heir with his nephew, the later Emperor Nero, and was to receive only a third of the property (Suet. Nero 6.3). Rogers (loc. cit.) is no doubt correct in attributing Gaius' behaviour in this affair to the fact that Nero's mother, Agrippina, had just been exiled (see on Chapter 22.6 τὰς ᾽Αλλαῖς).
CHAPTER SIXTEEN

16.1 κακῶς ἔλεγε; For Gaius' earlier criticism of Tiberius, see Chapters 4.2 and 6.7. It is doubtful that Gaius was ever as vehement and open in condemning his predecessor as Dio suggests (see Balsdon Gaius pp. 48-49). There is no evidence whatever of any official public censure, with the possible exception of the omission of Tiberius' name from the annual oaths—but then he had never allowed his name to be included when he was alive (see on Chapter 9.1 οἱ Ὄρκοι). It would, of course, have been politic for Gaius to refrain from extolling Tiberius immediately on his accession, since the Empire was rejoicing in the change of government. Yet by 25/26 May A.D. 38—a year before Dio here records his apparent change in attitude—Gaius was making public sacrifices to Tiberius' memory (Acta Arvalium = Smallwood no. 3; cf. Henzen p. xliiv).

16.2 ἀδέβτε ...: The extent to which the lex maiestatis could be applied to words or actions which infringed on the dignity of a former Emperor or a member of the imperial house is a matter of great complexity (see, for example, Rogers Criminal Trials pp. 6-9). The very division of charges of maiestas into perduellio and lèse majesté, which was first put forward by Rogers (see on Chapter 6.2 τά τε ἑγκλήματα), has been challenged by C.W. Chilton (JRS 45 [1955] 73-81), who claims that all charges must have been the same, since the only recorded punishment for one convicted of maiestas in the early Empire was aquae et ignis interdictio, never execution (for Rogers' reply, cf. JRS 49 [1959] 90-94). Chilton's argument was later taken up by J.E. Allison and J.D. Cloud (Latomus 21 [1962] 711-31), who refer with some justification to Tac, Ann. 3.50.4.
At any rate, Augustus, although he was willing to include "imperial" adultery as a form of maiestas (Tac. Ann. 3.24.3; cf. Baumen Crimen Maiestatis pp. 198-206), refused to prosecute anyone for slander against himself or his family, and in a letter advised Tiberius to follow his example: "aetati tuae, mi Tiberi, 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" (Suet. Aug. 51.3). Tiberius appears to have heeded this recommendation, and remained patiently unperturbed in the face of malicious rumours, once commenting, in explanation of his apparent indifference to them, that "in civitate libera linguam mentemque liberas esse debere" (Suet. Tib. 28). Dio, too, recognizes that Tiberius at first refused to prosecute those who had insulted him or who had violated an oath taken in the name of the deified Augustus; but, like Suetonius (Tib. 58), Dio also observes that as time passed "πάνω πολλοῖς ἔθανάτωσε" (57.9.2-3). After A.D. 20, he says later (57.19.1), Tiberius changed his attitude to treasonable offences and began to take up cases involving action or speech disparaging to Augustus, Livia, or even himself. Our sources, however, exaggerate: the "Tiberian Terror" never existed at all (it was, in fact, first disproved thoroughly by F.B. Marsh in CJ 24 [1928] 14-27).

As for offensive jokes at the Emperor's expense and simple disrespect toward the imperial house, these were not covered at all by the lex maiestatis, but were handled privately by the Emperor, who would sever any personal ties with the offender (amicitiam renuntiare; on this point, see particularly R.S. Rogers TAPhA 90 [1959] 224-37). We have from the reign of Tiberius thirteen cases (at most) involving charges of maiestas based on more serious slander or libel, extending from A.D. 15 to A.D. 35.
Of these thirteen cases, four resulted in outright acquittal, all at the insistence of Tiberius himself: Falanius and Rubrius in A.D. 15 (Tac. Ann. 1.73); M. Granius Marcellus in the same year (Tac. Ann. 1.74); Appuleia Varilla in A.D. 17 (Tac. Ann. 2.50); and M. Aurelius Cotta Maximus in A.D. 32 (Tac. Ann. 6.5-6). Another accused, C. Cominius Macer, was convicted on the charge in A.D. 24, but was pardoned by the Emperor (Tac. Ann. 4.31.1); while Sextus Vistilius, blamed in A.D. 32 of slandering Gaius in a poem, committed suicide although Tiberius had instigated no prosecution (Tac. Ann. 6.9.2-4). The outcome of two other cases is doubtful: the charge of lese majeste against C. Junius Silanus in A.D. 22 was probably dismissed, although he was convicted of extortion (Tac. Ann. 3.66-69; cf. Rogers Criminal Trials pp. 66-70); and the execution of Aelius Saturninus in A.D. 23, reported only by Dio via Xipholinus (57.22.5), has justifiably been doubted by Rogers (Criminal Trials pp. 72-73). Further, two men were indicted while still serving sentences for previous offences: the punishment of Cassius Severus, who had been banished by Augustus for libel, probably in A.D. 12 (cf. Dio 56.27.1-3; Tac. Ann. 1.72.4), was increased by Tiberius in A.D. 24 because he was continuing his insults from his distant exile (Tac. Ann. 4.21.5); and Sextius Paconianus, already in prison for his part in Seianus' plot against Tiberius and Gaius (see below, section 4), was convicted of slandering the Emperor from his cell and was executed in A.D. 35 (Tac. Ann. 6.3.4-5; 6.39). Of the three remaining cases, that of a certain Xeno resulted in conviction and banishment, although it is not known whether the formal charge was one of maiestas (Suet. Tib. 56). In A.D. 21 Clutorius Priscus, accused of anticipating Germanicus' death in a poem, was convicted and summarily executed during an absence of Tiberius, who later rebuked the senators for their haste in condemning a man simply for an insult (Tac. Ann. 3.49-51).
There is left only the conviction in A.D. 25 of Votienus Montanus (Tac. Ann. 4.42), who, in Marsh's view (Tiberius p. 115, n. 1; his suggestion is accepted by Rogers, Criminal Trials p. 91), was probably accused of seditious slander rather than simple libel.

Despite the insistence of our sources to the contrary, then, it is clear that Tiberius discouraged the proliferation of trials for maiestas (at least as it was applied to cases of libel and slander), and tried time and again to limit its use to the much more serious crimes of sedition and high treason. On this point, see particularly, in addition to Rogers' excellent monograph, Marsh Tiberius pp. 109-15; 287-95; Seager Tiberius pp. 151-62; Hammond Augustan Principate pp. 172-79.

16.2 τοὺς βουλευτὰς ...: Cf. Tac. Ann. 6.7.4: "quod maxime exitiabile tulere illa tempora, cum primores senatus infimas etiam delationes exercerent, alii propalam, multi per occultum." Suetonius (Gaius 30.2) attributes to Gaius the rather perceptive statement that Tiberius, presented as he was with so many accusations of maiestas, could not help but accept the validity of some.

16.3 ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν γραμμάτων ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 30.2. The disclosure of the incriminating letters gave Gaius an opportunity to accuse the Senate particularly of supporting Seianus and of betraying his mother and brothers. It is quite possible, as Meise has suggested (Untersuchungen p. 118, n. 162), that a desire for revenge prompted this new attitude of Gaius toward the Senate, although it is difficult to understand why he had suppressed it until now.
Perhaps one of those charged at this time was Domitius Afer (see Chapter 19). For the history of these letters, see Chapters 4.3; 6.3; 10.8; and the notes there.

16.3 διὰ τῶν ἀπελευθέρων: Although a freedman could not normally become a senator (cf. Suet. Claud. 24.1; Nero 15.2; Pliny HN 33.8.32), there is no evidence to support the statement of Venturini (Caligola p. 65) that regulations prevented freedmen from entering the Senate chamber. Their presence as nuntii of the Emperor must have been an insult to the senators' dignitas, but for this Gaius had already shown little concern. On the growing use of imperial freedmen, particularly after the death of Augustus, see A.M. Duff Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire pp. 66-67, 137-40, 150-59, 173-86; also S. Treggiari Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic pp. 52-64. The most recent work on the subject is H. Chantraine's Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser (Wiesbaden, 1967). A revealing senatorial debate on the status of freedmen can be found in Tac. Ann. 13.26-27.

16.4 καὶ τῶν Σείανου φυσησάντες....: This comment is quite justified since, at least according to Dio (58.12.6), the Senate was well aware of its complicity in Seianus' rise to power. It seems strange, however, for Gaius to have used the death of that man as an example of ill-treatment by the Senate, for officially Seianus had been found guilty of planning to assassinate Gaius along with Tiberius (cf. ILS 157-159 = E&J 51, 52, 85; Valerius Maximus goes so far as to call his attempt at revolution "parricide" [9.11.4]). Having brought about the imprisonment of Agrippina, Nero, and Drusus, Seianus apparently realized
that he was still not considered by Tiberius as his successor, and that the young Gaius was not willing to act as his tool. The result was, according to Tacitus (Ann. 6.3.4-5), that Seianus and Livilla formed a plot against Gaius and approached Sextius Paconianus to assassinate the prince. The conspiracy was betrayed by Satrius Secundus, who revealed it presumably to Antonia, Gaius' grandmother (Tac. Ann. 6.47.2). She in turn passed on the information to Tiberius in a letter whose exact contents are unknown; it probably disclosed the plot against Gaius, but did not implicate Livilla, whose involvement Tiberius discovered only later, in the letter from Seianus' widow, Apicata (Jos. AJ 18.6.6 [181-182]; cf. Dio 65.14.1-2).

For his participation in this affair, Paconianus was tried probably on a charge of treason, although technically the *lex maiestatis* does not seem to have covered Tiberius' family or heir apparent, against whom Paconianus' part was directed (cf. Rogers Criminal Trials p. 130). He was sentenced to death in A.D. 32, but this was commuted to imprisonment when he offered to give evidence against his fellow conspirators (Tac. Ann. 6.3.5). Three years later, however, his original sentence of execution was carried out, allegedly because of verses he had written while still in prison, slandering the Emperor (Tac. Ann. 6.39.1; cf. Rogers Criminal Trials p. 157).


16.5 λέγοντά οί ...; See Dio 57.19.1b, where Tiberius is made to express the same sentiments during his lifetime. This passage reflects the antithesis of the kind of rhetorical political philosophy found
in Seneca and Dio Chrysostom, and in the long speech on the behaviour of a ruler which Dio has Maecenas deliver to Augustus (52.14-40).

16.8 τὰ τῆς ἄσεσεις ἐγκλημάτα; Gaius had abolished the charge of maiestas immediately on his accession, and had freed those imprisoned on that account by Tiberius (see Chapters 4.3; 6.2). But Gaius, like Tiberius before him, obviously found that the lex maiestatis and the work of informers were precautions, however unfortunate, that were necessary against the threat of revolution and assassination (see Willrich Caligula pp. 433-37; Rogers Criminal Trials p. 83; Marsh Tiberius p. 60; Seager Tiberius p. 162). Although the reintroduction of the charge cannot be more specifically dated than within the year A.D. 39, it is tempting to see in the conspiracies of that year a cause of Gaius' action (see on Chapters 18.4 and 19).

We know from Dio of several people who, during Gaius' short reign, were perhaps tried for maiestas: the man who sold hot water during the period of mourning for Drusilla (but see on Chapter 11.6 τὸν γὰρ πωλήσαντα); those probably involved in a conspiracy with Silanus, although no trials are mentioned (see on Chapter 8.1 ἐγκλημα); Carrinas Secundus, who foolishly spoke out against tyrants in general (see Chapter 20.6); those implicated in the attempted revolt of Gaetulicus, including Lepidus, Gaius' two surviving sisters, and perhaps Ofonius Tigellinus (see Chapters 22.5; 23.9); the conspirators of A.D. 40 (see Chapter 25.5b-8); Pomponius (or Pompeius or Pompeius; see on Chapter 26.4 Πομπῶνιον); and perhaps Lucius Vitellius (see on Chapter 27.4 τῷ τε γὰρ).

It is as difficult now to comment on the content and validity of such charges as it had been a century and a half after the events, when Dio
observed (of trials under Augustus): "οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀκριβῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα τοῖς ἔξω αὐτῶν οὐσίων εἰςέναι... πολλὰ γὰρ ὧν ὃς κρατῶν πρὸς τιμωρίαν, ὦς καὶ ἐπιбеβολεύμενος, ἥτις ἦν ἐν τῷ εὐαντῷ καὶ διὰ τῆς γερουσίας πράξῃ, ὑποτευνόει την ἐπίφρειαν, καὶ ὦτι μιᾶς τής δικαιότητος συμβῇ, γεγονέναι (54.15.2).

Soon after his accession in A.D. 41, Claudius too abolished the lex maiestatis and freed any who were still under sentence from Gaius' reign (Dio 60.3.6; 60.4.2). An attempt was made to revive it in A.D. 51, when the same L. Vitellius was on trial (Tac. Ann. 12.42.4-5), but another eleven years passed before the law was permanently restored by Nero (Tac. Ann. 14.48.1-3).

16.8 ἔσ τε στήλην: By publishing the law in a permanent and visible form, Gaius was attempting to prevent such misapplication and excuses of ignorance of the charge as had happened under Tiberius, for example, during the case of Clutorius Priscus (Tac. Ann. 3.49-51).

16.10 τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ αὐτοῦ: Cf. E. Bickermann Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 27 (1929) 20. There is no numismatic evidence of sacrifices to Gaius' clementia.

16.10 ἐν ταῖς τῷ παλατίῳ προσκυνώσαις: Sc. ἡμέρας. Boisseyvain's hesitant addition of θέας ταῖς before τῷ παλατίῳ is hardly required.

This probably refers to the Ludi Palatini, established in A.D. 14 by Livia in honour of Augustus (Dio 56.46.5; cf. Jos. Ap 19.1.11 [75]; Tac. Ann. 1.73.4). The festival began on 17 January, and the three days from
21 to 23 January were devoted to theatrical presentations. It is ironic that Gaius was to be assassinated during this very festival in A.D. 41 (Chapter 29.4-5). For the Ludi Palatini, see Inscr. It. 13.2.400-401; G. Wissowa Religion und Kultus p. 458, n. 5.

16.10 έικόνος τη αυτου χρυσης; This should not be confused with the golden effigy of Gaius that was later set up in his own temple (Chapter 28.4), but was similar to that voted him in A.D. 40 before his return to Rome (Chapter 24.7). Dio is careful to distinguish the terms εικων and ἄγαλμα: the former is a statue in the tradition of the republican imagines, while the latter is a simulacrum that demands worship (for the distinction, cf. K. Scott TAPhA 62 [1931] 105).

16.11 τα τε Επινίκια τα σμικρότερα: For the distinction between a triumph and an ovation, see Aulus Gellius (5.6.21-27), who includes among the reasons for the awarding of the latter "hostium nomen humile et non idoneum est, ut servorum piratarumque" (section 21). It is possible that Gaius had earlier been awarded the privilege, either because of the treaty struck with Artabanus or as a result of the detection of a conspiracy (cf. G. Rohde RE "ovatio" col. 1902-1903: "Vielleicht feierte Caligula die ovatio auf Grund eines Senatsbeschlusses vom vorhergehenden Jahre, den er aber damals zurückgewiesen hatte"). Gaius was to celebrate another ovation, on his return from the north in A.D. 40 (see Chapters 23.2 and 25.5). Although normally reserved for members of the imperial family, an ovatio was later granted by Claudius to Aulus Plautius for his part in the conquest of Britain (Dio 60.30.2; Suet. Claud. 24.3; Tac. Ann. 13.32.3). On ovatio in general, see H.S. Versnel Triumphus pp. 165-70.
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

17.1 

Dio is the only author to give any clear indication of the date of the bridge. Suetonius (Caio 19) includes it under the acts of the Emperor rather than the Monster, while Josephus (AJ 19.1.1 [5-6]) and Seneca (Brev. Vit. 18.5) both suggest a time near the end of Gaius' reign. For reasons that will become clear in the following comments, it seems most likely that this spectacular demonstration took place in the summer of A.D. 39, before Gaius' trip to Germany.

17.1 

There is some disagreement in our sources concerning the western terminus of the bridge. Josephus (AJ 19.1.1 [5-6]) says that it extended from Dicaearchia (= Puteoli: cf. Jos. Vit. 1.3 [16]) to Misenum, a distance he gives as 30 stades. Suetonius, in an otherwise corrupt passage (Caio 19.1), gives Baiae as the western end; but since Bauli was sometimes considered a district of Baiae (cf. Pliny HN 9.81.172: "apud Baulos in parte Baiana"), we need not accept Oudendorp's emendation of the MS "Baiarum" to "Baulorum."

The location of ancient Bauli itself has also caused some argument. Pliny at one point (HN 3.5.61) suggests that it lay between Baiae and Puteoli, and this vagueness is not helped by Tacitus (Ann. 14.4.4), who places it between Misenum and Balianus lacus, which probably refers to the Lucrine lake (but cf. Furneaux ad loc.). Although some have favoured the more northerly punta dell'Epitaffio, it has always been tempting to associate the site with modern Bacoli, which is situated between Misenum and Baiae: this identification has been convincingly defended by A. Maiuri (RAI 2 [1941] 249-60). For a concise summary of the debate, see J.H. d'Arms Romans on the Bay of Naples p. 181.
Bauli was identified with the resting-place (βόδουλος) of Hercules with the herd of Geryon (cf. Sil. 12.156). Hortensius the orator had owned a villa there, renowned for its murenae; this later came into the possession of Antonia, Gaius' grandmother (Pliny HN 9.81.172). For Bauli in general, see A.G. McKay *Ancient Campania* 1.76-91.

17.1 σταδίους ἑξ καὶ εἴκοσι: Whatever the accepted identification of the site of ancient Bauli, none of our sources seems to have recorded accurate distances in the area. Josephus (*AJ* 18.7.2 [249]) greatly underestimates the distance from Puteoli to Baiae, declaring it to be only five stades. Suetonius (*Caio* 19.1) gives the length of Gaius' bridge as 3600 passus, or 3.60 Roman miles (= 4.8 km); while Dio, who apparently reckons 7.5 stades in a Roman mile rather than the more usual 8.0 (cf. 52.21.2 and Casaubon's emendation thereto), gives a figure of 3.46 Roman miles (= 4.6 km). The actual distance by sea from Puteoli to modern Bacoli is 3.60 km, and to the alternative punta dell'Epitaffio, 3.00 km (H. Nissen *Italische Landeskunde* 2.733, note 9). It seems likely, then, that Dio, who was familiar with the area, gave the distance by road rather than by water.


17.2 λιμός ...: Cf. Seneca *Brev. Vit.* 18.5: "C. Caesar perit, si quis inferis sensus est, hoc gravissime ferens, quod sciebat populo Romano superstiti septem aut octo certe dierum cibaria superesse, dum ille pontes navibus iungit et viribus imperi ludit, aderat ultimum malorum obsessis quoque, alimentorum egestas." Gaius was last in Campania
in the summer of A.D. 40 (see on Chapter 25.5 ἐπελθὼν), but it seems unlikely that this pageant was performed after his return from the north (see on section 7). This passage of Seneca is suspect on grounds other than its chronology, since we hear nothing in Philo and Suetonius about the threat of a famine in Gaius' reign; nor should we necessarily accept as an explanation of this omission Seneca's statement in the same passage that the scarcity of food was not common knowledge because those in charge of the annona "summa dissimulatione tantum inter viscera latentis mali tegebant, cum ratione scilicet: quaeam enim ignorantibus aegris curanda sunt." Seneca is perhaps associating with Gaius the potential famine of A.D. 42, which prompted Claudius to plan his new harbour at Ostia (Dio 60.11.1-5): even this insufficiency was not due to any misconduct on the part of the Emperor, but rather occurred "ob assiduas sterilitates" (Suet. Claud. 18.2), which presumably had been experienced during Gaius' reign as well.

17.3 ἀνάπαυλαι ἐν αὐτῇ ...: Suetonius (Gaius 19.1) gives a much less graphic description of the roadway itself, saying only "superiectoque terreno ac directo in Appiae viae formam." However, his account of Gaius' pleasure barges used off the Campanian coast bears a certain resemblance to Dio's picture of the elaborate fittings of the bridge: "Fabricavit et deceris Liburnicas gemmatis puppibus, versicoloribus velis, magna thermarum et porticum et tricliniorum laxitate magnaque etiam vitium et pomiferarum arbore varietate; quibus discumbens de die inter choros ac symphonias litora Campaniae peragraret" (37.2). Two massive craft which fit this description have been discovered, not on the coast, but in Lake Nemi (see G. Ucelli Le Navi de Nemi [Rome, 1940]), and can be dated to Gaius' reign or later from lead water pipes found on
board and stamped with the Emperor's name. It is certainly possible that Dio's account of the ἀνάτομαλν and καταλύσεις, which probably were erected on the bridge (but which Balsdon dismisses as "probably a later and imaginary pendant to the story [Gaius p. 51]), owes some of its detail to these pleasure barges, which Dio could not have seen but whose fame could have been preserved, particularly in local tales.

17.3 τὸν τε θώρακα τὸν Αλεξάνδρου: Suetonius does not mention this detail, although he does say that Gaius sometimes wore Alexander's breastplate, which had been removed from his sarcophagus, perhaps by Augustus when he had had his tomb opened (Suet. Gaius 52; cf. Aug. 18.1). It was perhaps significant that Gaius wore the thorax at this demonstration (see on section 11), since Alexander served as a model for most of the ambitious and successful generals of the late Republic and early Empire (for a discussion of the following references, see J.P.V.D. Balsdon JRS 26 [1936] 159-60): for Pompey, who wore his χλαμύς in his triumph of 61 B.C. (App. Mith. 117; Plu. Pomp. 46); for Julius Caesar (Suet. Caes. 7.1) and his lieutenant Antony (Plu. Ant. 54.8); for the Emperor Augustus throughout his long career (Cic. Phil. 5.17.48; Suet. Aug. 18; 50; 94.5); and particularly for Gaius' father, Germanicus (Tac. Ann. 2.73).

17.3 χλαμύδα σηρικήν ἄλουργή ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 19.2: "aureaque chlamyde." This garment seems to be the Latin paludamentum, a kind of general's cloak (Varro LL 7.37). Claudius was accustomed to wear it during gladiatorial games (Dio 60.17.9), as well as at the maritime games on the Fucine Lake in A.D. 52, when Nero and even Agrippina were dressed similarly (Dio 60.33.3; Tac. Ann. 12.56.5; cf. Pliny's
description of Agrippina on the occasion as "indutam paludamento aureo 
textili sine alia materia" [HN 33.19.63]).

17.3 λίθους ἰνδικούς: These gems were probably margarita or pearls (cf. 
    Pliny HN 36.9.51; Petr. Sat. 55.6: "baca Indica"); 
or perhaps onyxes (cf. Pliny HN 37.24.90).

    According to tradition, the wreath of oak leaves 
    (corona cívica) was first given by Romulus to Hostus Hostilius for being 
    the first Roman to enter Fidenae. Conditions governing its award were added 
    later: "civem servare, hostem occidere, ut ne eum locum in quo sit actum 
    hostis optineat eo die, ut servatus fateatur--alias testes nihil prosunt--ut 
    cīvis fuerit" (Pliny HN 16.5.11-12; cf. Livy 6.20.7). In 27 B.C. a decree 
    of the Senate granted Augustus the corona cívica to symbolize his perennial 
    victory over his enemies (Dio 53.16.4; cf. RG 34.2: "ο τε δρύινος στέφανος 
    δ διδόμενος έπι σωτηρίαν τῶν πολείτων"). The same privilege may have been 
    among the unnamed honours given to Gaius after his accession (see Chapter 
    3.1-2; Suet. Gaius 16.2); certainly within the first year of his reign the 
    inscription OB C S (ob civem servatum) is found on coinage (BMC Imp. 1.150, 
    no. 29, 32; 152, no. 38).

17.4 ἐς τὴν πόλιν: That is, into Puteoli.

17.5 τῆς ὑστεραϊάς: Suetonius (Gaius 19.2) says that he rode back and 
    forth each day, and does not indicate from which end 
    he began.
17.5 οἱ ἀδήλται ὑποί οἱ ἄξιονικότατοι: Cf. Suet. Gaius 19.2: "cur-
riculoque biungi famosorum equorum."

17.5 Δαρείος ἀνήρ Ἀρσακίδης: Cf. Suet. Gaius 19.2: "prae se ferens Dareum
puerum ex Parthorum obsidibus." The son of
Artabanus III (cf. Jos. AJ 18.4.5 [103]), young Darius had been sent to
Rome as a hostage after Vitellius made peace with the Parthian king in
A.D. 37 (see Chapter 27.3: "καὶ παῖδας αὐτοῦ ὀμήρους λαβὼν"). For the
significance of Darius' presence in the spectacle, see on section 11.

17.6 οἱ τε φίλοι καὶ οἱ ἐταῖροι αὐτοῦ: These were probably the amici
Augusti who might form the consilium principis to aid the Emperor in legal, administrative, and provincial
matters (cf. Suet. Tib. 55). Although Gaius had undertaken not to interfere
in whatever administrative and judicial functions remained with the Senate
and magistrates (see Chapter 6.1; Suet. Gaius 16.2), there can be no doubt
that important criminal cases and extraordinary official matters were from
the beginning discussed in closed meetings of the Emperor with leading
senators and such transitory amici as Macro and Silanus (see, for example,
Chapter 18.1). On the presence of a consilium during Gaius' reign, see
J. Crook Consilium Principis pp. 39-40; and on Chapter 5.5 ἄρχησατο.

While Dio has ὁ στρατός following Gaius in the procession, Suetonius
(Gaius 19.2) is more specific—and more accurate—in mentioning the
Praetorian Guard, since they were the only troops stationed in Italy at
this time.
17.8 χρήματά τε: Such a military donative, as opposed to the public congiarium, was repeated only twice, during Gaius' northern expedition (Chapter 22.7; 25.3).

17.9 συχνώς μὲν τῶν ἑταίρων ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 32.1: "Puteolis dedicatione pontis, ... cum multos e litore invitasset ad se, repente omnis praecipitavit, quosdam gubernacula apprehendentes contis remisque detrusit in mare." What is here used by our sources as an example of Gaius' natural cruelty was perhaps in reality a festive naumachia of the kind instituted by Julius Caesar (Suet. Caes. 44.1; Vell. 2.56.1), and later presented by Augustus (Suet. Aug. 43.1; RG 23; Vell. 2.100.2), Claudius (Tac. Ann. 12.56; Dio 60.33.3; Suet. Claud. 21.6), and Nero (Dio 61.9.5; Suet. Nero 12.1).

17.9 θάλασσαν γῆν: So, too, had Xerxes made the sea into land when he bridged the Hellespont (see following note) and the land into sea when he cut a channel through the isthmus at Athos (Hdt. 7.22-23).

For Darius' crossing of the Bosporus, see particularly Hdt. 4.85-88; for Xerxes at the Hellespont, Hdt. 7.33-37. The distance spanned by Gaius was indeed much greater than that bridged by either of the Persian kings: at its narrowest part the width of the Bosporus was either four stadia (Hdt. 4.85.3 [cf. How and Wells ad loc.]; Str. 2.5.23; Pliny HN 4.12.76 ["latitudine quingentorum passuum qua Darius pater Xerxis copias ponte transvexit"]) or five stadia (Plb. 4.43.2; Str. 7.6.1); the Hellespont was seven stadia wide where Xerxes crossed, between Sestos and Abydos (Hdt. 4.85.4; 7.34.1; Str. 2.5.22; 13.1.22; Pliny HN 4.11.49). Merivale (5.423, n. 1) has pointed out that it is strange that Gaius' exploit is not mentioned by Roman poets when referring to the crossings of Darius and Xerxes, although the comparison would have been obvious (cf. Luc. 2.672-674; Juv. 10.174-176). It is perhaps surprising that the bridging of the Hellespont does not appear as a *topos* in the writings of Seneca Rhetor.

Suetonius, in addition to the reason given above, records two other possible motivations for constructing the bridge: that Gaius hoped thereby to intimidate Germany and Britain with a display of his power; or (the reason favoured by Suetonius, who heard it from his grandfather) that he wished to prove correct the prediction of Thrasyllus that Gaius would no more become Emperor than cross the Bay of Baiae on horseback. The former explanation may contain a kernel of the truth; but as for the latter, there were easier ways for Gaius to fulfil the prophecy (although they perhaps did not satisfy his desire for ostentation), if indeed he felt it necessary at all to vindicate Thrasyllus' credibility.

Seneca (*Brev. Vit.* 18.5-6) sees the performance simply as another example of the Emperor's insane orientalizing ("furiosi et externi et infeliciter superbi regis imitatio"). The unsatisfactory explanation of
Josephus (Ant. 19.1.1 [5-6]) is that Gaius thought it tiresome to have to cross the bay in a trireme; not very perceptive, but closer to the mark, is his later comment that Gaius considered himself lord of the sea as well as the land. Many recent historians have been no more profound in their interpretations of Gaius' motivations. Maurer (pp. 100-101) saw the bridge as a great spectaculum with no hidden purpose, a magnificent display described by Suetonius in the midst of the Emperor's other "entertainments." In a similar manner, Garzetti (L'Impero pp. 94-95) declared it to be simply a manifestation of the bases of Gaius' concept of absolute power, and with rather obtuse logic thought the sacrifice to Envy to be a glorification of the Emperor's own omnipotence. The suggestion of R. Lugand (REAJ 32 [1930] 10-13), that Gaius was imitating a Parthian custom by acting as the sun traversing the sky, assumes that the Emperor was consciously displaying his own divinity, but the date of the bridge is against this. Quidde, on the other hand (Caligula p. 11), attributes Gaius' behaviour to what he sees as the Emperor's pervading passion for the sea.

The most intelligent solution has been offered by Balsdon (Gaius pp. 52-54), who, following Suetonius, finds the clue to the whole spectacle in this last section of Dio's chapter. The bridge, he says, was an attempt to impress on the Parthians the strength of Roman arms and technology, for before the treaty obtained by Vitellius Artabanus had been boasting that he was prepared to conquer the lands which had been taken from the Persians by Alexander (Tac. Ann. 6.31.2). Here, then, are explanations of the presence of young Darius in the ceremony and of the pejorative references to the two Achaemenid monarchs, of whom the Parthians considered themselves successors; here, too, the reason for Gaius wearing the thorax of Alexander the Great: not only had he been the last westerner to conquer Persian
territory, but he had successfully crossed the Hellespont to do it (Arr. An. 1.11.6; Curtius 2 [summary]). The extravagant display according to Balsdon, then, was a primitive form of military deterrent.

One further point should be made. Suetonius (Gaius 37.3) talks of moles which Gaius had built out into the sea. Could the affair of the bridge, including the previously mentioned naumaquia, have been a dedicatory ceremony for a new breakwater constructed out from the western shore of the bay opposite the main pier at Puteoli (Quidde [Caligula p. 9] unwittingly implied this same interpretation)? The suggestion of L.H. Savile (Antiquity 15 [1941] 228) that the bridge "probably had also the military object of protecting the upper end of the bay of Naples against attack by sea" is hardly worth considering, since it suggests piratical activity for which there is no evidence. But the complete dependence of Rome on grain imported through Puteoli particularly from the East, and the vagaries of winter weather in the Mediterranean, were soon to prompt Claudius to begin work on a new and supposedly more protected harbour at the mouth of the Tiber. We know, too, that Gaius contemplated, but had no time to begin, another harbour near Rhegium and a canal through the Isthmus of Corinth, both projects designed to aid the transport of eastern grain (see on Chapter 10.5). Although it is not yet possible to attribute to the reign of Gaius those masonry remains recently discovered a kilometre offshore from the punta dell'Epitaffio, and identified by A. Franciscis as probably a mole (Archaeology 20 [1967] 215), such an explanation of Gaius' bridge must be considered along with other sensible proposals, none of which it necessarily excludes (on the construction of molés, see Vitr. 5.12).
18.1 διὰ τὰς οὐσίας: Cf. Suet. Gaius 38.1: "exhaustus igitur atque egens ad rapinas convertit animum vario et exquisitissimo calumniarum et auctionum et vectigalium genere." The calumniæ were probably trials for maestas (see particularly Chapter 10.7-8); for auctiones see Chapters 14.1-4 and 21.4-6; and for vectigalia Chapter 28.8-11 (A.D. 40). It has already been shown (Chapter 2.6) that bankruptcy of the imperial fiscus at any time during Gaius' reign was very unlikely.

It was an exceptional occurrence when Gaius confiscated for himself the property of a condemned man: it was normally sold at public auction. The only specific example we have of such behaviour follows the conviction of Aulus Avillius Flaccus, the prefect of Egypt, about which Philo reports: "μυρίων δεμοπράτων γενομένων οὐσιῶν, αι τῶν κατακρίτων ἤσαν, μόνην τὴν τοῦ Φλάκκου ταμιευθηναί τῷ αὐτοκράτορι" (in Flacc. 18.150 [539]; cf. Willrich Caligula p. 426). In addition, Gaius took a large step towards discouraging delation by reducing the informers' fees to one-eighth of the property of their victims (Jos. AJ 19.1.16 [131]), from the minimum of one-quarter that had been customary under Augustus and Tiberius (Tac. Ann. 4.20.3; cf. Dio 58.16.1; Suet. Nero 10.1).

18.1 ἕδικαξε ...: According to Republican precedent, the Emperor by virtue of his imperium was empowered to sit in judgement on any criminal cases, either by himself (e.g. Suet. Aug. 33; Tac. Ann. 11.2.1), or with the Senate as a high court (e.g., Tac. Ann. 3.12.1; see Chapter 19.7), or as an assessor in a regular praetorian court (e.g., Dio 57.7.6; Suet. Tib. 33; Tac. Ann. 1.75.1). We know, for example, of one instance when Gaius used the Senate as a judicial consilium: in A.D. 39 he presided at the trial
of Domitian Afer, perhaps for *maiestas* (see Chapter 19.3). While the Emperors most often restricted their participation to treason trials, they were sometimes present at lesser hearings (cf. Dio 54.30.4; 55.33.5-34.1 [Augustus]; Dio 57.7.2; 57.19.1b; Suet. *Tib.* 33 [Tiberius]; Dio 60.4.3; 60.33.8; Suet. *Claud.* 12.2; 14 [Claudius]; Suet. *Nero* 15.1 [Nero]). For discussions of the criminal jurisdiction of the Senate and the Emperors, see Hammond *Augustan Principate* passim; *CAH* 10.169-172; Rogers *Criminal Trials* pp. 180-82. According to McFayden ("Jurisdiction" pp. 242-49) there was no separate court of the Princeps: he may have given a pretrial hearing (*cognitio*) together with his *consilium*, but he never passed sentence. While this last statement may be true under some Emperors (but see below, section 2), it was a result not of their lack of appropriate power but of a desire to leave some responsibility—preferably when it involved a potentially unpopular decision—to the Senate and regular *quaestiones* (cf. Jolowicz and Nicholas *Roman Law* pp. 324-25; 395-97).

Suetonius records that Gaius often threatened to do away with all lawyers, to prevent them from giving opinions contrary to his own (*Gaius* 34.2).

18.2 οὐ μέντοι καὶ αὐτοτελῆς ἢν: It was possible to appeal to the Emperor a conviction by magistrates or by the Senate (cf. Chapter 8.5). In 30 B.C., according to Dio (51.19.6), Augustus was given the power ἔκκλησιν ὑποδίκασεν: that is, he could receive *appellationes* and veto the decision of an equal or inferior magistrate within the pomerium (cf. McFayden "Jurisdiction" pp. 232-33). Dio, for example, has Maecenas advise Augustus to sit in private judgement over cases that come to him on appeal or are referred to him from other officials (Dio 52.33.1). Emperors could refuse to admit a case for trial (e.g., Tac. *Ann.* 3.70.2), could
lighten the court's sentence (e.g., Tac. Ann. 3.18.1), or could exercise full pardon (Dio 60.4.1-2; see A.H. Greenidge CR 8 [1894] 429-37). The potential abuse of these privileges perhaps lies behind Philo's statement that Gaius thought of himself as the sole source of law (Leg. 17.119 [562]): certainly the belief that a ruler represented incarnate Law was a Hellenistic one with which Philo must have been familiar and which would have appealed to the autocratic spirit in Gaius, but there is no evidence that it had become official dogma by this time: the concept of νόμος ἐμφύχιος does not appear in Roman law until the time of Justinian.

On the right of appeal to the Emperor, see Jolowicz and Nicholas Roman Law pp. 400-401.

18.2 ἀλλως ἐφανερωτό: That is, in the acta senatus, a record of the proceedings of the Senate begun in 59 B.C. by Julius Caesar (Suet. Caes. 20.1), apparently abandoned by Augustus (Suet. Aug. 36), but re instituted by Tiberius (Tac. Ann. 5.4.1; Suet. Tib. 73.1).

18.2 τὰ δονόματα ἐξετίθετο: This was presumably done, not for the reason suggested here by Dio, but to prevent such suspicion about secret trials conducted by the Emperor as had arisen under Tiberius (see on Chapter 9.4 τοὺς τε λογισμούς). It is worth noting that Tiberius, too, almost never took the responsibility of personally condemning a defendant, but usually passed it on to the Senate to avoid any reproach of concealment (compare Tac. Ann. 6.10.2 with 3.10.6).

18.3 ἀπὸ τῶν Καπιτωλίων: Traitors as well as criminals guilty of various offences were sometimes hurled from the Tarpeian rock, after which their bodies were displayed in the Forum (cf. D.H. 8.78.5).
In Tiberius' reign, for example, this form of execution was inflicted on an astrologer (Tac. Ann. 2.32.5: the practice of astrology was a treasonable offence [Dio 57.15.8; Suet. Tib. 36]), a Spaniard convicted of incest with his daughter (Tac. Ann. 6.19.1), and some of the condemned supporters of Seianus (Dio 58.15.3); a son who had perhaps falsely accused his father was threatened with this same punishment (Tac. Ann. 4.29.2). On this form of punishment see Garnsey Social Status pp. 34-35.

18.3 τοῖς ἔξελαυνομένοις: Cf. Suet. Gaius 28: "opinans sibi quoque exules suos mortem imprecari, misit circum insulas, qui universos contrucidarent." Philo gives a somewhat fuller account (in Place. 21.180-185): the story was ("φωκίν" [sec. 183]) that one sleepless night Gaius contemplated the great number of prominent men in exile and, when he realized that they had actually obtained a peaceful existence, he composed a list of the most distinguished ("τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους" [sec. 185]), who were to be executed. Flaccus, whose name was first on the list, is the only victim specifically identified. See also Philo Leg. 43.341-342 (595-596).

18.4 Καλουσίος δὲ ὁ Σαβῖνος: Gaius Calvisius Sabinus (PIR² C 354) had been consul ordinarius in A.D. 26, together with Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus (Tac. Ann. 4.46.1). Six years later he was among four other senators accused of maestas, but was released when a tribune of the urban cohort, who was one of the informers, intervened on his behalf (Tac. Ann. 6.9; Rogers Criminal Trials pp. 138-39). He is not mentioned at all by Suetonius, and Dio does not give the charge against him now. It seems likely, however, that it was one of treason: Sabinus was perhaps involved in a conspiracy to incite his Pannonian legions to revolt
in support of Gaetulicus' planned rising with the German armies that same year (so Balsdon *Gaius* p. 71; see on Chapter 22.5 Γαίτούλικον). It seems unlikely that he is the same Sabinus as the one used by Seneca as an example of the very wealthy, pretentious, and ignorant man in the mould of Trimalchio (*Ep.* 27; cf. *PIR*² C 351).

18.4 τοὺς στρατιώτας ἄσκοντας ἱδοὺς: Cornelia, who was probably the sister of Gaetulicus (cf. *PIR*² C 1479; Garzetti *L'Impero* p. 95), seems to have been arraigned on a double charge of adultery and maiestas, a not uncommon pair of accusations in the time of Tiberius (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.50; 3.22; 4.52 [see on Chapter 19.1 κατηγορεῖται]; 6.29.4-7 [Dio 58.24.3-5]; 6.47-48 [Dio 58.27.2-5]; Rogers *Criminal Trials* pp. 27-28; 51-56; 92-93; 151-54; 162-64). That she had observed her husband's troops during their exercises was not in itself an indictable offence: Gaius' mother, Agrippina, and her archenemy Plancina, the wife of Piso, had both done so with impunity (Tac. *Ann.* 1.69; 2.55.5). In fact, it was the governor himself who was considered accountable for misbehaviour on the part of his wife (Tac. *Ann.* 4.20.6; cf. 3.33-34). That Cornelia was guilty of adultery is known from Tacitus (*Hist.* 1.48.4), who tells the story of her crime in more detail. She was accustomed to visit the camp dressed as a soldier and to have sexual relations with (among others) the guards on duty. One night, however, she was apprehended in the headquarters building with Titus Vinius, a minor officer at the time. Dio alone records her fate; her lover was imprisoned, but was released after Gaius' death. Plutarch (*Galba* 12) gives a similar account to Tacitus', but says that Vinius was responsible for bringing Cornelia into camp.
18.5 Τίτιος Ποσίφος: Cf. *PIR*¹ Τ 201. He is not mentioned elsewhere. It is interesting that Gaius appears in this incident as the defender of the Senate's insulted *dignitas*.

18.5 Ὀουνίδος τῆς Πρίσκος: Cf. *PIR*² I 801. Similarly in this year a certain Julius Sacerdos is said to have been killed when he was confused with another of the same name (see Chapter 22.4).
19.1 ἐν Ἀφροῖς συν Δομίτιος: Cf. PIR² D 126. His full name was Cn. Domitius Afer (ILS 3068). He had been praetor shortly before A.D. 26 (Tac. Ann. 4.52.1).

19.1 Κατηγορηκέται: The victim of Afer's prosecution in A.D. 26 was Claudia Pulchra, who, with a certain Furnius, was accused and convicted of adultery and attempted poisoning of the Emperor (Tac. Ann. 4.52.1-2, 6). Tacitus calls her Agrippina's sobrina (i.e., cousin on her mother's side): she seems to have been the daughter of Claudia Marcella (one of the children of C. Marcellus and Octavia, Augustus' sister) and M. Valerius Messalla Barbatus Appianus (cf. PIR² C 1116).

\[
\begin{align*}
C. \text{Octavius} &= \text{Atia} \\
C. \text{Marcellus} &= \text{Octavia minor} & C. \text{Octavius} &= \text{Scribonia} \\
| & \quad & | & \quad & | \\
\text{Claudia Marcella} &= \text{Barbatus} & M. \text{Vipsanius Agrippa} &= \text{Julia} \\
| & \quad & | \\
\text{Claudia Pulchra} & & \text{Agrippina}
\end{align*}
\]

Since her son was named Quintilius Varus (Tac. Ann. 4.66.1), it seems likely that Claudia Pulchra had been married to the unfortunate Varus whose army was destroyed by the Germans in A.D. 9 (Dio 56.18-24; Tac. Ann. 1.3.6; 1.10.3).

Agrippina's supporters had been suffering prosecutions before Afer became active. Seianus had played on Tiberius' fear of his ambitious daughter-in-law by claiming that "diductam civitatem ut civili bello; esse qui se partium Agrippinae vocent, ac ni resistatur, fore pluris; neque aliud gliscentis discordiae remedium quam si unus altere maxime prompti subverterentur" (Tac. Ann. 4.17.4). The result was accusations laid against
C. Silius and Titius Sabinus in A.D. 24 (Tac. *Ann.* 4.18-19: Silius committed suicide), and against P. Suillius Rufus in the same year (Tac. *Ann.* 4.31: he was banished). After his successful prosecution of Claudia Pulchra two years later, Afer went on to prosecute her son, Quintilius Varus, in A.D. 27, but the trial was postponed and apparently never held (Tac. *Ann.* 4.66). Then Sabinus, who had avoided conviction the first time, was accused again in A.D. 28 and executed: Tacitus calls him the last friend of Germanicus' family (Tac. *Ann.* 4.68-70; Dio 58.1).

It is tempting to see behind these prosecutions, particularly that of Claudia and Furnius since it involved a charge of poisoning, a conspiracy against Tiberius by those who supported Agrippina's claim that she was the true descendent of Augustus—a claim that provoked from Tiberius the reply, "si non dominaris, ... filiola, iniuriam te accipere existimas?" (Suet. *Tib.* 53.1; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.52.6). For Domitius Afer and Claudia Pulchra, see R.S. Rogers *TAPhA* 62 (1931) 153-54.

Perhaps the reason why Afer was brought to trial before the Senate at this time was that Gaius, while reading those incriminating letters he had supposedly burned (see Chapter 16.3), discovered the part he had played in the prosecutions of Agrippina's associates. Gaius was, however, living in Rome during the trials and must have had some knowledge of the proceedings then.

19.2 ἀλλ' Ἀγαμέμνων: Agamemnon = Tiberius. The line is adapted from Homer's *Iliad*, 1.335-336, where Achilles addresses Talthybius and Eurybates, the messengers of Agamemnon who have come to remove the concubine Briseis:

"ἐξεχνεῖν ἢτ· οὐ τί μοι ἔπαυσε ἐπαίτιοι, ἀλλ' Ἀγαμέμνων, ὃ σφῆν προῖει βρισιδὸς εἶνεκα κούρης."
19.2 εἰκόνα τινὰ αὐτοῦ: Gaius had forbidden the erection of statues to himself shortly after his accession (see Chapter 4.4).

19.3 τὸ τι μετροκλίδες: Although consul for the first time at age 24 (see Chapter 6.5), Gaius was not the youngest Roman to hold that magistracy. Octavian, who had not even been quaestor, was made consul on 19 August 43 B.C., more than a month before his twentieth birthday. (Dio 46.45; 56.30.5; Tac. Ann. 1.9.1; Feriale Cumanum = ILS 108 = E&J p. 50). Augustus realized that his own case must be exceptional, however, and in 24 B.C. gave Marcellus, his intended successor, the right to stand for the consulship only ten years earlier than the normal age of 43 (Dio 53.28.3; cf. 52.20.1-2).

For a similar example of Gaius' sensitivity about his youthfulness, see Chapter 13.6.

19.3 προέχειν ἀπάντων τῶν ἰητῶν: Our sources are agreed that Gaius, despite his many faults, was an exceptional orator. Josephus (AJ 19.2.5 [208]) calls him "μαθαίνως δὲ ἰητῶρ τε Ἐρυστος"; Tacitus (Ann. 13.3.6) comments that even his deranged mind did not affect the vigor of his speech; and in Suetonius (Gaius 53) he is described as *facundus* and *promptus* in speech, and as devoting more time to the refinement of his oratory than to the study of literature: "solebat etiam prosperis oratorum actionibus rescribere et magnorum in senatu reorum accusationes defensionesque meditari."

He was too young to have benefited directly from the literary talents of his father, Germanicus, of whom Suetonius says "ingenium in utroque eloquentiae doctrinaire genere praecellens" (Gaius 3.1); but he probably
had received instruction on Capri from the intellectuals in attendance on Tiberius there (Tac. Ann. 4.58.1). Regarding Gaius' education and his love for oratory, see E.R. Parker AjPh 67 (1946) 42-44.

None of his speeches, of course, has survived, but it is clear from the few sententiae preserved in the sources (e.g., Chapters 8.5; 8.8; 13.6; 28.6; 29.2; Suet. Gaius 23.2; 29.1-2; 30.2; 32.3; 33; 55.1; 56.2) that he had a sharp wit, which is usually interpreted by his solemn biographers as evidence of his shameless cruelty: Philo describes them as "τὰ πολλὶμφημα Γαίος λόγιο" (Leg. 14.110 [561]; cf. the comment of Quidde [Caligula p. 12]: "inbesondere ihm die Kunst, zu verletzen und zu schmähen, eigen war").

19.3 δεινότατοι εἰπεῖν: Quintilian, who was a follower of Domitius Afer (cf. Pliny Ep. 2.14), considered him one of the outstanding orators of his day: "eorum quos viderim Domitius Afer et Iulius Africanus longe praestantissimi. arte ille et toto genere dicendi praeferendus et quem in numero veterum habere non timeas" (10.1.118; cf. Tac. Dial. 13.3; 15.3).

19.4 ἀντεἰπε μὲν οὖν οὐδὲν: The tactic of concealing artifice, sometimes by saying nothing at all, in order to render one's rhetoric more effective was part of the repertoire of many post-Augustan orators. Tacitus, for example, mentions a certain Claudius Cossus, "notae facundiae sed dicendi artem apta trepidatione occultans atque eo validior" (Hist. 1.69). Even the loquacious Pliny used this strategy on occasion: "accepi enim non minus interdum oratorium esse tacere quam dicere. atque adeo repeto me quibusdam capitis reis vel magis silentio quam oratione accuratissima profuisse" (Ep. 7.6.7-8).
19.5 οὗτος: That is, fearing the orator in him rather than the Caesar.

19.6 Καλλιστός: C. Iulius Callistus (cf. PIR² I 229) was one of the most powerful imperial freedmen. According to Josephus (AJ 19.1.10 [64-69]) he inspired fear in those who had dealings with him and amassed great wealth from bribes, with the result that his power was equal to that of the Emperor (cf. Sen. Ep. 47.9; Pliny HN 36.7.60). He was part of at least two conspiracies against Gaius, including the successful one of A.D. 41 (see Chapters 25.7-8; 29.1; cf. Suet. Gaius 56.1). After Claudius' accession, he claimed to have once been ordered by Gaius to poison his uncle, but to have refrained: Josephus (AJ 19.1.10 [64]) was probably right in seeing this as a lie, an attempt to ingratiate himself with the new Emperor. His effort was apparently effective, however, for he remained a powerful figure in Claudius' court, where he held the position of secretary a libellis (Dio 60.30.6b; cf. Tac. Ann. 11.29.1). After the death of Messalina in A.D. 48, Callistus favoured Lollia Paulina rather than Agrippina as Claudius' next wife (Tac. Ann. 12.1.3; see on Chapter 12.1 καὶ ἔκεινην). This misjudgement undoubtedly led to a steady weakening of his power until his death, sometime before A.D. 51 (Dio 60.33.3a).

19.7 ἔσωθε: He was made suffect consul by Gaius later in the same year (see Chapter 20.1), and became curator aquarum in A.D. 49, a position he held until his death ten years later (Frontin. de Aq. 102; Tac. Ann. 14.19.1; cf. Pliny Ep. 8.18). He was still actively pleading cases in A.D. 52 (Dio 60.33.8), although his delivery became increasingly impaired through old age (Quint. 12.11.3-4; Tac. Ann. 4.52.7-8).
Since Gaius openly criticised Seneca's compositions, calling them *commissiones merae* and *harena sine calce* (Suet. *Gaius* 53), it seems hardly likely that he would consider him a threat to his own fame as an orator. It is possible, however, to find elsewhere a reason for the Emperor's anger. In A.D. 41 Seneca was banished by Claudius for adultery with Gaius' sister Julia, who was also exiled, now for the second time, to Pandateria (Dio 60.8.5; Tac. *Ann.* 14.63.2; Suet. *Claud.* 29.1). Was Seneca already involved with Julia in A.D. 39, the year in which she was to be implicated in the conspiracy of Lepidus and Gaetulicus (see Chapter 22.6)? We know, too, that Seneca was later suspected of adultery with Agrippina as well (Dio 61.10.1; cf. 61.12.1). Or did Seneca himself, as Balsdon has suggested (*Gaius* pp. 55-56), invent the story of his imminent death and salvation as a way of explaining the survival of a "good man" under a tyrant (cf. Sen. *Ep.* 7.27.14: "multorum mortem distulit morbus et saluti illis fuit videri perire")?

That Seneca was to be executed by Gaius because of his rhetorical skill, as Dio suggests, is most unlikely; and that Gaius criticised the man's written work, as Suetonius says, is impossible. Seneca's first known publication, the *Consolatio ad Marciam*, did not appear until A.D. 40 at the earliest (see J. Stroux *Philologus* 86 [1931] 349-55; Z. Stewart *AJPh* 74 [1953] 81-82). If Gaius did at this time make the disparaging remarks about Seneca's style, then, as A. Grisart has observed (*Helikon* 1 [1961] 302-308), they must have been directed at Seneca Rhetor rather than his son: the phrase *commissiones merae* may indeed be more suitable for *sententiae* than for the writings of the younger Seneca, and Gaius was, as we have seen, more concerned with rhetoric than literature. For various interpretations of the phrase *harena sine calce*,
see Stroux op. cit. pp. 351-52; Grisart op. cit. p. 305, n. 13; E. Braun

JOEAI 38 (1950) 229-32.

G.W. Clarke (Latomus 24 [1965] 62-69) has convincingly connected the younger Seneca with the conspiracy of A.D. 39, but he thinks that his escape from death occurred earlier, perhaps at the insistence of Agrippina herself (Dio's γιναικι τασι): this, says Clarke, would explain Tacitus' description of Seneca during Nero's rule as fidus in Agrrippinam memoria beneficii (Ann. 12.8.3). But surely the beneficium more easily refers to Claudius' recall of Seneca from exile, prompted as it was by Agrippina? We should, at any rate, consider Seneca's implication in the plot of A.D. 39 as all but certain.

19.8 φθόνος: The disease was apparently empyema, involving an accumulation of pus in the pleural cavity (Hipp. Prog. 18; Galen 6.421; cf. Hipp. Epid. 1.2, where the word refers to tuberculosis).
CHAPTER TWENTY

20.1 τοὺς τότε ἀρχόντας καταλύσας: Soon after his accession Gaius had refused to remove the consuls from office so that he might hold the magistracy himself (Chapter 6.5). It is difficult to believe that he would eject them now for the trivial reasons Dio gives, which are no more than an attempt to indicate in as obvious a way as possible the growing autocracy of the Emperor. The chronology indicates that there may well be, as Balsdon has suggested (Gaius pp. 71-72), a connection between the deposition of the consuls and the cause of the Emperor's sudden departure for the north that same month (see on Chapter 21.2 ἔξαίφνης). For the identity of the suffecti who were removed, see on section 3 ἐκεῖνοι.

20.1 τὰ γενέθλια αὐτοῦ: The chief magistrates were deposed sometime after 31 August, Gaius' birthday (Suet. Gaius 8.1; see on Chapter 7.2 τὰ γενέθλια). The reference to the anniversary of Actium, celebrated on 2 September (Dio 51.1.1; Fasti = E&J p. 51), suggests that their ejection took place in the first week of that month. There followed an interregnum of three days before new suffecti were appointed (Suet. Gaius 26.3).

20.1 ἱερομνιῶν: The word normally means a sacred month (cf. Thuc. 3.56.2), or sacrifices held over a long period of public rejoicing (cf. Dio 39.53.2: twenty days). Here it must refer to a single day of thanksgiving, the equivalent of the Latin supplicatio (so Liddell and Scott; cf. App. BC 5.13.130).
20.1 τῶν στρατηγῶν: For the festal duties of the praetors, see on Chapter 14.2 δύο γάρ.

20.1 ἐπὶ ταῖς τοῦ Ἀὔγουστου νίκαις: Cf. Suet. Gaius 23.1: "Actiacas Siculasque victorias, ut funestas populo Romano et calamitosas, vetuit sollemnisibus feriis celebrari." A distinction must be made between the annual celebration of Augustus' victories at Actium and in Sicily, which were held at Rome on 2 and 3 September respectively (App. BC 15.13.130: "ἐτησίων τε ἱερομνήμων"; Fasti = EJ p. 51; cf. Tac. Ann. 15.23.3), and the quinquennial Actian games, established on the Olympian model by Augustus at his new town of Nicopolis, near Actium itself (Dio 51.1.2; Str. 7.7.6; Jos. BJ 1.20.4 [398]: "μετὰ δὲ τὴν πρώτην Ἀκτιάδα"; Suet. Aug. 18.2; perhaps Tib. 6.4). Dio himself seems unaware of the difference: in 53.1.4-5 (28 B.C.) he first mentions the festival held in Rome, but adds that it was celebrated every four years. Not only does this contradict Appian and the Fasti, but it would mean that the festival, if (as we should assume) it was held regularly, would have fallen in A.D. 37 rather than A.D. 39. There is, unfortunately, no other datable reference to the quinquennial Actia.

20.2 τοῦ Ἀντωνίου ...: Augustus was the maternal grandfather of Gaius' mother, Agrippina, while Antony was the maternal grandfather of Germanicus. Suetonius (Gaius 23.1) says that Gaius' dislike was directed, not at Augustus, but at Agrippa, his mother's father, because of his supposed low birth; and that he even declared his mother to have been born of an incestuous union between Augustus and his daughter Julia. At any rate, the victories in Sicily and at Actium belonged as much to Agrippa as to Octavian.
It is possible that Gaius' grandmother, Antonia, with whom he spent part of his youth (Suet. Gaius 10.1), inspired the future Emperor with the glory of Antony and his achievements, particularly in the East (cf. Willrich Caligula pp. 95-100; J. Colin Latomus 13 [1954] 394-416). Garzetti (L'Impero p. 89) has suggested that Gaius' appreciation of Antony was one of the reasons why, as Emperor, he fostered the concept of an oriental monarchy at Rome. It seems equally likely that, as memory of the civil war faded, Antony's accomplishments were recognized as worthy of approval--his settlement of the East had, after all, been retained almost intact by Augustus (RG 27; cf. Syme Roman Revolution pp. 259-75), and it was most suitable for a descendant of both antagonistic generals to reconcile once again the West and the East, at odds since the propaganda of the last civil war (cf. P. Ceaușescu Historia 22 [1973] 269-83). It is worth noting that Claudius continued Gaius' policy of showing favour towards Antony (Suet. Claud. 11.3).

20.3 ἐκεῖνος μὲν ...: Identification of the suffect consuls of A.D. 39 presents an insoluble problem. At the end of January Gaius had been replaced as consul by Sanquinius Maximus, although the other consul ordinarius, L. Apronius, had been allowed to finish his six-month term (Chapter 13.2). The names of the new suffecti who entered office on 1 July, and who presumably were those now expelled by Gaius, are not known. Domitius Corbulo is a likely candidate, since we know from Dio that he was consul in this year (Chapter 15.5). It is strange, however, that Dio would not mention his subsequent deposition in the same chapter where he does remark on his later punishment under Claudius.

The problem is further complicated by the next sentence in this chapter: "τὸν δὲ δὴ Δομίτιον τὸν συνάρχοντα αὐτοῦ ...." Which Domitius does
Dio mean? To whom does οὗτος refer? Balsdon (Gaius p. 72, n. 1) takes Domitius to be Corbulo, and the οὗτος to be Domitius Afer (so, too, Willrich Caligula p. 452). This interpretation, however, means that the pronoun—as ambiguous in Greek as it is in English—would have as its antecedent a name mentioned three sentences earlier, and separated from it by several other proper names and pronouns. Balsdon's proposal also assumes that Dio was unaware of the confusion that would result from failing to distinguish between two men with the same nomen, one of whom (Corbulo) he elsewhere calls by his cognomen (cf. Chapter 15.5).

Cary and Sturz try to resolve the difficulty by taking οὗτος to refer to Gaius, one of the two subjects of the sentence, and thus dismiss Domitius Corbulo altogether. Such a reading, however, assumes that Gaius either became consul for a second time in the same year—an impossibility, especially since all his consulships are accounted for—or chose Domitius Afer as his colleague for A.D. 40—equally impossible, since his colleague died before the beginning of the year (Chapter 24.2), while Afer lived another twenty years (see on Chapter 19.7 ἔσομη). Nor can the pronoun refer to δ ὁμος, since συνάρχων must be "colleague" rather than "consul" or "magistrate" (cf. Chapter 13.2).

The only certainty, then, is that Domitius Afer replaced one of the ousted suffects in the first week of September. As for his colleague and for the date of Corbulo's consulship, we must admit ignorance. The οὗτος is, I suspect, corrupt and should be obelized.

20.3 ὀπέδωκε μὲν ...: Gaius had restored elections to the Comitia in A.D. 38 (see Chapter 9.6).
20.4 ἐκείνων τε ἄγροτέρων ...: For the construction, cf. Thuc. 7.67.3:

"πολλαὶ (sc. νῆες) ἄγροτεραι, μὲν ἐς τὸ ὅραν τι ὧν βούλονται ἔσονται." Juvenal reflects the same view of the lack of political enthusiasm on the part of the populace at Rome (10.78-81):

"... nam qui dabat olim
imperium, fasces, legiones, omnia, nunc se
continet atque duas tantum res anxius optat,
panem et circenses ...."

20.4 τῶν σπουδαρχιῶντων: The failure of sufficient candidates to present themselves for election was not a new problem. As early as 24 B.C. there was a shortage of aspirants for the quaestorship (Dio 53.28.4), and by 13 B.C. many men of noble families were unwilling to enter public life (Dio 54.26.3).

20.4 τὸ μὲν σχῆμα τῆς δημοκρατίας: Compare Thucydides' comment on the Athenian state under Pericles:

"ἐγίγνετο τε λόγω μὲν δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχῆ" (2.65.9).

20.5 κατελύθησαν: The imperial mints seem to have been slow in removing from the coinage the cap of liberty, which indicated the revival of popular elections: these same issues are being produced up until Gaius' death (BMC Imp. 1.158, no. 79).

20.5 στρατηγοὶ δὲ ...: At the end of the Republic the previously established number of eight praetors elected each year was increased by Julius Caesar to ten (Dio 42.51.3; Suet. Cass. 41.1), although
sometimes as many as sixteen were appointed during his dictatorships (Dio 43.49.1; 43.51.4). Augustus, too, varied the number at the beginning of his reign, settling on ten as the proper number in 23 B.C. (Dio 53.32.2). After A.D. 5, the required number of candidates for the consulship and praetorship was chosen beforehand by a committee of senators and equites, and the list was then presented to the Comitia as a whole (a text of the Tabula Hebana, the source of this information, can be found in *AJPh* 75 [1954] 225-49; E§J 94a). In A.D. 11 there were sixteen candidates for the office of praetor, all of whom were elected to avoid anyone being disappointed; thereafter twelve became the usual number (Dio 56.25.4; but cf. *Digest* 1.2.2.32: "divus deinde Augustus sedecim praetores constituit, post deinde divus Claudius duos praetores adiecit qui de fideicommissi ius dicereunt").

Tiberius, at least initially, followed the example of his predecessor. Since his *imperium* gave him the right to reject unqualified aspirants, he himself nominated all twelve candidates for the praetorship and commended four of them, whose election was thus guaranteed (Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.6; 1.15.2: "quattuor candidatos commendaret, sine repulsa et ambitu designandos": cf. Dio 58.20.3). W.K. Lacey (*Historia* 12 [1963] 167-76) has rightly questioned the difference between *nominatio* and *commendatio*, if only twelve names for the praetorship were presented for election (see, too, A.H.M. Jones *JRS* 45 [1955] 9-21 = *Studies* pp. 29-50). This difficulty has perhaps partly been resolved by A.E. Astin (*Latomus* 28 [1969] 863-74), who regards *nominatio* as having no formal part in the electoral procedure, but as simply the reading of the list of names by the Senate before presentation to the Comitia for ratification. But if, as Tacitus suggests, the number of candidates was always equal to the number of positions, one still wonders about the advantages of receiving the Emperor's *commendatio*. 
By A.D. 33 the number of praetors seems again to have risen to sixteen, although fewer were chosen if there was a dearth of candidates (Dio 58.20.4-5; on the text of this passage, see W.K. Lacey CR 12 [1962] 120). Such was the practice followed by Gaius.

The expanded size of the college under the Principate was probably a result of the praetors' increased responsibilities. Although still primarily judicial officials, they were also liable for the conduct of certain games and festivals (cf. Dio 52.20.5; see on Chapter 14.2 δόε γάρ). On the number of praetors in the early Principate, see particularly Hammond Augustan Principate pp. 136-37; 284, n. 45.

20.6 και βάσκανος και ήποπτος: A further example of his suspicious nature can be found in Suetonius (Gaius 27.4):
"Atellan[i]ae poetae ambigui loci versiculum media amphitheatrum harena igni cremavit."

20.6 Καρρίναν έκκοούθον: Cf. PIR² C 449. He apparently chose Athens as his place of exile, and there committed suicide sometime later (Juv. 7.203-206). The Carrinas Secundus sent by Nero in A.D. 64 to plunder Asia and Greece for masterpieces with which to adorn Rome was probably his son (Tac. Ann. 15.45.3; cf. PIR² C 450).

It is an exaggeration to see in the banishment of this one man "the beginnings of the long quarrel between philosophy and the Principate" (CAH 10.664). We know of only two other philosophers (excepting Seneca) who suffered at the hands of Gaius: Julius Canus, who faced his execution in a manner worthy of his professed Stoicism; and a certain Rectus (Sen. Tranq. 14.4-10; Plu. Moralia fr. 140 [Loeb: fr. 211]). The charges laid against these men are not known (see on Chapter 25.6 τούς συνειδότας).
Lucius Calpurnius Piso (cf. PIR² C 293) was the son of Cn. Calpurnius Piso, who was implicated in the death of Germanicus (see below). The son, too, had originally been called Gnaeus, but after his father's suicide in A.D. 20 he was forced to change his praenomen in order to receive his inheritance (Tac. Ann. 3.17.8; but cf. IG 3.1.601-602 [= 2-3².3.1.4162] for an apparent preservation of his earlier name). The disgrace of his family was short-lived, and Lucius became consul ordinarius in A.D. 27 (Tac. Ann. 4.62.1; Fasti = E§J p. 42; cf. Pliny Ep. 3.7.12). He is probably to be identified with the Piso who, as praefectus urbi late in A.D. 36, was responsible for sending Herod Agrippa to Tiberius on Capreae to answer the charge laid against him by Eutychus (Jos. AJ 18.6.5 [169]; see on Chapter 8.2 Ἀγρίππαν). If so, he still held that position at the time of Gaius' accession (Jos. AJ 18.6.10 [235]), but was replaced by Sanquinius Maximus before 31 January A.D. 38 (Chapter 13.2). There is no epigraphic evidence regarding his proconsulship in Africa. He seems to have still been alive in the reign of Vespasian, when he would have been over eighty years old (Pliny Ep. 3.7.12, and Sherwin-White ad loc.).

Cn. Calpurnius Piso (cf. PIR² C 287), consul with Tiberius in 7 B.C. (Dio 55, index; 55.8.1; 57.20.2; Tac. Ann. 3.16.5), had during his career been legate of Hither Spain (Tac. Ann. 3.13.2) and proconsular governor of Africa (Sen. de Ira 1.18-19). He was noted for his willingness to speak openly in the Senate (e.g., Dio 57.15.9), and Augustus had seen him as a potential rival for the Principate (Tac. Ann. 1.13.2-3).

It was his friendship with Tiberius (cf. Tac. Ann. 3.16.7) that led in A.D. 17 to his appointment as governor of Syria, allegedly to assist Germanicus,
who had been given *mater imperium* over all the eastern provinces (Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.2-7; 3.12.2; Suet. *Tib.* 52.3; *Caesarius* 2; cf. Vell. 2.130.3). Because of the ambiguity of their respective powers and the similarity of their characters, conflict between the two men was unavoidable, and Germanicus finally renounced his *amicitia* with Piso (Tac. *Ann.* 2.70.3). It was, then, inevitable that the subsequent death of the prince should be blamed on Piso, who was alleged, together with his wife, Plancina, to have administered poison to Germanicus at Antioch, supposedly at the instigation of Tiberius himself (Dio 57.18.9-10; Tac. *Ann.* 2.69.5; 2.71.3; Suet. *Tib.* 52.3; *Caesarius* 1.2-2.1). Piso was recalled to Rome. At his trial (see Tac. *Ann.* 3.10-18) he was convicted of having left his province without permission, but the charge of poisoning could not be proven, and even Tacitus admits that it was probably unfounded (Tac. *Ann.* 2.73.5-6; 3.14.2; cf. Pliny *HN* 11.71.187). Piso, however, cut his throat before the final verdict was passed, after proclaiming his innocence in a letter which Tiberius later read aloud to the Senate (Tac. *Ann.* 3.15.6-17.1; cf. Suet. *Caesarius* 2).

Plancina, who had remained loyal to her husband only as long as his defence was going well, managed to be pardoned through Livia's influence over her son (Tac. *Ann.* 3.15.1-3). She was allowed by Tiberius to live, according to our sources (Dio 58.22.5; Tac. *Ann.* 6.26.4), only to irritate her rival, Agrippina. On the death of Agrippina in A.D. 33, however, Plancina was arraigned presumably on the same charge as before, but committed suicide before the trial: her fate, in Tacitus' words, was "sera magis quam inmerita" (*Ann.* 6.26.5).

20.7 δικά τὸ ἔθνος νεώμας: Africa in the early Principate was an exceptional province, since it was the only one left to the Senate in the settlement of 27 B.C. that had a standing legion (except Macedonia, which temporarily had three or four legions: cf. Parker *Legions* pp. 91-92; Dio
53.14.2; there was under Tiberius an additional legion stationed in Africa for a short time [Tac. Ann. 4.5.4; 4.23.2]), the supreme command of all other armies being in the hands of the Princeps through his imperial appointees, the legati. Why was Africa an exception, especially since it was an important source of grain for Rome and Italy?

In the first place, Africa in 27 B.C. must have seemed fairly well pacified. Unlike the situation in other frontier provinces, there was no threat of an organized effort by the hostile border tribes to invade the area: all that seemed needed was an effective policing unit to repel minor raiding parties. Secondly, because the Emperor held Egypt himself and so had an assured source of grain for Italy, Rome could always avoid famine even if, in the most drastic circumstances, Africa were to be lost either to the interior tribes or to a rebellious general. Finally, by giving Africa to the Senate Augustus stood to gain some support from that body, since he was allowing it to govern an important province which was, at any rate, commercially controlled by the senatorial order. The extensive holdings of senators occupied by far the greatest portion of arable land, so that Africa was virtually a senatorial possession (by Nero's time, according to Pliny [HN 18.7.35] six landholders owned half of Africa; cf. Rostovtzeff Social and Economic History p. 99).

The Senate's administration of Africa had been effective so long as there was no great threat to the province's security. In A.D. 6, for example, the marauding Gaetulians were successfully beaten back by the proconsul, Cossus Cornelius Lentulus, whose honorary cognomen Gaetulicus was later borne by his son, the legate of Upper Germany who was to be involved in a conspiracy against Gaius (Dio 52.28.3-4; Flor. 4.12.4 [2.31]; see on Chapter 22.5 Γαίτοσλικοῦ). Then came the Numidian, Tacfarinas, who successfully ravaged
Africa from A.D. 17 onward, thanks to the incompetence of the senatorial appointees sent against him. The Senate's ineptitude became most obvious in A.D. 21 when Tiberius was asked to appoint a governor for the province. Unable to persuade the senators to choose a competent person themselves, he tried to temper his unwilling interference by giving them a choice. They, of course, selected Q. Junius Blaesus because he was the uncle of Seianus (Tac. Ann. 3.32; 3.35). Three years later, as Tacitus sarcastically notes (Ann. 4.23.1), three generals had been honoured for their victories over Tacfarinas, who was still plundering Africa. Finally in that year (A.D. 24), P. Cornelius Dolabella brought an end to the seven years of Roman military impotence (Tac. Ann. 4.25).

Gaius had perhaps learned a lesson from Tacfarinas' success against proconsular governors; perhaps his discovery of a conspiracy centred in the army of Upper Germany caused him to fear any governor who was commanding an army but was not his personal choice; perhaps he was preparing for difficulties following the anticipated annexation of Mauretania (Chapter 25.1). At any rate, he decided to regularize the hitherto abnormal administration of Africa by placing the legion under the command of a legatus Augusti pro praetore, while leaving the civil administration in the hands of the proconsul. The solution was a compromise, designed to satisfy the ambition of consuls while placing every segment of the army under the indirect control of the Emperor.

The explanation of Dio—that Gaius' fear of L. Piso caused him to make the change—is contradicted by Tacitus, who names M. Silanus as the source of the Emperor's apprehension (Hist. 4.48.1). This is not Gaius' father-in-law, as Venturini thought (Caligola p. 93), but rather M. Junius Silanus Torquatus (cf. PIR² I 839), consul in A.D. 19 (Dio 57, index;
57.18.3; Tac. Ann. 2.59.1; CIL 10.1964; Fasti = E&J p. 41), and proconsular
governor of Africa, probably for the six years from A.D. 30 to 35 (cf. Dio
58.23.5; R. Syme JRS 45 [1955] 30, n. 70): Tacitus, then, is wrong. Silanus
was apparently succeeded by C. Rubellius Blandus for a period of two years
(cf. AE 1948.1; Romanelli Africa p. 248; 250, n. 2), but the list of African
governors cannot be continued beyond that point with any certainty. This
is no reason, however, to assign Gaius' division of authority there to A.D.
37 rather than A.D. 39 (Mommsen RP 2.310, who is followed by R. Cagnat [L'armée
romaine d'Afrique pp. 23; 113] and Venturini [Caligola p. 93]; in support of
For Gaius' early attitude towards the privileges of the Senate was one of
complete indulgence (see Chapter 6.1). Perhaps Piso was allotted the African
command after the end of a term as praefectus urbi late in A.D. 37 or early
in A.D. 38 (see above). His ancestry would certainly give Gaius cause to
fear his potential participation in any conspiracy, as a kind of revenge.

The reorganization of the African command must also be considered in
relation to other changes in provincial commands and client kingdoms undertaken
by Gaius: his support of friends such as Agrippa and Antiochus; his removal
of Mithridates and Ptolemy, both remainders from Tiberius' foreign policy; and
his replacement of Flaccus, Calvisius Sabinus, and Gaetulicus with his own
appointees. It is understandable that the new Emperor would want those
responsible for frontier and foreign policy to be loyal to himself rather
than to his predecessor (cf. Romanelli Africa pp. 247-48).

That Gaius' change in the African command was not revoked by Claudius
shows its merit. Although Africa was still in theory a single province, in
effect the senatorial appointee controlled the settled coastal area of
Africa Vetus, while the legate was posted with his legion in the west, near
the Mauretanian border. As a propraetor, he was inferior in status to the proconsular governor, but his position as an officer of the Emperor demanded a certain obedience, particularly since his command could be prolonged beyond the sometimes annual appointment of the governor. This division of powers within a single geographical and administrative area inevitably led to conflicts of interest, of which Tacitus says: "m mixtis utriusque mandatis discordia quaesita auctaque pravo certamine. legatorum ius adolevit diuturnitate officii, vel quia minoribus maior aemulandi cura, proconsulum splendissimus quisque securitati magis quam potentiae consulebant" (Hist. 4.48). Finally, in A.D. 198 or 199, Septimius Severus formally split the province into Africa Proconsularis and Numidia (CIL 10.6569; cf. H.G. Pflaum Lybica 5 [1957] 75; Gascou La politique municipale p. 12, n. 3).

Further details of the divided command in Africa can be found in Romanelli Africa pp. 246-73; Vrind de Cassii Dionis Vocabulis pp. 158-63.

20.7 τὸ τε στρατιωτικὸν ...: The word usually signifies the pay of the soldiers or the aerarium militare (cf. Mason Greek Terms p. 87). Thucydides, however, uses it to mean a military force (8.83.3), as does Herodian, Dio's contemporary (1.5.8).

The legion stationed in Africa during the early Principate was the III Augusta (cf. RE "legio" col. 1495; Parker Legions pp. 128-29).
CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

21.1 χρήματα πάντα . . . : Regarding the improbability of this statement, see on Chapter 2.6 οὐδὲ. For Gaius' remission rather than imposition of taxes, see Chapter 9.6.

Tenney Frank (JRS 23 [1933] 143-48) has demonstrated quite clearly for the Augustan period that income from the provinces more than met the government's expenses to support the army and other units, the grain dole and production of games, the imperial building programmes, and the expanding civil service. It would be unreasonable to assume that under Tiberius and Gaius expenses had increased significantly more than income (cf. Willrich Caligula p. 425; Gelzer RE "Julius" col. 408-409).

21.2 τοὺς Κέλτους τοὺς πολέμιους: Dio frequently errs in calling the German tribes Κέλτοι (e.g., 38.24.2-3; see Chapter 25.5a). J.A.S. Evans recently made the interesting suggestion to me that Dio, by using the term Κέλτοι for tribes on the far side of the Rhine, was consciously archaizing in the manner of the Second Sophistic. Herodotus, it is true, uses the term indiscriminately for the barbarians of western Europe (cf. 2.33.3; 4.49.3), and the Celts of the fifth century B.C. occupied much of the territory that was, by Dio's time, to have become Germania. Yet many of the ancients considered the Germans to be related to the Celts: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for example, includes Germania as a part of Celtica (14.1.1-3; cf. T.G.E. Powell The Celts pp. 164-65);

C.M. Wells, however (The German Policy of Augustus pp. 14-15; Polis and Imperium [ed. J.A.S. Evans] p. 270), suggests that the distinction between Celts and Germans was well known by the time of Augustus.
The threat of an invasion of the northern provinces by the Germans was indeed a real one. In A.D. 28 the governor of Lower Germany, L. Apronius (father of Gaius' colleague in the consulship), was unable to maintain Roman domination of the Frisii, whose successful revolt was prompted by the exorbitant appropriations of a centurion (Tac. Ann. 4.73.1). Other German tribes made inroads into Gaul itself late in Tiberius' reign, when Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, Apronius' son-in-law (Tac. Ann. 6.30.3) and governor of Upper Germany from A.D. 29 or 30 onwards (see Chapter 22.5) did little to hinder their devastations, "magno dedecore imperii, nec minore discrimine" (Suet. Tib. 41). That there was immediate danger from the Germans in A.D. 39 is obvious from Galba's expulsion from Gaul of some encroaching Chatti shortly after Gaius had appointed him as Gaetulicus' successor (Dio 60.8.7; Suet. Galba 6.3; see on Chapter 22.2 &μήτη).

There is some evidence, too, that two of the allied tribes on the Roman side of the Rhine were on the point of rebelling at this time. The Cannenefates, who occupied the south bank of the river near its mouth, directly opposite the Frisii, were perhaps contemplating revolt, for they were very ready to refuse any support for Gaius' campaigns (Tac. Hist. 4.15). Their neighbours, the Batavi (cf. Tac. Germ. 29), may have shared their seditious intentions, thereby creating a situation that would have demanded immediate correction. Suetonius' claim (Gaius 43.1) that the whole purpose behind Gaius' expedition was to recruit more Batavians for his bodyguard might well be a misinterpretation of the Emperor's punitive operations in their country. It must be remembered that in A.D. 69/70 the Batavians were easily roused to revolt by their leader, Julius Civilis (Tac. Hist. 4.13-36).
21.2 ἐξαιρήθησαν ἀπ' ήρει: Cf. Suet. Gaius 43: "militiam resque bellicas semel attigit neque ex destinato .... iter ingressus est, confecitque modo tam festinanter et rapide, ut praetorianae cohortes contra morem signa iumentis imponere et ita subsequi cogerentur." Gaius set out on his journey from Mevania, an Umbrian town on the banks of the river Clitumnus (cf. Pliny Ep. 8.8). Its location—some ninety miles due north of Rome along the via Flaminia—hardly suits Dio's phrase "προσδετείδυ τι." The date of his departure could not have been before the end of the first week of September, since he must have overseen the appointment of the new consules suffecti before he left (see on Chapter 20.3 Ἐκείνουs; Balsdon JRS 24 [1934] 17).

There are several indications that Gaius had been openly planning for some time a visit to the military camps of the northern frontier. Although he had been raised among the legions there, he had not undergone any formal military service before his accession—service that had been required of and enjoyed by all other imperial princes, most especially his father. It was only to be expected that Gaius, like Claudius after him (Dio 60.21-22; Suet. Claud. 17.1), would be keen to emulate those of his ancestors whom he admired, and to earn through his own actions the title of imperator which he had borne since his accession. He must conduct a military campaign himself, rather than through his legati. The Rhine frontier was an obvious choice because of his early associations with the area and because of the recent troubles there, even though his personal intervention was not absolutely necessary for the success of Roman arms (cf. A. Riese Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher 6 [1896] 154; J. Janssen Mn 48 [1920] 205-206; Willrich Caligula pp. 305-306).

As early as May A.D. 38 a document was set up in Rome "pro salute et pace et | victoria et genio | Caesaris Au[gesti]" (ILS 192; other inscriptional
references to Gaius' safety in the north can be found in *CIL* 12.256; 342). Philo says that the Jews of Jerusalem were offering sacrifices "κατὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς Γερμανικῆς νίκης" (*Leg.* 45.356 [598]), perhaps in the spring of A.D. 39 (on the complex problem of dating the Jewish embassy to Gaius, see Willrich *Caligula* p. 410, n. 1; Gelzer *RE"Julius"* col. 397-401; P.J. Sijpesteijn *Journal of Jewish Studies* 15 [1964] 87-96; three admirable and relatively complete accounts of various recent suggestions can be found in Smallwood *Legatio* pp. 47-50; Garzetti *L’Impero* pp. 600-601; and F.H. Colson *Philo X* [Loeb] pp. xxvii-xxxii; Balsdon, in *JRS* 24 [1934] 23-24, argues for a date after Gaius' return from the north in May A.D. 40). Some, too, saw the building of the bridge at Baiae in the summer of A.D. 39 as a magnificent gesture to overawe the Germans and Britons, "quibus imminebat" (*Suet. Gaius* 19.3; see on Chapter 17.11 τὸν Δαφεῖον).

If Gaius' intention to travel north had been common knowledge, then, why was his eventual departure so sudden and unannounced? Perhaps word arrived that the Chatti had unexpectedly crossed the Rhine and were threatening Gaul: any successful breach of the Roman frontier would encourage other hostile tribes to follow, and so would have to be met with immediate and severe retaliation, for which Gaetulicus (and Apronius, too, if he was still in Lower Germany) had once before shown himself unwilling if not incapable. Perhaps, as Balsdon has so convincingly suggested (*Gaius* pp. 70-72), Gaius had by accident discovered the existence of a conspiracy to assassinate him on his arrival in Upper Germany and to replace him with Lepidus as Emperor. The suffect consuls were presumably part of the plot, and for this reason were deposed before Gaius set off rapidly for the Rhine frontier. Surprise was necessary, since foreknowledge of his approach
would allow Gaetulicus to hasten his planned rebellion. For details on this conspiracy, see on Chapter 22.5 \(\text{Γα\'ιτούλικος}\).

The speed of Gaius' journey north was remarkable. Gaetulicus' execution, news of which reached Rome by 27 October (cf. \textit{Acta Arvalium} = Smallwood no. 9), must have been carried out on 22 October at the latest, since the greatest speed possible for the imperial \textit{cursus} was 200 Roman miles a day (Pliny \textit{HN} 7.20.84; Val. Max. 5.5.3; cf. A.M. Ramsay \textit{JRS} 15 [1925] 60-74) and the legionary camp was some 966 miles north of Rome (Balsdon \textit{JRS} 24 [1934] 16-17). Since Gaius had not left the capital until about 7 September, he travelled those 966 miles in six and a half weeks, averaging 21 miles each day. Such a pace over a long period was possible only because Gaius had with him a small but disciplined force, and certainly disproves Suetonius' claim that he sometimes marched "segnerile delicateque" (\textit{Gaius} 43).

21.2 \(\text{πολλοῦς} \; \text{μὲν} \; \text{δροχὴτας} \ldots\): Cf. Orosius 7.5.5: "\textit{magno et incredibili apparatu profectus} \ldots." The rapidity with which Gaius accomplished the journey hardly supports this accusation by Dio, who is so intent upon ridiculing the Emperor for his companions that he neglects to mention that the Praetorian Guard was among them (cf. Suet. \textit{Gaius} 43). Besides Gaius' two sisters and Lepidus, his intended successor, we know the names of only two others who accompanied him: a certain Claudius Etruscus (Stat. \textit{Silv.} 3.3.69-75); and Passienus Crispus (Scholiast on Juvenal 4.81), who ironically was to marry Agrippina after the death of her first husband, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (Suet. \textit{Nero} 6.3; Pliny \textit{HN} 16.91.242; cf. Dio 60.23.1; \textit{Pir} \textsuperscript{2} P 109).

The presence of Gaius' two sisters indicates clearly that the Emperor knew about the latent conspiracy before he began the journey: otherwise he
surely would not have taken Agrippina, Julia, and Lepidus along while leaving his beloved Caesonia in Rome (so Willrich Caligula p. 308). If, too, the common source for Gaius' activities in the north should have been the memoirs of Agrippina herself, then much of the distortion can be easily accounted for (cf. A. Riese Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher 6 [1896] 161-62).

21.3 ἐκεῖθε: Judging from Suetonius' remark, "postquam castra attigit" (Gaius 44), Gaius probably went directly to Moguntiacum (Mainz), the site of the headquarters of the governor of Upper Germany, where two of the province's four legions were stationed (ILS 2262; 2265; Parker Legions p. 122).

21.3 υπόθεν ἐκκακωσεν: Cf. Eutr. 7.12: "bellum contra Germanos suscepit et ingressus Sueviam nihil strenue fecit." The Suevi were a large group of Germanic tribes living near the Chatti, across the Rhine from Moguntiacum (cf. Dio 51.22.6; 55.1.2-3; Tacitus [Germ. 38-46] assigns broader limits to Suevia, placing it north and east of the Elbe).

Tacitus calls Gaius' entire expedition a ludibrium (Hist. 4.15.3; Germ. 37.5), a judgement that was accepted until A. Riese (Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher 6 [1896] 152-62) first questioned the traditional account of Gaius' military activities in Germany and Gaul. See further Chapter 22.2.

21.3 ὡς καὶ ἐσ τὴν Βρεττανίαν στρατεύσων: Dio here anticipates his treatment of Gaius' abortive campaign to Britain, which took place in the spring of the following year (Chapter 25.1-3; but cf. Dessau 2.1.125). This entire chapter, in fact, stands as an introductory summary of the events which took place in Germany and Gaul.
from October A.D. 39 until about March of A.D. 40, and which are described in more detail in the following four chapters.

21.4 ὲλλος ὁς νεωτερίζοντας ...: Suetonius (Gaius 44.1) is more explicit in his account of Gaius' treatment of the governors and legionaries. Those legates, he says, who arrived late with their forces when summoned were dishonorably discharged; centurions were demoted; and the common soldiers suffered a 50% cut in their retirement allowance, receiving only 6000 sesterces (cf. Dio 55.23.1). His description certainly suggests the suppression of a latent revolution.

It is, however, doubtful that the centurions and legionaries were conscious participants. Some of them had probably been serving with the same units 25 years previously, during the military turmoil that had followed the death of Augustus and had involved Gaius himself in its settlement (Dio 57.5.6-7; Tac. Ann. 1.31-44; Suet. Tib. 25.1-3; Gaius 9; with regard to the various traditions about Gaius' part in quelling the revolt of A.D. 14, see J. Burian in Mnema V. Groh pp. 25-29). Such an extension of the length of service was not unusual: although legionaries were normally retired after twenty years, most were kept on for a further five years sub vexillo (Dio 54.25.6; 55.23.1; see on Chapter 2.3 ἐν τοῖς μικροτέροις τείχεσιν). One of the complaints of the soldiers in A.D. 14 was the presence among them of veterans who had been with the legions thirty or forty years (Tac. Ann. 1.17.4)! Tiberius at first had reduced service to sixteen years of active duty followed by an indefinite term sub vexillo (Tac. Ann. 1.36.4), but the financial difficulties of the aerarium militare forced him to keep men in the ranks for twenty years or more (Tac. Ann. 1.78.3; cf. ILS 2252; 2253; 2267).
It is likely, then, that many legionaries were now overdue for retirement, which Gaius effected on the spot, thus giving grounds for the rumour that he was punishing legions that had taken part in the uprisings of A.D. 14 (Suet. *Gaius* 48.1).

21.5 διὰ εἴρηκα: See Chapter 14.2. Suetonius gives a vivid account of Gaius' emotional behaviour at these auctions: "cui instrumento distraherente nihil non fraudis ac lenocinii adhibuit, modo avaritiae singulos increpans et quod non pudaret eos locupletiores esse quam se, modo paenitentiam simulans quod principalium rerum privatis copiam faceret" (*Gaius* 39.2).

21.5 τὰ τῆς μοναρχίας κειμήλια: This affair probably took place in Lugdunum during the winter of A.D. 39-40. Gaius began by selling off the confiscated property of his two sisters, whom he had condemned to banishment for their part in the conspiracy against him (see Chapter 22.6-8). This auction proved so profitable that he sent to Rome for more items that would bring high prices in the provinces (Suet. *Gaius* 39.1).

This peddling of effects from the Palace became a kind of motif in the biographies of later Emperors. At the end of the century Nerva, when in financial difficulties, is said to have conducted a similar sale of imperial property—but, according to Dio (68.2.2), his auction benefited many because he did not demand high prices (cf. Willrich *Caligula* pp. 311-12). The same was done by Antoninus Pius (*HA* "Pius" 7.10); Marcus Aurelius, whose sale to raise money for his German wars lasted two months (*HA* "Marcus" 17.4-5); and Pertinax (*HA* "Pertinax" 7.8-8.7). The sale of imperial property would
give an Emperor a reserve fund in his own treasury, from which to draw in emergencies, as Augustus frequently did (RG 17-18): such procedure is not unusual in an economy that knew nothing of national debt and public bonds.
CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

22.1 θέασ τινάς ...: Details can be found in Suet. Gaius 20: "hic certamen quoque Graecae Latinaeque facundiae, quo certamine ferunt victoribus praemia victos contulisse, eorumdem et laudes componere coactos; eos autem, qui maxime displicuissent, scripta sua spongia linguave delere iussos, nisi ferulis obiurgari aut flumine proximo mergi maluissent."

Such appropriate, if unusual, punishment later gave rise to the expression "Lugudunensem rhetor dicturus ad aram" (Juv. 1.44), indicating nervousness of one in an awkward situation.

22.1 ἐσ τὰ στρατεύματα ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 43: "... legionibus et auxiliis undique excitis, dilectibus ubique acerbissime actis, contracto et omnis generis commeatu quanto numquam antea." All sources agree that Gaius assembled an immense force in Gaul and the Germanies in preparation for his campaign (cf. Tac. Germ. 37.5: "ingentes C. Caesaris minae"; Agr. 13.4: "ingentes adversus Germaniam conatus"), but whether or not he raised new legions for the purpose is a matter of dispute. Dio's claim of 200,000 to 250,000 troops is too outrageous to be considered, and Suetonius' statement that levies were carried out could simply mean that recruits were enlisted to fill the depleted ranks of existing units (dilectus has this meaning, for example, in Tac. Ann. 13.35.4).

There is evidence, particularly inscriptional (but cf. Tac. Hist. 1.55), that points to the existence in A.D. 43 of two new legions, XV Primigenia and XXII Primigenia. Most historians are agreed that they were formed to compensate for the removal from the two Germanies of three legions which took part in the conquest of Britain (cf. Tac. Ann. 14.32.6), but are divided on whether they were raised by Gaius or by Claudius. The arguments in support
of neither are conclusive, and Dio himself, who seems to have thought that they existed under Augustus (55.23-24), is of no help. The case for Gaius has best been presented by Ritterling (RE "legio" col. 1244-1248; see, too, his article in Römisch-germanisches Korrespondenablatt 6 [1913] 1-4) and Balsdon (JRS 24 [1934] 13-16); their arguments are summarized and criticized in Parker Legions pp. 93-98, and in CAH 10.788-789.

Ritterling bases his case on two major points that at first seem attractive. Referring to an inscription (CIL 10.4723) recording the career of a certain Julius Italicus who served in VII Macedonica before becoming centurion in XV Primigenia, he notes that since VII Macedonica became Claudia pia fidelis in A.D. 42 (cf. Dio 55.23.4; Suet. Claud. 13.2) Italicus must have left it for XV Primigenia before that date, since its new epithet is not mentioned in the inscription—so the new legion was in existence before Claudius contemplated an invasion of Britain. Ritterling then suggests that, since Fortuna Primigenia was apparently Germanicus' protecting deity, Gaius was honouring his father's memory by calling the new legions Primigeniae.

With regard to the first argument, however, Momigliano has pointed out (Claudius p. 111 n. 37) that "all that this inscription really proves is that Julius Italicus was centurion of VII Macedonica before 42; it does not exclude the possibility that he was centurion of XV Primigenia several years after 42." Momigliano goes on to make the rather simple observation that Claudius was, after all, Germanicus' brother and was just as likely as Gaius to honour him with the legions' names.

The arguments of Balsdon, though equally as conjectural as those of Ritterling, are more difficult to disprove. Expanding on Ritterling's earlier article, he observes that the numerical designations of the two new legions were apparently chosen to fit in with those of the units already in each of the provinces. Thus, XV Primigenia was originally posted in Upper
Germany (cf. *CIL* 13.11853-11856) along with II Augusta, XIII Gemina, XIV Gemina, and XVI. Gallica (Tac. *Ann.* 1.37.4); and XXII Primigenia was placed in Lower Germany with I Germanica, V Alaudae, XX Valeria Victrix, and XXI Gallia (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.5.2; Dio 55.23; Parker *Legions* pp. 119-22). After Claudius' invasion of Britain, XV is found in Lower and XXII in Upper Germany. Presumably, then, according to Balsdon, one Emperor distributed them in order of their numerical sequence, while another Emperor neglected that sequence. The assumption is that Gaius enrolled the legions as part of his preparations for a serious invasion of Germany. Balsdon ends with an *argumentum ex silentio*: since Dio, Suetonius, and Tacitus all comment on the size of Gaius' force but say nothing of an increase under Claudius, we must assume that Claudius found it unnecessary to levy more troops.

Such reasoning, though appealing, is by no means conclusive. All that can be said with any certainty is that the two new legions were created between A.D. 39 and 42 because of a projected invasion of Britain by either Gaius or Claudius. It must be remembered that, if the new legions are assigned to Gaius' reign, we have further proof that he was planning some sort of campaign in the north before he learned of the existence of Gaetulicus' conspiracy (cf. A. Riese *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 6 [1896] 158-60). Further, the presence of a large and potentially dangerous army of ten legions on the Rhine frontier may partly account for Claudius' decision to employ some of them in an invasion of Britain so soon after his accession.

22.2 Ἐπτάκις οὗτοκράτωρ: It is strange that coins from Gaius' reign give no indication that he was saluted as *imperator* in the field (see *BMC* Imp. 1.156-158), and in only one inscription (*ILS* 193) is the *nomen imperatoris* included among his titles. Perhaps he frowned upon
its use as he did on that of the *praenomen imperatoris* (see Chapter 3.2; cf. R.W. Davies *Historia* 15 [1966] 127-28).

Claudius, too, was several times hailed as *imperator* by his troops during the conquest of Britain despite the tradition, noted by Dio, that a general could not be saluted more than once during a single war (60.21:5).

22.2 ἡταντι τινι ...: Suetonius, too, admits that Gaius did capture a few enemy soldiers (*Gaius* 47), but like Dio emphasizes what he thought were sham battles organized by an Emperor who was afraid to meet the real foe. He tells of how Gaius with a small force attacked at one time some Germans *de custodia* (probably who were "in custody" [cf. Suet. *Tib.* 61.4; Tac. *Hist.* 4.2] rather than "from his bodyguard" [so Quidde *Caligula* p. 11]), at another some young hostages taken from an elementary school, all of whom had been hidden in the woods across the Rhine to simulate enemy troops (*Gaius* 45.1-2). During one of these forays, Gaius is said to have hurriedly retreated in a fright when one of his companions casually remarked on the panic that a real German attack would cause (*Gaius* 51.2). Domitian's personal and successful expedition against the Chatti in A.D. 83 (Suet. *Dom.* 6.1), for which he took the title Germanicus (Suet. *Dom.* 13.3; Frontin. *Strat.* 2.11.7), was treated with similar scorn by the historians, who accused him of the same kind of deception as they did Gaius: "ἐκστασιας δε ἐσ την Γερμανιαν και μη ἔφακως που πόλεμον ἐπανήκε" (Dio 67.4.1); "... falsum e Germania triumphum, emptis per commercia, quorum habitus et crinis in captivorum speciem formarentur" (Tac. *Agr.* 39.2; cf. Pliny *Pan.* 16).

An explanation of such strange behaviour on the part of Gaius is not hard to find. Balsdon comments that the German expedition did not in fact lead to a campaign across the Rhine, as Gaius had probably planned, since
there is no mention of the loss of Roman lives and the campaigning season was over by October (*Gaius* pp. 78-82). Rather, it became a series of military exercises designed to restore discipline in the troops which Gaetulicus had neglected to drill (see on section 5; even Quidde [*Caligula* pp. 10-11] interpreted Gaius' exploits in Germany as manoeuvres, but he missed the point when he said that they soon degenerated into a farce).

The necessity of regular and comprehensive manoeuvres had long been recognized by Rome's military leaders, as a means both to avoid sedition and to train new recruits. Livy (23.35.6) describes such exercises during the war with Hannibal: "quia otiosa stativa erant, crebro decurrere milites cogebat ut tirones ... adsumecerent signa sequi et in acie agnoscer ordines suos." Tacitus praises the general Corbulo as a strong disciplinarian who kept his men busy by having them dig a canal: "idque usus salubre et misericordia melius adparuit" (*Ann.* 13.35.10; cf. 11.18.2-5). Vegetius (3.4) outlines at some length the methods used to discipline troops in preparation for an upcoming battle: "silvam caedere, iter per dumos et abrupta facere, materiam dedolare, aperire fossam, occupare aliquem locum et, ne a contubernalibus detrudantur, scutis invicem obviantibus niti" (cf. Sen. *Ep.* 18.6: "miles in media pace decurrit, sine ullo hoste vallum iacit et supervacuo labore lassatur ut sufficere necessario possit"; Jos. *BJ* 3.5.1 [70-75]).

Such was the purpose behind Gaius' conduct in Germany. Finding the army unable to take the field immediately against the Chatti, he instead put them through a *campestris decursio* under the command of Galba, who thus set about to restore discipline and fighting spirit in the legions that had been allowed to become lazy, and to accustom the new recruits to battle (cf. Suet. *Galba* 6.3; Pareti *Storia* 4.786-787). That these exercises accomplished their purpose is obvious from the success with which Galba soon turned back the Chatti.
This is not to deny that Gaius led some troops on forays across the Rhine, where he did meet with some success against the Germans. O. Brogan (AJ 92 [1935] 3-4) has shown that Gaius' soldiers did capture some posts across the river from Moguntiacum, and that the Emperor may even have established a fort northeast of the Rhine. These victories were honoured as far away as Lydia, where a relief depicts with some exaggeration the subjugation of a personified Germania (T. Mommsen Ath. Mitt. 13 [1888] 18-21).

22.2 τούς μὲν καθ’ ἐκάστους κατακόπτων ...: Suetonius (Gaius 48) describes Gaius' unsuccessful attempt to decimate the legions, which is perhaps reflected in this sentence of Dio (see also Chapters 21.4; 22.5). Riese (Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher 6 [1896] 153) tries to draw from our sources the conclusion that Gaius' punishment was to be aimed at the legions of Upper Germany, although those who had rebelled under Germanicus were mostly from the Lower province; but both Dio and Suetonius are far too vague in their geographical settings to allow such a deduction.

Although Augustus had used this form of punishment against cohorts who had retreated in battle (Suet. Aug. 24.2), it was only rarely carried out under the Empire: once in A.D. 20 against troops who had abandoned their commander during a battle with Tacfarinas (Tac. Ann. 3.21.1: "raro ea tempestate et e vetere memoria facinore"); and again by Galba (Suet. Galba 12.2) and Macrinus (HA "Macrinus" 12.2). See Parker Legions pp. 232-34.

22.3 ἀπὸ τοῦ φαλακροῦ μέχρι τοῦ φαλακροῦ: The authenticity of both this and the following story is questionable. Not only does Dio in the first case admit ignorance of the
victims' identity, but Suetonius gives a quite different version of each. According to him, a shortage of affordable meat for the wild beasts of the arena caused Gaius to order them to be fed with a line of prisoners "a calvo ad calvum" (Gaius 27.1). It is usually assumed that by coincidence a bald-headed man stood at either end of the row; it is equally possible that their names happenened to be Calvus, or that Gaius' own baldness somehow lay behind his comment (cf. Suet. Gaius 50.1: "capillo raro at circa verticem nullo"). The discrepancy between the stories of Suetonius and Dio suggests that they were devised at a later date to account for an otherwise inexplicable statement by Gaius.

It might also be noted that in A.D. 32 the praetor L. Apronius Caesianus, whose father was still governor of Lower Germany, had made fun of Tiberius' baldness during the Floralia by arranging for the celebrations to be conducted by baldheaded or shaven men and boys: henceforth, bald men were called Caesiani (Dio 58.19.2). Although neither the elder Apronius nor, of course, his son-in-law Gaetulicus bore the cognomen Caesianus, the wives of both were apparently called Caesia (cf. PIR² A 971). Can the occasion of Gaius' phrase, then, be somehow connected with the execution of Gaetulicus, and perhaps also of his father-in-law, for conspiracy?

22.3 κυβεύων δὲ ποτέ ...: Again, Suetonius' account is quite different: he appears to set the story in Rome, with Knights as the victims of Gaius' greed and cruelty (Gaius 41.2).

Several Emperors were fond of gambling with dice. Augustus played quite frequently and for high stakes, although he often subsidized his opponents (Suet. Aug. 70.2; 71.1-4). Claudius was a fanatical player, and even wrote a book on the subject (Suet. Claud. 33.2; Sen. Apocol. 12; 15).
The charge against Gaius was not only that he played (cf. Sen. Cons. Polyb. 17.4), but that he always cheated (Suet. Gaius 41.2). On dice games in general, see Balsdon Life and Leisure pp. 154-59.

22.4 ἐξ ἐπωνομάτας: Cf. Suet. Gaius 30.1: "punito per errorem nominis alio quam quem destinaverat, ipsum quoque paria meruisse dixit." So Junius Priscus had died earlier, allegedly because he was thought to be wealthier than he really was (Chapter 18.5). Sacerdos was perhaps one of the conspirators in the plot to eliminate Gaius. Balsdon (Gaius p. 76) postulates from his name that he may have been a priest of the imperial cult.

22.5 Ταιτούλικου Λέντουλον: Cf. PIR² C 1390. Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus was the son of Cossus Cornelius Lentulus (see on Chapter 20.7 διήθα). He was praetor peregrinus in A.D. 23 (CIL 1² 1.71) and consul in A.D. 26 (Tac. Ann. 4.46.1; cf. 4.42.3). He was appointed by Tiberius as governor of Upper Germany in A.D. 29 or 30 (cf. Dio's statement here: "τῆς Γερμανίας δέκα ἕτεσιν ἑξεπαντά"; cf. Willrich Caligula p. 305 [A.D. 29]; and Balsdon Gaius p. 67 [A.D. 30]). While his father-in-law, L. Apronius, was in charge of the Lower province despite his failures against the Frisii (Tac. Ann. 4.73.1; 6.30.3; Apronius probably remained as governor of Lower Germany until A.D. 39, when Gaius replaced him with P. Gabinius Secundus [Dio 60.8.7; cf. Suet. Claud. 24.3]). Gaetulicus may have owed this appointment to Seianus, who could thereby count on the support of the Rhine legions if he were openly to make a move for the monarchy (so F.B. Marsh AHR 3 [1925/1926] 244). Some think that Gaetulicus may even have been related to Seianus, through the latter's grandfather, Cn. Lentulus Maluginensis (cf. C. Cichorius Hermes 39 [1904])
469-70; Z. Stewart *AJPh* 74 [1953].73, n. 21), but this connection has been satisfactorily disproven by R. Sealey (*Phoenix* 15 [1961] 103).

In A.D. 34 Gaetulicus was accused of having betrothed his daughter to a son of Seianus, but escaped execution by pointing out to Tiberius that it was the Emperor, not he, who had proposed the match, and by ending his letter with a thinly veiled threat: "firmarent velut foedus, quo princeps ceterarum rerum poteretur, ipse provinciam retineret" (Tac. *Ann.* 6.30; on the validity of the whole story, see Marsh *Tiberius* p. 214, n. 1). His leniency as a commander made him very popular with his troops (Tac. *Ann.* 6.30.3) and perhaps contributed to his failure in stopping inroads made by hostile German tribes near the end of Tiberius' reign (Suet. *Tib.* 41; see on Chapter 21.2 τοῦς Κέλτους).

After Gaius' accession Gaetulicus perhaps did not feel as secure in his position as he had been under Tiberius, and apparently tried to gain favour with the new Emperor by composing a poem in which he erroneously claimed that Gaius' birthplace was Tibur, a town sacred to Hercules (Suet. *Gaius* 8.1-2; cf. Willrich *Caligula* p. 307; Balsdon *Gaius* p. 74. Gaetulicus was well known as a composer of epigrams [cf. Martial 1, praef.; Pliny *Ep.* 5.3.5; Sid. *Carm.* 9.259-260; *Ep.* 2.10.6], nine of which are included in the Greek Anthology [5.17; 6.190; 331; 7.71; 244; 245; 275; 354; 11.409]).

It may have been Gaetulicus' lax discipline and imperial ambition that caused Gaius to march north to relieve him of his command (so Merivale 5.439-443; Riese *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 6 [1896] 154-55), but it seems more likely that Gaetulicus (and perhaps Apronius) had already formed a conspiracy against the Emperor that included Lepidus and Gaius' sisters (see section 6), Ofonius Tigellinus (see Chapter 23.9), the suffect consuls of A.D. 39 (see on Chapter 20.1 τοῦς τῶτε Ἱρχοντας), and perhaps even Seneca,
who was friendly with Gaetulicus (Sen. QN 4, praef. 15; see Chapter 19.7).
The existence of such a plot is indisputable: it is mentioned twice by Suetonius (in Gaius 24.3 it is called a conspiracy of Lepidus, in Claud. 9.1 a conspiracy of Lepidus and Gaetulicus).

Many, however, have wondered about Gaetulicus' reason for associating himself with a plot to replace Gaius with, presumably, Lepidus, for "mehr konnte er für sich auch nach dem Gelingen der Umsturzpläne unter der Herrschaft des Lepidus und der Agrippina minor kaum erhoffen" (Meise Untersuchungen p. 113). If Cornelia, the wife of Calvisius Sabinus, was in fact Gaetulicus' sister, there may have been an element of revenge in his participation. But the deciding factor must have been his fear that Gaius was about to replace him as governor of Upper Germany, just as others appointed by Tiberius were feeling their positions threatened; and Gaetulicus' danger was compounded because of his earlier association with Seianus (cf. Willrich Caligula pp. 305-308; Meise op. cit. pp. 114-15).

There can be no doubt that Gaius' life was in danger, surrounded as he was by antagonistic and ambitious relatives, friends, and military leaders. A. Riese (op. cit. p. 158) described the threatening situation in Germany as "... einem rheinischen Truppenaufstand, der, hätte ihn Gaius nicht unterdrückt, gefährlicher als der des Jahres 14 und ebenso erfolgreich wie der des Jahres 69 hätte werden können" (cf. Mullens G&R 11 [1941/1942] 60-62). The Emperor acted swiftly and harshly: the consuls had already been deposed; he executed Gaetulicus on 22 October, immediately after arriving at Moguntiacum (Acta Arvalium = Smallwood no. 9), and replaced him with the rigorous Galba (Suet. Galba 6.2); Lepidus, too, was executed; he banished his sisters, along with Tigellinus; he ignored Seneca only because that man's illness was thought fatal; and he may even have contemplated punishing the legions of the Rhine
frontier as well, but refrained (Suet. Gaius 48.1-2: this passage might reflect instead the military problems faced by Gaius during his abortive invasion of Britain the following year: see on Chapter 25.2 ἐξελεύσε).  

22.6 τὸν Λέπιδον ...: For his earlier relations with Gaius, see Chapter 11.1. 

As the Emperor's designated successor, Lepidus would inevitably be involved in any conspiracy, either as a participant or as a victim. Philo (in Flacc. 21.181 [543]; cf. 18.151 [539]) reveals that Lepidus' influence with Gaius began to wane after he had intervened with the Emperor on behalf of the exiled Flaccus. Moreover, with Gaius' marriage to Caesonia and the subsequent birth of his daughter, Drusilla, in the summer of A.D. 39 (see on Chapter 12.1 καὶ ἐκείνην), Lepidus must have realized that he was no longer needed as Gaius' heir apparent; Agrippina at the same time would lose all hope that her son Domitius might be designated successor. The ambitions of both could be satisfied only by eliminating the Emperor and his family. Gaetulicus was invited to join their plot because the support of a large part of the army was necessary for the success of a coup d'état (cf. Linnert Beiträge pp. 81-82; Willrich Caligula p. 308; Meise Untersuchungen pp. 110-11; 119). 

Lepidus was executed at Gaius' command by the tribune Dexter (Sen. Ep. 4.7), but his death did not go unavenged: because of it his friend, Annius Vinicianus, was persuaded to join the successful plot against Gaius in A.D. 41 (Jos. AJ 19.1.3 [20]; 19.1.8 [49]; see on Chapter 29.1 συνῶμοσαν). 

22.6 ταῖς ἐλλασὶν αὐτῷ ἀδελφαῖς ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 24.3: "eas in causa Aemili Lepidi condemnavit quasi adulteras et insidiarum adversus se conscias ei .... chirographa omnium
requisita fraude ac stupro divulgavit." Agrippina, whose ambition was clearly revealed through her later marriage to Claudius, was perhaps more actively involved in the conspiracy than Julia: she later openly admitted her adultery with Lepidus "spe dominationis" (Tac. Ann. 14.2.4; cf. 12.8.3; Rutil. 1.305-306, speaking of a series of Lepidi: "quartus, Caesareo dum vult irrepere regno, | incesti poenam solvit adulterii"), and was accused also of having had relations with Ofonius Tigellinus (Chapter 23.9; for allegations of immorality against Agrippina throughout her life, see T.A. Dorey University of Birmingham Historical Journal 8 [1961] 1-6).

Because of Rutilius Namatianus' comment "incesti ... adulterii" it has been suggested that Lepidus was related by blood to Agrippina, that he must have been the son of Julia (Augustus' granddaughter) and Aemilius Paulus, and that Gaius indicated him as his successor because of this relationship (cf. Mullens G&R 11 [1941/1942] 61). Incestus need not have this meaning, however (cf. Tac. Hist. 5.4), and the evidence is against Lepidus' direct descent from Augustus, which is nowhere mentioned by our sources (cf. Meise Untersuchungen p. 103, n. 70). Nor can Rutilius be considered a reliable source for such information.

The banishment of Gaius' sisters is recorded in Suetonius (Gaius 29.1; 39.1). In his life of Nero (6.3) Suetonius suggests that Agrippina was exiled after the death of her husband, Domitius Ahenobarbus, in A.D. 40 (cf. Nero 5.2). This is only possible if Domitius died early in that year, which is unlikely (cf. R.M. Geer TAPhA 62 [1931] 59-61). The tradition that Gaius later ordered his exiled sisters to be executed, and that his death anticipated this punishment, occurs only in Orosius (7.5.9): it was perhaps falsely deduced from Suet. Gaius 28, and should be rejected.
Both Agrippina and Julia were recalled from their exile by Claudius shortly after his accession in A.D. 41 (Dio 60.4.1). That same year, however, Julia was banished once again, supposedly through the intrigues of Messalina, who was said to be jealous of her friendship with Claudius; she died soon after (Dio 60.8.5; see on Chapter 19.7 δ. δὲ δὴ Σενέκας).

22.7 τοῖς τε στρατιώταις ἀργυρίου ...: For other donatives to the troops, see Chapter 17.8 (after bridging the Bay of Baiae) and Chapter 25.3 (after the failure of his British campaign).

22.7 ξιφίδια τρία τῷ Ἀρεί τῷ Τιμωρῷ ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 24.3: "tres gladios in necem suam praeparatos Marti Ultori addito elogio consecravit." The same custom was followed by Nero after putting down the conspiracy of Piso in A.D. 65 (Tac. Ann. 15.74.2); by Vitellius, who dedicated to Mars the sword with which Otho had committed suicide (Suet. Vit. 10.3); and by Caracalla, who consecrated the weapon with which he had killed his brother, Geta (Dio 77.23.3).

Before the battle of Philippi in 42 B.C., Octavian vowed to build a temple to Mars if he were successful in avenging the assassination of Caesar (Suet. Aug. 29.1). The temple, completed and dedicated in 2 B.C. (Dio 55.10.6; cf. RG 12.1-2), was located in the northeast half of Augustus' Forum, its back abutting the huge enclosure wall that separated the Forum from the ugliness and hazards of the Subura behind. As Augustus had intended, it became a symbol of Roman military might: in the porticoes flanking it on both sides were two rows of rectangular niches in which were placed statues of triumphatores from Aeneas onwards, and in the temple proper victorious generals on their return to Rome dedicated their insignia triumphorum (Suet.
Aug. 29.2; Dio 55.10.1-5). It was in imitation of this custom that Gaius now dedicated the weapons with which he was to have been assassinated: his "triumph" in this case was that he had saved the state by putting down a conspiracy against his own life. For the temple, see Lanciani Ruins and Excavations pp. 302-304; Platner and Ashby Topographical Dictionary pp. 220-23; Nash Pictorial Dictionary pp. 401-10.

22.8 τὰ ὅστα ὧτοῦ ...: This part of Agrippina's punishment is not only "a hideous burlesque of her mother's journey twenty years before" (CAH 10.659; cf. Tac. Ann. 2.75.1, of Agrippina maior after the death of Germanicus: "tunc feralis reliquias sinu ferret ..."), but an ironic imitation of Gaius' own filial piety in A.D. 37 when he carried back to Rome the bones of his mother and brother (see Chapter 3.5).

22.9 ἀπηγὸρευσε ...: The honours previously granted to his sisters are listed in Chapters 3.4 and 9.2. Gaius' behaviour in this instance is similar in intent to that of the Senate in A.D. 31 when, aware that the excessive honours granted to Seianus had caused him to desire even more, they forbade any distinctions to be granted to anyone, and any oaths to be taken in anyone's name except that of the Emperor (Dio 58.12.6).

The Senate on this occasion, however, did not completely heed Gaius' wishes, and he was forced only a short time later to reiterate his prohibition after Claudius, his only living relative left in a position to be awarded any honours, had been chosen by the senators to convey to the Emperor their congratulations on his escape from the conspiracy (Chapter 23.2).
CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

23.2 τὰ ἐπινίκια τὰ σμικρότερα ...: For ovations, see on Chapter 16.11 τὰ τε ἐπινίκια. The "other honours" voted him at this time no doubt included the traditional sacrifices in thanks for his success as well as the erection throughout the Empire of statues and commemorative inscriptions recording his "conquest" of Germany (see, for example, *ILS* 8791 from Lydia and the note on Chapter 22.2 ἀπάτη'). Vespasian, now a praetor, chose this occasion to make amends for his previous laxity (see Chapter 12.3), by proposing not only special games in honour of Gaius' victory, but an additional punishment for the conspirators, that they remain unburied (Suet. *Vesp.* 2.3).

23.2 ἄλλος κλήρῳ καὶ τὸν Κλαύδιον αἵρετον: Cf. Suet. *Claud.* 9.1: "cum vero detecta esset Lepidi et Gaetulici coniuratio, [sc. Claudius] missus in Germaniam inter legatos ad gratulandum etiam vitae periculum adiit." It was traditional to choose all envoys by lot (cf. Tac. *Hist.* 4.8: "vetera exempla quae sortem legationibus posuissent, ne ambitioni aut inimicitii locus foret"). Claudius' special appointment now is even more unusual in light of Gaius' recent pronouncement about honouring his family (Chapter 22.9). If the frightened Senate hoped to appease the Emperor in this way, the insensitivity of its members would equal their servility.

23.2 μη κατ' ἀξίαν τετιμηθοῦν ἐδοκεῖ: According to Suetonius, Gaius had been preparing for a full triumph, the expenses for which were to be raised from assessments on private individuals
(Gaius 47; in 48.2 Suetonius errs in suggesting that Gaius' prohibition of honours for his relatives was taken to apply to the Emperor himself). See on Chapter 25.3 τὴν τῶν ἐπινικίων πομπὴν.

23.3 ὡς καὶ κρείττοσιν οὗτοι οὕσι: Contrast his earlier relationship with the Senate as described in Chapter 6.1.

23.4 καὶ οὐδεῖς ...: The same should be said of Dio himself, who can find some basis for criticism in both the acceptance and rejection of honours offered to Gaius.

23.5 σεμνοῦ τινος ἡξίωσεν: Details of Gaius' behaviour towards the embassy are given by Suetonius (Gaius 49.1). When the senators begged him to hasten his return to Rome, he tapped his sword and replied, "veniam, et hic mecum." He then forbade any senator to approach him, and singled out the Senate alone as being hostile to him, basing his judgement, no doubt, on the number of its members involved in the recent conspiracy (on the participation of senators in the recent plot, see particularly A. Riese Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher 6 [1896] 155-56).

23.5 τῶν Κλαύδιον ἀπέκτεινεν ζών: With some skepticism ("... non defuerint qui traderent ...") Suetonius records the story of how Gaius hurled his uncle, fully clothed, into a nearby river (Claud. 9.1). Popular belief considered such treatment of Claudius as normal. At the end of the Apocolocyntosis, for example, Gaius is portrayed demanding Claudius for his slave: "producit testes qui illum viderunt ab illo flagris, ferulis, colaphis vapulantem" (15.2). The present incident in Gaul, however,
rather suggests the punishment inflicted on those contestants who failed in
the oratorical competitions held at Lugdunum that winter (Suet. Gaius 20;
see Chapter 22.1). Was Claudius among them?

Claudius had always been considered slow-witted by members of his
family (see on Chapter 6.6 τότε πρωτόν), of whom Gaius was the first to
elevate him to a public position of some importance, thus disproving Sueto-"nus' claim that "Claudium patruum non nisi in ludibrium reservavit" (Gaius 23.3;
cf. Nero 6.2). Although his physical and mental infirmities were a real
affliction resulting from various childhood diseases, Claudius himself
later claimed to have exaggerated their expression: by appearing innocuous,
he said, he was able to avoid the fate suffered by other members of the
imperial family (Dio 60.2.4; Suet. Claud. 38.3, who adds rather malevolently
that this claim was not believed).

23.7 ἐκβάλω τὴν Πούλινα: For Gaius' third wife and the date of their
divorce, see on Chapter 12.1 καὶ ἐκεῖνην.

23.7 Μιλωνίαν Καισονίαν: Cf. PIR¹ M 420. Anxious more than ever for a
legitimate heir since Drusilla's death, Gaius
married a woman of proven fertility--she had already produced three
daughters--who could claim neither beauty nor youth (Suet. Gaius 25.3; cf.
Meise Untersuchungen pp. 104-105). He nevertheless seems to have felt a
deep affection for her. Since such devotion did not suit his detractors' concept of his character, various stories arose concerning their relation-
ship: Gaius once declared that he would torture her to discover why she
attracted him so (Suet. Gaius 33); Caesonia aroused his lust for her by
administering a love potion that drove him mad, and so she was the cause of
all Rome's misfortunes (Suet. Gaius 50.2; Jos. AJ 19.2.4 [193]; Juv. 6.614-618). For the birth of their child, Julia Drusilla, see Chapter 28.7; arguments for dating the marriage of Gaius and Caesonia to the summer of A.D. 39 are given in the notes to Chapter 12.1.

23.8 τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπεισόντας κριθήναι: Under normal circumstances, an active magistrate could not be prosecuted for a criminal offence, but would be indicted at the end of his term when he again became a privatus (cf. Gell. 13.13). To remove a magistrate from office before the expiry of his allotted term was a rare procedure, but did have precedents in the Republican period: Lentulus, for example, was pressured into resigning the praetorship because of his involvement in the Catilinarian conspiracy of 63 B.C. (Cic. Cat. 3.15; another instance can be found in Dio 42.23). There seems no reason to doubt that the defendants in this case, whose names are not known, were accused of complicity in the recent plot against Gaius, as the suffect consuls had been (Chapter 20.1).

23.9 ὑπὸ καιμάτων ἐταλαίπωρησαν ...: It is strange that this incident is placed by Dio among the events of the winter of A.D. 39/40 when it probably belongs to the summer of one of those years (cf. Balsdon Gaius p. 96, n. 1). Dio's ordering of events in this chapter, including the divorce of Paulina, is not reliable. It is tempting, in fact, to consider sections 7 to 9 as entirely misplaced, perhaps from the end of Chapter 20.5: if so, then Gaius' divorce and remarriage, the birth of his daughter, the impeachment of aediles and praetors together with the consuls, and the hot weather at Rome would all fall, as one should expect, in the late summer of A.D. 39. The MSS and epitomes, however, give no hint of this.
Awnings had previously been stretched over the Forum Romanum during the dictatorship of Julius Caesar (Pliny *HN* 19.6.23) and again in 23 B.C. (Dio 53.31.3; Pliny *HN* 19.6.24).

23.9 Ὅφωνιος Ὁφωνιος: For the variants of his name (Ophonius or Sophonius), see PIR¹ S 540. Details of his early life are given by the Scholiast on Juvenal 1.155. He came from a poor family in Agrigentum, but fell in with M. Vinicius and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, the husbands of Gaius' sisters Julia and Agrippina. After his exile in A.D. 39, he spent some time in Greece working at menial jobs until he inherited some money and was allowed by Claudius to return to Rome.

He then began raising race-horses in southern Italy, an occupation that brought him to the attention of the young Nero (cf. Plu. *Galba* 17), who as Emperor appointed him praefectus vigilum (Tac. *Hist.* 1.72). After the death of Burrus in A.D. 62, Tigellinus was elevated to praetorian prefect (Tac. *Ann.* 14.51.5; cf. Dio 62.13.3). In this position he held as much power over Nero as Seianus had over Tiberius, and his disreputable character aided him in becoming very wealthy through bribery (cf. Dio 62.28.4; 63.21.2; Tac. *Ann.* 15.40.3; 16.14.5; 16.17.6). He was awarded triumphal ornaments after the detection of Piso's conspiracy in A.D. 65 (Tac. *Ann.* 15.72.2). Two years later he accompanied the Emperor to Greece (Dio 63.12.3-13.1), but deserted him during the general revolt of A.D. 68 (Tac. *Hist.* 1.72; Plu. *Galba* 17.3). His life was temporarily saved thanks to the intervention of Titus Vinius with Galba (cf. Dio 64.3.3), but in A.D. 69 he was ordered by Otho to commit suicide and he cut his own throat: "infamem vitam foedavit etiam exitu sero et inhonesto" (Tac. *Hist.* 1.72; cf. Plu. *Otho* 2).
24.1 ούσις τινάς τυραννοδοξικάλους: For Agrippa and Antiochus, see Chapter 8.2; Venturini Caligola pp. 75-76. It seems more probable that the visit of these two friends and client kings of the Emperor took place during Gaius' sojourn in Campania in the summer of A.D. 40, rather than at Lugdunum during the previous winter (cf. Willrich Caligula p. 454; Balsdon Gaius p. 96, n. 1; Smallwood Legatio pp. 34-35; 287-88). They had perhaps been summoned to take part in the triumph with which Gaius was planning to celebrate his northern "victories" (cf. Suet. Gaius 49.2), and so were among the "reges qui officii causa in urbem advenerant" mentioned by Suetonius (Gaius 22.1). For inscriptional evidence of their close relationship with the Emperor, see IGRR 3.1089-1090; 4.940.

In the same passage Suetonius records that Gaius was at that time close to proclaiming his government a monarchy. Such a move would quite obviously be seen as a direct result of the influence that these eastern despots held over him (Agrippa, for example, was later to be regarded as responsible for having Claudius proclaimed Emperor by the Senate: Jos. AJ 19.4.1-2 [236-247]; cf. Dio 60.8.2). Republican government had, of course, been a fiction since 27 B.C. and it was inevitable that the facade of constitutionality so carefully erected by Augustus to conceal the military basis of his monarchy would eventually be dropped by a successor who saw little merit in preserving the old forms to appease an old-fashioned nobility that no longer existed.

Merivale is doubtless close to the truth when he says that it was from Agrippa that Gaius "learnt the customs of the East and the simple machinery of Asiatic despotism, and imbibed a contemptuous disgust at the empty forms of the Republic, which served only, as he might in his blind experience
imagine, to impede the march of government, while they contributed nothing to its security" (5.350-351). Gelzer, too, is only partially exaggerating when he says that "Gaius machte sich selbst zum Gesetz und tat die alten Verfassungen als leeres Gerade ab" (RE "Julius" col. 407). Willrich (Caligula pp. 88-92) carries the beginnings of Hellenistic monarchy in Rome back to Julius Caesar: "Die hellenistischen Könige, nicht die verschollenen Könige Roms sind Caesars Vorbilder" (p. 89). Octavian's victory over Antony brought a temporary halt to eastern influences in Rome; but with the death of the republican-minded Tiberius and the accession of a youth born 43 years after the final, historic struggle between East and West, the way was open for the conversion of Roman government into a form of oriental absolutism. It was, in many ways, not only inevitable but essential for stable administration. It was hardly necessary in A.D. 39 for Gaius to proclaim his government a monarchy: all but the naive had known the truth for the past 25 years.

It is easy to see why, at least in senatorial eyes, Gaius became more of a tyrant at this time: several members of the Senate had recently been implicated in Gaetulicus' conspiracy, and the Emperor had as a result declared his mistrust of the whole body (Suet. Gaius 49.1; cf. Chapter 25.5).

24.2 ὑματεύοντος αὐτοῦ τὸ τρίτον: Cf. the almost identical statement in Suet. Gaius 17.1: "tertium autem Lugduni iniit solus, non ut quidam opinantur superbia negligentiave, sed quod defunctum sub Kalendarum diem collegam rescisse absens non potuereat." For references to this third consulship, see the Fasti Antiates (CIL 1. 1.247); CIL 2.4639; 4640; 6233 (where he is given the name Germanicus); BMC Imp. 1.149, no. 22; 156, no. 61.
Although he resigned the office after only twelve days (see below, section 6), the entire year was, according to custom, named after his consulship with no colleague (cf. Tac. Agr. 44.1: "natus erat Agricola Gaio Caesare tertium consule idibus Iuniis").

24.2 οὔτε τῶν δημάρχων ...: The tribunes retained during the Empire the power of convening the Senate, which they had been granted probably in the third century B.C. (cf. Gell. 14.7.4; Greenidge Roman Public Life p. 161). For parallels, see Dio 41.15.2 (in 9 B.C., Antony as tribune convened the Senate); 56.47.2 (the tribunes exercised their ius consulendi senatus during the riots following Augustus' death); 60.16.8 (the tribunes of A.D. 42 summoned the Senate even while the consuls were at hand); 78.37.5 (Dio comments that the practice was unusual by his own time [A.D. 218]). On the praetors' right to convene the Senate, see below, section 3.

24.3 τῶν στρατηγῶν ...: Since the praetors were formally considered colleagues of the consuls (cf. Gell. 13.15.6: "quod eodem auspicio creantur"), it was normally the duty of one of them, particularly of the praetor urbanus, to summon the Senate during the consuls' absence (Cic. Fam. 10.12.3; Tac. Hist. 4.39).

24.4 τοῦ τοῦ Γαίου δίφρου ...: Perhaps a golden chair had been voted to Gaius at the same time as the statue in the previous year (see Chapter 16.10). For other examples of obeisance, the most obvious external trapping of oriental monarchy, see Chapter 27.5-6. Suetonius is significantly silent on this point; and Dio's placing of this
first example of proskynesis at a time before Gaius had begun to demand ruler-worship suggests either that his chronology is faulty, or that it was not the Emperor who introduced obeisance to the court.

24.4 ἀργύριον κατὰ τὸ ...: The custom of presenting a small gift of money (stips or strena) to the Emperor at the beginning of the New Year originated under Augustus, who sometimes returned the coins with an equal or greater sum added (Dio 54.35.2-3), and at other times used the money to erect expensive statues of the gods in the vici of the city (Suet. Aug. 57.1; cf. CIL 6.457, the dedication on a marble statue-base of 9 B.C.: "ex stipe quam populus Romanus | anno novo apsenti contulit"). A similar practice existed during the Saturnalia (see Chapter 6.4 and notes).

As a pretext for buying the Emperor's favour, the custom seems to have gotten out of hand, and Tiberius was forced to restrict its occurrence to 1 January only (Suet. Tib. 34.2). Gaius continued the tradition and, according to Suetonius (Gaius 42), took great pleasure in receiving handfuls of coins in which he would later walk barefoot and roll toto corpore. The annual ceremony was finally forbidden by Claudius shortly after his accession (Dio 60.6.3).

24.6 τὰς εὐχὰς....: On the annual prayers for the safety and prosperity of the Emperor, see Chapter 9.2 and notes.

24.6 ὀδώρεκατη ημέρᾳ: Suetonius says that word of his resignation was actually received on 13 January (Gaius 17.1: "... tertium usque in Idus Ian.").
24.7 οἱ ἐσ τὸ ἐπεὶτε κεχειροτονημένοι: G. Barbieri (Epigraphica 29 [1967] 3-4) has shown that the suffecti who replaced Gaius on 14 January were Q. Lutatius Lusius Saturninus (PIR² L 449) and M. Seius Veianus (PIR¹ S 249; cf. CIL 3.8753). It has long been known that their consulships fell between A.D. 39 and 44 (Degrassi I Fasti Consolari p. 11), but an inscription recently found near Pompeii reveals that they were in office on 1 February; A.D. 40 is the only suitable year for which the consuls of that month are not elsewhere recorded.

Saturninus and Veianus in turn were replaced, sometime before 13 March A.D. 40, by two new suffecti, C. Laecanius Bassus (PIR² L 30; he had been praetor urbanus in A.D. 32 [CIL 1.71]) and Q. Terentius Culleo (PIR¹ T 54), both of whom presumably resigned at the end of June (G. Barbieri loc. cit.; CIL 1.58; CIL 2.5792). No other suffecti for the year are known.

24.7 τοῖς τῆς Δρουσίλλης γενεσίωις: On her birthday celebrations before this year, see Chapters 11.3; 13.8-9.

24.7 τοῖς τοῦ Αὐγοῦστου ...: The anniversary of Augustus' birth, 23 September (Fasti = E&J p. 52; Dio 56.30.5; cf. E&J no. 98.20-26; Gell. 15.7.3), was first celebrated in 30 B.C., when a thanksgiving was decreed (Dio 51.19.2). The sacrifice seems to have been an annual affair, and was supplemented at various times by Circus games and the slaughter of wild beasts, arranged by magistrates on their own initiative (Dio 54.8.5 [20 B.C.]; 54.26.2 [13 B.C.]: at this time the Emperor and Senate were also banqueted on the Capitoline Hill, a practice that also may have become an annual event [cf. 54.30.5; 55.26.3]). It appears that a formal decree was never passed to make the celebrations, including the Circus games, a permanent
affair (Dio 54.34.1-2), and Augustus himself once forbade the traditional banquet because of a threat of famine (Dio 55.26.3 [A.D. 6]). We hear of further celebrations in A.D. 11 in the provinces (Dio 56.25.3), and again in A.D. 13 (Dio 56.29.1, where the historianconfuses the Emperor's birthday with the Augustalia, an annual festival officially instituted in 11 B.C. to commemorate Augustus' return to Rome eight years earlier [Dio 54.34.1-2; cf. 54.10.3], and held from 3 to 12 October [Tac. Ann. 1.15.3-5; Acta Arvalium = Smallwood no. 26; CIL 1 332; Degrassi Inscr. It. 13.2.516; W.F. Snyder YCL7 7 (1940) 287]); two posthumous occasions are also recorded, in A.D. 14 and 15 (Dio 56.46.4; 57.14.4). For details of the celebrations on Augustus' birthday, see YCL 7 (1940) 227-230; Degrassi Inscr. It. 13.2.512-514.

24.7 εἴκόνα τοῦ τε Γαίου: See on Chapter 16.10 εἴκόνος.

24.8 καὶ γὰρ τὰ ἄλλα ὄσα ...: Suetonius (Gaius 44.2) gives a specific example of similar behaviour: Gaius sent word back to Rome of the submission of Adminius in Gaul, "monitis speculatoribus, ut vehiculo ad forum usque et curiam pertenderent nec nisi in aede Martis ac frequente senatu consulibus traderent."
25.1 ὶπὲκτείνε: Suetonius (Gaius 35.1) has recorded the apparent cause of Ptolemy's execution: "Ptolemaeum ... arcessitum e regno et exceptum honorifice, non alia de causa repente percussit, quam quod, edente se munus, ingressum spectacula convertisse hominum oculos fulgore purpureae abollae animadvertit." Like Agrippa and Antiochus, Ptolemy had perhaps been invited to Rome to take part in the celebrations associated with Gaius' intended triumph or ovatio (see on Chapter 24.1 ᾧπεδο). Hoffmann's suggestion (RE "Ptolemaios" col. 1780-1782), followed by Carcopino (Maroc pp. 191-99) and Fishwick (Historia 20 [1971] 467-73), that the incident of Ptolemy's purple
cloak occurred at the local amphitheatre of Lugdunum in the winter of A.D. 39/40 certainly fits Dio's ordering of events in these chapters. The statement of Seneca, however, that "Ptolemaeum ... inter Gaianas custodias vidimus" (Tranq. 11.12) surely should place the event in Rome, either before or (more likely) after Gaius' campaign in Germany and Gaul.

It is difficult to credit Suetonius' explanation of Ptolemy's death. While it is true that under Augustus client kings visited Rome "togati ac sine regio insigni more clientium" (Suet. Aug. 60), yet Tiberius had allowed even Roman citizens to wear purple clothing (Dio 57.13.5), and Agrippa himself wore a purple robe (Jos. AJ 18.6.6-7 [191; 195]). Nor is it necessary to accept Suetonius' suggestion that Gaius was given cause for anger only after the king's arrival in Rome: the fact that Mithridates of Armenia was summoned to the capital and imprisoned at the same time suggests that Gaius may have been planning a reorganization of those client states whose rulers he himself had not installed (cf. Sen. Tranq. 11.12, whose error in saying that Mithridates was exiled rather than imprisoned casts doubts on his statement that Gaius had at first intended to exile Ptolemy; Dio 60.8.2; cf. Willrich Caligula pp. 301-302; Marquardt Rom. St. 1.323). Other less likely motives for annexing Mauretania can be found in Romanelli Storia pp. 252-56. Dio's explanation, that Ptolemy was murdered for his wealth, has been successfully disproved by Willrich (Caligula p. 317), who points out that Mauretania was never a wealthy kingdom. The possibilities of suicide prompted by the loss of his kingdom, or of death by natural causes (Ptolemy was not a young man) cannot be excluded.

25.1 οἱ Μαυριτανίαι: Evidence from inscriptions dated by "provincial year" proves beyond doubt that Ptolemy's kingdom was put under Roman administration immediately in A.D. 40 (e.g., CIL 8.8630; cf.
369, 458, 630, 937, etc.; Carcopino *Maroc* 191-92; Mommsen *Roman Provinces* 2.308-314). Partly because a freedman of Ptolemy had led many of the Moors in revolt against the new Roman administration (Pliny *HN* 5.1.11), three governors and three years of fighting were required to pacify the area: M. Licinius Crassus Frugi in A.D. 40/41 (*CIL* 6.31721), C. Suetonius Paulinus in A.D. 41/42 (Dio 60.9.1; Pliny *HN* 5.14-15), and Cn. Hosidius Geta in A.D. 42/43 (Dio 60.9.1-2; cf. Romanelli *Storia* pp. 259-64). It remained for Claudius to divide the subdued kingdom into two provinces—Mauretania Caesariensis and Mauretania Tingitana—and to station a substantial force there to prevent further outbreaks of violence (Tac. *Hist.* 1.11; 2.58; cf. D. Fishwick *Historia* 20 [1971] 480-84). For his part in the conquest and organization of Mauretania, Claudius was persuaded to accept triumphal ornaments, "ἄλλα οὖθ' ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ πω ὄντα ὅτε διεπολεμήθη" (Dio 60.8.6). This no doubt deceived Pliny into thinking that the war there had begun under Claudius (*HN* 5.1.11).

25.1 ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ Βρεττανίᾳ στρατεύσων: Augustus had more than once contemplated an invasion of Britain to complete what Julius Caesar had only begun. Early in 34 B.C. he set out on an expedition "κατὰ τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς ζηλοῦ," only to turn back when he received news that the recently conquered people of Dalmatia had started to revolt (Dio 49.38.2). That his intentions were serious is shown by references to the intended campaign made both by Horace (*Od.* 1.35.29-30; on the date of this poem, cf. A. Momigliano *JRS* 40 [1950] 39-40; R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard *A Commentary on Horace Odes* I pp. xxviii-xxix) and by Vergil (*Geor.* 1.30; 3.25; on the date of composition, cf. L.P. Wilkinson *The Georgics of Virgil* p. 69).
By 27 B.C. he was making plans for another attempt, and even advanced as far as Gaul, where he seems to have received the submission of Dumnonbellanus and Tincommius, kings probably of the Trinobantes (Dio 53.22.5; RG 32.1; Str. 4.5.3; Hor. Od. 3.5.2-4, and Nisbet and Hubbard op. cit. pp. xxxv-xxxvii; cf. Epod. 7.7). Distracted once again, this time by disorders in Spain and Gaul, he was unable to press his advantage, and the Britons refused to accept the Roman terms. A third attempt to bring them under Roman domination was forestalled the following year by a pressing need to subdue some mountain tribes in the Alps and Pyrenees (Dio 53.25.2), after which Augustus abandoned any further thought of invasion.

Thereafter it was considered imperial policy to ignore Britain and the insignificant dangers that it posed to the security of the northwestern frontier (cf. Tac. Agr. 13.3: "longa oblivio Britanniae etiam in pace: consilium id divus Augustus vocabat, Tiberius praeceptum"). Strabo's assertion that the conquest of the island was unnecessary sounds very like an official imperial apology: since the British chieftains had already paid homage to Augustus, the whole island was in effect a Roman possession; there was no need to fear a British attack on Gaul; and the cost of garrisoning the island would not be offset by the resulting tribute, which would at any rate bring in less revenue than the existing portoria (2.5.8 [115-116]; 4.5.3 [200]; cf. CAH 10.793-794).

Gaius decided to reverse this policy late in A.D. 39, when he received the voluntary submission of Adminius, who had recently been expelled from the island by his father, Cynobellinus, king of the Britons (Suet. Gaius 44.2; Oros. 7.5.5). Orosius suggests that the homage paid Gaius by the prince removed any casus belli (so, too, CAH 10.796); P.J. Bicknell (AClass 5 [1962] 72-74) proposed that with the defection of Adminius Gaius felt it unnecessary
to invade Britain, but was persuaded by the prince to "make a triumphant demonstration against the Ocean, which dissident Britons regarded as their protection and shield against the power of Rome" (p. 73). But it seems more likely that he was prompted by the prince to invade Britain, probably in an attempt to install Adminius as client king (cf. Tac. Agr. 13.4: "agitasse Gaium Caesarem de intranda Britannia satis constat"; Dio 62.41). An attack on Britain would, at any rate, compensate for the unfortunate postponement of his German campaign, and this would seem too good an opportunity to pass up.

The invasion must have been planned for the early spring of A.D. 40, since Gaius was back in Italy by the end of May (see below, section 5): that a crossing of the Channel was extremely hazardous at that time of year need not indicate more than Gaius' lack of military experience. R.W. Davies' contention (*Historia* 15 [1966] 124-28) that this proves that Gaius had never planned an invasion of Britain, but was only continuing on the Channel shores the manoeuvres begun in Germany, has been well answered by P. Bicknell (*Historia* 17 [1968] 496-505). But Bicknell goes on to suggest that the invasion, perhaps planned in Rome as early as A.D. 39, had to be abandoned because the Emperor, after Gaetulicus' conspiracy, could not risk weakening the Rhine frontier further by removing troops for Britain. On the other hand, if we accept the existence of two new legions on the Rhine (see on Chapter 22.1 ἐς τὰ στρατεύματα), then it follows that a fighting spirit could best be instilled in Gaetulicus' pampered soldiers by removing them from their regular stations and leading them in a campaign against a new enemy, the Britons. Gaius erred, however, in thinking that such troops would follow him.

25.2 ἀνέπλευσε: The sudden about-face of Gaius after he had apparently set sail for Britain has been explained in various ways, none of them satisfactory: because he suddenly realized that he would be so
separated from the Senate that it might contemplate revolution (Willrich Caligula p. 314); because he learned that Britain was more prepared for an attack than it had been a few months earlier (Gelzer RE "Julius" col. 405-406); that Cynobellinus had sent him tribute to discourage the invasion (Venturini Caligola p. 154); or that, having set out himself, he soon discovered that his fleet was too small to transport his army (Dessau 2.1.125)! It is more than likely that Gaius' troops, like those of Claudius in A.D. 43 (Dio 60.19.2), were unwilling to take part in an expedition across a stormy sea to a land thought to be at the edge of the world and to be inhabited by fearsome tribes (Pareti Storia 4.788; cf. Dio 62.4.1, a fictitious speech of Boadicea suggesting that Dio may know more than he says: "καὶ τῷ Καῖσαρι τῷ Καλιγόλα, φοβερὸν τὸ καὶ πειρᾶσθαι τὸν πλοῦν ἐποιήσαμεν"). In A.D. 43 the army, indignant at receiving commands from Claudius' freedman, Narcissus, finally followed their commander across the Channel. Gaius devised no such ploy to win their support, and was compelled to abandon his invasion. The lax discipline of Gaetulicus was the cause behind this failure.

25.2 τὰ κογχύλια συλλέξασθαι: Cf. Suet. Gaius 46: "postremo, quasi perpetraturus bellum, directa acie in litore Oceani ac ballistis machinisque dispositis, ... repente ut conchas legerent galeasque et sinus replerent imperavit, spolia Oceani vocans Capitolio Palatioque debita"; and Aur. Vict. Caes. 3.11-12: "spolia a se non ex hominibus, sed caelestium capi dictitaret, scilicet quod huiuscemodi pisces Graecorum dicto, quis augendi omnia studium est, Nympharum lumina accepisset." Such an order may well have been intended, like the subsequent donative (see below, section 3), as an insult to the troops who had refused to obey his command to embark for Britain, particularly (as may be the case) if Gaius
had been thwarted in his attempt to decimate the reluctant legions (cf. Suet. 
Gaius 48.1-2; see Chapter 22.5).

Balsdon (JRS 24 [1934] 18; Gaius p. 92) has suggested another, rather 
more imaginative, explanation, though he does so with hesitation: that the 
"shells" were actually musculi, a rare term used by Caesar (BG 7.84; BC 
2.10.1) for the small huts that protected siege-engineers (cf. Veg. Mil. 
4.16: "musculos dicunt minores machinas, quibus protecti bellatores sudatum 
aufertunt civitates .... vocantur autem a marinis beluis musculi"). Such a 
word would be obscure enough to be misinterpreted by later writers (for 
musculi proper, cf. Celsius 2.29.2; 3.6.14). This suggestion of Balsdon 
has been dismissed by P.J. Bicknell (Historia 17 [1968] 499-500) because, he 
says, the common source of Dio and Suetonius was "the consular Cluvius 
Rufus, who must have had military experience and could not have made such a blunder" 
(p. 500). The blunder, however, might have been made by those using Cluvius 
Rufus; and Bicknell must be aware that the dependence of Dio and Suetónius 
on Cluvius is by no means certain.

25.3 Τῇν ἡμῷ ἕπανερκόμῃ πομηθήν: Suetonius (Gaius 47) describes the preparations 
that Gaius made for his return while still in 
Gaul: he had the triremes carried overland to Rome and, like Domitian after 
him (cf. Tac. Agr. 39.2), was accused of disguising friendly Gauls to take 
the place of the Germans he had failed to capture. Caesonia, who had probably 
remained in Rome, was said to have managed arrangements there: cf. Persius 
6.43-47: 

O bone, num ignoras? missa est a Caesare laurus 
insignem ob cladem Germanae pubis, et aris 
frigidus excutitur cinis ac iam postibus arma,
iam chlamydos regum, iam lutea gausapa captis
essedoque ingentèsque locat Caesonia Rhenos.

25.3 ὡς καὶ τὸν ἐκεινὸν αὐτοῦ δεδουλωμένος: As he had boasted after bridging the bay at Baiae (see Chapter 17.11). Before leaving the Channel, Gaius erected a lighthouse, to commemorate his "victory," according to Suetonius (Gaius 46), as well as to guide ships navigating the treacherous passage. Remains of a structure that may well be attributed to Gaius have been found near Boulogne: F. d'Erce (RA 1 [1966] 89-96) deduces from its strategic situation that it was built in anticipation of a second expedition against Britain. The lighthouse was used regularly until the sixteenth century; thereafter it was robbed for building material and was gradually eroded by the sea. For Mediaeval and Renaissance descriptions and drawings of the structure, see d'Erce loc. cit.

25.3 τοῖς στρατιώταισι πολλὰ ἐδωρήσατο: Suetonius is more accurate when he suggests that the donative was so small that it was insulting: "pronuntiatoque militi donativo centenis viritim denariis, quasi omne exemplum liberalitatis supergressus: 'abite,' inquit, 'laeti, abite locupletes'" (Gaius 46). It should be noted, however, that the regular troops had received only 75 denarii by Tiberius' will, and no bonus from Gaius on his accession (see Chapter 2.3). For earlier donatives, see Chapters 17.8; 22.7.

25.5 ἐσελθὼν ἐς τὴν πόλιν: Cf. Suet. Gaius 49.2: "omisso vel delato triumpho ovans urbem natali suo ingressus est." The Acta Arvalium (Smallwood no. 10; cf. Henzel 1-li; Dessau 2.1.128) record Gaius'
presence at a sacrifice performed by the Brethren on 1 June A.D. 40, three months before his birthday. The conflict with Suetonius has been explained away by Balsdon (Gaius p. 96; JRS 24 [1934] 20-21), who suggests that the Emperor bypassed Rome in the early summer on his way south into Campania, where he delayed until his entry into the city on 31 August. That Gaius was indeed south of Rome during the summer of A.D. 40 is implied by Pliny's comment (HN 32.1.4) that the Emperor travelled to Antium from Astura shortly before his death. This prolonged sojourn south of Rome was perhaps the source of a rumour that he intended to remove the capital to Antium (Suet. Gaius 49.2). Since the grove of Dea Dia, where many of the Arvals' sacrifices were carried out, was outside the pomoerium (cf. Smallwood Legatio p. 254), Gaius could have attended the ceremony on 1 June without crossing the religious boundary of the city and so losing his right to a triumph or ovation.

There is, however, some doubt that Gaius ever intended to celebrate a triumph rather than a simple ovation, since it was traditional to be granted only the latter for victory in a civil war. Augustus, for example, celebrated triumphs for his successes over foreign enemies in Dalmatia, at Actium, and in Egypt, but triumphal oviations after Philippi and Sicily (Suet. Aug. 22; RG 4.1; cf. Gell. 5.6.21; see on Chapter 16.11 τὸ ἐπὶ Κίλιαν).

25.5 τὴν μὲν βουλήν ...: Cf. Sen. de Ira 3.19.2: "... homo, qui de toto senatu trucidando cogitabat." Dio's reason for Gaius' hostility towards the senators, that they had not voted him divine honours, anticipates his account of the Emperor's desire to be worshipped, which apparently began only after Gaius had briefly relaxed his "despotic" behaviour (see Chapter 26.5). Suetonius' explanation of his anger, that he was upset at being deprived of his deserved triumph (Gaius 48.2) is no more
convincing, since the Senate was hardly in a position to refuse him what was a prerogative of the imperial family. His hostility was rather due to the participation of senators and magistrates in the conspiracy of Gaetulicus (see Chapter 23.5).

25.5 πολὺ μὲν ἀργύριον ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 37.1: "quin et nummos non mediocris summae e fastigio basilicae Iuliae per aliquot dies sparsit in plebem." The Chronographer of 354 (Mon. Germ. Hist. 9.145.23-25) supplies more information, the remarkable detail of which gives the impression of accuracy: "cong. dedit *LXXIS et de basilica Iulia sparsit aureos et argentos, in qua rapina perierunt homines XXXII, [mulieres] CCXLVII et spado." Josephus mentions that, during this congiarium, Cassius Chaerea was standing behind Gaius on the roof, but refrained from pushing him off (AJ 19.1.11 [71]): he either had not yet conceived of his conspiracy, or thought that the circumstances were not favourable.

For an earlier distribution of money to the populace, see Chapter 9.6 (A.D. 38).

25.5a ἐκ δὲ τῶν μοιχεῖν ...: If this excerpt from John of Antioch is not corrupt, then the play on words must be similar to that found in the verses sung by Julius Caesar's veterans during his triumph (Suet. Caes. 49.4):

Gallias Caesar subegit, Nicomedes Caesarem:
ecce Caesar nunc triumphat qui subegit Gallias,
Nicomedes non triumphat qui subegit Caesarem.

Dio's word ἀντικράτωρ, then, would suggest Suetonius' triumphat, and κεχειρωμένος the Latin subegit. The sentence may be a reflection of an apotropaic poem sung by Gaius' soldiers during his ovation.
The parallel with Caesar is not a completely happy one, particularly since Gaius had just been hailed as a consul several times following the suppression of Gaetulicus' conspiracy (Chapter 22.2); and, rather surprisingly, there is no evidence that χερδον was ever used in an obscene sense. Perhaps μαχων should be read in place of μοιχειων.


25.5b [Zon.] Ἀνίκιον Κερεάλιον ... Σέξτον Παπίνιον: Sextus Papinius (PIR1 P 75) was actually the son of a consular (Sen. de Ira 3.18.3), probably of that Sextus Papinius Allenius who had been consul ordinarius in A.D. 36 (Tac. Ann. 6.40.1; CIL 5.2823). The elder Papinius seems to have divorced the mother of his two sons, the older of whom committed suicide in A.D. 37 (Tac. Ann. 6.49). At this time our Papinius, the younger brother, was perhaps adopted by Anicius Cerealis, who could not have been his senior by many years. It is nowhere stated explicitly that Papinius was among those executed for treason in A.D. 40 (cf. Sen. de Ira 3.18.3).

Anicius Cerealis (PIR2 A 594) was not put to death as Dio suggests, probably because he did break down and exposed his fellow conspirators. He became suffect consul in August A.D. 65, when his obsequious proposal for the immediate erection of a temple to the Divine Nero was vetoed by that Emperor (Tac. Ann. 15.74.3; cf. ILS 8584). Implicated, perhaps wrongly, in the conspiracy of Piso, he took his own life the following year, "minore quam ceteri miseratione, qui proditam C. Caesari coniurationem ab eo meminerant" (Tac. Ann. 16.7.8).
The torture of senators, while unusual, was not Gaius' innovation: it had been instigated by both Tiberius and the senators themselves (Dio 57.19.2; cf. Suet. Tib. 58; Willrich Caligula pp. 432-33).

25.6 [Xiph.] Βετιλίνου δὲ Κάσσου: His name should rather be Betilienus Bassus (cf. Sen. de Ira 3.18.3; PIR² B 114). Bassus, whose father was one of Gaius' procurators, held the quaestorship at the time of his arrest. He was tortured for information about the conspiracy at the same time as Sextus Papinius and, if Dio is correct that he was executed, he may have been among those who, Seneca says (de Ira 3.18.3; cf. Suet. Gaius 26.3), were decapitated by the impatient Emperor.

25.6 [Xiph.] Καπίτωνα: Cf. PIR² B 116. The story of a father being compelled by the Emperor to witness his son's execution is a common one in the tradition surrounding Gaius. Suetonius makes the general statement that "parentes supplicio filiorum interesse cogebat" (Gaius 27.4), and Seneca adds an odious detail: "adicere his longum est, quod patres quoque occisorum eadem nocte, dimissis per domos centurionibus, confecit, id est, homo misericors luctu liberavit" (de Ira 3.19.5). In the same essay (2.33.3-4) Seneca recounts a story that may be attributed to the punishment of these same conspirators: Gaius invited the father of a certain Pastor to dine with him on the night of his son's execution, and forced him to drink to the Emperor's health and to wear perfume and garlands.

The story of a father and son being killed together is a common motif among other imperial historians as well: Appian tells of the death of Cicero's brother, Quintus, and his son (BC 4.4.20), and of two Metelli (4.6.42);
Suetonius (Aug. 13.2) tells an anecdote about the young Octavian whose cruelty rivals that of Gaius.

25.6 [Exc. Vat.] μύσαι τοὺς ἀφροδισίους: The text as it stands makes no sense. It is clearly corrupt, although Boissevain notes that the MS clearly shows ἀφροδισίους. The most acceptable explanation is that the word is a gloss inserted to explain the verb μύσαι, which appears in its normal intransitive sense in both Zonaras and Xiphilinus. As for the nature of the original gloss before its corruption, ὀφθαλμοῦς seems the most obvious reading, or perhaps ὀφρῶς ὀροσῶς (but see Boissevain's note ad loc.).

25.6 [Exc. Vat.] τοὺς συνειδότας: We know the names of only a few of the other conspirators: perhaps this was the occasion for the execution of the philosophers Julius Canus and Rectus (see on Chapter 20.6 Καρρίναν); Balsdon's suggestion (Gaius p. 98, n. 1) that Demetrius the Cynic was involved has no real foundation (cf. Sen. Ben. 7.11.2); but we do know that Julius Graecinus, the father of Agricola, was probably executed in A.D. 40, and it may have been in this plot that he was implicated (Sen. Ben. 2.21.5; Tac. Agr. 4.1; Willrich: Caligula p. 436; see on Chapter 8.4 ὃ δὲ ὃ ἐνεπερθέρσ). There were, Suetonius mentions (Gaius 56.1), other conspiracies that went undetected.

25.7 [Zon.] τοὺς ὑπάρχουσ ...: On the two praetorian prefects, one of whom was probably Clemens, see Chapters 10.6 and 29.1; for Callistus, who was part of the successful conspiracy the following year, see Chapters 19.6 and 29.1; for Caesonia, Chapter 23.7.
25.8: [Zon.] ἐξ ἐκείνου δὲ μισεῖσθαι νομίσας ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 56.1, concerning the two praetorian prefects: "quod ipsi quoque etsi falso in quadam coniuratione quasi participes nominati, suspectos tamen se et invisos sentiebant. nam et statim seductis magnam fecit invidiam destricto gladio affirmans sponte se periturum, si et illis morte dignus videretur, nec cessavit ex eo criminari alterum alteri atque inter se omnis committere."

25.9 ἀμνηστίαν αὐτοῖς δέδωκεν: See Chapter 26.3-5.
CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

26.1 [Xiph.] ἢν δὲ τις Πρωτογένης: Protogenes (PIR¹ P 757) is named by Juvenal among other famous delatores (3.120). Nothing is known of his ancestry or other exploits under Gaius. He was executed in the first year of Claudius' reign, and his two infamous books were burned (Dio 60.4.5).

26.1 βιβλία ἄεὶ ὑπὸ περιφέρειαν: Suetonius (Gaius 49.3; cf. Oros. 7.5.10) clarifies Xiphilinus' brevity: the two books, Gladius and Pugio, contained a list of those marked for execution, presumably on charges of maiestas arising principally from the recent conspiracies. The words of Petrus Patricius, "ἐν οἷς τὰς συκοφαντίας ἔγραφεν" (Exc. Vat. 32), erroneously suggest that Protogenes was indulging in blackmail.

26.2 Ἐκριβωνίῳ Πρόκλῳ: Scribonius Proculus (PIR¹ S 215) is no doubt the same senator as the one mentioned by Suetonius in an almost identical story (Gaius 28): the Emperor, according to his version, "nec ante satiatus est quam membra et artus et viscera hominis tracta per vicos atque ante se congesta vidisset."

26.3 πανηγύρεις τέ τινας ἐψηφίσαντο: Other honours granted to Gaius at this time are probably those recorded in Suet. Gaius 16.4, although these are placed by Suetonius after Gaius had released Pomponius and his mistress. They included a clipeus aureus, to be carried in an annual festival to the Capitoline; and a decree that his dies imperii be called the Parilia, "velut argumentum rursus conditae urbis"
(Gelzer [RE "Julius" col. 388] wrongly assigns the creation of this festival to Gaius' first consulship, in A.D. 37). Because his assassination anticipated the next anniversary of his accession, there is no mention of the Parilia in inscriptions (on Gaius' *dies imperii*, see Chapter 1.1).

26.3 Φρουρᾶ στρατωτικῆ: Either the Senate, in a rather backward fashion, intended to prove its loyalty to Gaius by this action, or the Emperor himself had requested the presence of a guard in the Curia to protect him from the real hostility of an Order whose members had already instigated at least three conspiracies.

A similar guard, consisting of the praetorian prefect together with tribunes and centurions, had been requested by Tiberius in A.D. 33, and was granted by the Senate (Dio 58.18.5-6; Tac. *Ann.* 6.15.5-6; the guard was in fact never used, since Tiberius did not return to Rome). It is significant that, only the year before this, the Senate itself had voted Tiberius the protection of twenty senators armed with daggers. This motion was rejected by the Emperor, allegedly because it was without precedent, but actually because it would have exposed him to an even greater danger (Dio 58.17.4-18.1: with his customary perception Dio comments that this resolution of A.D. 32 was clearly directed by the senators against themselves; cf. Merivale 5.454).

The presence in the Curia of an armed bodyguard loyal only to the Emperor marks a significant stage both in the growing mistrust between the two most powerful branches of the Roman administration, and in the revelation that the Principate had always been a thinly veiled military monarchy. The practice was to be continued by Claudius (Suet. *Claud.* 12.1).
26.4 ΠΟΜΠΟΝΙΟΥ: Josephus, who gives the man's name as Pompedius (cf. PIR¹ P 516), says that he had been accused of referring to Gaius by obnoxious epithets. When his mistress, an actress named Quintilia, refused to give evidence against him since she believed in his innocence, Gaius had her tortured by Cassius Chaerea, but was so moved by her resulting disfigurement that he released them both, giving the woman money as recompense for her lost beauty (AJ 19.1.5 [32-36]). The amount of the gift, found in Suetonius' abbreviated version of the story, was 800,000 sesterces (Gaius 16.4)!

Pomponius should probably be identified with the Pompeius Pennus (PIR¹ P 482) described by Seneca as "summis usus honoribus," who when released by Gaius was forced to kiss the Emperor's left foot (Ben. 2.12.1-2). His consulship cannot be dated, but since Seneca calls him senex as well as consularis it seems unlikely that he was one of the two consuls deposed by Gaius the previous year (see Chapter 20.1 and note on Chapter 20.3 ΕΚΚΕΙΝΟΥΣ).

26.5 τῶν μὲν ἀνδρῶν τῶν δὲ θεῶν: It has already been shown (see notes on Chapter 1.1) that from the very beginning of his reign Gaius had been treated to that peculiar form of personal ruler-worship common throughout the eastern Mediterranean from the beginning of the Bronze Age. A decree of Cyzicus called him the New Sun, an epithet that was bound to suggest his association with Apollo (SIG 798 = Smallwood no. 401); a bronze coin minted at Alexandria in A.D. 37/38 showed on the obverse a bust of the Emperor radiate (Smallwood no. 126); and provincials had requested and received the privilege of erecting statues to him (ILS 8792
Smallwood no. 361; see on Chapter 4.4 εἰκόνας). All western rulers of eastern subjects had been accorded the same honours, from Alexander through Sulla and Pompey to Augustus and Tiberius (for a list of the cults established to lesser Roman magistrates in the East, see G.W. Bowersock *Augustus and the Greek World* pp. 150-51). What made Gaius unique among Roman rulers—and what exposed him to the disgust and ridicule of some of his fellow Romans—was his willingness to act fully the roles that had been passed on to him, and by so doing to violate the dignitas associated with his position.

In his attempt to conciliate the Republican, or rather aristocratic, elements of the conservative Senate, Augustus had consistently refused to allow divine worship of himself within Italy (e.g., Dio 53.27.3), while at the same time he encouraged the provincials to show their loyalty to Rome and to the Imperial House by erecting temples to "Rome and Augustus" or by sacrificing at an altar of the Emperor (cf. Dio 54.32.1; Suet. Aug. 52; Tac. Ann. 4.37.4; but cf. Jos. *AJ* 15.10.3 [363], which seems to indicate a temple dedicated to Augustus alone). The same diplomatic result was obtained by Romans in Italy and abroad through the worship of Augustus' divine ancestors, Venus and Julius, as well as of his own genius (Dio 51.20.6; Tac. Ann. 1.73.2; Ov. *Pont.* 4.9.105-110; Hor. *Od.* 4.5.31-36). For a list of inscriptions recording divine honours given to Augustus and his family throughout the Empire, see L.R. Taylor *TAPhA* 51 [1920] 116-33; *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* pp. 270-83. The very name Augustus, of course, carried with it certain religious connotations from the beginning. "Imperator cum Augusti nomen accepit, tamquam praesenti et corporali deo fidelis est praestanda devotion" (Veg. *Mil.* 2.5): such a comment could with some justification be applied to the early Emperors as well.
Tiberius, always determined to follow where his predecessor led, officially maintained the same attitude. While always claiming that he was no more than human (Tac. Ann. 4.38), he was still referred to as θεός in eastern inscriptions (e.g., IGRR 3.721 = E&J no. 88 [Lycia]; IGRR 4.144 = E&J no. 352 [Cyzicus]), and was associated with Jupiter in such western areas as Aquitania (cf. E&J no. 132) and Lutetia (ILS 4613d = E&J no. 341). His son, Drusus, and Germanicus appear together as νέοι θεοί on a coin from Lydia (E&J no. 130a); the popularity of Germanicus especially is obvious in inscriptions from the East, in which he is called for example σωτήρ καὶ ἐθεργήτης (IGRR 3.715 [Lycia]; for other examples see Rosborough pp. 8-11).

Such an extravagant epithet as θεός, it must be assumed, was intended to convey extraordinary honour rather than belief in its bearer's divinity. This fact must have been realized by the Romans themselves, who do not criticize Augustus and Tiberius for allowing its use (notice, e.g., Verg. Eel. 1.6: "... deus nobis haec otia fecit.") See further on these points L.R. Taylor The Divinity of the Roman Emperor pp. 142-238; G.W. Bowersock op. cit. pp. 112-21; T. Rice Holmes Architect of the Roman Empire 2.69-72; 156-58. The cult of the Emperor, then, was viewed as an expediency by the Romans, who saw their own gods in the same light (cf. Ov. AA 1.635: "expedit esse deos, et ut expedit, esse putemus"). For Emperor-worship in general, see E. Kornemann Klio 1 (1901) 51-146; M.P. Charlesworth HThR 28 (1935) 5-44. Charlesworth also discusses the divine honours refused by Augustus, Tiberius and Claudius in PBSR 15 (1939) 1-10; and M. Rostovtzeff (RH 163 [1930] 1-26) points out the similarities between Hellenistic ruler-cults and the worship of Tiberius in the eastern Mediterranean.

Gaius' mistakes—and they no doubt contributed to the hostility that prompted his assassination—were that he demanded such divine honours openly,
rather than simply acquiescing in them; that he encouraged the application of this traditional eastern practice in Italy and Rome; and that he actively associated himself—for he was as much an actor as Nero was to be (see Chapter 5.4-5)—with the divine personalities of various cults.

Such behaviour on the part of a youthful monarch should not be surprising. As a boy of six Gaius had accompanied his father on his mission to the East (Suet. Gaius 10.1; cf. Tac. Ann. 2.70.2; 3.1.5; Willrich Caligula p. 88), and was no doubt aware that his mother, Agrippina, was deified on Lesbos after giving birth to Julia there (IG 12.2.212 = E&J no. 95; cf. Tac. Ann. 2.54.1), while Germanicus was hailed as a living god by the Egyptians (E&J no. 320b). Since he was not to have the same sentimental or political attachment to Republican traditions as both his predecessors had exhibited, Gaius would be quite prepared to ignore those traditions to strengthen his hold over his subjects.

By assenting to the deification of Augustus, Tiberius had been able to place himself in the same relation to his predecessor as Augustus had been to Julius Caesar: he was *divi filius* (the title appears almost immediately on his coinage: cf. BMC Imp. 1.120, no. 1). Gaius, however, had not been adopted by Tiberius, nor was he able in any case to obtain that Emperor's consecration (see Chapter 3.7). He lacked, then, that direct link with divinity that had been such an integral part of imperial propaganda (on this political use of religion, see E. Bickermann Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 27 [1929] 29-30). The best he could claim was to be *divi Augusti pronepos*, which appears on his coinage from A.D. 39 onwards (e.g., BMC Imp. 1.155, no. 56). Although it was too late to elevate Germanicus to divine status, Gaius was able to carry through the posthumous deification of his sister Drusilla in A.D. 38, with no obvious opposition (Chapter 11.3-4).
Clearly the next logical step—and in Gaius' mind a necessary one—was to promote more direct worship of himself throughout the Empire.

The step was not a large one, and other sources besides Dio (see also Chapter 27.2) bear witness to the effect that excessive flattery had on precipitating the young Emperor's designs: "verum admonitus et principum et regum se excessisse fastigium, divinam ex eo maiestatem asserere sibi coepit" (Suet. Gaius 22.2); "οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι πάντες, ἄνδρες, γυναῖκες, πόλεις, ξύνη, χώραι, κλίματα γῆς, ὀλίγου δὲν φάναι πάσα ἤ οἰκουμένη... ἐκοιλάκευον αὐτὸν ἀποσεμνύνοντες πλέουν τοῦ μετρίου καὶ τῶν τύφων συναύξοντες" (Philo Leg. 16.116 [562]; cf. Jos. AJ 18.7.2 [256]). There is much truth in Juvenal's comment that "nihil est quod credere de se | non possit cum laudatur dis aequa potestas" (4.70-71).

It was perhaps such flattery from the embassy of Alexandrian Greeks, who were probably meeting with Gaius about this time (see Balsdon Gaius p. 164), that caused the Emperor to remark to their adversaries on the Jewish embassy, "δυνάς ... ἐστὲ οἱ θεομιστεῖς, οἱ θεοῦ μὴ νομίζοντες εἶναι μὲ, τὸν ἢ ηῆ παρὰ πάσι τοῖς ἄλλοις διωμολογημένον..." (Philo Leg. 44.353 [597]). Such a comment from Gaius, while admittedly rash, expresses his anger at the Jews' disloyalty as much as his surprise at their disbelief. On the steps taken by Gaius in retaliation for the Jews' refusal to participate in the imperial cult, see particularly Philo Leg. 31.207-42.337 (576-595); Jos. BJ 2.10.1-5 (184-203); AJ 18.8.1-9 (257-309). A summary of the confused events in Alexandria and Judaea at this time can be found in Willrich Caligula pp. 65-87; Balsdon Gaius pp. 111-45; JRS 24 (1934) 19-24; E.M. Smallwood Latomus 16 (1957) 3-17; Legatio pp. 31-36.
26.5 τὴν Σελήνην συγγίγνεσθαι: Cf. Suet. Gaius 22.4: "et noctibus quidam plenam fulgentemque lunam invitabat assidue in amplexus atque concubitum." See also Chapter 27.6, where the same verb, συγγίγνομαι, probably suggests conversation rather than sexual intercourse.

26.5 ὑπὸ τῆς Νίκης στεφανωθαι: The same motif of Victoria Dea crowning the triumphant Emperor was applied by Ovid to Augustus: "[sc. Victoria] ponat et in nitida laurea sertas coma ..." (Trist. 2.172). In a similar fashion Augustus was shown on the Gemma Augustea as Jupiter being crowned by Oikoumene.

26.5 Zeus τε εἶναι ἐπλάττετο: Cf. Suet. Gaius 22.2: "quidam eum Latiarem Iovem consalutarunt." See further Chapter 28.2-5. According to Philo (Leg. 43.346 [596]), Gaius contemplated turning the Temple in Jerusalem into a sanctuary to himself under the name Zeus Ἐπιφάνης Νέος. The epithet was perhaps consciously adopted from Antiochus IV Epiphanes, king of the Seleucid Empire in the second century B.C., who in his determination to force his Jewish subjects into the mould of Hellenism attempted to install Zeus Olympius in the Temple (Jos. BJ 1.1.1-5 [31-40]; AJ 12.5.4 [248-256]; II Macc. 6.2).

26.6 τοσσότον θαλάσσης μέτρον ἔξευξε: See Chapter 17.11.

26.6 τὸν τε Ἡρωκλέα τὸν τε Διόνυσον: See below, section 7, where Gaius is said to have outfitted himself with a club and a lion's skin. Philo (Leg. 11.78-79 [557]) makes the significant remark that the Emperor first began to act the part of demigods, particularly
Dionysus, the Dioscuri, and Heracles (cf. his phrase "οὐκεῦμην ὄλλοτε ὄλλοις ἄνελάμβανε, τότε μὲν λεοντὶ καὶ ὀξαπαλον ...". He then goes on to complain that Gaius did not carry his masquerade further by emulating the good deeds of those heroes as well as their costumes (11.81 [557] - 12.92 [559]). For his imitation of Dionysus, cf. Philostr. VA 5.32, where Gaius is described as διόνυσσομανών; as for his playing the part of Heracles, Gaius may have been imitating his great-grandfather, Antony (Plu. Ant. 42; cf. M. Rostovtzeff JRS 13 [1923] 91-109).

Hellenistic rulers often identified themselves with Dionysus in particular: he was, in the words of Michael Grant, "the characteristic universal god of the Hellenistic age, the deity who stood for eastern conquest" (Cleopatra p. 110; see, too, pp. 22-26). Most important from Gaius' point of view, both Alexander and Antony saw themselves as νέοι Διόνυσοι, and considered their worship in that form as part of the official ruler-cult (for Alexander, see A.D. Nock JHS 48 [1928] 21-38; for Antony, see Dio 48.39.2; Plu. Ant. 24.3; Vell. 2.82.4; K. Scott CPh 24 [1929] 133-41). Once again Gaius' innovation—and his mistake—was to introduce such a custom into Rome itself.

26.6 τοῦ τε Ἀπόλλων. Cf. Philo Leg. 13.95 [559]: "... στεφάνως μὲν ἀκτινοειδέσθαι τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀναδομήν, τὸ δεῖ τῇ εὐνωμῇ καὶ βέλη κρατῶν χείρι, χάριτας δὲ τῇ δεξιᾷ προτείνων ..." (cf. Paus. 9.35.3). It is important to notice that all these divinities imitated by Gaius—Apollo, Dionysus, Heracles—are associated with the spread of civilization and the conquest of barbarism, particularly in the Hellenistic period (cf. M. Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire p. 78); and as the god of music, Apollo must have been doubly attractive to the performer in Gaius.
Gaius was certainly not the first Roman Emperor to indulge in divine play-acting. As a young man Augustus had participated in a οενα δωσκάθεος, in which he appeared dressed as Apollo. For this he was severely criticized (Suet. Aug. 70.1). He also adopted the swan, sacred to Apollo, as his own symbol: it appears several times, for example, on the Ara Pacis.

It is quite possible, if not provable, that Gaius' behaviour may indicate his involvement in an eastern mystery religion: "Aber können die Göttergestalten--männliche und weibliche--von denen wir hören, mit einer etwa zwölfstündigen Fahrt durch die Unterwelt, die etwa mit der Apotheose in Gestalt des Sonnengottes, 'des Führers der Götter,' schliesst, kombiniert werden?" (S. Eitrem SO 10 [1932] 51; cf. Jos. AJ 19.1.5 [30]).

26.6 "Αρτέμις καὶ Ἀφροδίτη: For Artemis, see below, section 7; concerning his impersonation of Aphrodite, see Suet. Gaius 52 ("etiam Veneris cultu conspectus est").

26.6 τὸ ἄλλο σχῆμα: Philo, who compares Gaius to Proteus because of his transformations, comments: "εἰδὴ ὁσπέρ ἐν θεάτρῳ σκηνὴν ἄλλοτε ἄλλοιαν ἀνελάμβανε" (Leg. 11.78-80 [557]; cf. Suet. Gaius 52).

26.7 καὶ κράνος ἀσπίδα τε ἐφόρει: That is, he identified himself with the god Mars. Cf. Philo Leg. 13.97 [559]: "πολλάκις δὲ καὶ θώρακα ἐνδυμάμενος ξιφῆρης προῆλε μετὰ κράνους καὶ ἀσπίδος, Ἀρης ἀνακαλούμενος."

26.8 τοῖς προσθέτοις τοῖς τε περιθέτοις: For Gaius' use of wigs and other trappings, cf. Jos. AJ 19.1.5 [30]: "... ἐν τινών τελεταίς μυστηρίων, ὡς αὐτὸς συνίστατο, στολὰς τε ἐνδυμάμενος
γυναικείους καὶ τινὺς περιθέσεις πλοκαμίδων ἐπινοῶν ἄλλα τε ὁπόσα ἐπικατα-
ψεύσασθαι θηλύτητα τῆς θύεως ἔμελλεν."

26.8 Χρηματίζοντα: Gaius was probably not "uttering oracles" (Cary), but
rather "conducting judicial business" (cf. Dio 57.7.2).

26.9 Μέγα παράληπημα: "One who raves and talks nonsense" (cf. Ar. Eq. 531;
Ra. 594).

26.9 Σκυτοτόμος γὰρ ἦν: Balsdon (Gaius p. 169, n. 1) has suggested that
the story may originally have been a joke on the
Emperor's nickname, Caligula. If so, it is impossible now to reconstruct.
Gelzer (RE "Julius" col. 411) takes the incident to indicate that Gaius was
not particularly serious about his own divinity as far as the common people
were concerned.

26.10 Καὶ ίκετεῖαι καὶ εὐχαὶ θυσίαι τε: Cf. Suet. Gaius 22.3; see also
Chapter 28.6.

26.10 ἐν τῇ στρατικῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ νικητηρίᾳ σκευῇ: Seneca (Const. Sap. 18.3)
describes Gaius in his
extravagant dress as "perlucidus, crepidatus, auratus." According to
Suetonius (Gaius 52), the Emperor often wore triumphal dress even before
he was entitled to do so by the award of an ovation (for his ovation, see
Chapter 16.11).
CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

27.1 τὴν χεῖρα ἢ τὸν πόδα προσκυνεῖν ὤρεγε: So Gaius is said to have presented his left foot to be kissed by Pompeius Pennus after he had released him from prison (Sen. Ben. 2.12.1 [see Chapter 26.4]; another example of this behaviour can be found in Chapter 29.5), and to have offered his hand to be kissed by Cassius Chaerea (Suet. Gaius 56.2: "[sc. Cassio] agenti gratias osculandum manum offere formatam commotamque in obscaenum modum"). Even the Jews seem to have offered the Emperor such obeisance, and of their own accord (Philo Leg. 44.352 [597]: "μετ’αἵδοῦς καὶ εὐλαξεῖς τῆς ἀπώσης νεύοντες εἰς τούδαφος ἔδεξιούμεθα").

Aristotle (Rhet. 1.5.9) talks of προσκύνησις as one of several honours bestowed upon worthy men, but includes it among τὰ βαρβαρικὰ. It is not at all clear whether the word was taken to suggest kissing, prostration, or a combination of the two: L.R. Taylor (The Divinity of the Roman Emperor pp. 18-21; 256-66) associates one form of proskynesis with the simple ritualistic kissing of one's fingers during a toast or libation. Definitions are perhaps unimportant in a discussion of προσκύνησις under Gaius, since it seems in most cases to have involved kissing the Emperor's foot, necessitating a position that would seem very like grovelling. The custom was considered by the Romans not so much an act of worship as undignified and unworthy of a free man (cf. Tac. Ann. 1.13.7, the well-known story of Q. Haterius kneeling to Tiberius). Inevitably, however, as M.P. Charlesworth has pointed out (HThR 28 [1935] 17-18), just as with the terms dominus and deus, "abasement and worship tend to be mingled."

For the introduction of this eastern practice to Rome, perhaps by Vitellius, see below, section 5. There can be little doubt that Gaius'
acceptance of the custom was prompted by the behaviour of one of his heroes, Alexander the Great (for Alexander's thwarted attempt to introduce proskynesis among his reluctant Macedonians, see Arr. An. 4.12; Plu. Alex. 54). The practice was outlawed by Claudius soon after his accession (Dio 60.4.5). See Smallwood Legatio pp. 209-11.

As for senators formally thanking the Emperor for having kissed them, it is worth noting how acceptable the custom had become by Trajan's time: "gratum erat cunctis, quod senatum osculo exciperes, ut dimissus osculo fueras" (Pliny Pan. 23.1).

27.1 τούς δροχηστάς ...: An example is given by Suetonius (Gaius 55.1):

"Mnesterem pantomimum etiam inter spectacula osculabatur" (see also Chapter 5.2-3).

27.2 Οὔτελλιος δ' Λούκιος: Lucius Vitellius (PIR¹ V 500), the father of the future Emperor (Suet. Vit. 3.2; Tac. Hist. 1.9), was from a family whose origin was debated even in antiquity, despite Dio's comment that he was οὔτ' ἀγεννής (on the "nobility" of Vitellius' birth, see M. Gelzer The Roman Nobility p. 144). His ultimate ancestor, according to the results of Suetonius' research (Vit. 1.1-2.2), was either a patrician of Sabine stock or a shoemaker; his father, however, P. Vitellius, was a knight from Nuceria who served as procurator rerum Augusti. Lucius Vitellius was enrolled as an Arval at least from A.D. 28 until the reign of Claudius (cf. Smallwood no. 13; 15). He was first elected consul for A.D. 34 (Dio 58.24.1; Tac. Ann. 6.28.1; Fasti = E&J p. 53), and was appointed governor of Syria the following year (Suet. Vit. 2.4; Pliny BN 15.21.83). Despite his rather poor reputation at Rome (caused, says Suetonius, "amore libertinae perinamis"
(Vit. 2.4]), he performed his duties in the province exceptionally well (Tac. Ann. 6.32.5). It was this Vitellius, for example, who by removing Pontius Pilate from the procuratorship of Judaea managed temporarily to placate the irate Jews (Jos. AJ 18.4.2-3 [88-95]). He remained at his post in Syria until recalled at this time by Gaius.

Following the assassination of Gaius, Vitellius' friendship with Claudius (e.g., Jos. AJ 20.1.2 [12]) brought him a second consulship in A.D. 43 and a third in A.D. 47, both with the Emperor as his colleague (Fasti Antiates = Inscr. It. 13.2.324-327 = Smallwood no. 171; cf. Smallwood no. 373; Dio 60.29.1; Tac. Ann. 14.56.1). He was also entrusted with the administration of the Empire while Claudius was campaigning in Britain (Dio 60.21.2; Suet. Vit. 2.4), and was the Emperor's colleague in the censorship for A.D. 47/48 (Tac. Ann. 12.4.1; Hist. 1.52; Suet. Vit. 2.4; Pliny HN 15.21.83; ILS 211 = Smallwood no. 311). It is unlikely that Vitellius' public success under Claudius was due solely to his servility, for which he was well known (e.g., Tac. Ann. 6.32.7; 11.34.1; 12.4.1). Yet he was obviously quite adept at keeping the favour of the Emperor by ingratiating himself with Claudius' influential wives, first Messalina (Dio 60.29.6; Suet. Vit. 2.5), and then Agrippina (Dio 60.30.8; Tac. Ann. 12.4). His attentions to the latter bore fruit in A.D. 51, when he was accused of maiestas but was acquitted through the persuasion of Agrippina (Tac. Ann. 12.42.4). Since no more is heard of him, and his name is not included among the Arvals under Nero, he must have died shortly after his trial.

27.3 τοῦ Ἀρταβάνου: Artabanus III (PIR² A 1155), a member of the Arsacid family, had become king of the Parthian Empire in A.D. 15 after the expulsion of Vonones, who was unpopular because he had been
brought up in Rome and had returned to Parthia as king partly through the influence of Augustus (Tac. Ann. 2.1.1-3.1; Jos. AJ 18.2.4 [39-49]; cf. RG 32.1; 33). Vonones fled to Armenia, where he was able to seize power, since the country had been without a ruler following a confused series of successions, expulsions, and assassinations. The governor of Syria, however, intimidated by threats from Artabanus, had Vonones removed to his province (Tac. Ann. 2.3.2-4.5; Jos. AJ 18.2.4 [49-52]).

Tiberius saw this slight to Roman power as a dangerous precedent, and so sent Germanicus, his most capable general, on a mission in A.D. 18 to settle the turbulent eastern affairs in a manner favourable to Rome (Tac. Ann. 2.5.1; 2.53; Suet. Gaius 1.2). Germanicus installed as king of Armenia Zeno, the son of Polemo of Pontus (for whom, see on Chapter 12.2 Κότυι), a choice that seems to have pleased the natives (Tac. Ann. 2.56.1-3; cf. BMC Imp. 1.162, no. 104 = E&J no. 182; E&J no. 173. The new king adopted the name Artaxias). At the same time Artabanus requested a meeting with the Roman prince at the Euphrates River, to renew the treaty that had been struck between Augustus and Phraates III and to make some demands concerning Vonones. But Germanicus, fearful of Tiberius' jealousy, declined (Tac. Ann. 2.58.1-2; Willrich [Caligula pp. 96; 297-302] is probably right in accusing Artabanus of playing Germanicus off against Tiberius). The Armenian problem, however, had been settled, and relations between Parthia and Rome remained undisturbed for sixteen years.

27.3 μηδεμιον τιμωριον ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀρμενίᾳ ἐδεδώκει: On the death of Artaxias in A.D. 35, Artabanus disrupted the delicate balance of power in the East by placing his own son, Arsaces, on the throne of Armenia, by threatening to retake countries that
had once been part of the old Persian Empire, and by writing insulting letters to Tiberius (Dio 58.26.1; Tac. Ann. 6.31; Suet. Tib. 66; the authenticity of this letter is doubtful [cf. CAH 10.747]). But Artabanus was unpopular with his own subjects, so with the help of some Parthian nobles Tiberius attempted to replace him as king, first with Phraates IV and then with Tiridates.

At the same time the Emperor encouraged Mithridates the Iberian to seize Armenia from Arsaces. Mithridates was successful in having Artabanus' son poisoned and then, with the help of his brother Pharasmanes, king of Iberia, he defeated an invading force of Parthians (Dio 58.26.3-4; Tac. Ann. 6.33-35). He remained as ruler of Armenia until A.D. 40, when he was summoned to Rome and imprisoned by Gaius (Sen. Tranq. 11.12; see on Chapter 25.1 ἀπέκτεινε). His kingdom seems to have been left to the Parthians until Claudius released Mithridates and sent him home (Dio 60.8.1; Tac. Ann. 11.8.1; 9.1; cf. CAH 10.750).

Meanwhile, Tiridates had been sent from Rome to Parthia in A.D. 35, accompanied by Vitellius as the new governor of Syria. On their arrival, Vitellius began instigating plots against Artabanus, and when his satraps started to revolt the King was forced to withdraw with a few supporters to the remote northern districts of his realm. Vitellius then encouraged Tiridates to take advantage of the opportunity by moving into Parthia, and gave him moral support by leading his legions a short distance across the Euphrates (Dio 58.26.2-3; Tac. Ann. 6.36-37). Tiridates was at first welcomed by the Parthians, and in Ctesiphon was crowned King. Some satraps, however, preferred to support Artabanus rather than accept a ruler imposed by Rome. Encouraged to return from the north, Artabanus advanced to Seleucia on the Tigris. Tiridates withdrew at first to Mesopotamia to
organize resistance, but he was deserted by most of his troops and was forced to seek refuge in Syria (Dio 58.26.3; Tac. Ann. 6.42-44). By late in A.D. 36 Artabanus was once more in control of all of Parthia.

27.3 σινονδάς: Peace was now seen as advantageous to both the Romans and the Parthians. The buffer state of Armenia was now ruled by a king who would remember the debt he owed to Rome, and Artabanus was faced with the almost impossible task of winning the favour of his mercurial nobles. Vitellius was instructed by Tiberius to conclude a new treaty with the Parthian King, on the condition that he could obtain hostages to guarantee its observance (Jos. AJ 18.4.4 [96-99]: Josephus' story that Vitellius tried unsuccessfully to have Artabanus poisoned, if at all factual, must belong to an earlier date). The two men met peacefully at the Euphrates River, in the middle of a bridge built especially for the event, and there struck a treaty of mutual friendship. It is very improbable that Artabanus would agree to sacrifice to statues of Roman Emperors or to pay homage to the standards of Roman legions (cf. Suet. Gaius 14.3; Vit. 2.4), since this would suggest to his subjects an intolerable weakness in their ruler. But he did surrender his young son, Darius, as a pledge of his faith (see Chapter 17.5; the story that Artabanus did obeisance to the imperial statues and legionary standards may have been spread by Vitellius as part of his flattery of Gaius [cf. CAH 10.250]).

The date of the treaty has caused much concern. Both Dio and Suetonius (Gaius 14.3) assign it to Gaius' reign, while Josephus quite clearly thought that it was concluded while Tiberius was still alive: he says that both Vitellius and Herod the tetrarch sent news of it to Tiberius, that Vitellius was angry at Herod for anticipating him, and that Vitellius did not get his
revenge until Gaius became Emperor (*AJ* 18.4.5 [104-105]). On the other hand, Josephus later (*AJ* 18.7.2 [250]) tells of how Agrippa accused Herod Antipas of plotting with Artabanus against Gaius. Since this intrigue probably took place *before* the treaty was signed (and there is no evidence of trouble with Parthia *after* the treaty), then Josephus here indicates that the treaty was made during the reign of Gaius. The fact that Tacitus fails to mention the peace altogether in Book 6 would suggest that he included it in his lost account of Gaius' first year. These difficulties can all be resolved if it is assumed that the meeting of Vitellius and Artabanus took place early in A.D. 37, certainly before the beginning of the Euphrates' annual flood in March, but that confirmation of the treaty did not reach Rome until after Gaius' accession. So Gaius could take credit for the completion of an enterprise that owed its success to Tiberius and his governor, L. Vitellius (cf. Furneaux 2.104 [intro.], n. 17; Mommsen *Rom. Ges.* 5.378; A. Garzetti in *Studi Calderini-Paribeni* 1.211-229).

27.4 ἐὰς ὅς γὰρ ὁ Πάρθων ...: For the story, see above, section 3, and Tac. *Ann.* 6.36.

27.4 τῷ τὲ γὰρ κρείττονι ...: Gaius' treatment of Pompey's heirs, whom he would not allow use the epithet *Magnus* (*Dio* 60.5.8-9), may be one of the incidents that lie behind this generalization by Dio.

27.5 πρὸς τὲ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ προσπεσὼν: Suetonius (*Vit.* 2.5) says that Vitellius was the first person to worship Gaius as a god: "cum reversus ex Syria non aliter adire ausus esset
quam capite velato circumvertensque se, deinde procumbans." This statement, together with that of Philo (Leg. 16.116 [562]: "ἐνιοίδε καὶ τὸ βαρβαρικὸν ἔθος εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἡγαγον, τὴν προσκύνησιν"), suggests that Gaius himself was not the one who instigated the practice of προσκύνησις. Vitellius had perhaps received such obeisance himself while governor of Syria, and saw it as a way of ingratiating himself with the young Emperor.

27.6 συγγίγνεσθαι τῇ Σελήνῃ: See also Chapter 26.5 and notes.

27.6 ἐσποτα: In the early Empire the word ἐσποτὴς/dominus was shunned by both Augustus (Dio 55.12.2; Suet. Aug. 53.1) and Tiberius (Suet. Tib. 27), since it recalled the relationship of master to slave rather than suggesting the apparent equality inherent in the word princeps. Even by the beginning of the second century A.D., when the epithet finds a place among official imperial titles, it is frequently used in conjunction with θεὸς (cf. Dio Chr. 45.1; IGRR 1.861; Mason Greek Terms p. 34).

27.6 κολακεῖα ὑπερεβάλετο: Attention is directed to the two distinct sides of Vitellius' character and behaviour by Suetonius (Vit. 3.4-5) and Tacitus (Ann. 6.32.7). as well. According to the latter, his evil half was the more memorable: "formidine Gai Caesaris, familiaritate Claudii turpe in servitium mutatus, exemplar apud posteros adulatorii dedecoris habetur, cesseruntque prima posteris, et bona iuventae senectus flagitiosa obliteravit."
CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

28.1 ἡ τέμενος τῇ ἑαυτῷ ἐν Μιλήτῳ: Although the worship of a Roman Emperor in a specially constructed temple was not a novel practice (see notes following), Gaius was the first to have a temple dedicated to himself alone, rather than in association with Rome or the Senate (cf. Willrich Caligula p. 444). He was the first, too, to demand for himself what was traditionally the prerogative of the people to bestow of their own accord (cf. CAH 10.481-482). On temples dedicated to Augustus and Tiberius, see the valuable comments of M.P. Charlesworth in HThR 28 (1935) 26-28; on the deification of Emperors in general, see the dated but still mostly valid analysis by E. Bickermann in Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 27 (1929) 1-31.

28.1 τὴν μὲν Ἑφεσον Ἡ Ἀρτεμις: For the famous temple of Artemis at Ephesus, see Str. 14.1.20-23 (639-641); F. Miltner Ephesos (Vienna, 1958); G. Bean Aegean Turkey pp. 160-70.

28.1 τὴν δὲ Πέργαμον ὧν Ἀὔγουστος: In 29 B.C. Octavian had given permission to the provincial subjects in Asia and Bithynia to erect new temples in Pergamum and Nicomedia respectively (Dio 51.20.7; Tac. Ann. 4.37.4). They were to be consecrated, not to Augustus alone, but to deified Rome as well (Suet. Aug. 52; cf. Tac. Ann. 4.55.6). Only non-Romans were to be allowed to worship in these shrines: provincial Roman citizens were expected to attend the sanctuaries dedicated to Rome and the Deified Julius, built in Ephesus and Nicaea (Dio 51.20.6). In the western Empire, where there was no tradition of ruler-cults, altars to Rome and Augustus took the place of formal temples (for the most famous, that at
Lugdunum, see CIL 13, pp. 227-30). Within Italy, Augustus' attitude to his own worship is best seen in his refusal to accept from Agrippa the honour of having the new Pantheon dedicated to him (Dio 53.27.3; cf. Willrich Caligula p. 440). Despite Augustus' cautious support of the imperial cult, there were still some Romans who criticized his willingness to be worshipped as a god (cf. Tac. Ann. 1.10.5).

28.1 θὰ εἰς Σμύρναν ὁ Τιβέριος: Although Tiberius consistently refused to accept the divine honours that many of his associates encouraged him to assume (e.g., Dio 57.9.1; Suet. Tib. 26.1), he did nevertheless permit himself to be styled θεός in the East (e.g., IGRR 3.721 = E&J no. 88), and even in Italy he had his own priests (ILS 6481 [Venusia]; 6565 = E&J no. 335 [Asculum]) and allowed sacrifices to be performed before his statues (Dio 58.4.4).

In A.D. 23 the cities of Asia, in gratitude for some services from Tiberius, requested and were granted permission to erect in their province a temple to be consecrated to the Emperor, Livia, and the Senate (Tac. Ann. 4.15.4-5). There followed a competition among eleven cities for the privilege of building the sanctuary. Finally, in A.D. 26, after rejecting Pergamum on the grounds that there was already a temple of Augustus there, the Senate voted in favour of Smyrna and determined that an ex-praetor selected by lot was to be in charge of the temple's construction (Tac. Ann. 4.55-56).

In the meantime, envoys from Hispania Ulterior had arrived in Rome to ask permission to build a shrine to Tiberius and his mother in that province. Tiberius refused their request, insisting once again on his own mortality, and suggesting that a proliferation of temples in his honour would make meaningless those dedicated to the god Augustus (Tac. Ann. 4.37-38 [A.D. 25]).
What the Emperor did not express openly was his unwillingness to allow direct worship of himself in the western Empire. Tacitus, however, criticizes Tiberius for refusing the Spanish request, and charges him with a lack of ambition. *Quid faciat?*

28.1 τὸν ἱερὸν τὸν Μιλέτοι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνι: The unfinished temple of Apollo was actually located at Didyma (= Branchidae [cf. Pliny *HN* 5.31.112]), a site some ten miles south of Miletus but within the territory of that city. The oracle there, which was thought to have existed even before the Ionian migrations to the area (Paus. 7.2.6), rivalled Delphi for popularity in the sixth century, and was consulted and heavily endowed by Croesus of Lydia (Hdt. 1.46; 5.36.3). The original temple of Apollo was destroyed by Darius in 494 B.C., as punishment for the part Miletus had played in instigating the Ionian revolt (Hdt. 6.19.3; but Strabo [14.1.5 (634)] attributes its destruction to Xerxes in 479 B.C.; cf. Curtius 7.5.28). A new temple was not begun until after Alexander's visit to the oracle, which diplomatically addressed him as the son of Zeus (Str. 17.1.43 [814]). Such a response to one of his heroes might well have endeared the site to Gaius, who now decided to finish construction of the second temple (Suet. *Gaius* 21, included under the acts of the Emperor rather than the Madman). At the same time he probably extended the sanctuary's right of asylum beyond the two-mile limit previously determined by Julius Caesar (*OGIS* 473-474 and notes; B. Haussoulier *RPh* 23 [1899] 50-56; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.63). The work on the temple was never to be completed, however (Paus. 7.5.4), and the remains of the structure still show signs of being unfinished.

This temple, the Didymaeum, which Strabo calls the largest in the world (14.1.5 [634]), was Ionic decastyle with a double colonnade (cf. Vitr.
7 [praef.] 16). The *cella*, whose floor was sunken and had to be approached by ramps from the *pronaos*, was so huge that it was never roofed (Str. loc. cit.). The cult statue itself, a seated figure of Apollo (Paus. 2.10.5; cf. Pliny *HN* 34.19.75), was placed in a small, roofed Ionic temple at the rear of the *cella*. Reports of the German excavations of the sanctuary can be found in *Didyma* (Berlin, 1941-1958) I-II; G. Bean (*Aegean Turkey* pp. 231-42) gives a brief description of the site.

That this temple of Apollo was not in fact appropriated by Gaius for his own worship is shown by a coin from Miletus (*BMC "Ionia"* p. 198, no. 143) which undoubtedly represents the temple of the imperial cult as hexastyle, not decastyle. (cf. B. Haussoullier op. cit. p. 161). It is more likely that Gaius' own temple was located in Miletus itself (cf. L. Robert *Hellenica* 7 [1949] 206-238 [= Smallwood no. 127] for a dedication to Gaius by his priests at Miletus). Just as it was thought improper to erect temples to different Emperors in the same city, so too shrines of living Emperors seem not to have been established at first in those cities like Ephesus and Didyma that already possessed established cults.

The list of cities that sent representatives (*VEWTTOxai*) to the board supervising the construction of Gaius' temple at Miletus (cf. L. Robert op. cit. pp. 212-23) shows that the entire province was involved in the project. This does not exclude the possibility, however, that the Emperor did undertake work on the incomplete Didymaeum: 'the same kind of patronage, in reverse, had been shown by the client kings of Augustus, who joined together to complete the temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens and to dedicate it to the Emperor's *genius* (Suet. *Aug.* 60).
28.2 τὸν μὲν τινὰ τῷ Τίτῳ βουλέα: Since Suetonius (Gaius 22.3) mentions only one
temple of Gaius in Rome, it is possible that
this temple voted by the Senate was that of Isis in the Campus Martius. For
the theory that this temple was built during Gaius' reign, see G. Wissowa
Religion und Kultus pp. 353-54; Platner and Ashby Topographical Dictionary
pp. 283-86.

If Gaius was honoured by the Senate with a temple to be built at public
expense, construction was probably never started. Balsdon (Gaius p. 166) is
perhaps right in seeing such a move by the senators as an attempt by Gaius'
opponents to make him hateful to all Romans (for a similar action directed
against Julius Caesar, see Plu. Caes. 57.2; cf. Dio 43.21.2).

28.2 τὸν δὲ ἴδιον ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ: Cf. Suet. Gaius 22.3: "templum etiam numini
suo proprium ... instituit." There is no
archaeological evidence of such a structure on the Palatine dating from
Gaius' reign, but that does not necessarily mean that a temple there was not
conceived of or even begun. More significant is the fact that neither Seneca
nor Philo, the only contemporary sources, mentions a temple to Gaius in Rome
itself or that there were priests of the Emperor in the city (see below,
on section 5). Certainly Dio's credibility in this matter suffers from his
earlier statement (51.20.8) that no Roman Emperor up to his own time had ever
allowed a temple to himself in Rome (on this point, see Gelzer RE "Julius"
col. 409-411).

28.2 ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ κατάλυσιν τίνα ...: Dio neglects to mention the bridge
which, Suetonius says (Gaius 22.4),
Gaius had built from the Palatine to the Capitoline, directly over the temple
of Augustus, so that he might commune more easily with Jupiter, whom he dared to call his "brother" (Jos. AJ 19.1.1 [4]). Only later did the Emperor lay the foundations for a *nova domus* in the *area Capitolina*, next to the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. The building is never again mentioned, and no suitable remains have been found, so its true function must remain a mystery (cf. Platner and Ashby *Topographical Dictionary* pp. 47-50; Baring-Gould [*Tragedy* p. 408] makes the novel suggestion that Gaius, under the direction of Herod Agrippa, joined the Palatine to the Capitoline in imitation of the bridge that united Mt. Zion to Mt. Moriah in Jerusalem).

28.3 ἡγαλμα ἐς αὐτὸν ...: Cf. Suet. *Gaius* 22.2: "datoque negotio, ut simulacra numinum religione et arte praeclara, inter quae Olympii Iovis, appurrectur e Graecia, quibus capite dempto suum imponeret." For the chryselephantine statue of Olympian Zeus, a product of Pheidias' skilled workmanship, see particularly Paus. 5.10.2-11.9; Pliny *HN* 34.19.49, 54, 87.

Dio does not mention the other temples and cities pillaged by Gaius for statuary and paintings with which to adorn his palace in Rome (cf. Jos. AJ 19.1.1 [7]): statues such as that of Eros from Thespiae in Boeotia, which was later returned by Claudius only to be carried off again by Nero (Paus. 9.27.1-3); and paintings like those at Lanuvium, which Gaius would have removed had it not been for the nature of the plaster (Pliny *HN* 35.6.18). Those works of art which he was successful in transporting to Rome were later restored by Claudius (Dio 60.6.8).

With regard to the substitution of human for divine heads, Merivale has commented of the Greeks that "it was the insult to art, taste, and feeling, not to their languid religious principles, which they chiefly resented" (5.397).
28.4 μὴ δύνηθείς δὲ ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 57.1: "Olympiae simulacrum Iovis, quod dissolui transferrique Romam placuerat, tantum cachinnum repente edidit, ut machinis labefactis opifices diffugerint."

Josephus, too, mentions the portents that frightened the workmen, and adds that Memmius Regulus, who was overseeing the transfer of the statue, wrote to Gaius explaining that it would be damaged if moved, and was saved from execution only by the timely death of the Emperor (AJ 19.1.1 [9-10]: this story of Regulus' narrow escape resembles that of Petronius in Judaea too closely to be authentic). It is unfortunate that Pausanias, who knew the dimensions of the seated statue, did not record them because he felt they could not convey the visual impression of its massive bulk.

28.4 ἐκείνῳ μὲν ἐπεμείλει: This would seem an appropriate moment for Gaius to have threatened Jupiter with that line from the Iliad, "Either lift me or I shall lift you!" (see below, section 6).

28.4 οὕτως δὲ ἔτερον ἐνέστησε: The statue was apparently of gold, and each day would be dressed in the same style of clothing as that worn by the Emperor (Suet. Gaius 22.3). This may be that very effigy voted to him by the Senate in A.D. 39 after the reintroduction of the trials for maestas (see Chapter 16.10 and note), although K. Scott has pointed out (TAPhA 62 [1931] 114-15) that statues of precious metal were considered divine honours by the Romans, an inheritance from the Hellenistic tradition. If so, then the gold statue could not be dated before Gaius' return to Rome in A.D. 40. As for the practice of dressing the statue, M. Malaise (Les Conditions de Penetration et de
Diffusion des Cultes Egyptiens en Italie pp. 397-401) has traced it back to an Egyptian custom (Malaise's book, however, is marred by its naïvité, its errors of fact, and a general misunderstanding of Roman history and institutions).

28.5 τὸ τε Διοσκόρειον: Cf. Suet. Gaius 22.2: "aede Castoris et Pollucis in vestibulum transfigurata, consistens saepe inter fratres deos, medium adorandum se adeuntibus exhibebat." This entranceway was to give access to the domus Tiberiana on the north edge of the Palatine hill, high above the Forum. Gaius' extension to the palace of his predecessor was magnificent enough to cause Pliny to speak of it in the same hyperbolic breath with Nero's domus aurea: "bis vidimus urbem cingi domibus principum Gai et Neronis" (HN 36.24.111).

Very little remains of Tiberius' original structure, but the additions credited to Gaius include a peristyle with a water-basin immediately behind the temple of Castor, together with fragments of its reservoir (cf. Platner and Ashby Topographical Dictionary p. 192; E.B. Van Deman AJA 28 [1924] 368-98). The temple of Castor, which had previously been rebuilt by Tiberius in A.D. 6 (Dio 55.27.4; Suet. Tib. 20), was soon to be restored to its former state by Claudius (Dio 60.6.8; cf. Platner and Ashby op. cit. p. 103).

Identification of members of the imperial family with the Dioscuri was by this time an established tradition: K. Scott (CPh 25 [1930] 155-61; 379-80) sees in it a possible method of identifying heirs to the Principate, and mentions as examples Gaius and Lucius Caesar, Tiberius and his brother Drusus (cf. Dio 55.27.4; Suet. Tib. 20), Germanicus and the younger Drusus, Germanicus' sons Nero and Drusus (cf. BMC Imp. 1.154, no. 44), and perhaps even Gaius and Tiberius Gemellus.
28.5 Διάλεγε τε έκαστον δυνάμεις: Since there is no other suggestion that Gaius ever considered himself the flamen dialis, Casaubon suggested reading instead Δία τε Λατιάλιου (Bs. Λατιάριου), to agree with Suetonius (Gaius 22.2: "quidam eum Latiarem Iovem consalutarunt"). Certainly this emendation better suits Dio's following comment about priests. As Boissevain has noted, however, Jupiter Latiaris is elsewhere referred to in the text by a circumlocution (cf. 39.15.1; 47.40.4); and Dio does use the word διάλειος in 44.6.4 when speaking of the flamen dialis (cf. Willrich Caligula p. 445).

28.5 ἱερέας προσέθετο ...: The wealthiest men in Rome vied with one another in bidding for a place in Gaius' priesthood (Suet. Gaius 22.3), but Claudius was forced into the college and had to borrow from the aerarium to make up the entrance fee, which Suetonius places at only eight million sesterces (Suet. Claud. 9.2; cf. Dio's πεντήκοντα κοίλι διακοσίας ... μυριάδας).

28.6 τὸν τε ἱππον συνιερέα διέφηνε: There was also a rumour that Gaius had considered appointing Incitatus to a consulship as well (see Chapter 14.7 and note).

28.6 ὁρνίθες: Suetonius (Gaius 22.3) lists the types of birds sacrificed daily to the Emperor: phoenicopteri (flamingoes), pavones (peacocks, normally sacred to Juno), tetraones (moor-fowl), numidiae (African hens), meleagrides (guinea-hens), and phasianae (pheasants). There was a story that on the very day of his murder Gaius was spattered by the blood of a flamingo he was sacrificing. (Suet. Gaius 57.4; Josephus [AJ
19.1.13 (87)] does not mention the type of victim and says that it was P. Nonius Asprenas who was splashed. Gaius was probably not sacrificing the exotic bird to himself on this occasion, but rather to the deified Augustus, for whom the Palatine Games then in progress had been established (see on Chapter 29.4 ἐφορτὴν); it should be pointed out, however, that in A.D. 39 sacrifices during the Palatine Games had been voted to Gaius (see Chapter 16.10).

28.6 ἐκ μηχανῆς τινος ἀντεβρόντα ...: Compare the myth of Salmoneus, condemned to eternal suffering because he had dared to imitate heavenly thunder and lightning (Verg. *Aen.* 6.585; Lucian *Tim.* 2). According to Servius' note on this passage of Vergil, Salmoneus had constructed a bronze bridge over which he used to rattle in his chariot while hurling flaming torches against it. The nature of Gaius' machine is a mystery (cf. Them. *Or.* 34.18).

28.6 τὸ τοῦ Ὄμηρου: The line is spoken by Ajax to Odysseus during their wrestling match (*Il.* 23.724; cf. Lucian *Dial. Mort.* 11.376). The second half of the hexameter is interesting by its omission: "... τὰ δ' αὐτὸ τὸ πάντα μελήσει," "... all the rest is up to Zeus."

Seneca, who was out of favour at this time and so must have heard the story second-hand, says that Gaius' comment was made in anger when a pantomime was interrupted by a violent storm, and comments rhetorically: "non puto parum momenti hanc eius vocem ad incitandos coniuratorum mentes addidisse; ultimae enim patientiae visum est eum ferre, qui Iovem non ferret" (*de Ira* 1.20.8-9).
28.7 μετὰ τριῶκοντα ημέρας ...: See Chapter 23.7 and note. Suetonius (Gaius 25.3) disagrees, saying that Gaius used to boast of how he became a husband and father on one and the same day. Since neither the date of Gaius' marriage to Caesonia nor the birthday of his daughter, called Julia Drusilla, is known, it is impossible to decide between the two accounts (see on Chapter 12.1 και ἔκεινην). Suetonius also mentions (Gaius 42) that the Emperor complained of the financial burdens of fatherhood, and willingly accepted contributions towards his daughter's upbringing and dowry.

Remnants of another, no doubt false, tradition are present in the account of Petrus Patricius (= Exc. Vat. 34), who says that Caesonia bore a son, conceived by an earlier lover.

28.7 ἐσ τὸ τὸ Καπιτῶλιον ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 25.4: "infantem autem, Iuliam Drusillam appellatam, per omnium dearum tempa circumferens Minervae gremio imposuit alendamque et instituendam commendavit." R. Enking (JDAI 59-60 [1944/1945] 111-24) has tried to show that the custom was borrowed from the Etruscans. A more immediate parallel, however, is Gaius' association of Minerva with his sister Drusilla, after whom his daughter had been named (see, for example, ILS 197 from Aquitania: "pro salute | Caesarum et p. R. | Minervae et Divae | Drusillae sacrum | in perpetuum ...").

Josephus, too, mentions Gaius placing his daughter in the lap of Jupiter Capitolinus, and adds: "κοινόν αὐτῷ τὸ καὶ τῷ Διί γεγονέναι τὸ τέκνον καὶ δύο χειροτονεῖν αὐτῆς πατέρας, ὤποτερον μεῖζονα φάμενος ἐν μέσῳ τῇ καταληπτάνειν" (AJ 19.1.2 [11]). Gaius' motive for this can perhaps be found in an incident recorded by Suetonius (Aug. 94.8): several years
after he had rebuilt the Capitol in 69 B.C., Q. Lutatius Catulus had a
dream in which he saw a boy in the lap of Jupiter Capitolinus; the next
day he recognized the child as the future Emperor, Augustus. The dream
was seen as a portent of the lad's future greatness.

28.8 οὖτος οὖν ὁ θεὸς ...: Compare Dio's comment regarding Commodus
(72.16.1): "οὖτος οὖν ὁ χρυσός, οὖτος ὁ Ηρακλῆς, οὖτος ὁ θεὸς (καὶ γὰρ καὶ τούτῳ ἦκουεν) ..." The phrase deus
noster Caesar was originally applied to Gaius by Seneca (Tranq. 14.9): for
its significance, see M.P. Charlesworth CR 39 (1925) 113-15.

28.8 ἐς γράμματα φέρεσθαι: Gaius is called θεὸς only in honorary and
dedicatory inscriptions from the eastern
Empire (e.g., Smallwood no. 127), and never on coinage (cf. S. Eitrem SO
10 [1932] 54).

28.8 χρήματα αὐτόχρατα καὶ δεινότατα συνελέγετο: After the general comment,
"nullo rerum aut hominum
genere omisso, cui non tributi aliquid imponeret," Suetonius goes on to
give some exact figures for Gaius' new taxes (Gaius 40): an unspecified
fixed amount on food and drink; a 2 1/2% tax on the amounts involved in
lawsuits; 12 1/2% on the income of geruli; and on the earnings of prostitutes,
the equivalent of a single concubitus, presumably each day; this last tax
is to be collected even from married ex-prostitutes and retired pimps,
probably to prevent tax-evasion (cf. Willrich Caligula p. 425).

These new taxes need not indicate a drastic shortage of funds in the
aerarium or fiscus: they seem to be aimed as much at limiting extravagances
as at raising money, although their form may have been suggested to Gaius by the elaborate systems of taxation that had existed in the Hellenistic East (descriptions of which can be found by consulting Index I [s.v. "Taxes"] of M. Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* [see particularly p. 242]).

Little can be said about the tax on edibles without more information; and why the *gerulī* were singled out is a mystery. The impost on lawsuits may have been an attempt to discourage unnecessary litigation and to relieve the pressure on the courts, while the taxing of πορνοί suggests a practical method of keeping their profession within control. Similarly, if the tax on wage-earning slaves was imposed on their employers, it would serve as an incentive for hiring from the mass of free-born unemployed workers in the city. The fact that Claudius did not immediately abolish all these taxes of his predecessor indicates that some, at least, were desirable if not popular (Dio 60.4.1).

According to Suetonius, Gaius' new tariffs were collected at first by *publicani*, then by centurions and praetorian tribunes. Among this last group was Cassius Chaerea, who was once chided by Gaius for being too sensitive and lax in the performance of his duty (Jos. *AJ* 19.1.5 [28-29]).

28.9 τὰ τε οἰκήματα ...: Cf. Suet. *Gaius* 41.1, the only other instance in which Gaius is accused of playing the pander.

Suetonius adds that the Emperor would send heralds through the city to advertise his *lupanar*, and then would record the names of his clients "quasi adiuvantium Caesaris redivus."

28.11 ἐσ λεύκωμα ...: Cf. Suet. *Gaïus* 41.1: "cum per ignorantium scripturae multa commissa fient, tandem flagitante populo proposuit quidem legem, sed et minutissimis litteris et angustissimo loco, uti ne cui describere liceret." Willrich (*Caligula* p. 426) sees in this story an unjustified complaint by spoiled Romans who were trying to defraud the government. While he may be right, his cold acceptance of the methods by which Gaïus is said to have brought the angry crowds under control reveals the Prussian in him.

28.11 ἔσ τε τῶν ἰππόδρομων: The same account is found in Josephus (*AJ* 19.1.4 [24-27]): at the Circus the people begged Gaïus to give them some relief from taxes; he refused, and when they persisted and grew louder, he had some arrested and executed immediately, whereupon the rest quickly fell silent. Josephus gives this incident as one of the final causes of Cassius Chaerea's determination to assassinate the Emperor.
CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

29.1 ὃς ὄντα τρόπον ἐξεμαίνετο: This is Dio's first and only explicit mention of Gaius' supposed madness (although cf. Chapter 26.5: "δεινῶς ἐξεφρόνησεν"), which he quite clearly does not associate with the Emperor's illness in the first year of his reign (see notes on Chapter 8.1). His mental instability is alluded to by all the major sources: Suetonius speaks of his mental infirmity, but nothing so serious as insanity (Gaius 50.2; 51.1); Josephus accuses him of "τὴν μανίαν χρὴσθαι μὴ ἀφησόμενον" (AJ 19.1.8 [50]; cf. 19.1.1 [1]; 19.1.6 [39]; 19.2.4 [196]); Philo talks of "τὴν τῶν ἡθῶν ἀνωμαλίαν· ἄλλοκοτα γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπιμανή κατεφαίνετο" (Leg. 6.34 [551]); in Tacitus he is "turbidus animi" (Hist. 4.48; cf. Ann. 13.3.6); and Seneca mentions that "... tanta illi palloris insaniam testantis foeditas erat" (Const. Sap. 18.1; cf. Cons. Polyb. 17.5).

There is no doubt that his opponents encouraged such a belief in Gaius' madness, and it was given official approval by his successor, Claudius, who publicly branded his dead nephew as insane in an edict to the Alexandrians and Syrians (Jos. AJ 19.5.2 [284]; Willrich [Caligula p. 461] cleverly attributes Claudius' reference to his predecessor's madness to the new Emperor's hope that thereby his own foolishness would be less criticized).

Not to be surpassed by the ancients, Baring-Gould (Tragedy p. 393) has traced a streak of hereditary madness through most of the Julian line, from Augustus' daughter Julia ("moral paralysis"), through Agrippina ("probably half-insane") to Gaius and the future Emperor Nero (both "insane").

Such a simplistic interpretation of the behaviour of any ruler tells us more about the writer than about the object of his analysis, and is frequently the result of the ancients' inability to comprehend both the natural evolution of a man's character and any deviation from normal and acceptable conduct.
So Tiberius was accused of dissimulation when he at first hesitated to accept the responsibility of Empire (Tac. *Ann.* 1.11), and of sexual excesses during his "abnormal" retirement to Capreae (Suet. *Tib.* 42-45). The case for Gaius' sanity has been put most succinctly by Momigliano in a comment that nicely accounts for most of the supposed irregularities in the Emperor's behaviour: "Gaius has too often been regarded as insane; not because he really was so, but because to the execution of his clear-cut plan for transforming the Roman principate into a monarchy he brought a levity and forthrightness which made his opponents, naturally hostile, think that he could not be responsible for his actions .... All his most remarkable performances become explicable when we look on him as a novice aiming at an absolute monarchy on the Oriental pattern" (*Claudius* pp. 22-23).

It would be of little value to analyze the ancients' use of the word μανία: it indicates, not insanity in the modern medical sense, but any unusual or irrational behaviour, such as the frenzies of Bacchic revelers or passionate rages. Certainly the diagnosis of J. Lucas (*AC* 36 [1967] 159-89), that Gaius was psychopathic, is based on a naïve acceptance of the traditional accounts. It would be better to accept Quidde's concept of Cæsarenwahn as the result of a moral degeneration among the upper classes, who encouraged divine rule by their obsequiousness, and among the lower classes, who were willing to accept the concept: with such moral corruption, "so ist es ja wirklich zu verwundern, wenn ein so absoluter Monarch bei gesunden Sinnen bleibt" (*Caligula* p. 7). Gaius' μανία was his seemingly irrational attitude to the *mos maiorum*, that most powerful of Roman concepts: he ignored it. "Wahnsinnig ist nach den Begriffen eines römischen Aristokraten ein Princeps, der vor der altrömischen Tradition keinen Respekt zeigt, sondern rücksichtslos seine Anschauungen durchsetzen will" (*Willrich Caligula* p. 461).
29.1 Κάσιος τε Χαερέας καὶ Κορνήλιος Σαβίνος: Surprisingly little is known of Cassius Chaerea (PIR² C 488). In A.D. 14 he held the rank of centurion in one of the legions in Germany, and only by reckless daring did he save himself from being murdered by the rebellious soldiers who, following news of Augustus' death, singled out the centurions as the nearest cause of their misfortunes (Tac. Ann. 1.32). Though described by Tacitus as an *adulescens* at that time, Chaerea might well have been thirty years of age or older (cf. Tac. Hist. 2.2; L&S s.v. "adulescens") and so could properly be described by Suetonius as a *senior* 27 years later (Gaius 56.2); at any rate, in the traditional military terminology that may still have been current, a *senior* was a soldier over 46 years of age (Gell. 10.28.1).

By A.D. 41 Chaerea had risen to the rank of military tribune in the Praetorian Guards (cf. Jos. Ant. 19.1.3 [18]), the same position held by his fellow conspirator, Cornelius Sabinus, about whose earlier life nothing at all is known (cf. PIR² C 1431).

29.1 συνώμοσαν μὲν γὰρ πλεῖνες: According to Suetonius' reckoning, two earlier conspiracies against Gaius had already been detected, while others had been formed but were delayed for want of opportunity (Gaius 56.1). It seems most likely that he is referring in the first case to the insurrection planned by Gaetulicus and Lepidus in A.D. 39 (see Chapter 22.5) and to the plot involving Anicius Cerealis, Sextus Papinius, Betilienus Bassus and others in A.D. 40 (see Chapter 25.5b). There is some evidence (Suet. Gaius 15.4) of another conspiracy, in the first months of Gaius' reign, but the Emperor contemptuously ignored the information he was given and nothing came of it. Suetonius does not, of course,
admit that Macro, Silanus, and Tiberius Gemellus may have been involved in a conspiracy (see on Chapter 8.1 Εγκλημα).

Of the leading plotters in this successful conspiracy, we know the names of nine. There can be little doubt that Cassius Chaerea was the chief mover of the plot. Josephus gives him all the credit for devising and developing the plan, gathering and organising the accomplices, convincing them to act when they faltered, and striking the first blow, "ὡστε δὲν ὁικαίως καὶ ὀπόσα τοῖς λοιποῖς εἶνε πεπραγμένα τῇ Χειρέου γνώμη τῇ καὶ ἄρετῇ προσ-
tίθεσθαι καὶ πόνου τῶν χειρῶν" (AJ 19.1.14 [111-113]; cf. Suet. Gaius 56.2). By the second century he alone among the conspirators was to be idolized as a tyrannicide (Plu. de Superst. 11 [170E-F]).

In addition to Chaerea and Sabinus, another military tribune by the name of Papinius was involved: there is no evidence that he was closely related to the Sextus Papinius involved in the plot of A.D. 40 (Chapter 25.5b; Jos. AJ 19.1.6 [37]). Annius Vinicianus, perhaps a nephew of Julia's husband, M. Vinicius (cf. PIR² 1.125-126), had been a friend of Lepidus: he was said to have joined the plot to avenge that man's execution, and only incidentally out of fear for his own life because of his earlier association with Lepidus (Jos. AJ 19.1.3 [20]; 19.1.8 [49]). He had once before been accused of maiestas, but the charge had been dismissed by Tiberius (Tac. Ann. 6.9 [A.D. 32]). Valerius Asiaticus, a consular, must have played some active part, although he was later wrongly credited with having been "praecipuum auctorem ... inter-
ficiendi [Gai] Caesaris" (Tac. Ann. 11.1.2; cf. PIR¹ V 25; Chapter 30.2).

Two other participants mentioned briefly are P. Nonius Asprenas, the consul of A.D. 38 (cf. PIR¹ N 95), and a certain Aquila, otherwise unknown (see on section 6 Ἀπέκτειναν).
Both Callistus, Gaius' freedman, and the two praetorian prefects had earlier been suspected of complicity in a conspiracy (see Chapter 25.7-8). Although their guilt then was never established, Callistus and at least one of the prefects—probably M. Arreccinus Clemens, father-in-law of the future Emperor Titus (Tac. Hist. 4.68; cf. Suet. Tit. 4; Jos. AJ 19.1.6 [37]; PIR² A 1073)—were now actively involved with Chaerea (Jos. AJ 19.1.10 [64]).

There is no real proof that the Pomponius/Pompeius who had recently been freed by Gaius (Chapter 26.4) was one of the plotters, as Balsdon has suggested (Gaius p. 102).

Josephus (AJ 19.1.10 [62]) says that the plot was widely known among the senators, equestrians, and soldiers, but Suetonius (Gaius 56.1) mentions only the praetorian prefects and potentissimi liberti. The conspiracy that resulted in Gaius' murder was, it seems, not instigated by a general feeling of fear or revulsion among the upper classes, nor by any rebellious sentiment on the part of the army or Praetorians. (The "noble" view of the plot is still rather surprisingly held by some modern scholars: P.M.D. Swan, for example [HSPh 69 (1965) 351], believes that the conspiracy was motivated by "the degeneration of Gaius' person and his despotic treatment of the Senate" and was "supported by a movement of senators which sought to end the dynasty and restore the republic"). It was instigated by a small group of palace guards and courtiers for their own safety, for revenge, or for apparent advantage, and it was led by a man whose only cause for hating the Emperor was a matter of manly pride (see below, section 2; cf. Baring-Gould Tragedy p. 425; Merivale 5.457).

29.1 Ὁτὲ Κάλλιστος καὶ ὅ Ἐπαρχός: For Callistus, see on Chapter 19.6

Κάλλιστον. Gelzer (RE "Julius" col. 414) suggests that Callistus joined the plot through fear of falling victim
to Gaius' rapacity, since he was so wealthy. Although Suetonius says that both praetorian prefects were involved (Gaius 56.1), and although we hear from Dio himself that there were two prefects at this time (see Chapters 25.8; 30.3), we know the name of only one who was a conspirator: Clemens. We should hesitate, then, to follow Reimar in altering the MS reading of ἔπαρχος to ἔπαρχοι, simply to agree with Suetonius.

29.2 γύννιν τε γὰρ αὐτόν: Of the visible aspects of Chaerea's effeminacy, Seneca—who perhaps had met him—comments: "sermo non pro manu erat, languidus sono et, ni facta nosses, suspectior" (Const. Sap. 18.3). Chaerea was teased about this by Gaius when, as tax-collector for the imperial treasury, he neglected his responsibilities out of pity for the debtors (Jos. AJ 19.1.5 [28-30]). Also, when asked for the password of the day, the Emperor would give Chaerea such signa as "Priapus" or "Venus" (Suet. Gaius 56.2; Sen. Const. Sap. 18.3). "Venus" had in fact been used by Julius Caesar as a respectable password, because of his alleged descent from that goddess (Dio 43.43.3), but for Chaerea in particular it proved a source of ridicule from his fellow tribunes (Jos. AJ 19.1.5 [31]). The password used among the assassins and after Gaius' murder—"Libertas"—was as much a token of Chaerea's personal revenge as it was a plea for a restored Republic (Jos. AJ 19.1.9 [54]; 19.2.3 [186]; for the supposed significance of the password "Liberty," see M. Hammond's comments in HSPh 67 [1963] 97-98).

29.3 θεοπρόπιον δὲ τι: Of equal veracity is a similarly ambiguous oracle thought to have portended the death of Pompey in 48 B.C.: warned to beware of a Cassius, Pompey was unaware that the oracle was indicating, not a man, but an Egyptian mountain at whose foot he was later killed and buried (Dio 42.5.6).
29.3 Γάιος Κασίου: Cf. Suet. Gaius 57.3: "monuerunt et Fortunae Antiatinae, ut a Cassio caveret; qua causa ille Cassium Longinum Asian tum proconsulem occidendum delegaverat, inmemor Chaeream Cassium nominari." There can be little doubt that the Cassius whom Gaius suspected was C. Cassius Longinus (PIR² C 501), brother of the L. Cassius Longinus who had once been the husband of Drusilla (see on Chapter 11.1 Μερκος). He had held the suffect consulship in A.D. 30, the same year in which his brother had been ordinarius (CIL 10.1233; cf. Dio 58.3.8). As governor of Asia in A.D. 40-41 he was in theory subject to the authority of the Senate, not of the Emperor: by recalling Cassius on his own initiative, Gaius was once again showing his lack of respect for the prerogatives of the Senate (cf. D. Magie Roman Rule in Asia Minor pp. 515; 1581).

Reimar (ap. Sturz 6.352, n. 295) suggested that Dio here meant L. Cassius Longinus rather than his brother, and proposed that a scribe mistook the abbreviation Α for Γ, perhaps because of the proximity of the Emperor's name. His suggestion was based on the assumption that Gaius, who had taken his sister Drusilla from Longinus, her first husband, would have good reason to suspect him of revenge (cf. Suet. Gaius 24.1).

There is no sound reason for rejecting C. Cassius, however, particularly since he seems to have made an unfortunate habit of openly boasting that his ancestor had assassinated Julius Caesar (for this republican C. Cassius, see particularly Dio 44.14.2). It is possible, though doubtful, that he can even be identified with a Cassius mentioned only briefly by Suetonius among the portents of Gaius' death, "iussum se somnio affirmans immolare taurum Iovi" (Gaius 57.1). Any charges against him that Gaius was now contemplating were probably never laid, and we next hear of him as imperial governor of Syria from A.D. 44 to A.D. 49 (Jos: AJ 20.1.1 [1]; Tac. Ann. 12.11.4.-12.1).
After a successful career as a lawyer, he was exiled by Nero in A.D. 65 for the very reason that had brought him to the attention of Gaius 25 years earlier: "... quod inter imagines maiorum etiam C. Cassi effigiem coluisset, ita inscriptam 'duci partium' ..." (Tac. Ann. 16.7.3; 16.9.1; cf. Suet. Nero 37.1).

29.4 Ἀπολλωνίδος τῆς Αἴγυπτος: If this story refers to Apollonius of Tyana, a native of Cappadocia (cf. Philostr. VA 1.4), then it must be assumed that Dio called him an Egyptian because it was there that he taught. On the other hand, Dio does give him his correct origin elsewhere, when describing how Apollonius of Tyana, who was in Ephesus in A.D. 96, spoke of Domitian's assassination at the very moment it was being carried out in Rome (67.18.1; cf. Philostr. VA 8.26). The name of Apollonius, if not the whole story as it relates to Gaius, can be rejected as another example of contamination from the tradition of his "double," Domitian (for another example, see Chapter 22.2).

There were many other omens that foreshadowed Gaius' fate, none of them included in Xiphilinus' abbreviation. At the festival preceding the assassination, for example, there was presented a mime entitled Laureolus, in which a robber-king is crucified (Suet. Gaius 57.4; Jos. AJ 19.1.13 [94]; cf. Juv. 8.187; Martial Spect. 7); and Mnester danced in the Cinyras, a play in which the hero and his daughter were slain (the latter for incest: cf. Apollod. 52.14), and which had been presented immediately before the murder of Philip of Macedon (Suet. Gaius 57.4; cf. Jos. AJ 19.1.3 [94-95]). For other reported portents, see Suet. Gaius 57.1-3.
The delay refers to the interval of ten days between conviction and punishment. Following the hasty and unwarranted execution of Clutorius Priscus in A.D. 21, Tiberius had obtained a senatus consultum that established the interval in all cases in which the judgement had been passed by the Senate or the Emperor (Dio 57.20.4; Tac. Ann. 3.51.3; Suet. Tib. 75.2; Sen. Tranq. 14.4-6; cf. Rogers Criminal Trials pp. 62-64; and CPl. 27 [1932] 78-79). This same postponement of execution had saved the lives of many sentenced during the last days of Tiberius' reign (Dio 58.27.5; but cf. Suet. Tib. 75.2).

For the ludi Palatini, see particularly Inscr. It. 13.2.400-401, and note on Chapter 16.10 ἐν ταῖς ...). During the festival, held in honour of Augustus, a stage was erected in front of the palace, where the Emperor and senators with their families watched the spectacles. The conspirators decided to act when the shows were being performed since the presence of thousands of spectators in a small area would make easier any approach to the Emperor's seat and would at the same time hinder assistance from Gaius' bodyguard (so Jos. AJ 19.1.11 [75-76]).

According to Suetonius (Gaius 58.1), on the day of his death Gaius was suffering cramps from a night of overindulgence, and by early afternoon was still hesitating to leave the theatrical performance for dinner. Josephus, whose elaborate account of the assassination is our most complete and reliable source, does not disagree (AJ 19.1.13 [96]).
29.5 Πομπονίως Σεκυνδός δράτε ύπατεύων: For Q. Pomponius Secundus, see on Chapter 6.2. Κυήντος. He became consul suffectus on 7 January A.D. 41, in place of Gaius (cf. Suet. Gaius 17.1), and was still in office in June of that year (CIL 6.20142; Fasti Feriarum Latinarum = Smallwood p. 2). His facility for obsequiousness had been evident as early as A.D. 33 (Tac. Ann. 6.18.2).

29.5 ἐκατέρους ἐπὶ πέντε ἡμέρας: The conspirators had in fact planned to assassinate Gaius well before the time of the Palatine Games, but despite Chaerea's eagerness the plot was postponed because of the caution of some of his accomplices, who feared that there would be no second chance if they failed, since Gaius would thereafter increase the protection of his guards (Jos. AJ 19.1.11 [70; 74]). Finally it was decided to strike on the first day of the festivities, but again τύχη caused one delay after another. Three days of performances, 21-23 January (not five days as Dio says), were allowed to pass before Chaerea managed to urge his comrades to action by pointing out that Gaius intended to sail to Egypt immediately after the festival (Jos. AJ 19.1.12 [77-83]; cf. Philo Leg. 33.250 [583]; 43.338 [595]). The same argument had been used to prompt Julius Caesar's murderers to strike, and in each case it led to an unfounded rumour that the capital was in danger of being transferred to Alexandria (Suet. Caes. 79.3; Gaius 49.2).

29.6 καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ Γαίος ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 54.2: "nec alia de causa videtur eo die, quo periiit, pervigilium indixisse quam ut initium in scaenam prodeundi licentia temporis auspiceareetur." Dio is alone in suggesting that Gaius added more days to the festival this
year, but he must be right since traditionally the ludi ended on 23 January, while Gaius was murdered on 24 January (Suet. Gaius 58.1).

29.6 ἵνα τούς παιδᾶς θέασηται: Gaius had been persuaded, probably by Asprenas, to leave the theatre in order to bathe and dine, but as he was passing out he decided to follow a shorter route than that taken by his relatives in front of him, the only passage guarded by his attendants. It was then that he came upon the youths brought from the East (both Suetonius and Josphus mention only Asia, not Greece) to take part in the theatrical displays, and he stopped to inspect their troop (Jos. AJ 19.1.14 [104]; Suet. Gaius 58.1). It was just past midday on 24 January (Suet. Gaius 56.2 ["meridie"]; 58.1 ["hora fere septima"]; Jos. AJ 19.1.14 [99] ["περὶ ἐνατῆς ὥραν"]).

29.6 ἀπέκτειναν ἐν στενωπῇ τηλι: The assassination took place in a narrow, deserted alley (Jos. AJ 19.1.14 [104] ["κατὰ στενωπὸν ἡρεμηκότα"]; Suet. Gaius 58.1 ["in crypta"]), often wrongly identified with the surviving cryptoporticus along the southeast side of the domus Tiberiana: the site of Gaius' murder was to be obliterated by the great fire of A.D. 80 (cf. Dio 66.24.1-3).

Although details of the actual murder vary, all accounts agree that Cassius Chaerea dealt the first blow. Josephus (AJ 19.1.14 [105-110]) says that Chaerea struck after he asked the Emperor for the password and was given yet another obscene one. While admitting that the first blow was not fatal, Josephus dismisses the suggestion that Chaerea purposely avoided killing Gaius outright so that he might suffer (a possible source for this rumour was found by M.P. Charlesworth [Camb. Hist. Journ. 4 (1933) 112] in the
tradition that Gaius himself liked to inflict a lingering death [cf. Suet. Gaius 30.1]). Though wounded, the Emperor tried to escape but was prevented by the tribune, Cornelius Sabinus, who forced him to the ground and, together with the other conspirators, stabbed their victim to death, the ultimately fatal blow being delivered by a certain Aquila. The account of Suetonius (Gaius 58.2) is substantially the same, although he gives a variant in which Sabinus asked for the password: "Gaio 'Iovem' dante, Chaeream exclamasse: 'accipe ratum!' respicientique maxillam ictu discidisse." Seneca, on the other hand, wrongly credits Chaerea with severing Gaius' neck by a single blow (Const. Sap. 18.3).

29.7 νεκρὸν οὖτον δούναμις ἑττίρωσκον: Cf. Suet. Gaius 58.3: "iacentem contractisque membris clamantem se vivere ceteri vulneribus triginta confecerunt; nam signum erat omnium: 'repete!' quidam etiam per obscaena ferrum adegerunt." Josephus (AJ 19.1.14 [109]) says that Gaius did not call out, but groaned in agony. Dio's statement that the assassins ate the flesh of their victim is scarcely credible.

29.7 τὴν τε γυναῖκα καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα: Details of the murder of Caesonia and Drusilla are found in Josephus (AJ 19.2.4 [190-200]) and Suetonius (Gaius 59). Ostensibly because he considered any living member of Gaius' family to be a threat to "liberty," but in fact because of his uncontrollable desire for revenge, Chaerea sent Julius Lupus, another military tribune (Suetonius calls him a centurion), to kill the Emperor's wife and daughter. Some conspirators objected to the decision, saying that Caesonia had taken no part in Gaius' cruelties; but others claimed that it was her love potion that had driven him mad (see on
Chapter 23.7 Μιαωνιαν. Lupus found Caesonia lying beside Gaius' body, with Drusilla next to her, and heard her reproach her dead husband because he had not heeded her warnings of imminent danger—Josephus did not know whether she had been aware of the plot (which seems improbable) or whether she had advised Gaius to avoid discontent by governing better (a typical theme more suited to Seneca's counsel than to a wife's mourning). Realizing Lupus' mission, she exposed her throat and died εὐψυχως. Drusilla was flung against a wall.
CHAPTER THIRTY

30.1 *ἐν ἐτεσί τριῶν καὶ ...*: Dio errs in computing the length of Gaius' reign. He begins by working from an inaccurate date for Tiberius' death--26 March A.D. 37 (58.28.5; see notes on Chapter 1.1)--and, even though he does not seem to count such dates inclusively, is still one day short for the period from Tiberius' death until 24 January A.D. 41. The confusion may be due either to his epitomists--although it is significant that they all give the same figure--or more likely to a misunderstanding of the particular date on which Gaius was killed, which is nowhere in the text stated explicitly. However determined Dio was to convince his readers of the accuracy of his imperial chronology (see 51.1.1-2; 66.17.3-5), he has blundered inexcusably in the case of Gaius.

In this he is not alone. Josephus is even wider of the mark when he says that Gaius ruled three years and eight months (*AJ* 19.2.5 [201]; *BJ* 2.11.1 [204]). The variety of other figures found in late writers includes: three years, eight months, thirteen days (Tert. *contra Iud.* 8.16); three years, ten months (Cassiod. *Chron.* = Mommsen *MGH* 11.137; Hier. *Chron.* = 0. Stählin *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 24.117); not quite four years (Eus. *Ecol. Hist.* 2.8.1; Orosius 7.5.1); and four years (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.21.144.2 = Stählin op. cit. vol. 15). Only Suetonius correctly records the length of Gaius' reign: counting inclusively from the Emperor's *dies imperii* on 18 March A.D. 37 (see on Chapter 1.1 *ὁ ἀπέθανεν ὁ βασιλεὺς*), he arrives at the proper figure of three years, ten months, eight days (*Gaius* 59; cf. the same figure in his epitomist, Eutropius [7.12]).

30.1a *σφάγιον ἐγίνετο*: Gaius' body was found by his friend, Agrippa, who laid it out and dressed it as well as he could (Jos.
AJ 19.4.1 [237]). It was then taken in secret to the imperial gardens on the Esquiline hill, where it was hastily and only partially burned, and the remains buried in a shallow grave. Later that year Julia and Agrippina, who had recently returned from exile, showed a piety toward their brother which they had lacked when he was alive: after disinterring his remains they cremated them properly and deposited them in a tomb (Suet. Gaius 59). Although it would seem likely, there is no direct evidence that his ashes were placed in the mausoleum of Augustus: a *cippus* found nearby, which reads "C. Caesar | Germanici Caesaris f. | hic crematus est" (ILS 181), must belong to Gaius' brother of the same name, who died in infancy (Suet. Gaius 8.2; see Chapter 7.2), since it makes no mention of imperial titles.

30.1a ἀνδριαντες τε ...: In his desire to show the requisite distaste for the image of his predecessor, Claudius later melted down much of Gaius' bronze coinage, "ὅσον τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ἐντευτῳμένην εἰχε." The bronze was then apparently cast into statues of Mnester at the instigation of Messalina, in gratitude for that actor's affections (Dio 60.22.3 [A.D. 43]).

30.1a μεμημένου μάλιστα τοῦ δῆμου ...: Josephus tells of a far different reaction from the people: they were angry, he says, because Gaius' murderers had escaped, and they demanded to know their names (AJ 19.1.20 [159]; see below, section 2). The conspirators were justifiably worried about their escape because Gaius had been loved by the people: "ὅποι τε ἀνοιῶς τοῦ δῆμου τιμώμενον καὶ ὑντα προσφιλὴ" (AJ 19.1.15 [115]). Josephus is concerned, however, to explain the sentiments of this "mindless" throng: the people grieved for Gaius because they had
been captivated by his games, shows, and distributions of food; the soldiers loved him because he had paid them well and had encouraged them to terrify the citizens; the slaves supported him because he despised their masters and encouraged their delation. In fact, Josephus observes, it was only the εὐπρεπείς who felt any joy at Gaius' death (AJ 19.1.16 [128-137]). Yavetz (Plebs: and Princeps pp. 113-18) accepts both Josephus' explanation of Gaius' early popularity with the masses and the tradition of general rejoicing at his death; but he gives no good reason for the sudden change in the attitude of the plebs.

30.1b οἱ δὲ στρατιωταί ...: Cf. Suet. Gaius 58.3: "ad primum tumultum lecticari cum asseribus in auxilium accurrerunt, mox Germani corporis custodes, ac nonnullos ex percussoribus, quosdam etiam senatores innoxios interemerunt." According to Josephus (AJ 19.1.15 [119-126]), it was the German bodyguard that first found Gaius' corpse; and he is probably right in suggesting that their affection for the Emperor was a result only of the donatives they had received from him. At any rate, they showed their anger by searching out and murdering Asprenas, Norbanus (either the consul of A.D. 15 [PIR¹ N 137] or his brother, the consul of A.D. 19 [PIR¹ N 134]), and an otherwise unknown senator named Anteius. Only the first victim was guilty.

Impressed with the military prowess of the Batavian horsemen (for which see Tac. Hist. 4.12; Germ. 29), Augustus had used them as part of his imperial guard (Dio 55.24.7-8), but discharged them after the defeat of Varus in A.D. 9 (Dio 56.23.4; Suet. Aug. 49.1). They were still used as frontier cavalry in Germany, however (Tac. Ann. 1.24.3), and it seems likely that in A.D. 40 Gaius brought some back to Rome with him to act as his
personal guard (Suet. Gaius 43; see on Chapter 21.2 τοὺς Κέλτους), putting
them under the command of a Thracian gladiator, Sabinus (Dio 60.28.2; Suet.
Gaius 55.2; Jos. AJ 19.1.15 [122]). They continued to be employed by Nero
(Tac. Ann. 15.58.2), but were ultimately disbanded by Galba, who feared
their influence in any potential civil war (Suet. Galba 12.2).

30.1c [Xiph./Zon.] εἴθε ἑνα αὐχένα εἴχετε: For Gaius' statement, see
Chapter 13.6. The reference
here makes a good story, but one that should be rejected as a fabrication
for rhetorical antithesis, given what Josephus says was the general
sentiment among the populace.

30.2 [Xiph.] Οὐαλέριος Ἄσιατικός ...: Two separate events have here been
compressed into one. Although one
band of Germans had already discovered Gaius' body, other members of the
guard were apparently convinced by the rumour, started by Agrippa during
the confusion to give himself time to encourage Claudius' accession (Jos.
AJ 19.4.1 [237]), that Gaius was still alive and under the care of physicians
(Jos. AJ 19.1.16 [134-136]; cf. Suet. Gaius 60). These Germans surrounded
the temporary theatre on the Palatine, intending to massacre the spectators
in revenge for the attempt on their master's life. The pleas of the audience
restrained them temporarily, and they were finally calmed by Arruntius
Euaristus, a professional auctioneer, who gravely announced that Gaius was
actually dead: no longer need the bodyguard show their devotion, since they
would receive no reward for it (AJ 19.1.17-18 [138-152]). It was probably
at this time that the unlucky conspirators who had been trapped in the
theatre, in an attempt to keep the Germans from searching out the assassins
anyway, imaginatively suggested that Gaius had taken his own life after receiving news of a military defeat (Suet. Gaius 51.3).

In the meantime Valerius Asiaticus was addressing τὸν δῆμον. The words of Josephus (AJ 19.1.20 [159]: "δὲ δῆμος ὑπὲρ καὶ εἰσώθασιν ἐκκλησιάζειν ἐπὶ τὴς ἁγορᾶς καταστάσ") and of Tacitus (Ann. 11.1.2: "contione in populi Romani") suggest a formal gathering of the popular assembly, which is hardly to be expected or even possible at this time. A mob had no doubt gathered in the Forum, noisily complaining because the Emperor's assassins had not been discovered, and demanding to know their identities. The reply of Asiaticus, all the more unexpected since he was known to be a friend of Gaius, shocked the throng into silence.

Valerius Asiaticus (PIR¹ V 25) was a native of Vienna in Gallia Narbonensis (Tac. Ann. 11.1.2), and was suffect consul sometime before A.D. 41, according to both Dio and Josephus. Although intimate with Gaius, he found the Emperor's coarse references to his wife difficult to bear (Sen. Const. Sap. 18.2), and perhaps joined the conspiracy for this reason. Following the assassination he became one of the claimants to the throne—hardly a position befitting one who had acted to restore libertas—but was restrained by Annius Vinicianus (see below, section 3). His ambition was not punished, however, and in A.D. 46 he became consul ordinarius, although he resigned early because he feared that his wealth would make him a target for jealous opponents (Dio 60.27.1-4). His fears were well founded: in the following year Messalina caused him to be indicted for maestas and for adultery with her rival, Poppaea. Asiaticus delivered a successful plea before Claudius, but L. Vitellius, "τὴν Μεσσαλίνην χαριζομένος," gave more incriminating evidence, and he committed suicide (Dio 60.29.4-6a; Tac. Ann. 11.1.1-2; 11.3.2).
After Gaius' death had been confirmed, the consuls sent word to the people and soldiers that they were to disperse, promising them rewards if they maintained discipline (Jos. *AJ* 19.1.20 [160]). So the assassins of Julius Caesar had in desperation distributed bribes to win the support of the surprisingly hostile plebs (App. *BC* 2.17.120).

The syntax of this sentence is by no means clear. One must agree with the comment of H. van Herwerden (*RhM* 64 [1909] 177): "priora non intellego."

Cn. Sentius Saturninus (PIR¹ S 296) was *consul ordinarius* for this year, together with Gaius (cf. Jos. *BJ* 2.11.1 [205]; *index libri*). When the Emperor resigned the magistracy on 7 January (Suet. *Gaius* 17.2), he allowed Saturninus to complete his term of office, as he had in the case of L. Apronius two years earlier (Chapter 13.2). For his colleague, Q. Pomponius Secundus, who had succeeded Gaius as consul, see on Chapters 6.2 and 29.5.

The father of Saturninus had been a friend of Germanicus, and as his *legatus* had accompanied him to the East; after Germanicus' death he had been chosen temporary governor of Syria (Tac. *Ann.* 2.73-74). It was because of this friendship, according to J. Colin (*Latomus* 13 [1954] 411-13) that the younger Saturninus had been chosen consul for this year (he may, too, have been a descendant of the Sentius Saturninus who had supported Marc Antony [App. *BC* 5.6.52]).

Cf. Suet. *Gaius* 60: "senatus in asserenda libertate adeo consensit, ut consules primo non in curiam, quia Iulia vocabatur, sed in Capitolium
convocarent." According to Josephus (AJ 19.4.3 [248]) the Senate met in the temple of Jupiter Victor, probably on the Palatine (cf. Platner and Ashby Topographical Dictionary pp. 306-307); but elsewhere (BJ 2.11.1 [205]) he places the meeting in the Capitolium, as do Suetonius and Dio (60.1.1).

There can be little doubt that the decision of the consuls to convene the Senate on the Capitol rather than in the Curia was influenced as much by fear for their own safety as by a desire to sever any association with the Julian family. In the same way those who had murdered Julius Caesar found refuge from public anger on that hill, the most easily defensible spot in all Rome (App. BC 2.17.120; 123; 18.126).

The funds that they moved must have belonged to the aerarium Saturni, located in the basement of the temple of Saturn in the Forum, at the foot of the Capitoline hill (Luc. 3.154-168; cf. Pliny HN 33.17.56; Macr. Sat. 1.8). Although it is quite impossible to estimate the amount in the public treasury at this time, Claudius' ability to pay an enormous bribe to the Praetorians and to give back some of the money appropriated by Gaius suggests that the aerarium and fiscus were not left empty by Gaius (Dio 60.17.2; Jos. AJ 19.4.2 [247]; Suet. Claud. 10.4; cf. Balsdon Gaius pp. 187-88; see on Chapter 2.6 oὀδε).
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30.3 τὸ πρακτέου ἐσκοποῦντο: The nocturnal deliberations of the Senate, at which no more than a hundred members were present, are recorded at length by Josephus (AJ 19.2.1-3 [166-189]; 19.4.3 [248-253]). Like the assassins of Julius Caesar, the conspirators of A.D. 41 had given no serious thought to a plan for restoring the Republic once the "tyrant" had been eliminated (cf. Suet. Gaius 60). The Senate as a result indulged itself in a debate about the proper form of government, some members supporting democracy, others monarchy (such behaviour had become a motif in historical writing; it first occurs in Herodotus [3.80-82]). The consul Secundus declared his support for the Republic (cf. AJ 19.4.5 [263]), while his colleague Saturninus delivered a long speech that included a declamation against tyranny in general and a proposal that the Senate congratulate Gaius' murderers. The honesty of Saturninus' sympathies was doubted, however, since he had already declared himself willing to succeed Gaius as Emperor (cf. BJ 2.11.1 [205]).

Yet once the senators had heard of Claudius' kidnapping by the Praetorians, they admitted the inevitability of monarchy and were determined only to make the new appointment themselves (cf. Jos. AJ 19.2.4 [234-235]). In addition to Saturninus, Annius Vinicianus (cf. Dio 60.15.1), Valerius Asiaticus, and Marcus Vinicius were all considered by the Senate as potential Emperors (the future Emperor Galba was also encouraged to declare himself a candidate, but refused [Suet. Galba 7.1]). But they had lost their opportunity, and the decision to assert the Senate's authority came too late: Claudius had already been hailed Emperor by the Praetorians in their camp, and early in the morning of 25 January the senators, with little military support, admitted the inevitable and acquiesced in the soldiers' choice (Jos. AJ 19.3.2 [223-225]; 19.3.4 [254-262]; Dio 60.1.2-4; Suet. Claud. 10).
Claudius' first act as Emperor was to punish those men whose deed had made possible his own accession: he was, as Dio says, "πόρρωθεν τὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐς ἀσφάλειαν προορώμενος" (60.3.4). His advisors praised the assassination of Gaius, but found the murderers guilty of ἀπιστία. Cassius Chaerea, who had openly presented himself to Claudius no doubt in expectation of his support, was executed on the spot, dying with a bravery and dignity reminiscent of his younger days. Lupus, who had murdered Gaius' family, showed his cowardice and had to be dispatched by several blows. Sabinus was pardoned, but committed suicide to avoid being thought disloyal to his comrades (Dio 60.3.4-5; Jos. AJ 19.4.5-6 [268-273]; Suet. Claud. 11.1). Of the remaining conspirators, Asprenas had already perished at the hands of the German bodyguard (see on section 1b), while the fates of Aquila and Papinius are not known. The two senators who had participated in the conspiracy--Annius Vinicianus and Valerius Asiaticus--as well as Clemens, the praetorian prefect, and Callistus (if his guilt was ever known), were pardoned by a general amnesty (Dio 60.3.5; Suet. Claud. 11.1). Claudius, like Gaius before him, was determined to make a favourable beginning to his reign.
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