

SOME IMPERATORIAL SALUTATIONS

RONALD SYME

IL. CAESAR'S HEIR could not expect ever to surpass the triple pomp of 29 B.C., and he did not bother to celebrate a triumph again, even for his much advertised subjugation of Spain, when he took the field for the last time. Caesar Augustus knew other ways of remaining supreme in military prestige or moving towards a monopoly.

Restraint offered an argument and pretext for curbing the pretensions of others. Proconsuls were permitted triumphs in the first years of the new dispensation when normal government ostensibly returned. But none after 19 B.C. Though proconsuls may still take salutations and acquire the title of "imperator," the source and nature of their authority is deemed inferior to that of Caesar Augustus. The relation finds expression in a document of A.D. 6 that records a war in Africa terminated by a proconsul: *auspiciis imp. Caesaris Aug. ductu Cossi Lentuli*.¹

Doctrine had developed—and it could always be interpreted for the benefit of ruler and dynasty. The Princeps acquired (in 19 B.C.) the semblance or equivalent of a consul's authority, since he was then empowered to bear in Rome the twelve *fascēs* of his *imperium* over provinces and armies.² In the meantime a novel type of *imperium* emerged. In the year 23 Augustus' mandate over his *provincia* was severed from the tenure of the consulship. That was not in itself an innovation: it declares the ruler heir and successor to the holders of *extraordinaria imperia* in the last epoch of the Republic. He might now have adopted the title *pro consule*. It was not good enough for Caesar Augustus.

The crisis of that year produced another phenomenon. M. Agrippa was associated in the provincial *imperium* of Caesar. Nowhere explicit in the literary sources, it is deduced from various facts.³

Invested with the *imperium* of a proconsul, which was manifest through the twelve *fascēs* (as against five for Caesar's *legatus pro praetore*), Agrippa was qualified to take an imperial salutation—and hence perhaps be awarded a triumph. Two episodes are recorded by Cassius Dio.⁴ First, in 19 the Senate, on injunction from Augustus, voted a triumph for the war in

¹IRT 301 (Lepcis).

²Dio 54.10.5 (as best interpreted).

³The position and powers of Agrippa at different times will not here be gone into. For the valuable new document P. Colon. inv. 4701 see L. Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 217 ff.; E. W. Gray, *ZPE* 6 (1970) 227 ff.; E. Malcovati, *Athenaeum* 50 (1972) 142 ff.

⁴Dio 54.11.6; 24.7.

Spain. Agrippa declined, such was his discretion. Second, in 14, a triumph decreed for successes in the Pontus: likewise renounced.

Marcus Agrippa, the loyal friend, the modest adjutant, may amuse or delude the ingenuous. This man had a fierce and concentrated ambition. Like Aelius Seianus he went for the facts of power, not the show and pageantry, approving the maxim: *sublati inanibus veram potentiam augeri*.⁵ Augustus promoted or permitted the Senate's vote. Surmise about his intent cannot be evaded. The ruler had a double motive, let it be supposed. He wished to assert and proclaim the unimpaired quality of Agrippa's *imperium*—and at the same time advertise his own precellence, deprecating military pageantry even for an ally and partner.

Agrippa's *imperium* was re-defined in 13.⁶ He died in March of the next year, after having initiated a design of wide conquests in Central Europe and the Balkan lands. For prosecuting the wars, the Princes now had to turn to his young stepsons, Tiberius Nero and Claudius Drusus. Hence a problem, to reward their ambition but not to incite it detrimentally; and it was a question how soon they might accede to an *imperium proconsulare*.

The authority conferred on princes of the dynasty comports various perplexities. One approach is to start with system and definitions. That recalls 'Staatsrecht,' ominous name, and it runs into trouble. It is better to proceed as did Caesar Augustus himself. His *novus status* is a series of experiments.

II. The salutations of the ruler furnish guidance in various ways, not only for the wars. "Imp. VI" for Actium, he reached twenty-one before his death. Seven of them find record in the pages of Cassius Dio, not always with proper clarity. Others are disclosed by inscriptions and coins, though several in Augustus' total are still missing. Awkward problems subsist. Mommsen's list will still be consulted, but it has to be modified here and there.⁷

Certain negative observations may be prefixed. First, victories won by proconsuls. In 29 the ruler took over the salutation earned by Licinius Crassus in Macedonia.⁸ But no instance is discoverable after the return of normal government in 28 and 27.⁹

⁵Tacitus *Ann* 4.41.2.

⁶Dio 54.28.1 (*maius* according to Dio).

⁷T. Mommsen (ed.), *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*² (Berlin 1883) 12 ff. See now T. D. Barnes, *JRS* 64 (1974) 21 ff. (hereafter "Barnes"), with a convenient table on page 26.

⁸Dio 51.25.2. It is "imp. VII," cf. *ILS* 81. Crassus bears the title on *ILS* 8810 (Athens). He was in fact allowed to hold a triumph—but not until July of 27.

⁹The contrary was asserted by H. Siber, *Das Führeramt des Augustus*, *AbhLeipzig* 44.2 (1940) 87 f.; 99. Much else was defective in the exposition and in the methods of that jurist. Cf. *JRS* 36 (1946) 149 ff. = *Roman Papers* (Oxford 1979) 141 ff.

Second, victories of legates. When M. Vinicius in 25 dealt with a German incursion, his action along with other events gave Augustus a salutation, according to Dio.¹⁰ That is, "imp. VIII"—which the historian ought to have assigned to the termination of Augustus' war in Spain. The occasion of the ninth was peaceful and diplomatic, namely the surrender of Roman standards by the Parthians, and the installation of a Roman vassal in Armenia.¹¹

However, the next salutation, in 15, accrued from the Alpine campaign of two legates, the Claudian brothers. They also contribute "imp. XI" and "imp. XII" (see below). But none thereafter can be shown to derive from the exploits of any *legatus Augusti*.

Third, holders of proconsular *imperium*. Agrippa stood twice in prospect of a triumph, and sporadic inscriptions happen to attach "imp." to his titulature. For example, one in 16 or 15, and one posthumous.¹² However that may be, neither was added to the Princeps' total. Other grants of proconsular *imperium* in the sequel exhibit a different practice—and there are variants. Each case will be taken as it arises.

III. In 12 and 11 the stepsons of the Princeps conducted wars of conquest in Illyricum and in Germany, as legates in the *provincia* of Caesar. For the elder, that rank is proclaimed with emphasis in the *Res Gestae*.¹³ After Tiberius' first campaign against the Pannonians the army acclaimed him as "imperator" and the Senate voted him a triumph, according to Dio (54.31.4, cf. 33.5). The Princeps intervened with a negative. He awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia*. That, it is clear, was an innovation.¹⁴ The same procedure followed for Drusus in the next year (32.1). On each occasion Augustus added the acclamation to his own total (33.5). Hence beyond doubt "imp. XI" and "imp. XII."¹⁵

Now the trouble begins. In the first place Drusus—for he is named first by Cassius Dio. Recording the honours voted for his victory in 11, the historian states that he was to have the *ornamenta triumphalia*, also an ovation, and, after the expiry of his praetorship, proconsular *imperium* (33.5). The passage is in need of interpretation.

An axiom stands. No triumph can be celebrated without an antecedent acclamation, no acclamation taken without the possession of a proconsul's

¹⁰Dio 53.26.4, cf. Barnes 21.

¹¹Hence registered on coins with *signis receptis* and *Armenia capta*, cf. *BMCRE* 1.108 ff.; 114.

¹²*I. l. de Gaule* 417 (Nemausus), of 16/15 B.C.; *ILS* 8897 (Ephesus), posthumous.

¹³*RG* 30 *Pannoniorum gentes*, etc.

¹⁴Suetonius *Tib.* 9.2.

¹⁵By inadvertence Tiberius is presented with the *ornamenta* twice by M. Gelzer, *RE* 10 (1918) 483; also in *CAH* 10 (1934) 153. The same interpretation of Dio would produce the same result for Drusus.

imperium. Therefore, it follows, the decree that granted *imperium* was for the future, and it further defined the scope and potential of the honour (i.e., an ovation, not the full triumph) that might fall to Drusus if and when he earned a salutation. Compare the phrase of Suetonius: Drusus before his consulate (in 9) had received the *ovandi ius*.¹⁶ The young man did not survive to exercise that privilege.

Some scholars assume that Drusus held an ovation, precisely in the year 11.¹⁷ It is unfortunate that a misconception should be perpetuated in a standard work. In *PIR*² C 857 one reads *ovans urbem ingressus* (under 11, with citation of Suetonius and Dio).

Subordinating in these chapters Illyricum to Germany and the elder brother to the younger, Cassius Dio goes on to state that Tiberius received the same honours as Drusus (34.3). Hence, one assumes, proconsular *imperium*, likewise from the beginning of 10.

By the same token, the ovation of Tiberius now comes up. An intricate problem, and not always well expounded.

In 11 Tiberius fought against both Dalmatians and Pannonians (34.3); and Drusus had been able to penetrate Germany as far as the Weser (33.2). Dio's account of their operations in 10 is brief and compressed. After dealing with rebellious Dalmatians, Tiberius went to join Augustus and his brother in Gaul (36.2 f.). They proceeded together to Rome "and carried out the ceremonies voted for the victories" (36.4). The curt phrase may cover and include an ovation of Tiberius, held either late in 10 or early in 9. If so, Tiberius' third campaign must have yielded a salutation. That is "imp. XIII" for Caesar Augustus, "imp. I" for Claudius Nero. However, by ill fortune, more will have to be said about the season of that ovation, which marked the termination of the Bellum Pannonicum, so Velleius states (2.96.3).

The brothers resumed their tasks in 9. Drusus reached the Elbe, but suffered a grave accident on the way back to the summer camp. Augustus was then at Ticinum. On receipt of the news he sent for Tiberius, who turned up (from Illyricum), *victor hostium*, as Valerius Maximus says (5.5.3). By forced marches Tiberius was able to reach his brother before his decease. When he arrived, Drusus staged a piece of martial pageantry: *legiones cum insignibus suis fratri obviam procedere iussit ut imperator salutaretur*.

Tiberius conducted the mortal remains all the way back to Rome, on foot.¹⁸ The funeral ceremony took place on the Campus Martius. Dio enumerates the honours, including the triumphal *cognomen* of "Germanicus" (55.2.2 f.). At this point Dio subjoins a notice about Tiberius.

¹⁶Suetonius *Divus Claudius* 1.3.

¹⁷G. Rohde, *RE* 18 (1939) 1902; R. Seager, *Tiberius* (London 1972) 26 f.

¹⁸Suetonius *Tib.* 7.3.

Having suppressed Dalmatians and Pannonians, again in revolt, while Drusus was still alive, Tiberius celebrated an ovation; he held public banquets, and the women were entertained by Livia and by Julia (2.4). The same ceremonies had been made ready for Drusus, but death annulled them (2.5).

The narrative proceeds to chronicle honours for Livia, with elucidation of the *ius trium liberorum* (2.6). It then diverges into various enactments of Augustus concerning the Senate, at some length (3.1–4.4). But, so Dio adds at the end, Augustus remained outside the limits of the city, because of the death of Drusus (4.4). Then, when at the beginning of the next year he entered Rome, he refrained for the same reason from holding any victory ceremonies (5.2).

iv. Dio inserts Tiberius' ovation after the funeral of Drusus. His peculiar narration carries a problem that few scholars appear to recognise.

Without being explicit or joining issue with Dio, two careful and standard accounts put the ovation in 9, before the death of Drusus.¹⁹ On that showing Tiberius celebrated an ovation for victories over Dalmatians and Pannonians in 9 before the end of the campaigning season and then reverted to Illyricum, whence he was summoned to Ticinum by Augustus.

If that is so, Dio's notice about the ovation is to be regarded as a parenthesis, and out of chronological order. That could be admitted, given the historian's methods of composition. He employed heterogeneous sources.²⁰ At least one of them put Drusus in high prominence.

Pursuing the notion of a parenthesis in Dio, one might go farther. As was briefly indicated, the ovation may belong late in 10 or early in 9—that is, justified by a salutation in 10. In that case Tiberius' actions recorded in 10 against Dalmatians (54.36.2), in 9 against Dalmatians and Pannonians (55.2.4), might be a doublet. Strange things can happen in compilation.

The alternative, to abide by Dio's order of exposition, has certain corollaries, by no means attractive. The date when Drusus died cannot be established. Perhaps quite late in the year.²¹ In any event, much time elapsed before the funeral: a slow cortège all the way to Rome. One compares the obsequies of Augustus—or of Germanicus Caesar. Then the period of mourning. Furthermore, Augustus' deprecation of ceremonies at the beginning of the following year.

One conjecture puts the ovation on January 16 of 8.²² Another has it a

¹⁹M. Gelzer, *RE* 10 484; A. Stein, *PIR*² C 841 (citing Dio 55.36.2).

²⁰F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford 1964), 83 ff.

²¹But it is not safe to press an allegation reported by Tacitus, *ipsum* [*sc. Augustum*] *quippe asperissimo hiemis Ticinum usque progressum* (*Ann.* 3.5.1).

²²G. M. Bersanetti, *Athenaeum* 35 (1947) 3 ff.

little later in that year, before Tiberius set out for the Rhine.²³ The lateness of the honour may well inspire hesitations.

The argument may therefore revert to the winter of 10/9. An entry in the *Fasti Praenestini* under January 16 refers to an action of Tiberius. It may be supplemented as follows:

Ti. Caesar ex Pan[nonia ovans urbem intr]avit.

That is, January 16 of 9 B.C.²⁴ The family group had returned to Rome before the end of the previous year, and the day was auspicious, made memorable forever by assumption of the ruler's august *cognomen*.

Another factor may be adduced. Augustus in his marked predilection for Drusus put him level with his consular brother (although four years junior) through the proconsular *imperium* decreed at the end of 11 B.C. An early ovation for Tiberius was a modest reparation.

The solution appears acceptable. None the less, objections arose and authority intervened, sometimes weighty. To avoid entanglement in controversy about the entry in the *Fasti Praenestini* (most of it futile) it will be expedient to resign the item to a brief appendix.

Tiberius' first salutation, corresponding with the thirteenth of Augustus, is not so far attested by any inscription. Augustus' numbers fail to furnish clear guidance. In 10/9 (summer to summer) he is "imp. XII" (*ILS* 91), for the salutation taken in 11; and in 9/8 he is "imp. XIII" (*ILS* 93 f.). What one requires is "imp. XIII" already registered in 10/9.

However, in 9/8 the ruler has risen to "imp. XIV" (*IRT* 319). The occasion is clear—the victory of Tiberius in Germany, which must fall in the early summer of 8 B.C. Now "imp. II," Tiberius duly held a triumph in January of the next year.

So far so good. There remains the problem of Drusus. On his inscription found in the Forum Augustum stands the item

*imp. [est appellat]us [i]n Germania.*²⁵

The acclamation may go back to 10 B.C. or belong to the last campaign, when Drusus set up a trophy at the Elbe. According to Dio, death forestalled his ovation.

A different and hazardous conjecture has recently been propounded. It

²³D. M. Pippidi, *Recherches sur le culte impérial* (Paris 1939) 197 f. An ovation put subsequent to the funeral of Drusus is called a second ovation by R. Seager, *Tiberius* (London 1972) 28.

²⁴As proposed by L. R. Taylor, *AJP* 58 (1937) 185. Against, D. M. Pippidi (previous note) 193 ff.

²⁵*AE* 1934.151. The dedication to Tiberius and Drusus at Saepinum set up in or soon after 2/1 B.C. apparently shows Drusus "[imp. II]" (*ILS* 147). Another, from the Porta Boviana, has "imp. II" beyond doubt. For the problems of these inscriptions, cf. A. U. Stylow, *Chiron* 7 (1977) 487 ff.

is based on Tiberius' meeting with the moribund Drusus, as described by Valerius Maximus (5.5.3, quoted above): the military scene was exploited so as to provide an acclamation for both (and hence the thirteenth of Caesar Augustus).²⁶

The hypothesis is vulnerable on several counts; and it would postpone unduly the ovation of the elder brother.

To resume. On the reconstruction here presented, "imp. XIII" derives from Tiberius' campaign of 10 B.C. If Drusus' salutation belongs in the next year, the Princeps refrained from a further augmentation of his own number. A difficulty, but not insuperable. A later parallel offers: a salutation of Germanicus in 15, not taken over by Ti. Caesar (see below).

v. The *imperium* of the two Claudii has not always received a satisfactory explanation from scholars and historians in the recent time. A source of trouble resided in a statement of Tacitus, *Tiberium Neronem et Claudium Drusum privignos imperatoriis nominibus auxit* (Ann.1.3.1).

There are no grounds for perplexity.²⁷ It is a question of style. The historian is deliberately avoiding the term *imperium proconsulare*. That power and that alone confers the right to accept and bear the title "imp."

The theme concerns high politics as well as warfare and ceremonial. The Princeps was eager to promote his stepsons. They accede to the consulship at twenty eight, four years earlier than normal for a *nobilis* in this epoch; and both are invested with proconsular *imperium*. At the same time, Caesar Augustus did not wish to antagonise the high aristocracy, the *decus ac robur* of the renovated Republic. A resplendent collection is on show, the coevals of the Claudii, consuls in the decade 16-7: a Scipio, two Fabii, two Pisones, and so on. No more triumphs, that was all too clear. But they could aspire to the *ornamenta*, devised in the first instance for Tiberius in 12 B.C. In the next year the honour fell to Piso the Pontifex (*cos.* 15) for his Thracian War: awarded either for his decisive victory or at the end of his triennium.²⁸

Furthermore, a new distinction emerges in these years, pleasing to some at least of the *nobiles*. Cities in Asia and Africa now put on their coins the names and images of proconsuls.²⁹ The first to acquire the honour is

²⁶Barnes 22. He did not mention the ovation of Tiberius—which should be anterior to the scene in Valerius Maximus.

²⁷The shortcomings of the recent commentators Koestermann (Heidelberg 1963) and Goodyear (Cambridge 1972) are emphasized by Barnes (22 n. 1). Observe also the confused statement in *CAH* 10 (1934) 153 f., where *imperium proconsulare* is not mentioned. Tiberius is apparently not allowed that *imperium* before 8 B.C. by K. Bringmann, *Chiron* 7 (1977) 235 (cf. n. 85); and he omits the ovation.

²⁸Dio 54.34.7; Livy, *Per.* 140 (both under 11). For the triennium, Velleius 2.98.2.

²⁹M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (Cambridge 1946), 139 f.; 224; 228 ff.; 387 f.

Paullus Fabius Maximus (*cos.* 11), proconsul of Asia by special appointment in 10/9. Too much should not be made of this phenomenon—and it was in fact sporadic. No coins commemorate the proconsuls L. Piso and Iullus Antonius.

vi. After the fourteenth salutation in 8 B.C. a lull supervenes, and the obscure decade when Claudius Nero was in eclipse (6 B.C.–A.D. 4). Campaigns occurred in central Europe, but the fifteenth salutation happens not to be attested until A.D. 2/3.³⁰ The occasion has been in dispute. Perhaps the German campaign of M. Vinicius in A.D. 2.³¹ Or again, something in 1 B.C., since a brief phrase of Dio indicates operations on the Danube.³² However, there is no sign that the Princeps, subsequent to 11 B.C., took a salutation for the victory of a legate.

A better solution has recently emerged. In 1 B.C. the young prince C. Caesar went out to wage war, ostensibly with the Parthians, and invested with proconsular *imperium*. Alluding to his consulship (in A.D. 1), the posthumous inscription at Pisa declares *ultra finis extremas populi Romani . . . bellum gerens* (*ILS* 140). Attention should go to Gaius' campaign in Arabia, otherwise on vague attestation.³³ Some modest and inflated success may have brought Augustus to "imp. XV."³⁴

Further, "imp. XVI" will then fall into place. When the Armenian fortress Artagira was captured (in September of 3) both Augustus and the prince acquired a salutation, according to Dio (55.10a 7).³⁵

Before his decease in the following February Gaius Caesar had thus become "imp. II," so it would appear. There is a plethora of inscriptions honouring the prince. Yet none equips his name with "imp. II"—and only one with "imp." has so far turned up.³⁶ That the lengthy inscription on the cenotaph should be silent is indeed peculiar.

vii. The next sequence is XVII–XIX, matched by III–V for Claudius Nero who, now Ti. Caesar, assumed *imperium* again in 4. It documents victories won in Germany and in the reconquest of Illyricum during the period 4–9. The first of these salutations is first attested in 7/8 by the dynastic inscription on the arch at Ticinum (*ILS* 107). The second is nowhere on record.

The years 4–6 witnessed three German campaigns, as is made manifest

³⁰*CIL* 10.3827.

³¹W. Kolbe, *Germania* 23 (1939) 104 ff.

³²Dio 55.10.17. For that conjecture, *Danubian Papers* (Bucharest 1971) 39.

³³J. E. G. Zetzel, *GRBS* 11 (1970) 266, adducing the inscription from Messene (*SEG* 23 (1968) 206 = *AE* 1967.458): it discloses Gaius fighting barbarians, escaping dangers, and enjoying good health.

³⁴Thus Barnes 23.

³⁵Previously assumed the occasion for "imp. XV." Thus in *PIR*² J 215.

³⁶*CIL* 13.2942.

by the narrative of Velleius (2.105 ff., cf. 122.2). The first took the army to the Weser, the second to the Elbe. The third is the invasion of Bohemia, directed against Maroboduus, the king of the Marcomanni. When close to the goal, it was frustrated by the insurrection of the Pannonians and Dalmatians.

Cassius Dio relates these events under the one year, A.D. 6. His account is confused as well as abridged. Tiberius advanced into Germany, first to the Weser, then to the Elbe, but no notable success was achieved, although both Tiberius and Augustus took a salutation, and Sentius the governor of Germany was awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia* (55.28.5 f.). Dio then goes on to mention what he calls a second campaign against Germans, which is interrupted by the rebellion in Illyricum (29.1).

The historian is at fault. He omits the name of Maroboduus, and he overlooks the fact of three campaigns in 4–6. His main source was probably compressed at this point.³⁷

Following Dio, scholars assign the salutation in question (XVII) to the year 6.³⁸ If that is so, it can only appertain to the conclusion of peace with Maroboduus. The previous year may appear more attractive, when army and fleet met on the Elbe, marking the subjugation of northwestern Germany, as proclaimed with great enthusiasm by Velleius (2.108).

As concerns Tiberius, a new inscription from Saepinum imports a slight difficulty.³⁹ It shows him “imp. IV” along with his seventh *tribunicia potestas*. That is, A.D. 5/6. The figures are in discordance. In 7/8 Tiberius was still only “imp. ter” (*ILS* 107). That number would agree with the date on the inscription, for Tiberius may have risen to “imp. III” precisely in the second half of the year 5.

Next, XVIII and XIX. As narrated by Velleius, the suppression of the revolt in Illyricum falls into two parts, the *Bellum Pannonicum* and the *Bellum Delmaticum*. An entry in the *Fasti Antiates* under August 3 is plausibly referred to the termination of the first episode: *Ti. Aug. (in) Inlyrico vic.*⁴⁰ That is, in 8, by the battle of the Bathinus. Next, Dio records a salutation for the reduction of the Dalmatians the year after.⁴¹

Nor is XX a problem. Tiberius went to the Rhine in 10 to repair the damage caused by the catastrophe of Quinctilius Varus. Velleius portrays an invasion of Germany in vivid and vigorous language: *penetrat interius*,

³⁷For Aufidius Bassus, cf. *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 275; 698.

³⁸Thus Mommsen (above, n. 7) 16; Stein, *PIR*² 941. Barnes has “in 6, Tiberius advanced far into Germany” (23). P. A. Brunt also assigns the salutation to 6, for Tiberius’ victories in Germany, with “imp. XVIII” stated “perhaps for the settlement with Maroboduus” (*ZPE* 13 [1974] 177), leaving only one for Illyricum (n. 47).

³⁹Published in *Athenaeum* 56 (1978) 147.

⁴⁰*III* 13.1 328.

⁴¹Dio 56.27.1. Barnes (24) prefers to adduce here the victory of August 3 recorded in the *Fasti Antiates*.

aperit limites, vastat agros, obvios fundit, etc. (2.120.2). In the next year, so he briefly states, the great general operated with the same *virtus et fortuna* (121.1).

The panegyrist is practising a deception.⁴² If Dio is to be believed, Tiberius did not venture beyond the Rhine in the year 10. That is also the impression conveyed by Suetonius—and most scholars concur.⁴³ The twentieth salutation is therefore assigned to A.D. 11. It appears by aberration in 9/10 on the splendid monument from Cabo Torres in Asturias.⁴⁴

VIII. Tiberius returned to Rome from Germany *post biennium* according to Suetonius (*Tib.* 20), and he celebrated his postponed Pannonian triumph on October 23 of 12. Now, or early in the next year, he attained to full parity with Augustus in command over provinces and armies.⁴⁵

Dio records no military action of Tiberius, or of anyone else, either in 12 or in 13. Hence a problem. Caesar Augustus engrossed another salutation before his death and Tiberius in consequence his seventh. It also corresponds to the first of Germanicus Caesar, so it has firmly been stated.⁴⁶

Consul in 12, the prince was despatched to the Rhine in the next year. Germany, it is clear, offered the only field of warfare available to supply an acclamation. Therefore a campaign of Germanicus is postulated, in 13 or early in 14.

Evidence now appears to accrue. First of all, the inscription of Fabricius Tuscus, an equestrian officer.⁴⁷ He superintended building operations at Alexandria Troadis, his home town, *iussu Augusti*. Next, he was employed raising troops in the levy *quem Romae habuit Augustus et Ti. Caesar*. Then, after having been *praefectus fabrum* for four years and *praefectus equitum* for four, Tuscus received military decorations *a Germanico Caesare imp. bello Germanico*.

Inferences of value seemed permissible. Since Augustus is not styled "Divus," the inscription was set up while Augustus was still among the

⁴²Cf. remarks in *AJP* 99 (1978) 58 f.

⁴³Dio 56.24.5a; Suetonius *Tib.* 18 f. Cf. M. Gelzer, *RE* 10 (1918) 494; H. v. Petrikovits, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 166 (1966) 193; C. M. Wells, *The German Policy of Augustus* (Oxford 1972) 240. R. Seager, however, gives credit to Velleius ([above, n. 17] 45). And see now especially A. J. Woodman in his commentary, *ad loc.* (Cambridge 1977).

⁴⁴*CIL* 2.2703. On which cf. *Epigraphische Studien* 8 (1969) 126 ff. = *Roman Papers* (Oxford 1979) 734 ff. The twentieth salutation is recorded on coins of 11/12 (*BMCRE* 1.50).

⁴⁵Velleius 2.121.1; Suetonius *Tib.* 21.1. Like the Pannonian triumph of Ti. Caesar, omitted by Dio. He now became in the full and proper sense *collega imperii*, by which term he is designated by Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.3.3), a little too soon.

⁴⁶M. Gelzer, *RE* 10 (1918) 439. Mommsen had "fortasse" ([above, n. 7] 17). As for Tiberius, he is *imp. VII* before the death of Augustus, cf. *BMCRE* 1.95 f.

⁴⁷Published by G. E. Bean in J. M. Cook, *The Troad* (1973) 412, whence *AE* 1973.501.

living. The levy at Rome should be a measure of the year 6. Therefore, with eight years thereafter for the equestrian posts of Tuscus, it follows that Germanicus had won a victory in Germany just before the decease of Augustus.⁴⁸

Some hesitations were conceived at an early stage, it is true. For example, to have "Augustus" twice without "Caesar" is in itself strange, perhaps as much as the omission of "Divus."⁴⁹ Those hesitations have recently been reinforced and carefully formulated.⁵⁰ First, when a deified ruler figures as a historical agent, the term "Divus" may not always be felt as suitable or necessary. Second, the levy can be assigned to 9 or 10, in the aftermath of the Varian disaster, hence Tuscus' last spell of service as *praefectus equitum* falls in 13–16. Third, decorations awarded for a *Bellum Germanicum* imply the termination of that war.

It is therefore premature and hazardous to make appeal to the inscription of Fabricius Tuscus.⁵¹ Evidence of another type is invoked. The epigram of Crinagoras acclaims Germanicus victorious over Gauls (with masses of slain) between the Pyrenees and the Alps that look down on the sources of the Rhine, hence a victory over rebels in Gaul is surmised.⁵² Again, one must hesitate. By *Κελτοί* the Greek poet may mean Germans, alluding to the subsequent campaigns of Germanicus Caesar.⁵³ That is not all. The epigram contains various perplexities. Mention of the Alps might evoke a hint of the famous action of Drusus in 15 B.C., Drusus who on his decease acquired the *cognomen* "Germanicus." Crinagoras, some argue, is paying honour to the parent of Germanicus Caesar.⁵⁴

The evidence is shown inadequate. But "imp. XXI" for Augustus is a fact, likewise "imp. VII" for Ti. Caesar. That a German campaign in this season should lapse from the annals of history is no surprise if one looks at the literary sources. Velleius and Dio were hastening towards the decease of Augustus. So too was Cornelius Tacitus—and not yet aware that he needed to give some study to the last decade of the reign.

As concerns Dio, a plain fact ought to have been brought into the reckoning. For 12 the text is entire, but it shows a lacuna extending from the summer of the next year down to the omens that heralded the death

⁴⁸Thus P. A. Brunt in his full commentary, *ZPE* 13 (1974) 162 ff. Followed by Barnes (25): he had access to the paper before publication.

⁴⁹Thus the present writer, quoted by Brunt 185.

⁵⁰W. Orth, *ZPE* 28 (1978) 57 ff.

⁵¹Brunt's thesis was in fact accepted during the composition of *History in Ovid* (Oxford 1978) 58.

⁵²*Anth. Pal.* 9.283, cf. Barnes 25: following Gow-Page, *The Garland of Philip* 2 (1968) 235 f.

⁵³C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (Leipzig 1922) 307 f.

⁵⁴See now G. Williams, *Change and Decline. Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley 1978) 129 f.

of the ruler (viz. in 56.28.6–29.3). Among other things in 13, the despatch of Germanicus to the Rhine has fallen out.

Light comes from a source not expected, from Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto*. The first two poems in the second book are consecrated to the Pannonian triumph of October 23, A.D. 12. Further, Ovid composed a separate piece in praise of the *magnus triumphus*. He refers to it in *Ex P.* 2.5.27 ff. (to Salanus); and in the next book he opines that his *Triumphus* has now been for some time (*iam pridem*) in the hands of readers at the capital (3.4.34).

The date of the second poem, to the address of a certain Rufinus, becomes a matter of high relevance. Making allowance for time and for distance, for the receipt of news in winter and for the despatch of epistles, Ovid's *Triumphus* is not likely to have reached Rome much before the summer of 13.

Now Ovid's poem to Rufinus carries a significant item. Ovid goes on to predict a second triumph, this time from Germany:

alter enim de te, Rhene, triumphus adest. (3.4.88)

Tiberius Caesar will conduct it. The poet is confident, he is emboldened to exhort the mother by name,

*quid cessas currum pompamque parare triumphi
Livia? dant nullas iam tibi bella moras.
perfida damnatas Germania proicit hastas.* (4.95 ff.)

Caution is prescribed in assessing the vaticinations of a poet. Ovid might be alluding to the prospect of a triumph which would implement the salutation taken in Germany two years previously. None the less, the language suggests that something new is in the air. Germania capitulates—*proicit hastas*. The war is over, nothing now impedes a triumph, so Livia is reminded.

Tiberius, it follows, was on the Rhine, or at least in the vicinity. Curiosity thus awakens, and conjecture.⁵⁵ When Germanicus went to the Rhine in 13, he was not alone but under the escort and supervision of Tiberius Caesar; and some exploit or other (perhaps trivial) earns a salutation and thus heralds a triumph. For Ovid, the glory accrues to Tiberius. No bar if in fact the action was that of Germanicus, even after Tiberius' departure from the seat of war.⁵⁶ When writing earlier about the Pannonian triumph, Ovid through excess of enthusiasm obtruded predictions about military laurels awaiting the young prince, at some length (2.1.55–68). This time the poet was prudent: no word of Germanicus in the letter to Rufinus.

⁵⁵*History in Ovid* (Oxford 1978) 53 f.; 63 ff.

⁵⁶*Ibid.* 65. The *imperium* of Tiberius was now equal to that of Augustus.

The conjecture will elucidate "imp. XXI" for Augustus, "imp. VII" for Tiberius; and Germanicus, now acquiring the *imperatorium nomen*, will not need another salutation should he later be conceded a triumph, or an ovation.

There is further benefit. In despatches at the end of the year 16, when urging a cessation of warfare, Tiberius recalled his own achievements: *se novies a divo Augusto in Germaniam missum plura consilio quam vi perfecisse* (*Ann.* 2.26.3). The computation of the nine missions has been a cause of perplexity. Seven are beyond dispute. There remains his rapid journey to meet his moribund brother in 9 B.C.; and the *biennium* of Suetonius (*Tib.* 20) can be extended from 10 to bring in A.D. 12.⁵⁷ However, if as is here conjectured, Tiberius went to the Rhine in A.D. 13, 9 B.C. can be excluded (not in fact an enterprise of warfare), and the total comes out as follows: 8 and 7 B.C.; A.D. 4–6; 10–13.⁵⁸

ix. Sundry questions concerning the *imperium* of Germanicus Caesar can no longer be deferred. He had seen service in Illyricum in 8–9, earning the *ornamenta*. In 11 the prince was with Tiberius when he invaded Germany. According to Cassius Dio, Germanicus had the *imperium* of a proconsul at that time (56.25.2). The notion has found fanciers in the modern time; and a recent survey assigns his first salutation to this year.⁵⁹

The last year of Augustus is another matter. Germanicus was then left with the supreme command: eight legions in two armies under legates of consular rank. Further, he held authority over Tres Galliae. Proconsular *imperium* was requisite—and obvious. That plain fact should never have been ignored.⁶⁰

There was an impediment, residing in a statement of Cornelius Tacitus. When the discussion about the position of the new ruler flagged and lapsed (an end of entreaty and an end of denials), the Senate passed to other business. First, several proposals in honour of Julia Augusta (for so Livia was now to be styled, by the testament of the deceased despot), most of them rejected by her son. Next, *Germanico Caesari proconsulare imperium petivit* (*Ann.* 1.14.3).

⁵⁷Thus G. V. Sumner, *HSCP* 74 (1970) 274 (discussing the military service of Velleius). The computation of Koestermann (*ad loc.*) falls one short of the nine.

⁵⁸That is preferable to the reckoning suggested in *Ovid in History* (Oxford 1978) 65. The journey in 9 B.C. was there included in the total. And there is no reason to exclude Tiberius' presence on the Rhine (or in Gaul) for the greater part of 12.

⁵⁹D. Timpe, *Der Triumph des Germanicus* (Bonn 1968) 37, cf. 45. Mommsen seems to have accepted proconsular *imperium* for Germanicus in 11 with a temporary lapse in 14 caused by the death of Augustus (*Römisches Staatsrecht* 2³ [Leipzig 1888] 1158, n. 3).

⁶⁰In *PIR*² J 221 Germanicus is said to be sent to the Rhine in 13 as *legatus Augusti pro praetore*.

An item of value. It demonstrates that the position of Ti. Caesar had been confirmed—or better, simply recognised. He required no new grant of *imperium*.⁶¹ Neither did Germanicus, however, if he was already in possession of *imperium*. The ruler, it may be supposed, judged it appropriate to advertise authority already in the hands of Germanicus.⁶²

Tiberius had a further motive.⁶³ He was able to develop his discourse and bring in a complimentary reference to the other prince: *quo minus idem pro Druso postularetur, ea causa quod designatus consul Drusus praesensque erat*.

Tacitus had precise information about these transactions, deriving from the *Acta Senatus*, so it may be surmised. But Tacitus had not paid much attention to events previous to the death of Augustus.⁶⁴ Otherwise he would have perhaps seen that what Tiberius requested for Germanicus was not a grant of *imperium* for the first time.

x. There are further consequences. They concern the campaigns of Germanicus as narrated by Tacitus: which critics have been impelled to censure, not always for the best reasons. Rhetoric and drama, to be sure—but such is the nature of Roman annals.⁶⁵ Yet Tacitus happens to furnish precise details about salutations and triumphs.

In the autumn of 14, after dealing not too well with the mutiny, Germanicus led a foray across the river, attacking the Marsi in their festal season. The action was opportune, and enough to justify a salutation by the standards now current. None is recorded by Tacitus. The Princeps reported Germanicus' success to the Senate, with ample and surface laudation: *multaque de virtute eius memoravit, magis in speciem verbis adornata quam ut penitus sentire crederetur* (*Ann.* 1.52.2).

The item introducing the next year is the decree of a triumph: *Druso Caesare C. Norbano consulibus decernitur Germanico triumphus manente bello* (*Ann.* 1.55.1). It is of primary value, for two reasons, heterogeneous. First, it shows that Germanicus must already be equipped with the necessary salutation. Second, the intentions of Tiberius Caesar. Hostile to warfare on a large scale and wishing to curb the ambitions of the young prince but not yet in a posture to recall him, the Princeps held out the prospect of a triumph in no distant future.

A problem now arises. A preliminary campaign in 15 enabled Germanicus to rescue Segestes, the dissident father-in-law of Arminius. After

⁶¹Cf. now B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician* (London 1976) 75.

⁶²Thus P. A. Brunt, *ZPE* 13 (1974) 180.

⁶³As indicated in *Historiographia Antiqua* (Louvain 1977) 240 f.

⁶⁴*Ibid.* 247, cf. *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 370 f.

⁶⁵For the normal strictures, E. Koestermann, *Historia* 6 (1957) 431 f. For a defence, H. v. Petrikovits, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 166 (1966) 84.

which, *exercitum reduxit nomenque imperatoris auctore Tiberio accepit* (*Ann.* 1.58.5). The main effort of the year was elaborate, by sea and by land. It ended in hazard and losses. In conclusion *ornamenta* were awarded to the consular legates (*Ann.* 1.72.1)—but nothing is said about Germanicus himself.

The sequence has appeared peculiar. A bold hypothesis was promulgated.⁶⁶ The exposition of the historian, it is assumed, is erroneous. The Senate's decree awarding the triumph does not belong to the very beginning of 15. It should go at the end, to stand with the honours conferred on the legates of Germanicus—and it is the consequence of the salutation conceded by Tiberius in the early summer of the year (*Ann.* 1.58.5).

The notion is ingenious—and facts can get out of order, even with a careful historian. It has an appeal, it enlists an impressive measure of endorsement.⁶⁷ None the less, it lapses—once it is seen that the triumph voted at the beginning of 15 depends upon and derives from an earlier salutation (i.e., that of 13).

The salutation conceded by Tiberius in the early summer of 15 makes Germanicus “imp. II,” and so he is styled on inscriptions set up before and after his death (*ILS* 176 ff.)

In 16 Germanicus renewed and extended his enterprises. A victory was won at Idistaviso, and the troops acclaimed Tiberius: *miles in loco proelii Tiberium imperatorem salutavit* (*Ann.* 2.18.2). Further, Germanicus set up a trophy in the name of the *exercitus Tiberii Caesaris*—and, *nihil de se addidit* (*Ann.* 2.22.1). When at the end of 16 an arch was dedicated at Rome to commemorate the recapture of standards lost by Varus, the formula is *ductu Germanici, auspiciis Tiberii* (*Ann.* 2.41.1).

Those are valuable statements. The eighth (and last) salutation of Ti. Caesar has been a cause of superfluous agitation. A number of scholars deny that it was in fact taken by Tiberius on this occasion.⁶⁸ The language of Tacitus suffices.⁶⁹

A pair of phenomena will be noted. First, Germanicus is granted a salutation in 15, but Tiberius does not add it to his titulature. Second, in 16 Idistaviso brings Tiberius to “imp. VIII”—but nothing more for Germanicus.

⁶⁶D. Timpe, *Der Triumph des Germanicus* (Bonn 1968) 45 f., cf. 57.

⁶⁷K. Wellesley, *JRS* 59 (1969) 278; E. W. Gray, *CR* n.s. 20 (1970) 347; R. Seager, *Tiberius* (London 1972) 81; P. A. Brunt, *ZPE* 13 (1974) 179 (“probably”); B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician* (London 1976) 144, cf. 267, n. 47.

⁶⁸Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* 2³ (Leipzig 1888) 1156, n. 4; M. Gelzer, *RE* 10 (1918) 448; H. Dessau (note on *ILS* 152); D. Timpe (above, n. 66) 51; E. Koestermann (above, n. 65) 459; R. Seager (above, n. 67) 85.

⁶⁹As it did for Stein in *PIR*² C 941, who cites Tacitus with no comment. For a lengthy piece in confirmation see H. Gesche, *Chiron* 2 (1972) 339 ff.

x1. For certain matters of high import, the Tacitean narration is the sole source of information, or of valid inferences. It has appeared inadequate. The historian refrained from offering a full and clear statement about the purpose of the campaigns, about the policy of the Roman government.

The renunciation of conquest in western Germany, that is a large question which cannot be discussed in this place.⁷⁰ On a restricted approach, what Tacitus reports about salutations and triumphs can be used to elucidate the relations between Tiberius and Germanicus, hence wider perspectives.

First, the Princeps could not deprecate Germanicus' foray in sequence to the mutiny, and he paid a generous tribute (*Ann.* 1.52.2). But almost at once, at the beginning of 15, a triumph was voted (*Ann.* 1.55.1). That may be interpreted as a gentle admonition.

Second, after the first of the campaigns in 15. Although the narrative discloses no acclamation by the troops, Germanicus is granted a salutation by Tiberius (*Ann.* 1.58.5). The honorific award, not imposed by the exploit, and not needed for the triumph (already decreed), may be taken as a second admonition, still amicable.

Third, at the end of 15. *Ornamenta* for the consular legates (*Ann.* 1.72.1). That should imply that the *Bellum Germanicum* was now regarded as terminated.⁷¹

Fourth. Though Germanicus was victorious in the field at Idistaviso, he was not acclaimed by the army. It was to be the victory of Ti. Caesar—who may previously have warned him in this sense. Furthermore, in the previous year Tiberius had not used Germanicus' salutation to augment his own total; and this time Germanicus is denied participation in the "imp. VIII" of the Princeps.

After the disaster of Varus, Tiberius set his face firmly against conquest and annexation, that is a painless assumption. The campaign of 11 was modest indeed, and there is no sign that the action which threw up another salutation in 13 was of any magnitude. The enterprises of Germanicus brought confirmation. In fact, in 16 the Roman army was no farther ahead than after the second campaign of Drusus in 11 B.C. By contrast, added danger and expense. Whereas the invasions strengthened native resistance and had evoked a leader of genius, styled with perhaps undue fervour by Tacitus as *liberator haud dubie Germaniae*. The military reasons were adequate without the personal friction. Urging Germanicus to re-

⁷⁰See various papers by D. Timpe, especially *Chiron* 1 (1971) 267 ff. I am happy to express myself in fairly close agreement with his general theses.

⁷¹In Timpe's view Tiberius up till this point had approved the actions of Germanicus. That is not so sure.

nounce, Tiberius expounded the matter in *crebrae epistulae* (*Ann.* 2.26). Tacitus' summary may derive in part from orations of the sagacious ruler.

At the death of Augustus the German War was still going on—for honour and prestige, not for conquest or any visible gain (*Ann.* 1.3.6). The motive of revenge for Quinctilius Varus, namely *recepta signa*, was duly advertised in the triumphal arch at Rome (*Ann.* 2.41.1).

xii. Epilogue. Pressing Germanicus to depart from the Rhine, the Princes subjoined a personal appeal. The prince should give a thought to the prospects of his brother, Germany being the only field where he could *adsequi nomen imperatorium et deportare lauream* (*Ann.* 2.26.4).

In the event, Drusus went to Illyricum in 17. He there carried out the crafty policy of Tiberius, demolishing Maroboduus without armed intervention beyond the Danube. Tiberius made much of this achievement (*Ann.* 2.63.3). Meanwhile Germanicus installed a Roman vassal as ruler of Armenia. Both princes were voted ovations in the course of 19 (*Ann.* 2.64.1), and Drusus celebrated his in the following year, on May 28.⁷²

Drusus had proconsular *imperium*, covering the provinces of Pannonia and Dalmatia. That is obvious—and the historian did not need to register it. Certain modern scholars fail to evince interest.⁷³

Now ovations presuppose that *imperium*. Also, one assumed, an acclamation by the soldiers. Of which, no sign this time. As has been seen, a salutation can crown a success that is more political than military; and, as now becomes evident, the ruler can award an ovation without its prerequisite.⁷⁴

With princes of the dynasty, practices fluctuate, and it is not easy or profitable to deduce a doctrine. Further, although distinctions can be drawn, it is better to avoid system when examining the grants of proconsular *imperium* conferred at the instance of Caesar Augustus.⁷⁵ Salutations deriving from this source may—or may not—go to augment the ruler's total. Thus Tiberius in 10 and 8 B.C. contributes XIII and XIV. But Germanicus, "imp. I" in 13 (with corresponding numbers for Augustus and

⁷²*Ann.* 3.19.2, cf. *FO* 8: *V K. Iun. Drusus [Caesar] triumphavit ex Illyrico.*

⁷³Nothing, for example, in *PIR*² J 219. No inscription shows Drusus Caesar as either "procos." or "imp." Germanicus, however, reached "imp. II" before his death (*ILS* 176 ff.); and he is styled "proconsul" on an edict he issued at Alexandria (A. S. Hunt-C. C. Edgar, *Select Papyri* 2 (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1934) 211).

⁷⁴And an ovation can be officially styled a triumph. According to Gellius (citing Masurius Sabinus) the conditions were much less rigorous (5.6.21). An ovation could derive from a not properly declared war, from operations against slaves or pirates, from victory without bloodshed.

⁷⁵Mommsen introduced the category "secundares *imperium*" in his section entitled "Mitregenschaft" ([above, n. 59] 1151 ff.). Various distinctions emerge from the facts—not all of them subject to clear definition.

Tiberius), does not again share a salutation with Tiberius. Tiberius alone benefits from the victory at Idistaviso. On this occasion, Germanicus appears to be treated like an ordinary proconsul, fighting *auspiciis Tiberii Caesaris*.⁷⁶

Salutations and even laurels won without warfare illustrate the progressive debasement of honours. Ti. Caesar did not go beyond "imp. VIII," it is true. When Caligula was in Gaul and on the Rhine in 39/40, he was acclaimed seven times, although he fought no battle, so Dio asserts (59.22.2). Caligula announced a triumph and in fact held an ovation, but no document shows him even "imp. II." Claudius Caesar, however, annexed a total of twenty-seven. Many of them in the invasion of Britain—which in Dio's view was improper, since tradition permitted only one for any one war (60.21.4 f.). With Claudius, it may be noted, salutations for the successes of legates are recognised, for the first time since 11 B.C.

That ruler was generous and innovatory in other respects. Whereas the proconsul Cossus Lentulus did not become "Gaetulicus" in the year 6, Claudius allowed his legate Gabinius Secundus to assume as cognomen the name of a German tribe; and A. Plautius, his general in Britain, was awarded an ovation.⁷⁷

By what perversion of antiquarian argument Claudius Caesar commended the honouring of A. Plautius baffles any conjecture. Tacitus recalled the fact (*Ann.* 13.32.2), and he may have inserted expert censure when it came up in 47, early in Book XI of the *Annales*.

Eagerly exploiting military glory for himself, the emperor went out of his way to conciliate senators. Lavish awards of the *ornamenta triumphalia* issued in scandal and ridicule. Curtius Rufus got them for opening a silver-mine, to the alarm of the soldiers (*Ann.* 11.20.3).⁷⁸

The declension goes on as the dynasty verged towards its end. After the conspiracy of C. Piso was detected, Nero bestowed the *ornamenta* on three friends of proved loyalty: Petronius Turpilianus, Cocceius Nerva, and the Guard Prefect Tigellinus (*Ann.* 15.72.1). Tacitus was alert to that transaction, which declared the first and equivocal entrance of a future emperor. He missed (or chose to omit) another damaging item, namely military decorations (*hastae* and *coronae*) for the freedman Epaphroditus.⁷⁹

⁷⁶*Ann.* 2.41.1. Compare the formula on the inscription that mentions Cossus Lentulus (IRT 301).

⁷⁷Suetonius *Divus Claudius* 24.3.

⁷⁸*Ann.* 11.20.3. A letter of protest was put into circulation.

⁷⁹*ILS* 9505, in large letters on the funeral monument in his garden on the Esquiline. Doubtful by Stein (*PIR*² E 29), the relevance to the year 65 is vindicated by W. Eck, *Historia* 25 (1976) 381 ff.

APPENDIX

A CEREMONY OF JANUARY 16

The Temple of Concordia Augusta was dedicated by Tiberius Caesar in person. That is stated by Suetonius (*Tib.* 20) and by Dio (56.25.1), the former in error about the year, the latter registering the item at the end of A.D. 10. Ovid, however, has the day, viz. January 16 (*Fasti* 1.475 ff.); and the *Fasti Praenestini*, while omitting the name of Tiberius, register the day and also the year, by the consuls. So far all is in order.

The next line on this calendar carries a fragmentary item concerning Ti. Caesar, with a gap of about nineteen letters. The standard edition, that of Degraffi, supplements as follows:

Ti. Caesar ex Pan[nonia reversus dedic]avit.¹

That is a simple solution: the same day in A.D. 10. However, the occasion has aroused perplexity and much disputation. Most recent enquirers argue with conviction for January 16, either in 9 or in 10. But they advocate instead a solemn entrance into the city by Tiberius Caesar. Hohl in a thorough investigation was firm for the latter year, and he proposed

Ti. Caesar ex Pan[nonia rediens p.R. salut]avit.²

The reasons for this conclusion must be put under sharp inspection. During the northern campaigns Tiberius was anxious not to lose touch with the seat of power, as Cassius Dio states under A.D. 6, with strong emphasis and unfriendly imputations (55.27.5). Now Tiberius in fact came to Rome at the end of 4, and similarly the year after.³ The rebellion in Illyricum detained him in 6—and perhaps also during the winter of 7/8.⁴ In the course of 8 Augustus himself was able to journey northward as far as Ariminum.⁵ However, Ti. Caesar paid two visits to Rome between the defeat of the Pannonians in the late summer of 8 and his despatch to the Rhine in the spring of 10. Each visit is on clear attestation.

First, Cassius Dio. Tiberius came to Rome “after the winter in which Quintus Sulpicius and Gaius Sabinus entered upon their consulate” (i.e.,

¹*IIt* 13.2 (1963) 115, cf. 398 f.

²E. Hohl, *Die Siegesfeier des Tiberius und das Datum der Schlacht im Teutoburger Wald*, *SBBerl* 1952 1.17). (Hereafter “Hohl.”) The pamphlet has a useful table of previous conjectures (24): for which see also *IIt* 13.2 (1963) 399 f.

³Velleius 2.105.3; 108.3. In the course of the second visit he dedicated the temple of Castor and Pollux (Dio 55.27.4). That is, on January 27 (Ovid *Fasti* 1.705 ff.), of the year 6.

⁴A visit of Tiberius at the end of 6 is conjectured by P. A. Brunt, *ZPE* 13 (1974) 176. His reason is the levy of troops attested by the inscription of Fabricius Tuscus (*AE* 1973.501), which he assigned to this date in preference to the end of 9.

⁵Dio 55.34.3.

the consuls of A.D. 9). Before going into the city he met Augustus, and he then addressed the people in the Saepta; and the consuls arranged some victory celebrations (56.1.1). The language of the historian indicates beyond any doubt an *adventus* in the spring of 9.⁶ It rules out the month of January, for the winter is not then over.

Second, Suetonius. Terminating the war in Illyricum (in 9), Tiberius was voted a triumph, but he postponed it because of the catastrophe in Germany, *maesta civitate clade Variana*. None the less, *urbem praetextatus et laurea coronatus intravit*. At a tribunal in the Saepta he took his seat along with Augustus between the consuls and, *populo consalutato*, he made a tour of the temples (*Tib.* 17.2). Then, the biographer proceeds, *proximo anno repetita Germania* (18.1). His explicit account declares a ceremony in the autumn of 9, subsequent to the Varian disaster; and Tiberius set out for Germany *proximo anno*.

The literary evidence is plain. It shows two *adventus* in the year 9, two ceremonies of a similar character: the first in the spring, the second towards the end of the year.⁷ The second is in Suetonius but not in Dio. There is a gap, it may be noted, in the text of the historian (after 56.24.5). The end of 9 and most of 10 is missing.

How and why raise objection? Yet that has happened. One critic, Pippidi, proposed autocratically to conflate the two visits.⁸ The two accounts, he argues, exhibit "une parfaite concordance." Yet, at the same time, that of Dio is "plus circonstancié." Moreover, the Greek historian furnishes a precise date, "dans les premiers jours" of A.D. 9. Therefore Dio is preferred. Suetonius was in error about the season he adduces, namely subsequent to the news of the *clades Variana*. The day and the date is January 16 of the year 9 when Tiberius *ex Pan[nonia] laureatus urbem intravit*.

The thesis is proclaimed with eloquence and with conviction. No service will be done by a refutation at comparable length. Enough to state what it entails—a rejection of the coherent evidence of Suetonius. Also what it is based upon—a misinterpretation of Dio's phrase *μετὰ τὸν χειμῶνα*. That phrase certifies the spring of A.D. 9.⁹

January 16, A.D. 9. That date for the entry in the *Fasti Praenestini* was taken over by Gag  in the "Appendice" to his edition of the *Res Gestae* (1935). Referring cursorily to Suetonius, Gag  stated "erreur probable de chronologie." To justify Gag 's posture entails something

⁶Hohl 10: "Dio meint das Fr hjahr 9 n. Chr."

⁷As correctly stated by Gelzer, *RE* 10 (1918) 492 and 493.

⁸D. M. Pippidi, *REL* 11 (1933) 450 ff. = *Recherches sur le culte imp rial* (Paris 1939) 66 ff.

⁹Hohl 10. The two visits are also conflated in *PIR*² C 941, where Dio's phrase is erroneously taken to mean the beginning of A.D. 10.

more than "probable." It is unfortunate for all concerned that a notion which defied or evaded the plain meaning of the literary sources should acquire consecration in that excellent and erudite commentary, with no remedy or even warning in the addenda to the second edition (1977).

As it happens, misfortune dogs Dio's notice about Tiberius' visit to Rome after the winter of 8/9 (56.1.1). In *PIR*² C 841, Stein cited Dio as well as Suetonius for a ceremony which he put on January 16 of 10.

A paradox now develops. Hohl was clear in his mind that the language of Dio means the winter of 8/9. But he was also clear that Dio and Suetonius referred to one and the same event.¹⁰ Whereas Pippidi proclaimed the similarity of the two accounts, with Dio superior, Hohl took the contrary stance. He quoted Mommsen's verdict on the biographer: "scriptor diligens, sed in minimis maxime."¹¹

One *adventus* therefore. Combining Suetonius and the entry in the *Fasti Praenestini* Hohl was positive that it fell on January 16 of 10.¹² That was premature. Inspection of Suetonius, context as well as text, shows that Tiberius reached Rome before the end of the previous year (*Tib.* 17.2, cf. 18.1).

None the less, that conclusion continues to enlist adherents.¹³ One scholar indeed not only accepts that day and date, but incautiously adduces Dio at the same time, taking Dio to refer to the winter of 9/10.¹⁴

It is time to abridge the melancholy story. Brief mention may go to the controversial entry in the *Fasti Praenestini* as treated in a pair of recent biographies. R. Seager regards it as belonging perhaps to A.D. 10;¹⁵ but B. Levick is careful to avoid that date when briefly registering Tiberius' visits in the winters of 8/9 and 9/10.¹⁶

To sum up. How does the matter now stand?

1) The literary evidence is clear. It registers two *adventus* of Ti. Caesar in the year 9. The first took place "after the winter in which the consuls of

¹⁰Hohl 11: "dass Dio dasselbe ungewöhnliche Ereignis im Auge hat wie Sueton ist sonnenklar. Um so auffälliger wirkt die zeitliche und davon untrennbar auch die sachliche Diskrepanz."

¹¹Hohl 16.

¹²Hohl 17.

¹³Thus W. John, *RE* 24 (1963) 958 (on Varus).

¹⁴P. A. Brunt, *ZPE* 13 (1974) 175: "according to Dio LVI 1, 1 Tiberius did not reach Rome until after the winter in which Q. Sulpicius and C. Sabinus were consuls, i.e. not till the beginning of 10, and his pompous entry into the city can be dated to 16 January 10." The tense of the verb is decisive: *ὑπέρευσαν*.

¹⁵R. Seager, *Tiberius* (London 1972) 44. In support he there cited "Taylor, *ASP* 58, 1937, 185 ff." But Miss Taylor there argued for January 16, 9 B.C. (i.e., Tiberius' ovation). Further, Dio 56.1.1 is nowhere adduced.

¹⁶B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician* (London 1976), 61 f. See further the note discussing the various theories (244, n. 53): Miss Levick there states that L. R. Taylor refers the January 16 item "to the ovation of 9 B.C., probably rightly."

A.D. 9 entered on office." That is in Dio, when Dio's language is not misinterpreted.

2) Tiberius was certainly in Rome again, during the winter of 9/10. He dedicated the Temple of Concordia Augusta on January 16 of A.D. 10.

3) The assumption is not valid that Tiberius dedicated the temple on the day of his arrival; and Tiberius arrived before the end of 9, as Suetonius shows (*Tib.* 17.2, cf. 18.1).

4) The ceremony recorded in the *Fasti Praenestini*. There remains Tiberius' Pannonian ovation which, as indicated above, should fall late in 10 B.C. or early in 9. That was proposed long ago by L. R. Taylor.

Ti. Caesar ex Pan[nonia ovans urbem intr]avit.

There is nothing against January 16 of 9 B.C.; and it has been accepted in a standard manual.¹⁷ A verbal change, however, should be made: Bersanetti's *ovans triumph*avit.

Along with his brother Drusus, Tiberius accompanied Augustus from Gaul to Rome towards the end of 10 B.C. (Dio 54.36.4). The January day was therefore convenient as well as auspicious. On the other hand, those who insist on bringing Ti. Caesar from Illyricum to make an official entrance on January 16, precisely (whether in A.D. 9 or in A.D. 10), are cruel or innocent, oblivious to the hazards and hardships of mid-winter. When Agrippa came back from a Pannonian campaign (of 13/12) he perished not long after, in the month of March (Dio 54.28.2 f.).

In many erudite controversies the time comes for asking unfriendly questions. The fuss about a ceremony on January 16 arose from a date registered on an epigraphic calendar. It has caused much harm and confusion.¹⁸ A decision or a solution makes little difference to history.

WOLFSON COLLEGE, OXFORD

¹⁷L. R. Taylor, *AJP* 58 (1937) 186. Followed (with a reference to Hohl's contrary opinion) in V. Ehrenberg-A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*² (Oxford 1955) 45.

As for the Pannonian ovation, Hohl (16) declared that Jan. 16 of 9 B.C. was too early, of 8 B.C. (Bersanetti's date) too late. He put it in 9 B.C., but nowhere indicated the season of the year he advocated.

¹⁸As notably when the literary evidence is slighted or misunderstood, when passages in Suetonius and Dio referring to distinct events suffer conflation.