

THE *PARTHI*, THE TYRANNY OF TIBERIUS, AND THE DATE OF Q. CURTIUS RUFUS

A. M. DEVINE

THE QUESTION of the date at which Q. Curtius Rufus wrote his *Historiae Alexandri Magni Macedonis* is one that has long been debated yet never conclusively settled. Since there is extant no ancient reference either to such a history or to a Quintus Curtius Rufus as the author of a work on Alexander, any attempt to date it must rest on internal evidence. Unfortunately, little in the way of such evidence is forthcoming. Indeed, only once in the surviving parts of the *Historiae Alexandri* does the author make any specific reference to the historical circumstances in which the work was written. An imperial panegyric, interjected at 10.9.1-7 to contrast the violent dissolution of Alexander's world-kingdom after its creator's death with the felicity enjoyed in Curtius' day by the Roman commonwealth, establishes the principate of Augustus as a *terminus ante quem non*. Although the panegyric clearly celebrates a princeps whose accession had narrowly averted or even actually terminated a civil war, the precise nature of the intestine strife alluded to still escapes—thanks to the fog of Curtian rhetoric—incontrovertible definition. If it was an *actual* civil war, then the subject of the panegyric could be Augustus himself, Vespasian, Septimius Severus, or Constantine the Great—or, indeed, any one of a number of lesser emperors who, in the third century, momentarily pacified the empire. If, on the other hand, Curtius is eulogizing a princeps whose accession averted the outbreak of an *impending* civil war, then the emperor in question could be Claudius, Galba, or again some ephemeral third-century emperor, such as Gordian III. But despite the fact that all of these emperors (and several others besides) have, at one time or another, been proposed as candidates for identification with the princeps of Curtius' panegyric,¹ only four—Augustus, Claudius, Vespasian, and Septimius

¹The literature is vast and continues to grow. See, for example, Sir William Tarn, *Alexander the Great, Part II Sources and Studies* (Cambridge 1948) 111-114; D. Korzeniewski, *Die Zeit des Quintus Curtius Rufus* (Diss. Cologne 1959) (Augustus); R. Zimmermann, "Die Zeit des Geschichtschreibers Curtius Rufus," *RhM* 79 (1930) 381-390 (Caligula); I. Lana, "Dell'epoca in cui visse Quinto Curzio Rufo," *RFIC* n.s. 27 (1949) 48-70; G. V. Sumner, "Curtius Rufus and the *Historiae Alexandri*," *AUMLA* 15 (1961) 30-39; J. E. Atkinson, "The Curtii Rufi Again," *Acta Classica* 16 (1973) 129-133 (Claudius); R. Verdière, "Quinte-Curce, Ecrivain Néronien," *WS* 79 (1966) 490-509 (Nero); R. D. Milns, "The Date of Curtius Rufus and the *Historiae Alexandri*," *Latomus* 25 (1966) 490-507 (Galba); J. Stroux, "Die Zeit des Curtius," *Philologus* 84 (1928/29) 233-251; H. U. Instinsky, "Zur Kontroverse um die Datierung des Curtius Rufus," *Hermes* 90 (1962) 379-383; U. Vogel-Weidemann, "Bemerkungen zu den Curtii Rufi der

Severus—have attracted much support in the last three decades of Curtian scholarship, while the most recent survey of opinion found only Claudius and Vespasian to be regarded as serious contenders.²

This predilection of Curtian scholarship for an identification with an early emperor is based in part on the assumption that Curtius' references to the *Parthi* as the contemporary rulers of much of what had formerly been Alexander's empire³ establish the fall of the Parthian empire around A.D. 226/227 as a fixed *terminus post quem non* for Curtius' writing.⁴ But this assumption must now be discarded, since it has recently been pointed out that Latin historians like Ammianus Marcellinus, writing well after the overthrow of the Parthian kingdom by the Persian Sassanids, equated the contemporary *Persae* with the defunct *Parthi*.⁵ Other suggested *termini post quos non*, proposed on the basis of alleged borrowing from Curtius by Silius Italicus and other first-century Latin authors, have also been shown to be untenable on methodological grounds.⁶

While it is necessary to be aware of the danger of *petitio principii*, it should be remembered that not all the parallels between Curtius and Latin authors of the first century or so of the imperial age are purely

frühen Principatszeit," *Acta Classica* 13 (1970) 79–88 (Vespasian); A. Rüegg, *Beiträge zur Erforschung der Quellenverhältnisse in der Alexandergeschichte des Curtius* (Diss. Basel 1906) 115–116 (Trajan); A. von Domaszewski, "Die Phalangen Alexanders und Caesars Legionen," *SB Heidelberg* 16 (1925/26) 3–5 (Hadrian); G. Castelli, *L'età e la patria di Q. Curzio Rufo* (Ascoli Piceno 1888) (Marcus Aurelius); F. Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertums* 1 (Halle 1948) 153–164; C. A. Robinson, *AJP* 82 (1961) 316–319 (Septimius Severus); R. B. Steele, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," *AJP* 36 (1915) 402–423 (Severus Alexander); E. Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury (London 1896) 1.204, note 59 (Gordian III); and R. Pichon, "L'époque probable de Quinte-Curce," *RevPhil* 32 (1908) 210–214 (Constantine the Great). Also relevant is E. I. McQueen, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Latin Biography* (London 1967) 17–43 (Claudius or Vespasian).

²Cf. E. Badian, *CW* 65 (1971) 48.

³Curt. 4.12.11; 5.7.9; 5.8.1; 6.2.12.

⁴Cf., for example, Steele (above, note 1) 402; Tarn (above, note 1) 2.113; Sumner (above, note 1) 30; Robinson (above, note 1) 316; Milns (above, note 1) 490; and McQueen (above, note 1) 21.

⁵Note especially Amm. 23.6.2–6 and 31.2.20. On this point, see now J. Rufus Fears, "Parthi in Q. Curtius Rufus," *Hermes* 102 (1974) 623–625; and Pichon (above, note 1) 212–213.

⁶J. Rufus Fears, "Silius Italicus, *Cataphracti*, and the date of Q. Curtius Rufus," *CP* 71 (1976) 214–223, especially 216 ("... since most scholars have accepted a Claudian date for the composition of Curtius' history, seeming connections between Curtius and such writers as Lucan, Seneca, and Silius have usually been formulated in terms of the question, Did Lucan, Seneca, or Silius use Curtius? However, since there is no clear proof that Curtius predates any of these writers, the contrary is also a possibility."), a telling indictment of the methodology of, *inter alios*, R. T. Bruère, "Silius Italicus, *Punica* 3.62–162 and 4.763–822," *CP* 47 (1952) 219–227.

"literary." Some, like those between Curtius' panegyric of the reigning emperor and similar encomia in other Roman writers, are obviously reflections of the regular and systematic interaction of official propaganda and rhetorical usage. Others, such as the well-known coincidence between the celebrated defence of the Roman knight M. Terentius against a charge of *Seiani amicitia* in A.D. 32 (as reported by Tac. *Ann.* 6.8 and Dio Cass. 58.19.3-4) and the Curtian account of Amyntas' defence in the face of a like charge of friendship with Philotas (7.1.26-30), must be related, not so much to use by one author of the work of another as to the common ideological or psychological impact of actual historical events or states of affairs. Most of the argument in this paper will in fact centre on parallels of this latter type.

I. THE PARTHI—AND A TERMINUS POST QUEM NON

At 6.2.12 Curtius reports Alexander's advance into Parthiene, the ancient homeland of the *Parthi*, and appends a brief note on the rise to power of this people: *hinc in Parthienem perventum est, tunc ignobilem gentem, nunc caput omnium qui post Euphraten et Tigrim amnes siti Rubro mari terminantur*. As we have seen, it is still an open question whether Curtius is really talking here about the true *Parthi*, and not just confusing and conflating them with their successors, the Persian Sassanids. Although at first glance this would appear to be an insuperable difficulty, its solution is to be found within the note itself. The corollary of the statement that the Parthians rule⁷ all the peoples beyond the Euphrates and the Tigris would, of course, be that Roman rule extends as far as, but no farther than, those two rivers. While Curtius, like many Roman writers, may have had only a very vague understanding of the internal affairs of the great Oriental monarchy that contended with Rome for hegemony in the East, he would doubtless have had a somewhat clearer idea of the eastern limit of Roman dominion. Though detailed knowledge on Curtius' part of the exact location of the Roman frontier cannot be assumed, he must have been conversant with at least the official territorial claims of the empire.

From the time of Augustus until that of Trajan it was established Roman policy to regard the upper reaches of the Euphrates and the Tigris as forming the boundary between the empire and the Parthian sphere of influence. Trajan made the decisive break with this long-standing policy and momentarily extended Roman dominion to the Persian Gulf. But his successor Hadrian reverted to the Augustan convention. The move was

⁷In Curtius, *caput* normally connotes domination rather than mere pre-eminence: cf. 4.5.8; 5.4.33; 5.8.1; 6.10.6; 7.4.31; 9.4.4; 10.6.8; 10.9.4.

not popular and aroused much resentment, as the tradition preserved in Eutropius (8.6.2) shows: *Hadrianus . . . qui Traiani gloriae invidens statim provincias tres reliquit, quas Traianus addiderat . . . ac finem imperii esse voluit Euphraten*.⁸ In view of this manifestation of imperialistic chagrin, it is difficult to see how any Hadrianic writer, whether he approved or condemned the emperor's decision, could refer to the Euphrates as the limit of Parthian power in the bland way that Curtius does. Better not to speak of it at all, especially as the true situation was by no means so clear-cut. Parthamaspatēs, the renegade Arsacid prince upon whom Trajan had bestowed the Parthian crown, proved unable to hold any part of his nominal kingdom and was transferred by Hadrian to the minor realm of Osroëne in north-western Mesopotamia. Here this would-be Great King reigned, according to the Syriac chronicle attributed to Dionysius of Telmahar, for four years and eight months (A.D. 118/119–123).⁹ There can be little doubt but that during these years both sides continued to regard Parthamaspatēs as a Roman vassal. And since Curtius, as his imperial panegyric would indicate, appears to have published soon after the accession of the eulogized princeps,¹⁰ this circumstance would also militate against a Hadrianic date. Moreover, had the *Historiae Alexandri* been published shortly after Hadrian's accession, then the bulk of the work would have been written during the last years of Trajan—that is, at the very time the Roman empire was being gloriously extended to the shores of the Caspian and the Persian Gulf, and when the Parthians were being driven back to the mountains of Media and the plains of Iran! The inappositeness of Curtius' Parthian references to this state of affairs requires no underscoring.

The keynote of Hadrian's *Ostpolitik* was appeasement. To the Parthian king Chosroes he promised to restore the golden throne of the Arsacids, which had fallen into Trajan's hands at Ctesiphon in A.D. 116.¹¹ However, this unpopular policy was abrogated by Hadrian's successor, Antoninus Pius, who launched a vigorous diplomatic and propaganda offensive against Parthia, retaining the golden throne as a symbol of Rome's suzerainty over the East.¹² At a more practical level, Pius kept Osroëne within the Roman sphere of influence through the client-king Manu VIII Philoromaïos (reigned A.D. 139–163 and 167–179),¹³ and give a king,

⁸Cf., however, *HA Hadrian* 5.3.

⁹A. von Gutschmid, "Untersuchungen über die Geschichte des Königreichs Osroëne," *Mémoires de l'académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, 7th ser. 35 (1887) no. 1. 27–28; F. A. Lepper, *Trajan's Parthian War* (Oxford 1948) 147–148.

¹⁰Cf. Sumner (above, note 1) 33; Milns (above, note 1) 494.

¹¹*HA Hadrian* 13.8.

¹²*HA Antoninus Pius* 9.7.

¹³Gutschmid (above, note 9) 30–32; K.-H. Ziegler, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich* (Wiesbaden 1964) 112.

Pacorus, to the Armenians around A.D. 142.¹⁴ In A.D. 155 he cowed the new king of Parthia, Vologaeses III, into abandoning an attempt to seize Armenia for an Arsacid prince.¹⁵ Furthermore, Pius revived Trajan's overt claim of world-rule. The princeps that the *Digest* (14.2.9) quotes as proclaiming ἐγὼ μὲν τοῦ κοσμοῦ κύριος, ὁ δὲ νόμος τῆς θαλάσσης could scarcely have viewed with favour anything like Curtius' allusion to the extent of Parthian overlordship.

Pius' grandiloquent claims were translated into action by his joint successors, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. The Parthian war of A.D. 161–165 saw Armenia and Mesopotamia overrun by Roman armies and the cities of Artaxata, Seleucia, and Ctesiphon destroyed. With the peace of A.D. 166 the eastern frontier of the Roman empire was advanced to the line formed by the river Chaboras and the town of Singara in north-western Mesopotamia. Whilst Osrhoëne itself escaped annexation and continued under the rule of native client-kings—Abgar VIII (reigned A.D. 165–167) and Manu VIII (restored in A.D. 167)¹⁶—Carrhae and Singara, and possibly Edessa, now became Roman *coloniae* garrisoned on a permanent basis by Roman troops.¹⁷ At about the same time, the Armenians received a new king in the person of the Arsacid prince and Roman senator Sohaemus.¹⁸ Imperial coins of A.D. 163/164, bearing the familiar legend REX ARMENIIS DATVS and closely modelled on Trajanic issues of A.D. 115–116, again advertised Roman claims of suzerainty over the Orient,¹⁹ whose validity even Adiabene, northeast of the middle Tigris, seems to have found it expedient to recognize at this time.²⁰ Thus there was some warrant for the systematic evocation of Trajanic glory in the Roman propaganda of the day: the Chaboras–Singara line approximated the boundary of Trajan's province of Mesopotamia,²¹ while Adiabene, his province of Assyria,²² was, if only very tenuously, once more within the Roman fold. In view of such a large-scale expansion of Rome's cordon of client-states and the establishment of a permanent military zone to cut off the deep re-entrant angle between Syria and Armenia, a statement that Parthia ruled all the peoples beyond

¹⁴R. Göbl, "Rex . . . Datus," *RhM* 104 (1961) 70–80; H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (London 1923)—hereafter *BMCEmp*—4.204, Antoninus Pius nos. 1272–1273a; cf. 3.223, Trajan nos. 1045–1049.

¹⁵*HA Antoninus Pius* 9.6; *CIL* 9.2457.

¹⁶Ziegler (above, note 13) 113–114; F. Schachermeyr, *RE* 15.1 (1931) 1148–1149, s.v. *Mesopotamien*; P. von Rohden, *RE* 1 (1894) 95, s.v. *Abgar* no. 8.

¹⁷Schachermeyr (above, note 16) 1160.

¹⁸Stein, *RE* 3 A.1 (1927) 798, s.v. *Sohaemus* no. 5.

¹⁹*BMCEmp* 4.562, Marcus Aurelius nos. 1099–1100; cf. above, note 14.

²⁰Schachermeyr (above, note 16) 1149.

²¹Lepper (above, note 9) 115; Ziegler (above, note 13) 114.

²²Lepper (above, note 9) 146.

the Euphrates and the Tigris would be palpably false—and any reasonably well-informed Roman of the late Antonine era could be counted on to recognize it as such.

A further tightening of Roman control in this region took place in A.D. 195 under Septimius Severus, who annexed Osrhoëne and established three new *coloniae* at Nisibis, Rhesaena, and Zaitha. Osrhoëne and the military district along the Chaboras-Singara line were reorganized as separate provinces, governed respectively from Edessa and Nisibis.²³ Though Severus soon saw fit to return Osrhoëne to the rule of its erstwhile king, Abgar IX (reigned A.D. 179–216), the long-standing anomaly of a client-kingdom *behind* the Roman lines was eliminated by Caracalla, who deposed Abgar IX (and his son and co-regent from A.D. 214, Abgar X) in A.D. 216 and annexed what remained of the little kingdom.²⁴ Apart from a short-lived restoration of the native dynasty in the person of Abgar XI (reigned A.D. 242–244) under Gordian III, Osrhoëne, like its twin province, Mesopotamia, remained—despite occasional but brief occupation by the Sassanids—part of the Roman empire until the seventh century.²⁵

We can thus be confident that Curtius wrote before Rome had a permanent foothold on the eastern bank of the Euphrates—that is, before Marcus Aurelius erected a military frontier on the Chaboras-Singara line and before Septimius Severus and Caracalla rationalized the situation by annexing the territory west of that line. Nor, in view of the evidence presented above, does any date later than the principate of Trajan seem possible.²⁶

The establishment of Trajan's reign as a *terminus post quem non* makes possible the elimination of all but a handful of the candidates proposed for identification with the saviour princeps of Curtius' panegyric. Since the entry upon the principate of three of the candidates—Caligula, Nero, and Trajan—was not attended by any real civil disturbance, it is more likely that Curtius published his *Historiae Alexandri* following the troubled accession of either Augustus, Claudius, Galba, or Vespasian.

II. THE AUTHOR OF THE HISTORIAE ALEXANDRI

Once a *terminus post quem non* has been established, the question of the date of the *Historiae Alexandri* may be usefully connected with an attempt to identify its author. Only two Curtii Rufi are on record from the relevant period. They are:

²³Schachermeyr (above, note 16) 1149–1150 and 1158–1161.

²⁴Schachermeyr (above, note 16) 1150; P. von Rohden, *RE* 1 (1894) 95, s.v. *Abgar* nos. 9 and 10.

²⁵P. von Rohden, *RE* 1 (1894) 95–96, s.v. *Abgar* no. 11; Schachermeyr (above, note 16) 1151–1157.

²⁶Cf. Sumner (above, note 1) 30.

(1) Q. Curtius Rufus, whose name appears under the heading *Rhetores* in the index prefaced to Suetonius' *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* in several of the better manuscripts. The list of rhetors given in this index is in roughly chronological order, which enables us to deduce that the rhetor in question was active sometime between the latter part of the principate of Augustus and that of Claudius.²⁷

(2) Curtius Rufus, the distinguished consular whose career is given in outline by Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.20.4–21.4) and Pliny (*Ep.* 7.27.2–3). This Curtius was a man of humble—possibly servile—origin, who began his career in the entourage of the quaestor assigned to the province of Africa. Whilst at Hadrumetum he was favoured with a vision which prompted him to go to Rome and stand for political office. Thanks to the financial resources of his friends and his own talents (*acri ingenio*),²⁸ he was elected to a quaestorship. In due course, he attained the praetorship—in spite of patrician competitors—as a *candidatus Caesaris* of Tiberius. However, something went badly wrong, for it was only long afterwards, in old age (*longa post haec senecta*), that an embittered and cynical Curtius (*adversus superiores tristi adulatione, adrogans minoribus, inter pares difficilis*) reached the consulship (*Ann.* 11.21.4). Basking once more in the favour of an emperor, Curtius moved quickly. He advanced first, probably in A.D. 46, to the post of consular legate of the Army of Upper Germany, where in A.D. 48 he was awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia* by Claudius for his silver-mining activities in the territory of the Mattiaci. Finally he attained the pinnacle of the senatorial *cursus* with the African proconsulship, and died at Carthage early in his term of office, probably about the end of Claudius' principate.²⁹

"It is an economical hypothesis," writes G. V. Sumner, "that the rhetorician Q. Curtius Rufus and the self-made man Curtius Rufus were one and the same person. *Nihil obstat*, and the dates fit" (36). Sumner's now widely-accepted hypothesis receives very powerful support from a recent epigraphical study by G. Barbieri,³⁰ where it is established, not only that Curtius Rufus was suffect consul in the period October 8–14, A.D. 43, but also that his *praenomen* was indeed Quintus.

The rhetor and belated consul Q. Curtius Rufus is on general grounds the most likely candidate for the authorship of the *Historiae Alexandri*. In the last section of this article evidence to support this identification will

²⁷Sumner (above, note 1) 35.

²⁸Though Tacitus' usage is by no means uniform, he tends to use *ingenium* of literary or rhetorical gifts: cf. *Dial.* 1.1–4; 2.1–2; 10.3; 14.2–3; 16.1; 37.3; *Ann.* 4.42.1; 4.52.7; 4.61.1; 5.8.4; 13.3.2; 13.11.2; 14.19.1; *Hist.* 2.10.2; 4.5.2.

²⁹Sumner (above, note 1) 35–36 and 39, note 32.

³⁰"I consoli del'anno 43 d.c.," *AttiLinc* ser. 8.30 (1975) 153–157.

be adduced from the work itself. Here it may be noted that composition of the *Historiae Alexandri* fits without difficulty with what is known of this man's rise and temporary fall. Tiberius' enthusiasm for *litterae humaniores* and active patronage of rhetoricians and grammarians are well attested.³¹ As praetor in A.D. 22, we have Junius Otho,³² a creature of Sejanus and formerly a teacher of rhetoric: *Iunio Othoni litterarium ludum exercere vetus ars fuit: mox Seiani potentia senator obscura initia impudentibus ausis prope polluebat* (Tac. *Ann.* 3.66.4). Elsewhere in the *Annales*, another contemporary senatorial rhetor, Junius Gallio,³³ receives a rough handling from Tacitus. This man had the misfortune, in A.D. 32, to arouse Tiberius' wrath by injudiciously proposing additional privileges for veterans of the Praetorian Guard.³⁴ Since the princeps construed this as a flagrant invasion of his province as *Imperator*, he reacted violently. The words put in Tiberius' mouth by Tacitus perhaps contain more factual information concerning Gallio's political connections than might be expected from the rhetorical context: *an potius discordiam et seditionem a satellite Seiani quaesitam, qua rudis animos nomine honoris ad corrumpendum militiae morem propelleret?* (*Ann.* 6.3.2). Although here, in contrast with the excursus *de origine Iunii Othonis*, the link with Sejanus is not stated as a fact but conveyed instead by rhetorical innuendo, the passage does seem to echo a genuine Tiberian allusion to advancement gained through the patronage of the fallen favourite. It is thus quite possible that our Q. Curtius Rufus was one of a group of professional rhetoricians promoted to the senate through the influence of Sejanus.³⁵

From the beginning of Tiberius' self-imposed exile on Capri in A.D. 26 until the catastrophe of A.D. 31, Sejanus was supreme at Rome, and Curtius, like everyone else, would have been obliged to cultivate his favour for the sake of political advancement³⁶—or, for that matter, political survival. Our man's *tristis adulatio* would, however, have been instrumental in drawing undue attention to him as a partisan of Sejanus; and when the crash finally came in A.D. 31, Curtius doubtless had ample reason to regret his natural propensity or trained facility for flattery. Though he seems not to have incurred any direct attack or prosecution, Curtius' political career under Tiberius was clearly at an end. Forced into effective retirement, the praetorian rhetor—perhaps at first more out of boredom than anything else—might have turned once again to his original

³¹Suet. *Tib.* 32.2; 56; 57.1; 70–71; Tac. *Ann.* 4.58.1.

³²Gerth, *RE* 10.1 (1917) 1071–1073, s.v. *Iunius* no. 113.

³³Gerth, *RE* 10.1 (1917) 1035–1039, s.v. *Iunius* no. 77.

³⁴Tac. *Ann.* 6.3.1–3; Dio Cass. 58.18.3–4.

³⁵Cf. Sumner (above, note 1) 36 and 39, note 32.

³⁶Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.68.2.

avocation and begun to write the *magnum opus* which he may have hoped would eventually bring him the renown that a now blighted senatorial career had failed to yield.

Hence it is to the ten years that elapsed between the fall of Sejanus and the accession of Claudius that the composition of the *Historiae Alexandri* would be dated. Caligula, who had no cause to love the former adherents of Sejanus³⁷—and who, moreover, appears to have had very little real discernment as regards Latin literature³⁸—left Curtius to languish in the political limbo to which he had been relegated. With the advent of Claudius, himself an accomplished historian and *littérateur*,³⁹ came the hope of a political resurrection, and Curtius hastened to include in the still unfinished work a historiographically gratuitous but politically apposite encomium of the new princeps. Indeed, this “judicious piece of adulation” may have been instrumental in bringing the long disregarded Curtius to the notice of the new régime. At any rate, the long-awaited consulship soon materialized, followed in due course by the command in Upper Germany and the proconsulship of Africa.

III. CURTIUS, ALEXANDER, AND THE TYRANNY OF TIBERIUS

Into his highly dramatic and improbably detailed account of the so-called “conspiracy of Philotas” and its aftermath,⁴⁰ Curtius introduces a speech by Philotas’ friend Amyntas which bears a marked resemblance to the famous defence of the Roman knight M. Terentius against the charge of *Seiani amicitia*. The latter episode is succinctly recounted by Dio Cassius (58.19.3–4):

τοῦ δὲ δὴ Τερεντίου, ὅτι ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ Σεϊανοῦ φιλίᾳ κρινόμενος οὐχ ὅσον οὐκ ἤρνήσατο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔφη καὶ σπουδάζειν μάλιστα αὐτὸν καὶ θεραπεῦσαι, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Τιβερίου οὕτως ἐτιμᾶτο, ὥστ’ εἰ μὲν ἐκεῖνος ὀρθῶς εἶπεν ‘ἐποίει τοιοῦτῳ φίλῳ χρώμενος, οὐδὲ ἐγὼ τι ἡδίκηκα· εἰ δ’ ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ὁ πάντα ἀκριβῶς εἰδὼς ἐπλανήθη, τί θαυμαστόν ἐστι καὶ ἐγὼ οἱ συνεξηπατήθην; καὶ γάρ τοι προσήκει ἡμῖν πάντας τοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τιμωμένους ἀγαπᾶν, μὴ πολυπραγμονοῦντας ὁποῖοι τινὲς εἰσιν, ἀλλ’ ἕνα ὅρον τῆς φιλίας σφῶν ποιουμένους τὸ τῷ αὐτοκράτορι αὐτοὺς ἀρέσκειν.’

Tacitus (*Ann.* 6.8.2–11) reproduces Terentius’ speech at greater length:

³⁷For the alleged threat to the young Caligula from Sejanus and his partisan Sextius Paconianus, see Tac. *Ann.* 6.3.4; cf. Suet. *Gai.* 30.2.

³⁸Cf. Suet. *Gai.* 34.2 for Caligula’s opinion of Curtius’ principal literary model, Livy (Steele [above, note 1] 403–409).

³⁹Suet. *Claud.* 3.1; 40.3; 41–42.

⁴⁰Curt. 6.7.1–7.2.38. On the realities behind the “conspiracy,” see E. Badian, “The Death of Parmenio,” *TAPA* 91 (1960) 324–338. Badian’s views, however, have recently been challenged by W. Heckel, “The Conspiracy against Philotas,” *Phoenix* 31 (1977) 9–21.

(2.) *Fortunae quidem meae fortasse minus expediat agnoscere crimen quam abnuere; sed utcumque casura res est, fatebor et fuisse me Seiano amicum, et ut essem expetisse, et postquam adeptus eram laetatum.* (3.) *videram collegam patris regendis praetoriis cohortibus, mox urbis et militiae munia simul obeuntem.* (4.) *illius propinqui et adfines honoribus augebantur; ut quisque Seiano intimus, ita ad Caesaris amicitiam validus: contra quibus infensus esset, metu ac sordibus conflectabantur.* (5.) *nec quemquam exemplo adsumo: cunctos, qui novissimi consilii expertes fuimus, meo unius discrimine defendam.* (6.) *non enim Seianum Vulsiniensem, set Claudiae et Iuliae domus partem, quas adfinitate occupaverat, tuum, Caesar, generum, tui consulatus socium, tua officia in re publica capessentem colebamus.* (7.) *non est nostrum aestimare quem supra ceteros et quibus de causis extollas: tibi summum rerum iudicium di dedere, nobis obsequii gloria relicta est.* (8.) *spectamus porro quae coram habentur, cui ex te opes honores, quis plurima iuvandi nocendive potentia, quae Seiano fuisse nemo negaverit.* (9.) *adbitos principis sensus, et si quid occultius parat, exquirere illicitum, anceps: nec ideo adsequare . . .* (11.) *quid ergo? indistincta haec defensio et promisca dabitur? immo iustis terminis dividatur. insidiae in rem publicam, consilia caedis adversum imperatorem puniantur: de amicitia et officiis idem finis et te, Caesar, et nos absolverit.*

To this may be compared the speech that Curtius (7.1.19–40) puts in the mouth of Amyntas. Quotation of just the central portion of the speech (7.1.26–30) will suffice for this purpose:

(26.) *Amicitiam quae nobis cum Philota fuit adeo non eo infitias, ut expetisse quoque nos magnosque ex ea fructus percepisse confitear.* (27.) *an vero Parmenionis, quem tibi proximum esse voluisti, filium omnes paene amicos tuos dignatione vincentem cultum a nobis esse miraris?* (28.) *tu, hercules, si verum audire vis, rex, huius nobis periculi es causa. quis enim alius effecit ut ad Philotam decurrerent qui placere vellent tibi? ab illo traditi, ad hunc gradum amicitiae tuae ascendimus; is apud te fuit, cuius et gratiam expetere et iram timere possemus.* (29.) *si non propemodum in tua verba, at tui omnes te praeunte iuravimus, eosdem nos inimicos amicosque habituros esse, quos tu haberes. hoc sacramento pietatis obstricti, aversaremur scilicet quem tu omnibus praeferebas!* (30.) *igitur, si hoc crimen est, paucos innocentes habes, immo, hercules, neminem. omnes enim Philotae amici esse voluerunt, sed totidem quot volebant esse non poterant. ita, si a consociis amicos non dividis, ne ab amicis quidem separabis illos, qui idem esse voluerunt.*

As one can see, the structure of the argument in the two speeches is all but identical. In both, the charge is actually embraced by the accused: zealous cultivation of the friendship of the fallen favourite is admitted (Curt. 7.1.26; Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.2; Dio Cass. 58.19.3), and benefits derived therefrom are acknowledged (Curt. 7.1.26; 7.1.28) or implied (Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.2; 6.8.4). By way of excuse, the speaker stresses the virtual universality of the alleged offence (Curt. 7.1.30; Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.5) and expatiates on the vast power that the former favourite had enjoyed through the concentration upon him of the ruler's favour (Curt. 7.1.27–28; Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.3; 6.8.6; 6.8.8; Dio Cass. 58.19.3), the practical necessity of paying court to one so powerful, and the danger incurred in failing to do so (Curt. 7.1.28; Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.4; 6.8.8). Then follows the high point of the argument: the speaker puts forward a formal justification of his previous *amicitia* in terms of an appeal to the moral and legal obligation to honour

the friends of the ruler in a spirit of blind obedience to his manifest will (Curt. 7.1.29, where the sanctity of the military *sacramentum* is adduced in support of the contention; Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.7 *obsequii gloria*; 6.8.9; Dio Cass. 58.19.4). Finally, the defence concludes with a plea that a distinction be drawn between the favourite's fellow-conspirators and his guiltless *amici* (Curt. 7.1.30; Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.11).

Nor do the similarities end there. The preamble to each defence couples an allusion to ill-fortune with a "whatever the outcome" clause (Curt. 7.1.19; Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.2). Both speeches are, in the main, addressed to the ruler himself (Curt. 7.1.19; 7.1.21; 7.1.28; 7.1.34; Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.6; 6.8.8; 6.8.11); and both make mention of the favourite's father (Curt. 7.1.27; Tac. *Ann.* 6.8.3).

Obviously the two speeches are, as noted at the beginning of this paper, related through the psychological or ideological impression made by a single historical event—the trial and inspired defence of M. Terentius—on both Curtius and Tacitus. Whilst it is distinctly possible, even probable, that Tacitus read and was influenced by Curtius, the two speeches represent something more than just the manifestation of a literary *topos*. Tacitus makes it quite clear that Terentius' defence was startlingly original (*Ann.* 6.8.1; 6.9.1). The very unanswerability of Terentius' argument would have kept it from becoming a forensic commonplace. Jurisprudence would be obliged to disallow it, just as it does the plea of "following orders." Admittedly Tacitus himself weakens the impression of originality by attributing a like argument to Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, the legate of the Army of Upper Germany, in a letter of self-exculpation to Tiberius.⁴¹ But this is more than likely a case of Tacitus himself "over-egging the pudding." At any rate, the historian, not uncharacteristically, disclaims any but hearsay evidence for the contents of the letter.

For Tacitus the primary significance of Terentius' plight is ideological. Terentius is, in his view, a victim not so much of Tiberian *dissimulatio* and inconsistency as of the institution of the Principate itself, of the un-Republican necessity of having to divine the motions of the mind of one man, the princeps, with the ever-present danger of fatally misreading that mind. Whatever Tacitus may have said in the *Agricola* (3.1) about a state of *principatus ac libertas* under Nerva and Trajan, his treatment of the Terentius affair in the *Annales* makes it plain that he saw an inherent incompatibility between the two institutions.

For Curtius, however, the significance of the event narrated is psychological. The absolutism of Alexander is assumed throughout, and the only real issue raised by Amyntas concerns the king's consistency. The question

⁴¹ *Ann.* 6.30.4.

that Curtius' account of these proceedings raises for us, however, has to do with the historian's personal connection with the Terentian model for his own literary defence of Amyntas. Specifically, we have to ask why Curtius should cast Alexander in the role of Tiberius. To most readers such a portrayal would be, to say the least, bizarre,⁴² and certainly in need of some explanation. This, I think, can only be provided by reference to the direct experience of the consular and rhetorician Q. Curtius Rufus. Himself involved in the downfall of Sejanus as an innocent *amicus*, Curtius would have left political life with the speech of Terentius still ringing in his ears. His version of Amyntas' defence should be seen, then, as an *apologia pro vita sua* and the quiet revenge of a man of letters on a man of power who had wronged him.⁴³

Although the above instance of parallelism between Curtius and Tacitus was first noticed by the great Flemish humanist Justus Lipsius in the sixteenth century, very few further parallels of this kind have been detected in the last four centuries. Moreover, with the exception of the one discussed, their importance for the dating of the *Historiae Alexandri* seems to have been missed altogether. I will therefore devote the remainder of this paper to a survey of such parallels between the principate of Tiberius as known from both the literary and numismatic sources and the reign of Alexander as narrated by Curtius.

Surely one of the most outrageous examples of Tiberius' notorious *dissimulatio* was his treatment of the eminent consular C. Asinius Gallus, who in A.D. 30 had the unenviable distinction of dining with the princeps in an atmosphere of apparent friendship at the same time as he was being condemned in the Senate at the instigation of his host. According to Dio Cassius (58.3.2–3), Tiberius

ἐπέστειλε περὶ αὐτοῦ τῇ βουλῇ τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ ὅτι τῷ Σεῖανῳ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν φιλίας φθονοίη, καίπερ αὐτὸς Συριακῷ φίλῳ χρώμενος. καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐξέφηνε τῷ Γάλλῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντῳ αὐτὸν ἐδεξιώσατο, ὥστε συμβῆναι οἱ πρᾶγμα παραδοξότατον, καὶ ὃ μὴδενὶ ἄλλῳ συνηνέχθη· ἐν γὰρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ παρά τε τῷ Τιβερίῳ εἰσιτιάθη καὶ φιλοτησίας ἔπιε, καὶ ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ κατεψηφίσθη, ὥστε καὶ στρατηγὸν τὸν δῆσοντά τε αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν τιμωρίαν ἀπάξοντα πεμφθῆναι.

Curtius (6.8.16) tells the same story of Alexander and his victim Philotas:

Invitatus est etiam Philotas ad ultimas ipsi epulas, et rex non cenare modo, sed etiam familiariter colloqui cum eo quem damnaverat sustinuit.

⁴²The point is eloquently illustrated by Mr. G. T. Griffith's observation (in correspondence) that "two more dissimilar characters could hardly be imagined. Alexander is essentially young, dynamic, extrovert, always on the move, slicing through Asia like a knife through butter; Tiberius is old, static, introvert, stick-in-the-mud, a recluse."

⁴³Which would go a long way towards explaining Curtius' favourable treatment of Callisthenes and his confident assertion of the latter's innocence (8.6.24; 8.8.21–22; cf. Arr. 4.14; Plut. *Alex.* 55).

The significance of this parallel is established by the fact that nothing even remotely like Curtius' story occurs anywhere in the other Alexander sources.⁴⁴ Its inclusion in the narrative reflects the shock and horror that Curtius doubtless felt at the fiendishly thoroughgoing nature of Tiberius' *dissimulatio*. Like Terentius' defence, the incident would have held a particular poignancy for Curtius, foreshadowing as it did the destruction of his patron, Sejanus.⁴⁵

Certainly one of the most puzzling passages in the entire *Historiae Alexandri* is the exchange between Alexander and Philotas at the latter's trial, concerning Philotas' choice of the language in which to present his defence (6.9.34–36):

Iamque rex intuens eum: "Macedones," inquit, "de te iudicaturi sunt; quaero, an patrio sermone sis apud eos usurus." tum Philotas: "praeter Macedonas," inquit, "plerique adsunt, quos facilius quae dicam percepturos arbitror, si eadem lingua fuero usus qua tu egisti, non ob aliud, credo, quam ut oratio tua intellegi posset a pluribus." tum rex: "ecquid videtis adeo etiam sermonis patrii Philotan taedere? solus quippe fastidit eum discere. sed dicat sane utcumque ei cordi est, dum memineritis aequae illum a nostro more quam sermone abhorrrere."

To this may be compared an anecdote related by both Suetonius (*Tib.* 71) and Dio Cassius (57.15.3–4). Describing Tiberius' attitude to the use of Greek instead of the Latin vernacular in official proceedings, Suetonius writes:

*Sermone Graeco quamquam alioqui promptus et facilis, non tamen usque quaque usus est abstinuitque maxime in senatu . . . militem quoque Graece testimonium interrogatum nisi Latine respondere vetuit.*⁴⁶

Dio's version is even more revealing:

καὶ ἑκατοντάρχου ἑλληνιστὶ ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ μαρτυρῆσαι τι ἐβέλησαντος οὐκ ἠνέσχετο, καίπερ πολλὰς μὲν δίκας ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ ταύτῃ καὶ ἐκεῖ λεγόμενας ἀκούων, πολλὰς δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπερωτῶν. τοῦτό τε οὖν οὐχ ὁμολογούμενον ἔπραξε . . .

Dio's concern is to illustrate Tiberius' *inconsistency*—the very hallmark of his tyranny. In the light of this anecdote, the significance of the curious

⁴⁴But cf. Suet. *Tit.* 6.2, where a similar instance of dissimulation is attributed to Titus prior to his accession: *Aulum Caecinam consularem vocatum ad cenam ac vixdum triclinio egressum confodi iussit* . . . However, an element of disanalogy is introduced by Suetonius' exculpation of Titus: . . . *sane urgente discrimine, cum etiam chirographum eius praeparatae apud milites contionisprehendisset*. No such allowance is made for either Tiberius or Alexander in the above passages.

⁴⁵As a victim, if only indirectly, of a political purge, Curtius must have felt some satisfaction at the punishment meted out to *delatores*. He celebrates the irony attendant upon the end of the Macedonian generals instrumental in putting Parmenion to death: *laeti reccidisse iram in irae ministros* (10.1.6); cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6.10.2: *quo laetius acceptum sua exempla in consules recidisce*.

⁴⁶Cf. Suet. *Claud.* 42.1 for Claudius' attitude to the use of Greek in such circumstances.

dialogue in Curtius becomes clear. Alexander the Graecophile has just addressed the assembled Macedonians in Greek. He demands to know in what language Philotas intends to make his defence. When the accused general announces that he will follow the king's lead and speak in Greek, Alexander attacks him for his unpatriotic refusal to use the Macedonian vernacular. No well-informed Roman of the middle or late Julio-Claudian era could have missed the point of Curtius' barb.

The great military scandal of Tiberius' principate, analogous, if only on a very small scale, to the Augustan *clades Variana*, was the Frisian revolt of A.D. 28 and the emperor's failure—or, rather, refusal—to reconquer or punish the tribe. The blow to the national honour must have been keenly felt at the time; Tacitus' account of the affair (*Ann.* 4.72.1–74.1) ends with a condemnation of Tiberius' inertia and of his suppression, for an improper reason, of intelligence concerning the extent of the Roman losses:

Clarum inde inter Germanos Frisium nomen, dissimulante Tiberio damna, ne cui bellum permetteret.

Curtius again supplies us with a parallel unknown to the other Alexander sources. During the campaign of 329 B.C. a large detachment of Macedonians under Menedemus was ambushed and destroyed by the Dahae (*Curt.* 7.7.31–39). According to Curtius (7.7.39), Alexander resorted to extreme measures in order to conceal the disaster:

Quam cladem Alexander sollerti consilio texit, morte denunciata his qui ex proelio adveniant, si acta vulgassent.

Though the dissimulation of reverses has always been accepted as part of a general's duty,⁴⁷ both these instances are presented in such a way as to show the respective "culprits" in a bad light. While Tiberius is prepared to sacrifice the national honour in order to avoid entrusting anyone else with the conduct of the war, Alexander is ready to make away with Menedemus' beaten soldiers so as to protect his own military prestige and reputation for invincibility.

The "virtues" of Tiberius—*clementia*,⁴⁸ *moderatio*,⁴⁹ *pietas*,⁵⁰ *iustitia*,⁵¹ *providentia*⁵²—are well known from his coinage. In view of the foregoing

⁴⁷Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.13–14 for a pre-Alexandrian example of the practice. I am indebted to Mr. G. T. Griffith for this reference.

⁴⁸*BMCEmp* 1.132, Tiberius nos. 85–89. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.31.4; 3.22.3; 3.68.2; 4.31.2; 4.74.3; Suet. *Tib.* 53.2.

⁴⁹*BMCEmp* 1.132, Tiberius no. 90. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.6; 2.36.2; 3.50.2; 3.56.1; 3.69.8; 6.2.6; Suet. *Tib.* 32.2; 57.1; Vell. Pat. 2.122.1.

⁵⁰*BMCEmp* 1.133, Tiberius no. 98. Cf. Vell. Pat. 2.99.2; 2.105.3; 2.123.2; 2.130.1; *ILS* 202.

⁵¹*BMCEmp* 1.131, Tiberius no. 79.

⁵²*BMCEmp* 1.141, Tiberius nos. 146–150. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.38.1.

discussion, it should come as no surprise to find all these "virtues," with the single exception of *providentia*, ascribed to Alexander in the *Historiae Alexandri*.⁵³ Curtius' interest centres, moreover, on *clementia* and *moderatio*—the two qualities on which Tiberius particularly prided himself,⁵⁴ and, as the literary sources for his principate clearly show, the loss or distortion of which did most to poison the minds of his contemporaries against him and ruin his reputation with posterity.⁵⁵ Curtius highlights a like deterioration in the character of Alexander. The king's initial *clementia* and *moderatio*, together with his *constantia*,⁵⁶ are undermined by an excess of *Fortuna*,⁵⁷ sullied *vini cupiditate*,⁵⁸ and transmuted into *ira*, *superbia*, and *lascivia*⁵⁹—all of them reputed Tiberian vices.⁶⁰ Nor does Curtius' Alexander want for that most characteristic of Tiberius' vices—*dissimulatio*.⁶¹

Tiberius' *pietas* towards his adoptive father Augustus was a social and political obligation, highly publicised but emotionally vacuous.⁶² The princeps' *pietas* towards his mother seems to have been genuine enough at first, but Livia's attempts to dominate her son poisoned the relationship;⁶³ and, in the end, Tiberius was content to leave his mother "a dead woman, when he might have converted her into a goddess."⁶⁴ Tiberius' *pietas* towards his brother Drusus, however, appears to have endured, possibly because of the latter's early death,⁶⁵ and is taken up by Valerius Maximus

⁵³Curt. 3.12.21; 4.11.16; 5.3.15; 5.7.1; 7.6.17–18; 9.1.23; 10.5.28 (*clementia*); 3.12.20; 4.11.7; 5.3.15; 6.6.1; 8.8.10 (*moderatio*); 10.5.30 (*pietas*); 4.11.2; 10.5.9; 10.5.25 (*iustitia*). I am greatly indebted to Professor D. Fishwick for the initial suggestion that Alexander's "virtues" might bear some relation to those of one or another of the Roman emperors.

⁵⁴Cf. C. H. V. Sutherland, "Two 'Virtues' of Tiberius: A Numismatic Contribution to the History of His Reign," *JRS* 28 (1938) 129–140; R. S. Rogers, *Studies in the Reign of Tiberius* (Baltimore 1943) 35–88.

⁵⁵It is significant that *clementia* is absent from the coinage of Tiberius' successors until the reign of Vitellius (*BMCEmp* 1.384, Vitellius nos. 78–80; 1.388, Vitellius no. 98), when it again disappears until that of Hadrian (*BMCEmp* 3.304, Hadrian nos. 513–514 and *passim*). Unlike *clementia*, which had been a "virtue" of both Julius Caesar and Augustus, *moderatio* is, and remains, exclusively Tiberian.

⁵⁶Curt. 5.7.1. It is perhaps significant that *constantia* appears on Claudian coins (*BMCEmp* 1.164, Claudius no. 1; 1.166, Claudius nos. 11–15; 1.180, Claudius nos. 109–111; 1.184, Claudius nos. 140–142; 1.191–192, Claudius nos. 199–201).

⁵⁷Curt. 3.12.20–21.

⁵⁸Curt. 5.7.1; and see below, note 74.

⁵⁹Curt. 3.12.19; 6.6.1.

⁶⁰Tac. *Ann.* 1.4.4; 1.12.6; 2.57.4; 3.69.8; 6.50.5 (*ira*); 1.4.3; 1.72.5; 6.13.4 (*superbia*); 1.4.4; 6.1.2–5; Suet. *Tib.* 43–45 (*lascivia*).

⁶¹Cf. Curt. 7.2.9.

⁶²Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 21; 23.

⁶³Tac. *Ann.* 3.64.1–2; 4.57.4–5; 5.1.5; 5.3.1; Suet. *Tib.* 50.2–3; 51.1.

⁶⁴J. Jackson on Tac. *Ann.* 6.5.1 (Loeb edition, 4.160, note 3). Cf. Suet. *Claud.* 11.2 for Claudius' *pietas* towards Livia: *aviae Liviae divinos honores . . . decernenda curavit*.

⁶⁵Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 50.1.

(5.5.3), whose section on *pietas erga parentes* (5.4) in significant contrast makes no mention of the emperor.

Alexander all but formally disowned his father Philip,⁶⁶ and even his relations with his mother Olympias seem to have been strained towards the end,⁶⁷ yet Curtius credits him with *pietas erga parentes* and an intention to deify his mother (10.5.30; cf. 9.6.26–27)! Moreover, Curtius obliquely credits Alexander with *pietas* towards his sisters (*sic*),⁶⁸ which, though certainly “reminiscent of Caligula’s *pietas* towards his sisters,”⁶⁹ may in fact be meant to recall Tiberius’ regard for his dead brother.

Curtius’ methodology, however, is complex. In ascribing these qualities to Alexander as real virtues, Curtius shows the influence of Tiberius’ propaganda, but in portraying Alexander’s moral decline, he is influenced by the real Tiberius as opposed to the official one. It is clear, nonetheless, that Curtius has used Alexander as a “whipping boy” for Tiberius.

The making of veiled allusions to Roman emperors in literary or theatrical works appears to have been a common practice in the first century of the Principate,⁷⁰ and Tiberius himself was the object of a number of such attacks.⁷¹ This is not to say that the *Historiae Alexandri* was written merely in order to conceal a polemic against Tiberius: the work is far too elaborate, well-researched, and lengthy for that. Yet it would seem that Curtius saw, and decided to exploit, some strong inherent similarity between the personalities and reigns of the Macedonian conqueror and the princeps. A general comparison in terms of parallels is easy to construct: both were great military commanders;⁷² both were irked by domineering mothers;⁷³ both were or became alcoholics;⁷⁴ both put their seconds-in-command to death;⁷⁵ both suffered an overall moral deterioration in the course of their reigns;⁷⁶ both were responsible for a lengthy succession of trials and executions for treason;⁷⁷ both seem to have

⁶⁶Plut. *Alex.* 28.1; Curt. 4.10.3; 6.11.23; on which, see J. R. Hamilton, “Alexander and His So-called Father,” *CQ* n.s. 3 (1953) 151–157.

⁶⁷Cf. Arr. 7.12.6. The corresponding part of Curtius is lost.

⁶⁸Curt. 3.6.15; 6.3.5.

⁶⁹Atkinson (above, note 1) 133, note 30.

⁷⁰Pace Milns (above, note 1) 501. Cf., for example, Suet. *Aug.* 68; *Gai.* 27.4; *Claud.* 38.3; *Nero* 39.3; *Galba* 13; *Dom.* 10.1 and 10.4.

⁷¹Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 45; 61.3.

⁷²For an appraisal of Tiberius’ generalship, see R. Syme, *CAH* 10 (Cambridge 1934) 371.

⁷³Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.1–3; 1.72.5; 3.64.1–2; 4.57; 5.1–3; Suet. *Tib.* 50.2–3; 51.1; cf. Arr. 7.12.6.

⁷⁴Suet. *Tib.* 42.1; 59.1; cf. Curt. 5.7.1; 6.2.2; 8.1.22–52; 10.5.34.

⁷⁵In the case of Tiberius, Sejanus; in that of Alexander, Parmenion or Philotas.

⁷⁶Tac. *Ann.* 6.51.5–6; Suet. *Tib.* 33; cf. Curt. 10.1.42.

⁷⁷For a catalogue of those under Tiberius, see R. S. Rogers, *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius* (Middletown 1935) 206–211; for the reign of terror

dabbled in unnatural vice towards the end of their lives;⁷⁸ both were reputed to have been murdered;⁷⁹ and both, for all their faults, were greatly preferable to their immediate successors.⁸⁰ With a little literary stimulation, these parallels would undoubtedly have occurred to any reasonably well-educated Roman of the later Julio-Claudian era. And it was precisely for this audience that Curtius was writing.

It has been suggested from time to time that the Curtian Alexander is, to some extent at least, a critical or hostile portrait of the emperor Caligula.⁸¹ But this is implausible. In the first place, a surreptitious attack of this subtlety would have been wasted on Caligula: even in his own lifetime the emperor must have been as much an object of (private) ridicule as he was of fear. Secondly, any parallel drawn between Alexander and Caligula would have been flattering to the latter, who in any case saw himself as an *aemulus Alexandri*.⁸² Modern critics of latter-day tyrants have sometimes unwittingly disarmed their attacks by including gratuitous comparisons with Napoleon.⁸³ An analogous comparison in the *Historiae Alexandri* could likewise have been taken as mild flattery of a thoroughly worthless ruler. Furthermore, those very aspects of the *Historiae Alexandri* that have been seen as constituting intentional parallels between Alexander and Caligula almost invariably reveal a marked element of disanalogy. While Alexander believed, or at least wanted others to believe, that he was the son of Zeus Ammon,⁸⁴ Caligula sought to be accepted as a god in his own right;⁸⁵ while Alexander loved his horse and founded the city of Bucephala in its posthumous honour,⁸⁶ Caligula (allegedly) planned to make his horse consul;⁸⁷ while Alexander as the Great King of the Persians kept the conventional harem,⁸⁸ Caligula opened a brothel in his palace;⁸⁹ and while Alexander displayed great

under Alexander, see E. Badian, "The Death of Parmenio," *TAPA* 91 (1960) 324–338, and "Harpalus," *JHS* 81 (1961) 16–43.

⁷⁸Tac. *Ann.* 6.1.2–5; Suet. *Tib.* 43–44; cf. Curt. 10.1.25–29; 10.1.42.

⁷⁹Tac. *Ann.* 6.50.9; Suet. *Tib.* 73.2; *Gai.* 12.2–3; Dio Cass. 58.28.3; cf. Curt. 10.10.14–17.

⁸⁰Dio Cass. 58.23.4; cf. Curt. 10.5.11–14; 10.8.9; 10.9.1–2.

⁸¹Lana (above, note 1) 63–69; Sumner (above, note 1) 33–34.

⁸²Suet. *Gai.* 52.

⁸³Cf. the judicious observations of D. G. Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon* (London 1967) xliii.

⁸⁴Curt. 4.7.8; 6.11.23–27; 8.5.5–8; 8.10.1.

⁸⁵Suet. *Gai.* 22.2–4; Dio Cass. 59.26.5–10; 59.27.5–28.8; Josephus *Bj* 2.184 and *Aj* 19.4–11.

⁸⁶Curt. 9.3.23.

⁸⁷Suet. *Gai.* 55.3; cf. Dio Cass. 59.28.6.

⁸⁸Curt. 6.6.8; cf. 3.3.24.

⁸⁹Suet. *Gai.* 41.1; Dio Cass. 59.28.9.

concern for his sisters (*sic*),⁹⁰ Caligula committed incest with his.⁹¹ In no instance here is the alleged parallel close enough to support the thesis of a Curtian identification of Alexander with Caligula. Though timeserving rhetoricians might liken Caligula to Alexander overtly, they would hardly do so surreptitiously. If cryptic comparisons were to be made, history afforded many examples of thoroughly disreputable tyrants to whom the lunatic emperor could be assimilated.

Curtius' treatment of Alexander betrays a love-hate relationship⁹² reminiscent of Tacitus' attitude to Tiberius.⁹³ Curtius admired the princeps that made him and hated—but still respected—the tyrant that broke him. In forced retirement, he recalled another great man who had succumbed to like defects of personality and character. And though Curtius' *Historiae Alexandri* is much more than just a veiled portrait of the emperor, Tiberius' role as a basic source of inspiration seems to be clear.⁹⁴

GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

⁹⁰Curt. 3.6.15; 6.3.5.

⁹¹Suet. *Gai.* 24.1; 36.1; Dio Cass. 59.3.6; Josephus *AF* 19.204.

⁹²Cf., for example, the paradoxical eulogy of Alexander at Curt. 10.5.26–36.

⁹³For Tacitus' attitude to Tiberius, see R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 1.420–434, especially 428–429.

⁹⁴A version of this paper was read at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for Cultural and Intellectual History held at London, Ontario, in May, 1978. I am greatly indebted to Mr. G. T. Griffith, Professors N. G. L. Hammond, and D. Fishwick, as well as to the journal's referees, for their valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper.