AHIS3120 - The Julio-Claudians: The Emergence of Empire
Course Outline

Course Co-ordinator: Jane Bellemore
Room: MGLG24
Ph: 4921 5231
Fax: 4921 6933
Email: Jane.Bellemore@newcastle.edu.au
Consultation hours: Open hours (by appointment)

Semester: Semester 2 - 2010
Unit Weighting: 10
Teaching Methods: Lecture Tutorial

Brief Course Description
Studies aspects of the rule of the first Roman emperors. Emphasis falls on political change towards a court-based society, and the development of a dynastic system.

Contact Hours
Lecture for 2 Hours per Week for 13 Weeks
Tutorial for 1 Hour per Week for 12 Weeks
Tutorials run weeks 2-13

Learning Materials/Texts
Matyszk, Ph. The Sons of Caesar: Imperial Rome’s First Dynasty, Thames & Hudson: London. 2006.

Course Objectives
1. Isolating the most important sources on the Julio-Claudians and gaining an understanding of their coverage and limitations.

2. Developing of a critical approach to early imperial Rome.

3. Understanding the operation of imperial politics, and differences of emphasis from the Republican period.

Course Outline Issued and Correct as at: Week 1, Semester 2 - 2010

CTS Download Date: 9th July, 2010
4. Appreciation of the operation of court society and its impact on social structure.

5. Ability to express such appreciation and criticisms succinctly and accurately.

**Course Content**

The emergence of the imperial system

The Senate and the Emperor

Social Change in the Empire

Imperial Succession

Change in the age of the Julio-Claudians

**Assessment Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progressive coursework and a major essay.</td>
<td>TOTAL : 4000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two tutorial papers or equivalent task</td>
<td>Two tutorial papers or equivalent task @ 25% (circa 1000 words each) = 50% - due early-mid &amp; late-end semester. These papers aim at training students in assessing the bias and content of major sources in relation to a specific historical problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major essay or equivalent task</td>
<td>One major essay or equivalent task = 50% (circa 2000 words) - due late-end semester. This is a major individual research and writing assignment selected from a choice of topics related to central themes of the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumed Knowledge**

20 units at any level in Ancient History or History

**Callaghan Campus Timetable**

**AHIS3120 Julio-Claudians**

Enquiries: School of Humanities and Social Science

Semester 2 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>and Lecture</th>
<th>and Tutorial</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:00</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:00-10:00</td>
<td>[V109]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:00</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>[W238]</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT UNIVERSITY INFORMATION**

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

Academic integrity, honesty, and a respect for knowledge, truth and ethical practices are fundamental to the business of the University. These principles are at the core of all academic endeavour in teaching, learning and research. Dishonest practices contravene academic values, compromise the integrity of research and devalue the quality of learning. To preserve the quality of learning for the individual and others, the University may impose severe sanctions on activities that undermine academic integrity. There are two major categories of academic dishonesty:

**Academic fraud** is a form of academic dishonesty that involves making a false representation to gain an unjust advantage. Without limiting the generality of this definition, it can include:

a) falsification of data;

b) using a substitute person to undertake, in full or part, an examination or other assessment item;

c) reusing one's own work, or part thereof, that has been submitted previously and counted towards another course (without permission);
d) making contact or colluding with another person, contrary to instructions, during an examination or other assessment item;

e) bringing material or device(s) into an examination or other assessment item other than such as may be specified for that assessment item; and

f) making use of computer software or other material and device(s) during an examination or other assessment item other than such as may be specified for that assessment item.

g) contract cheating or having another writer compete for tender to produce an essay or assignment and then submitting the work as one's own.

**Plagiarism** is the presentation of the thoughts or works of another as one's own. University policy prohibits students plagiarising any material under any circumstances. Without limiting the generality of this definition, it may include:

a) copying or paraphrasing material from any source without due acknowledgment;

b) using another person's ideas without due acknowledgment;

c) collusion or working with others without permission, and presenting the resulting work as though it were completed independently.

**Turnitin** is an electronic text matching system. During assessing any assessment item the University may -

- Reproduce this assessment item and provide a copy to another member of the University; and/or
- Communicate a copy of this assessment item to a text matching service (which may then retain a copy of the item on its database for the purpose of future checking).
- Submit the assessment item to other forms of plagiarism checking

**RE-MARKS AND MODERATIONS**

Students can access the University's policy at: [http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000769.html](http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000769.html)

**MARKS AND GRADES RELEASED DURING TERM**

All marks and grades released during term are indicative only until formally approved by the Head of School.

**SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES AFFECTING ASSESSMENT ITEMS**

*Extension of Time for Assessment Items, Deferred Assessment and Special Consideration for Assessment Items or Formal Written Examinations* items must be submitted by the due date in the Course Outline unless the Course Coordinator approves an extension. Unapproved late submissions will be penalised in line with the University policy specified in [Late Penalty](http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000641.html) (under student) at the link above.

Requests for Extensions of Time must be lodged no later than the due date of the item. This applies to students:

- applying for an extension of time for submission of an assessment item on the basis of medical, compassionate, hardship/trauma or unavoidable commitment; or
- whose attendance at or performance in an assessment item or formal written examination has been or will be affected by medical, compassionate, hardship/trauma or unavoidable commitment.

Students must report the circumstances, with supporting documentation, as outlined in the Special Circumstances Affecting Assessment Items Procedure at: [http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000641.html](http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000641.html)

**Note:** different procedures apply for minor and major assessment tasks.

**Students should be aware of the following important deadlines:**

- Special Consideration Requests must be lodged no later than 3 working days after the due date of submission or examination.
- Rescheduling Exam requests must be received no later than 10 working days prior the first date of the examination period.
Late applications may not be accepted. Students who cannot meet the above deadlines due to extenuating circumstances should speak firstly to their Program Officer or their Program Executive if studying in Singapore.

**STUDENTS WITH A DISABILITY OR CHRONIC ILLNESS**

University is committed to providing a range of support services for students with a disability or chronic illness. If you have a disability or chronic illness which you feel may impact on your studies please feel free to discuss your support needs with your lecturer or course coordinator.

Disability Support may also be provided by the Student Support Service (Disability). Students must be registered to receive this type of support. To register contact the Disability Liaison Officer on 02 4921 5766, email at: student-disability@newcastle.edu.au. As some forms of support can take a few weeks to implement it is extremely important that you discuss your needs with your lecturer, course coordinator or Student Support Service staff at the beginning of each semester. For more information on confidentiality and documentation visit the Student Support Service (Disability) website: www.newcastle.edu.au/services/disability.

**CHANGING YOUR ENROLMENT**

Students enrolled after the census dates listed in the link below are liable for the full cost of their student contribution or fees for that term.

http://www.newcastle.edu.au/study/fees/censusdates.html

Students may withdraw from a course without academic penalty on or before the last day of term. Any withdrawal from a course after the last day of term will result in a fail grade.

**Students cannot enrol in a new course after the second week of term**, except under exceptional circumstances. Any application to add a course after the second week of term must be on the appropriate form, and should be discussed with staff in the Student Hubs or with your Program Executive at PSB if you are a Singapore student.

To check or change your enrolment online go to myHub: https://myhub.newcastle.edu.au

**STUDENT INFORMATION & CONTACTS**

Various services are offered by the Student Support Unit: www.newcastle.edu.au/service/studentsupport/

The Student Hubs are a one-stop shop for the delivery of student related services and are the first point of contact for students studying in Australia. Student Hubs are located at:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Callaghan Campus</th>
<th>Port Macquarie Student Hub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortland Hub: Level 3, Shortland Building</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Hub: Level 2, Student Services Centre</td>
<td>A Block, Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Precinct</td>
<td>Widderson Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hub &amp; Information Common, University House</td>
<td>Port Macquarie NSW 2444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Campus (Ourimbah)</td>
<td>Phone: 49215000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Hub: Opposite the Main Cafeteria</td>
<td>Singapore students contact your PSB Program Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Websites</th>
<th>Dean of Students Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/business-law/">www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/business-law/</a></td>
<td>The Dean of Students and Deputy Dean of Students work to ensure that all students receive fair and equitable treatment at the University. In doing this they provide information and advice and help students resolve problems of an academic nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/engineering/">www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/engineering/</a></td>
<td>Phone: 02 4921 5806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/health/">www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/health/</a></td>
<td>Fax: 02 4921 7151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/science-it/">www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/science-it/</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Dean-of-Students@newcastle.edu.au">Dean-of-Students@newcastle.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rules Governing Undergraduate Academic Awards

School of Humanities and Social Science
This course outline will not be altered after the second week of the term except under extenuating circumstances with Head of School approval. Students will be notified in advance of the change.

**Online Tutorial Registration:**

Students are required to enrol in the Lecture and a specific Tutorial time for this course via the Online Registration system. Refer - [http://www.newcastle.edu.au/study/enrolment/regdates.html](http://www.newcastle.edu.au/study/enrolment/regdates.html)

NB: Registrations close at the end of week 2 of semester.

**Studentmail and Blackboard:** Refer - [www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/](http://www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/)

This course uses Blackboard and studentmail to contact students, so you are advised to keep your email accounts within the quota to ensure you receive essential messages. To receive an expedited response to queries, post questions on the Blackboard discussion forum if there is one, or if emailing staff directly use the course code in the subject line of your email. Students are advised to check their studentmail and the course Blackboard site on a weekly basis.

**Important Additional Information**

Details about the following topics are available on your course Blackboard site (where relevant). Refer - [www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/](http://www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/)

- Written Assignment Presentation and Submission Details
- Online copy submission to Turnitin
- Penalties for Late Assignments
- Special Circumstances
- No Assignment Re-submission
- Re-marks & Moderations
- Return of Assignments
- Preferred Referencing Style
- Student Representatives
- Student Communication
- Essential Online Information for Students
JULIO-CLAUDIAN FAMILY TREE

Gaiaus Julius Caesar ———— Marcia
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Gaiaus Julius Caesar ———— Aurelia
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# Lecture and Tutorial List – 2010.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lectures</th>
<th>Tutorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>28(^{th}) July</td>
<td>The Empire in AD 14 Sources for the Julio-Claudians</td>
<td>No tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4(^{th}) August</td>
<td><em>Domus Augusta</em> Accession of Tiberius</td>
<td>1. <em>Images of Empire</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>11(^{th}) August</td>
<td>Tiberius and Germanicus Piso and Germanicus</td>
<td>2. <em>Livia: wife, mother, stepmother, and part-time murderer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>18(^{th}) August</td>
<td>Tiberius and the Senate Rise and Fall of Sejanus</td>
<td>3. <em>The trial of Piso</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>25(^{th}) August</td>
<td>Treason Trials Trial of Jesus</td>
<td>4. <em>‘Conspiracy’ of Sejanus</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First Commentary due Week 6 (1\(^{st}\) September)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lectures</th>
<th>Tutorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1(^{st}) September</td>
<td>Last years of Tiberius Reign of Gaius/Caligula</td>
<td>5. <em>Julio-Claudians</em> (DVD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>15(^{th}) September</td>
<td>Claudius and the Senate Claudius and his court</td>
<td>7. <em>Aqueducts; Fucine Lake</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>22(^{nd}) September</td>
<td>Claudius and the Provinces Death of Claudius</td>
<td>8. <em>Pliny and Pallas</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEMESTER BREAK** (Monday, 27\(^{th}\) September – Friday, 8\(^{th}\) October)
### Lecture and Tutorial List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lectures</th>
<th>Tutorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Second Commentary, due Week 10</strong> (13th October)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10.  | 13th October | *quinquennium Neronis*  
Nero as Emperor | 9. *Julio-Claudians DVD*            |
| 11.  | 20th October| Nero’s Building programme  
Pisonian Conspiracy | 10. *The murder of Agrippina*      |
| 12.  | 27th October| Corbulo in the East  
Jewish Revolt | 11. *Great Fire of Rome*           |
| 13.  | 3rd November| Fall of Nero  
Impact of the Julio-Claudians | 12. *Julio-Claudians - DVD*        |

**Major Essay Due (Monday, 8th November)**

**Assessment:**

1. Sources assignment One 25% (Wednesday 1st September)
2. Sources assignment Two 25% (Wednesday 13th October)
3. Major Essay 50% (Monday, 8th November)

---

**Jane Bellemore, course co-ordinator, ph. 4921 5231, room MCLG 24**

*Jane.Bellemore@newcastle.edu.au*
Notes on Bibliography

**Main Ancient Sources for Julio-Claudians (available on-line)**


http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/home.html

http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Tacitus/home.html

http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Velleius_Paterculus/home.html

Some important documentary sources for the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius have been translated by the Documentary Research Centre at Macquarie University:
http://www.anchist.mq.edu.au/doccentre/Aug&Tib.html

**Modern References:**

There are many reference books that you may consult for his course; for example, the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*³, edd S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. Oxford: OUP, 1996, available both in the reference section of the library [R938.003 OXFO 1996] and on line at:

Apart from searching the net (Google, Google Scholar, Google Books, Google images), you might also search the library catalogue with its very useful collection of materials available in electronic form (Subject data bases – Classics) See http://libguides.newcastle.edu.au/classics

All books and articles cited as reading for the tutorials should be available in the Short-Loans Section of the Auchmuty Library or on-line. They may, in addition, be available as 3-day loans or on the open shelves.

There are books on all of the major characters of the Julio-Claudian period (on Tiberius: B. Levick, R. Seager; on Livia, Gaius Caligula, Agrippina: A.A. Barrett; on Claudius: B. Levick (and others); on Nero: M. Griffin (and others), and so I will assume that you will be using these to fill gaps in the reading for tutorials and lectures

**Notes on Assessment**

**Commentaries**

I have compiled an exemplar of a commentary-style exercise, which can be found in this booklet. This example is not meant to be prescriptive since each excerpt from the sources is different and must be treated individually, but the general format should be followed.

**Essay**

Precise topics for the essay will be handed out during the semester, but the general idea will be to examine the historical reliability of the sources as they portray some incident, theme or personality. All the work that we do during tutorials and for the commentary exercises will give you practice in the techniques required for the essay, and, on this basis, you will be in a good position to evaluate any material to be found in the ancient sources.
Tutorial One (Week Two)

Images of Empire

One of the more unusual forms of representation by the Julio-Claudians is that to be found on cameos (not like modern brooches, but more like plates), depictions sculpted on expensive, coloured onyx.

Consider the three (of many surviving) cameos given below, all of which are freely available on the web but are also to be found in books:

1. Gemma Augustea

![Gemma Augustea Cameo](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/4/45/Kunsthistorisches_Museum_Vienna_June_2006_031.png)

Address the following questions:

Can we identify any of the people represented on the cameo?
Does the cameo suggest monarchy?
Are the figures true to life or representational?
What are the figures doing?
What incidental imagery is present? What do these other items represent?

What is the overall impression to be conveyed by the cameo?

Who might have commissioned such an item? Why? When? Where would such an image have been shown?

Note: a specific description of this cameo is given by N.H. Ramage & A. Ramage in *Roman Art*, Laurence King: London, 1995, 116-7; also numbered and named by [http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/0/06/Gemma_Augusta(numbers).png](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/0/06/Gemma_Augusta(numbers).png)
2. Grand Camée


Address the following questions:

Can we identify the individuals represented on the cameo?
What do the figures and the imagery imply about the Roman Empire?
What do all the various parts of the cameo represent?

What does the ‘tableau’ suggest of the importance of the women of the imperial family?
What about the deification of the emperor?

Compare the GC with the Gemma Augustea. What do the cameos have in common and how do they differ?
3. Gemma Claudia

http://www.sdu.dk/-/media/Images/Om_SDU/Institutter/Ihks/Skulptursamlingen/Rom/106%20billede%20B.jpg

Address the following questions:

Can we identify any of the people represented on the cameo?
What are the figures suggesting in their poses?

What incidental imagery is present and what does this represent?
What is the overall impression to be conveyed by this cameo?

Who might have commissioned such an item? Why? When? Where would such an image have been shown?
What do these three representations tell us about the Domus Augusta as a whole and its development?
Bibliography

Balsdon, J.P.V.D. ‘Gaius and the Grand Cameo of Paris’, *JRS* 26 (1936) 152-60
Bartman, E. *Portraits of Livia: Imaging the imperial women in Augustan Rome*, Cambridge, 1999 [Q733.5 BART]
Richter, G.M.A. *Engraved gems of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans*, London, Phaidon, [1968-71] [Q736.2 RICH Pt. 1, Pt. 2]
Severy, B. *Augustus and the family at the birth of the Roman Empire*, New York, 2003 [937.07 SEVE]
Zanker, P. *Power of images in the age of Augustus*, trans A. Shapiro, Ann Arbor, 1990 [937.06 ZANK], esp. 210 ff.
Image of Livia

http://www.vroma.org/images/mcmanus_images/livia.jpg
Tutorial Two (Week Three)

Livia: wife, mother, step-mother, and part-time murderess

Comb the sources for comments concerning Livia:

1. **Role in the promotion of Tiberius:**
   - Tacitus *Annals* 1.3-5, 1.7, 1.10, 1.14, cf. 2.42
   - Suetonius *Tiberius* 12, 14, 21, 26, cf. 50-1
   - Dio 56.31; 57.3, 57.12, cf. 58.2 (excerpt from Dio’s *Roman History*)

   Q. What is the focus of the problem that Tacitus has with Livia’s promotion of Tiberius? Are criticisms being levelled at Livia alone, or are there other targets; for example, Tiberius or even the principate itself? Does Suetonius (*Tib.* 21) suggest a different rationale for Augustus’ promotion of Tiberius? See J. Bellemore, ‘Tiberius and Rhodes’, *Klio* 89 (2007) 417-53

2. **Role in the death of Augustus:**
   - Tacitus *Annals* 1.5 (See Goodyear’s commentary on Tacitus’ *Annals*)
   - Dio Cassius 56.30.1-2; cf. 56.30
   - Cf. Suetonius *Augustus* 98-9, *Tiberius* 21

   Q. How can such a charge against Livia be true? Was this contemporary gossip or did it ‘come to light’ only after the downfall of the Julio-Claudians (e.g. Dio 56.45.3–46.1)? What is the ultimate purpose of this criticism?

3. **Role in the dismissal and death of Agrippa Postumus:**
   - Tacitus *Annals* 1.3, 1.4, 1.6
   - Suetonius *Tiberius* 2
   - Dio 57.3, cf. 55.32.1-2

4. **Role in the deaths of others**
   - Tacitus *Annals* 1.3 (Gaius and Lucius); 1.5 (Fabius Maximus)

   Q. How much power do the sources believe that Livia wielded? Could she have been powerful enough to rid the state of all these men, supposed rivals to Tiberius (and their helpers)?

5. **Hatred of Germanicus/Agrippina:**
   - Tacitus *Annals* 1.33, 2.43, cf. 5.3 (Livia protected Agrippina)
   - Dio 57.18 (excerpts)

   Note also Livia’s obituary: Tacitus *Annals* 5.1; Dio 58.2; cf. Velleius Paterculus 2.130

   In the case of the *Annals*, much of the criticism of Livia appears in the Book One. How would such material have influenced the reader?

   What can we tell about the other sources through their criticism of Livia?

**Ancient Sources** (for full bibliographical details, see p.8)

- Dio Cassius *Roman History* (complete works)

- Suetonius *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*
  [http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/home.html](http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/home.html)

- Tacitus *Annals*

- Velleius Paterculus *Compendium of Roman History*
Modern Sources

Bartman, E. Portraits of Livia: imaging the imperial woman in Augustan Rome. Cambridge, CUP 1999 [Q733.5 BART]
Severy, B. Augustus and the family at the birth of the Roman Empire, New York, Routledge, 2003 [937.07 SEVE]
Vidén, G., Women in Roman literature: attitudes of authors under the early empire. Göteborg, Sweden: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, c1993) [870.9 VIDE]
Watson, P. Ancient stepmothers: myth, misogyny, and reality. Leiden, Brill, 1995 [880.09 WATS]
Tutorial Three (Week Four)

**Trial of Piso**

In AD 19 Germanicus, the adopted, elder son of Tiberius and heir-apparent to the principate, died near Antioch in Syria. In the following year, the ex-governor of Syria, Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso was arraigned in Rome on a number of charges, including the murder of Germanicus. The charges were examined in the senate, with Tiberius presiding over the court.

In Book Two of the *Annals* Tacitus gives us an account both of Germanicus’ and Piso’s movements leading up to Germanicus’ death, and in Book Three he relates the subsequent proceedings in the senate against Piso. In addition, we also possess an inscription transcribing a record of the relevant senatorial meeting(s) concerning the treason charges laid against Piso, called *Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre (SCPP)*. This decree of the senate was validated by Tiberius himself, and, in effect, was the ‘official’ version of events. This gives us a unique opportunity to compare and contrast what the imperial house claimed as the true record of the events of AD 19-20 and how Tacitus treated this same material.

There are naturally some major differences between the accounts, the first being that the ambit of Tacitus’ version is much broader than that detailed in the SCPP, and that the official account deals only with the treason charges against Piso, since Piso was officially found not guilty of the murder, as Tacitus himself relates (*Annals* 3.14).

1. We will consider first the charge that Piso murdered Germanicus. Whom do the sources blame for Germanicus’ death? Why do they think that Germanicus was murdered? How was he allegedly killed?

   - Tacitus *Annals* 2.5, 2.43, 2.69-72, 2.75; 2.82, 3.3-6, 3.7-8, 3.10, 3.12, 3.13-4, 3.17; cf. 3.31
   - Suetonius *Tiberius* 52, *Gaius* 1-2
   - Dio 57.3.1-4.1, 57.13.6, 57.18.6-10, 57.26.1

   Consider also the *SCPP*; see M. Griffin, ‘The Senate’s Story’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 87 (1997) 249-63 (below). *SCPP* lines 25-35, 60-70:

2. Examine the relationship between Tiberius and Piso (and Plancina) after the death of Germanicus. What were the main grounds for the treason charges? See Tacitus *Annals* 2.75-81, 3.10-12, 3.14-19; *SCPP* 5-120

3. What were the purposes of the *SCPP*? See esp. *SCPP* 124 ff.

4. Did Tacitus use the *SCPP* as a source for his *Annals*? If so, what does his account reveal about his attitude to Livia and Tiberius?

**Senatorial Decree concerning Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso (the father) = SCPP**

Decree of the Senate concerning Cn(aeus) Piso Senior, published in the proconsulship of N(umerius) Vibius Serenus

1 On the fourth day before the Ides of December (10 December) on the Palatine in the portico which is by the temple of Apollo, There were present at the drafting of the decree M(arus) Valerius Messallinus, son of Marcus, of the tribe Lemenia; C(aius) Ateius Capito, son of Lucius, of the tribe Aniensi; Sex(tus) Pompeius eius, son of Sextus, of the tribe Arnensis; M(arius) Pompeo Priscus, son of Marcus, of the tribe Teretina; C(aius) Arrenus Gallus, son of Caius, of the tribe Galeria; L(ucius) Nonius Asprenas, son of Lucius, of the tribe Pomptina, q ueastro; M(arius) Vinicius, son of Publius, of the tribe Pobilia, q ueastor).

Whereas Ti(berius) Caesar Aug(ustus), son of the divine Aug(ustus), 5 pontifex maximus, in his XXII tribunician power, consul for the third time, designated for the fourth time, referred to the senate for decision: how the case of Cn. Piso Senior was regarded and whether in their view he took his own life deservedly; and how the case of M. Piso was regarded, to which item he added that this House should be mindful of his pleas on behalf of the young man; < and> how the case of Plancina was regarded for whom he had presented earlier his pleas and the reasons for them

10 and what the senate's judgement was concerning Visellius Carus and Sempronius Bassus, members of the staff of Cn. Piso Senior concerning these matters the senate decreed as follows:

That the senate and the Roman people give thanks above all to the immortal gods because they did not suffer the wicked plans of Cn. Piso Senior to disturb the present tranquil condition of the commonwealth, than which no better could be desired and which the beneficence of our Princeps has 15 made it possible to enjoy; then to Ti. Caesar Augustus their Princeps for making available to the senate everything necessary to determining the truth - the senate admires his fairness and patience on this count
too, that, although the crimes of Cn. Piso Senior could not be more apparent and he had inflicted the death penalty on himself, none the less he (Tiberius) wanted a formal enquiry into his (Piso’s) case to be held
20 and summoning his sons, urged them to defend their father’s case, to the extent that he wished even the son who was not yet a member of the senate to be brought into the senate for that purpose and that he gave them both the opportunity to speak for their father, for their mother, and for M. Piso. That accordingly, inasmuch as the case has been pleaded over a number of days by the prosecutors of Cn. Piso Senior and by Cn. Piso Senior himself, letters have been read out as well as copies of the memoranda which

25 Germanicus Caesar had written to Cn. Piso Senior, witnesses of every order have been brought before the court, <the senate> is convinced that the exceptional restraint and patience of Germanicus Caesar was exhausted by the brutish behaviour of Cn. Piso Senior and that for this reason, when dying, Germanicus Caesar, who himself bore witness that Cn. Piso was the cause of his death, renounced his friendship with the man, not without good cause: this man (Piso), - although he should have kept in mind that he was assigned as an Assistant

30 to Germanicus Caesar, who had been dispatched by our Princeps with the authority of this House to put overseas affairs in order, affairs which called for the presence either of Ti. Caesar Aug. himself or of one of his two sons, without regard for the majesty of the house of Augustus, without regard even for public law in that he, when he had been attached to a proconsul, and indeed to a proconsul for whom a law had actually been passed by the people to the effect that in whatever province he entered he would have greater imperium.

35 than the person who was governing that province as proconsul, with the proviso that in every respect Ti. Caesar Aug. was to have greater imperium than Germanicus Caesar, conducted himself while he was in the province of Syria if everything ought to be a matter for his decision and authority - (this man) stirred up war with Armenia and Parthia, as far as lay within his power, in that he was unwilling, despite the instructions of our Princeps and the many letters which Germanicus Caesar wrote when he was away, for Vonones, who was an object of

40 suspicion to the Parthian King, to be moved farther away so that he might be unable to escape from custody (which he did), and in that he allowed some evil and reckless persons in the ranks of the Armenians to converse with Vonones to the end that disorder might be provoked in Armenia and that once the King of Armenia, whom Germanicus Caesar had assigned as king to that people in accordance with the wishes of his father and of the senate, had been killed or expelled, Vonones might take his place

45 and these things he did, corrupted by large bribes from Vonones. He also tried to foment civil war, when all the evils of civil war had long since been buried through the numen of the divine Augustus and the virtues of Ti. Caesar Aug., by trying to regain, after the death of Germanicus, the province of Syria which he had abandoned while Germanicus was still alive - a deed wicked both in its intent and in the example it provided, and on that account Roman soldiers were forced into conflict with each other, when he had also manifested

50 his unparalleled cruelty by inflicting the death penalty on many without hearing their cases, without consulting his consilium, and by crucifying not only foreigners but also a centurion, a Roman citizen; he had destroyed the military discipline established by the divine Augustus and maintained by Ti. Caesar Aug., not only by allowing soldiers not to obey in the traditional manner those in command of them, but also by giving donatives in his own

55 name from the fiscus of our Princeps, a deed which, he was pleased to see, led to some soldiers being called ‘Pisonians’, others ‘Caesarians’, and by going on to confer distinctions on those who, after usurping such a name, had shown him obedience; he dared, after the death of Germanicus Caesar, whose loss not only the Roman people but foreign nations as well mourned, to send to his most excellent and forbearing parent, a document accusing him (Germanicus), forgetting not

60 only the respect and affection due to a son of the Princeps, but even common humanity which does not permit feuds to be carried on after death; that he rejoiced in his death was obvious to the senate from the following evidence: that wicked sacrifices were offered by him, that the ships in which he sailed were decorated, that he reopened the temples of the immortal gods which the unwavering devotion of the whole Roman

65 Empire had closed; evidence of the same attitude was to be found in the fact that he had given a present of money to the man who informed him of the death of Germanicus Caesar; and it was also proven that on several occasions he had held banquets during those very days in which he had been informed of the death of Germanicus Caesar; it was also the opinion of the senate that the numen of the divine Augustus was violated by him in that he removed every sign of honour that had been accorded to his memory or to those portraits

70 which were [dedicated] to him before he was included in the number of the gods. That for these reasons the senate believes that he did not undergo the punishment he deserved but saved himself from the harsher one which he inferred from the devotion to duty and the strictness of the judges was threatening him; therefore it adds to the punishments which he inflicted on himself: that no mourning for
his death be undertaken by the women by whom he should have been mourned, in accordance with 
ancestral custom, had this decree of the 
75 senate not been passed; and that the statues and portraits of Cn. Piso Senior, wherever they may have 
been placed, be removed; that whoever shall at any time belong to the Calpurnian family or be connected 
to the family by blood or marriage will have acted rightly and properly if they take care, when anyone 
who belongs to that gens or who is one of those who is connected by blood or marriage to the Calpurnian 
family has died and is 
80 to be mourned, that the portrait of Cn. Piso senior shall not be brought out with the rest of the portraits 
<with which> they customarily solemnize the processions at their funerals nor placed among the portraits 
of the Calpurnian family; and that the name of Cn. Piso Senior be removed from the inscription on the 
statue of Germanicus Caesar which the sodales Augustales had erected to him in the Campus next to the 
Altar of Providentia; and that the property of Cn. Piso Senior be declared public property 
85 with the exception of the saltus which is in Illyricum. This saltus, it has been decided, should be 
returned to Ti. Caesar Augustus our Princeps, by whose father divus Aug. it was given to Cn. Piso Senior, 
since he (Tiberius) had expressed the wish that it be given to him because <the communities> whose 
territory borders that of the saltus have often complained of injuries from Cn. Piso Senior, his freedmen 
and slaves, and for this reason he thinks care should be taken 
90 that the allies of the Roman people should no longer be able to complain with just cause. Likewise the 
senate, mindful of its clemency, justice and generosity of spirit, virtues which it has inherited from its 
ancestors and also learned in particular from divus Aug. and Ti. Caesar Aug., its Principes, deems it fair 
and humane that from that confiscated goods of Cn. Piso Senior half of the property be given, in the name of 
the Principes and the senate, to his elder son Piso, about whom nothing had been said (sc. during the 
hearing), who had served as q(uaestor) of our Principes, whom 
95 Germanicus also had honoured with his liberality, and who had given many indications of his restraint 
which made it possible to hope that he would turn out very different from his father; and that he, under the 
obligation of so great a favour, would be behaving rightly and appropriately if he changed his first name, 
that of his father; 
100 and that to M. Piso - to whom the senate, in agreement with the humanity and restraint of its 
Principes, thought impunity should be given - so that the favour of the senate might more easily accrue to 
him unspoiled, the other half of his father's property should be given, and in such a way that from the 
whole of the estate which had been declared public property by senatorial decree and conceded to them, 
one million sesterces be given to Calpurnia, the 
105 daughter of Cn. Piso, as dowry and likewise four million sesterces as her peculium. Likewise the 
senate has decided that the curatores responsible for jurisdiction over public places should see to it that 
the structure which Cn. Piso Senior built above the Porta Fontinalis to connect private residences be 
removed and destroyed. That as regards the case of Plancina, against whom many extremely serious 
charges 
110 had been brought, since she was now admitting that she placed all her hope in the mercy of our 
Principes and the senate, and our Principes has often and pressingly requested from this House that the 
Senate be satisfied with the punishment of Cn. Piso Senior and spare his wife as it spared his son 
M(arcus), and pleaded himself for Plancina at the request of his mother and had very just reasons 
presented to him by her for wanting to secure her 
115 request, the senate believes that to Julia Aug., who had served the commonwealth superlatively not 
only in giving birth to our Principes but also through her many great favours towards men of every rank, 
and who rightly and deservedly could have supreme influence in what she asked from the senate, but who 
used that influence sparingly, and to the supreme piety of our Principes towards his mother, support and 
indulgence should be accorded and has decided 
120 that the punishment of Plancina should be waived. On Visellius Carus and Sempronius Bassus, 
members of the staff of Cn. Piso Senior and his associates and allies in all his misdeeds, the senate has 
decided that the penalty of aquae et ignis interdictio should be imposed by the praetor who presides over 
cases under the law of maiestas, and that their goods should be sold and the profits consigned to the 
aerarium by the praetors in charge of the aerarium. Likewise, since it is the view of the senate that Ti. 
Caesar Aug. our Principes has surpassed all parties in his devotion to duty, 
125 + after witnessing so often < the signs > of his grief, so great and so enduring, + by which the senate 
has also been deeply moved, it makes a strong plea and request that he devote all the care that he 
previously divided between his two sons to the one whom he still has, and the senate hopes that the 
immortal gods will devote all the more care to the one who remains, the more they realize that all hope for 
the position which his father holds to 
130 the benefit of the commonwealth rests for the future on one person alone; for which reason he 
(Tiberius) should end his grief and regain for his country, not only the frame of mind, but even the 
appearance appropriate to public rejoicing; likewise the senate offers abundant praise of the restraint of 
Julia Aug. and Drusus Caesar who, in imitation of the justice of our Princeps, as this House recognizes, 
equalled their devotion to the memory of Germanicus
135 with their fairness in reserving their own judgement until the case of Cn. Piso Senior was tried; likewise of the others related by kinship to Germanicus Caesar, the senate expresses its great admiration: of Agrippinina, whom the memory of the divine Augustus, by whom she was greatly esteemed, and of her husband Germanicus, with whom she lived in unique harmony, and the many children born of their most fortunate union and who survive commend to the senate; and further the senate expresses its great admiration of Antonia the mother of Germanicus Caesar, whose only marriage was to Drusus the father of Germ(anicus), and who, through the excellence of her moral character, proved herself to the divine Augustus worthy of so close a relationship; and of Livia the sister of Germ(anicus) Caesar whom her grandmother and her father-in-law, who is also her uncle, our Priniceps, hold in the highest esteem - whose esteem, even if she did not belong to their family, she could deservedly vaunt and can do so all the more as she is a lady attached by such family ties: the senate greatly admires these ladies in equal measure for their most loyal grief and their moderation in that grief. Likewise the fact that the child’s grief felt by the sons of Germanicus at the loss of such a father and especially the grief which is, in the case of Nero Caesar, already that of a young man, and similarly the grief of his brother Ti. Germ(anicus) Caesar has not exceeded the proper limits, the senate attributes primarily to the training of their grandfather and 150 of their uncle and of Julia Aug., but nonetheless accords them praise in their own right. Likewise the senate particularly commends the conscientious efforts of the equestrian order in that it has loyally understood how important a matter and how relevant to the safety and devotion of all was at stake, and because it declared with repeated acclamations its sentiments and its grief for the wrongs of our Priniceps and of his son and did this to the advantage of the commonwealth.

155 That the senate praises the plebs as well because it joined with the equestrian order in demonstrating its devotion towards our Priniceps and the memory of his son and, although with its unrestrained enthusiasm it roused itself to the point of itself carrying out the punishment of Cn. Piso Senior, it allowed itself to follow the example of the equestrian order and be governed by our Priniceps. That likewise the senate commends the loyalty of those soldiers whose hearts were tempted 160 in vain by the criminal activity of Cn. Piso Senior and hopes that all who were soldiers in the service of our Priniceps will continue to manifest the same loyalty and devotion to the Imperial House, since they know that the safety of our empire depends on the protection of that House. The senate believes that it belongs to their concern and duty that, among those who command them at any time, the greatest authority with them should belong to those who have with the most devoted loyalty 165 honoured the name of the Caesars, which gives protection to this city and to the empire of the Roman people. And in order that the course of the proceedings as a whole may be more easily transmitted to the memory of future generations and that they may know what the senate's judgement was concerning the exceptional restraint of Germ(anicus) Caesa(r) and the crimes of Cn. Piso Senior, the senate has decided that the speech which our Priniceps delivered and also these decrees of the senate, inscribed on bronze, should be set up in whatever place seems best to Tiberius Caes(ar) Aug., and of his son and did this to the advantage of the commonwealth.

170 and that likewise this decree of the senate, inscribed on bronze, should be set up in the most frequented city of each province and in the most frequented place in that city, and that likewise this decree of the senate should be set up in the winter quarters of each legion where the standards are kept. They passed the decree. There were 301 present in the senate. This senatorial decree was passed by proposal only. I Tiberius Caesar Aug., in the XXII year of my tribuniciain power, wrote this with my own hand: it is my wish that this senatorial decree, which was 175 passed on the fourth day before the Ides of December (on 10 December) in the year when Cotta and Messalla were consuls (A.D. 20) on the basis of my proposal and was copied by the hand of my q(uaestor) Aulus on fourteen tablets, should be placed in the public archives.
Ancient Sources (details, p.8)

Dio Cassius *Roman History* (complete works)

Suetonius *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/home.html

Tacitus *Annals*
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Tacitus/home.html

Velleius Paterculus *Compendium of Roman History*
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Velleius_Paterculus/home.html

On the SCPP, see the many articles to be found at the site:
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american%5Fjournal%5Fof%5Fphilology/toc/ajp120.1.html#articles1


Modern Sources


Death of Germanicus by Nicholas Poussin

Tutorial Four (Week Five)

‘Conspiracy’ of Sejanus

The ‘conspiracy’ of Sejanus needs to be examined in two parts: his alleged role in Drusus’ death (September AD 23), which was revealed only after Sejanus’ execution eight years later; and the reason for the execution in AD 31.

1. Consider Tacitus’ description of Drusus death (Annals 4.1-3, 7-12). What problems are apparent in his account? Note also Suet. Tib. 52, Claud. 57 and Dio 57.22. Velleius Paterculus (2.127-8), however, knows nothing of suspicions against Sejanus (work written in AD 30).

What problems are apparent in these accounts? Can we really determine whether Sejanus poisoned Drusus? If not, why was this charge made against him?

If there are problems establishing a firm connection between Sejanus and the death of Drusus, are there grounds to question the assertion that Liv(i)la was involved?

Unfortunately, the sections of the Annals covering the years from 29-31 are missing, and we need to guess how Tacitus depicted Sejanus’ exposure as Drusus’ murderer. See Tacitus Annals 4.11, cf. 5.6-9, 6.2, 3 (with Suetonius Tiberius 61), 7-10, 14, 19. On the other hand, both Suetonius (Tiberius 62, cf. 55, 61, 65) and Dio (58.11) refer to a connection between Sejanus and Drusus, but we may doubt their accounts (Dio exists only in excerpted fragments at this point).

2. Secondly, consider the accusation of conspiracy made against Sejanus in October 31. Try to reconstruct the events after May AD 31. What precise form did Sejanus’ conspiracy allegedly take?

For this, read relevant sections of Dio’s Book 58. See also Suet. Tib. 48, 55, 61, 65; Gaius 12, 30; Claud. 6, cf. 27. See also the material inscribed on the Fasti Ostienses for AD 31 (on this inscription the name ‘Apicata’ has been restored by modern editors, and I suggest that Liv(i)la is the restoration of Sejanus’ wife in October 31).

Translation by D. Braund, Augustus to Nero. London & Sydney, Croom Helm1985. See the original Latin below:

A.D. 31. (Tib. XXXIII) Ti. Caesar Aug[u]tus V
swf. Faustus Cornelius Sulla
Sex. Tediis (L. f. Valerius) Catuli[nus]
L. Fulciniius Trio
P. Memmius (P. f.) Regulus

The name of the second cos. ord., L. Aelius L. f. Seianus, is omitted (cf. our nos. 50a and 53).

Aelia[nus et] Tanilla Seiani [in Gem.] iacuerunt


Ancient Sources (details, p.8)

Dio Cassius Roman History (complete works)

Suetonius Lives of the Twelve Caesars
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/home.html

Tacitus Annals
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Tacitus/home.html

Velleius Paterculus Compendium of Roman History
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Velleius_Paterculus/home.html
Modern Sources


Boddington, A.  ‘Sejanus, whose conspiracy?’, *American Journal of Philology* 84 (1963) 1-16


Rogers, R.S.  *Studies in the reign of Tiberius*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1943

Sinclair, P.  ‘Tacitus' presentation of Livia Julia wife of Tiberius’ son Drusus’, *AJPh* 111 (1990) 238-56


Tuplin, Ch.J.  ‘The false Drusus of a.d. 31 and the fall of Sejanus’, *Latomus* 46 (198) 781-805

Tutorial 5 (Week Six)

*Julio-Claudians – DVD*

There will be a showing of a DVD in this week that considers some aspect of the Julio-Claudian principate. Following the showing, there will be a discussion of the main aspects of the film. Attendance at this showing is optional.

Coin of the twin sons of Drusus and Livia

[Image of coin]

http://www.vroma.org/images/mcmanus_images/ib_drususchildren.jpg
Praetorian Guard

http://image.absoluteastronomy.com/images/encyclopediaimages/p/pr/praetorian_guards_soldiers_basrelief_cropped.jpg
Commentary Exercise 1  
Due 1st September  
Worth 25%

Comment on TWO of the following five passages, one taken from the first four tutorials. Your commentary on each passage must be approximately 500 words (so, 1000 words in total).

Do not link the passages you have chosen for your commentary.

1. Tacitus *Annals* 1.6

There is no doubt that Augustus had made many bitter complaints about the young man’s character and had secured ratification of Agrippa’s exile by senatorial decree. But he never brought himself to murder one of his own, and that he would have killed a grandson to provide security for a stepson beggared belief. The more likely explanation is that Tiberius and Livia hurriedly effected the assassination of a young man whom they eyed with suspicion and loathing, Tiberius out of fear, and Livia from a step-mother’s hatred.

2. Dio 56.30.1-2

So Augustus fell sick and died. Livia incurred some suspicion in connexion with his death, in view of the fact that he had secretly sailed over to the island to see Agrippa and seemed about to become completely reconciled with him. 2 For she was afraid, some say, that Augustus would bring him back to make him sovereign, and so smeared with poison some figs that were still on trees from which Augustus was wont to gather the fruit with his own hands; then she ate those that had not been smeared, offering the poisoned ones to him.

3. Tacitus *Annals* 3.17

It was morally acceptable, then, for a grandmother to look her grandson’s killer in the face, they said, and to talk to her and rescue her from the hands of the Senate. The laws were there to benefit all citizens, they said – in Germanicus’ case alone they had not been applied! There had been *lamentation* for Germanicus in the speeches of Vitellius and Veranius: Plancina had actually been *defended* by the emperor and Augusta.
4. Senatus consultum de Cn Pisone Patre 126-30 (trans M Griffin)

… it [the senate] makes a strong plea and request that he [Tiberius] devote all the care that he previously divided between his two sons to the one whom he still has, and the senate hopes that the immortal gods will devote all the more care to one who remains, the more they realise that the benefit of the commonwealth rests for the future on one man alone...

5. Tacitus Annals 4.7-8

And it was not just on rare occasions and before a few people that Drusus would throw out such reflections, either; and his secrets were also being passed on, as a result of his wife’s seduction.

Sejanus therefore felt he should speed matters up, and he chose a poison whose gradual; working would resemble some ordinary sickness. This was given to Drusus by the eunuch Lygdus (as was discovered eight years after the event).
How to deal with a source-examination exercise

The following is an exemplar to help you deal with commentary-style answers. For example, you might be provided with the following extract by Suetonius and asked to comment upon it: You may use modern sources as a guide, but your main focus is an appreciation of the ancient sources.

Exemplar

‘Such virtuous conduct brought Germanicus rich rewards. He was so deeply respected and loved by all his acquaintances that Augustus – I need hardly mention his other relatives – wondered for a long time whether to make him his successor, but at last ordered Tiberius to adopt him.’

[Suetonius Life of Gaius 4]

1) Set the piece of evidence given within a context, both the immediate and the broader context. Often this will include a specific reference to the episode and general story-line of a particular work, or to the thematic imperatives. Where possible you should date and locate the material. Consider my ‘comments’ on the above passage:

‘Suetonius is drawing a contrast between the beloved Germanicus and his ‘monster’ son Gaius. The life of the former was one of virtue and his death was regretted, whereas Gaius’ life was abhorrent and his death a source of rejoicing. After three chapters describing Germanicus in the period after AD 7, mainly during his eastern command of AD 18-19, Suetonius then claims that Germanicus’s virtues were so apparent that Augustus considered making him his outright successor in AD 4. Suetonius adds to this claim by referring to Germanicus’ triumphal return to Rome from Germany in AD 16/17 (after the death of Augustus).’

2) Discuss the problems or issues raised by the extract, citing where possible other evidence to substantiate or contradict the extract:

‘Although Suetonius’ claim is matched by Tacitus Annals 4.57, both authors deal with this notice out of the appropriate context, that either of AD 4 or 14. At the time of the adoptions in AD 4 Tiberius at 46 was an experienced general and politician. Germanicus was about 18 and untired, with no office to his name. Suetonius ignores that Augustus also adopted his last grandson, Agrippa Postumus, in 4 (cf. Suet. Tib. 15; also Vell. Pat. 2.103-4). While Augustus wanted Tiberius as his immediate successor, he clearly wanted Agrippa to succeed, not Germanicus. Had Augustus wanted Germanicus as his successor, he could have promoted him quickly, as he had his grandsons Gaius and Lucius (consuls at age 19), but he gained only the lowly rank of quaestor in AD 7; he could have made his will of AD 13 (Suet. Aug. 101) favour Germanicus, consul in AD12 and holding an important command in Germany, yet he did not do this.’

3) Resolve any problem/s.

‘Suetonius was no doubt thinking of the period around death of Augustus in AD 14 (also Tacitus Annals 1.3), when Agrippa had been disowned (Vell. Pat. 2.112.7; Tacitus Annals 1.3, Dio Cassius 55.13.1a-2, which ignores the adoption of Agrippa cf. 55.32.1-2) and Germanicus was a viable alternative to Tiberius. Suetonius elsewhere mentions Augustus’ doubts about Tiberius’ succession in the context of AD 14 (Tiberius 21) but he dismisses these, stressing that Tiberius easily brushed aside rivals (Tiberius 22, 25). Suetonius condemns himself by his inconsistency.

‘All sources want to suggest that Tiberius was not the rightful heir, and Suetonius and Tacitus agree that Germanicus was preferable. Tacitus claims that Livia dissuaded Augustus from promoting Germanicus, and Dio 57.3.3 has Livia actually change Augustus’ will, to omit Germanicus and Agrippa. All follow the same tradition, but Suetonius ignores Livia and attempts to validate his case by embedding Augustus’ preference for Germanicus in a pile of pro-Germanicus material, dated mainly after AD 14.

‘That Augustus preferred Germanicus appears implausible on chronological grounds in AD 4 and is denied later by his will, and no one could have known Augustus’ unfulfilled intentions. The story probably dates to AD 41, when Claudius was seeking legitimacy for his principate. Also, Suetonius perhaps included this suspect material to heighten the contrast between Gaius and his father.’
Tutorial 6 (Week 7)

Gaius in the North

Discuss the chronology of Gaius’ northern campaigns? Did Gaius want military glory, or did he have other concerns? Why did the emperor return to Rome in AD 40?

What would you say about the mental stability of Gaius from his actions in this period?

Ancient Sources:

Tacitus \textit{Agricola} 13 \textit{(The Agricola of Tacitus. The Oxford Translation Revised, With Notes. With An Introduction by Edward Brooks, Jr. (out of print))}

‘The Britons cheerfully submit to levies, tributes, and the other services of government, if they are not treated injuriously; but such treatment they bear with impatience, their subjection only extending to obedience, not to servitude. Accordingly Julius Caesar, the first Roman who entered Britain with an army, although he terrified the inhabitants by a successful engagement, and became master of the shore, may be considered rather to have transmitted the discovery than the possession of the country to posterity. The civil wars soon succeeded; the arms of the leaders were turned against their country; and a long neglect of Britain ensued, which continued even after the establishment of peace. This Augustus attributed to policy; and Tiberius to the injunctions of his predecessor. It is certain that Caius Caesar meditated an expedition into Britain; but his temper, precipitate in forming schemes, and unsteady in pursuing them, together with the ill success of his mighty attempts against Germany, rendered the design abortive. Claudius accomplished the undertaking, transporting his legions and auxiliaries, and associating Vespasian in the direction of affairs, which laid the foundation of his future fortune. In this expedition, nations were subdued, kings made captive, and Vespasian was held forth to the fates.’

http://ancienthistory.about.com/od/texts/l/bl_text_Tacitus_Agricola.htm

Suetonius \textit{Gaius} 43-49; also \textit{Gaius} 24, \textit{Galba} 6, \textit{Vespasian} 2


http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/home.html

Dio Cassius 59.21ff.


See also the following extract by Orosius \textit{Against the Pagans} 7.5.5 (trans. J. Bellemore):

‘It is true that Gaius set out fully equipped to find the enemy, while their forces were inactive, rushing across Germany and Gaul, and he set up camp on the shore of Ocean within sight of Britannia. When he had received there the surrender of Minocynobelius, son of the king, who, expelled by his father, was wandering about with a few men, he returned to Rome, leaving behind his apparatus of war.’

Modern Sources


Barrett, A. \textit{Agrippina: sex, power, and politics in the early Empire}. London: Routledge, 1996

Bicknell, P. ‘The Emperor Gaius’ Military Activities in AD 40’, \textit{Historia} 17(1968) 496-505.


Hurley, D.W. \textit{An historical and historio-graphical commentary on Suetonius’ Life of C. Caligula}. Atlanta, Ga: Scholar’s Press, 1993

Kleijwegt, M.  ‘Caligula’s triumph at Baiae’, _Mnemosyne_ 47.5 (1994) 652-71
Lindsay, H.  _Suetonius: Caligula_. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1993
Massaro, V. and Montgomery, I.  ‘Gaius — Mad, Bad, Ill, or all Three?’, _Latomus_ 37 (1978) 894-909

**Sestertius of Gaius/Caligula (for soldiers)**

The front (obverse) on the left is the wreathed head of Caligula with the caption "C CAESAR DIVI AVG PRON AVG P M TR P III P P". On the reverse is Caligula standing on a platform addressing five helmeted soldiers with shields, parazonia and two aquila. It bears a legend "ADLOCVT COH".

[Image of Sestertius of Gaius/Caligula (for soldiers)]

There are different portraits of Claudius to be determined from different types of evidence. The literary opinion of Claudius is quite damning, as we see from the contemporary satire the Apocolocyntosis. See http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/apocolocyntosis.html, although Josephus' Jewish Wars 2.205 ff., Antiquities 19.212 ff. and Dio 60.3 ff. are more generally positive. Tacitus and Suetonius, however, present a uniformly hostile picture of Claudius’ weaknesses.

We might discern a different side to Claudius’ fitness for the principate through examination of his large-scale building projects.

1. What picture of Claudius emerges from his undertaking to build (finish) aqueducts? Note, for example, the lack of interest shown by Tacitus (Ann. 11.13).

   a. Consider Frontinus de aqueductu 1.13-5:

13. ‘After these aqueducts, Gaius Caesar, the successor of Tiberius, in the second year of his reign, in the consulate of Marcus Aquila Julianus and Publius Nonius Asprenas, in the year 791 after the founding of the City (AD 38), began two others, inasmuch as the seven then existing seemed insufficient to meet both the public needs and the luxurious private demands of the day. These works Claudius completed on the most magnificent scale, and dedicated in the consulship of Sulla and Titianus, on the 1st of August in the year 803 after the founding of the City (?AD 52-3). To the one water, which had its sources in the Caerulean and Curtian springs, was given the name Claudia. This is next to Marcia in excellence. The second began to be designated as New Anio, in order the more readily to distinguish by title the two Anios that had now begun to flow to the City. To the former Anio the name of “Old” was added.

14. ‘The intake of Claudia is at the thirty-eighth milestone on the Sublacensian Way, on a cross-road, less than three hundred paces to the left. The water comes from two very large and beautiful springs, the Caerulean, so designated from its appearance, and the Curtian. Claudia also receives the spring which is called Albudinus, which is of such excellence that, when Marcia, too, needs supplementing, this water answers the purpose so admirably that by its addition there is no change in Marcia’s quality. The spring of Augusta was turned into Claudia, because it was plainly evident that Marcia was of sufficient volume by itself. But Augusta remained, nevertheless, a reserve supply to Marcia, the understanding being that Augusta should run into Claudia only when the conduit of Marcia would not carry it. Claudia’s conduit has a length of 46,606 paces, of which 36,230 are in a subterranean channel, 10,176 on structures above ground; of these last there are at various points in the upper reaches 3,076 paces on arches; and near the City, beginning at the seventh milestone, 609 paces on substructures and 6,491 on arches.

15. ‘The intake of New Anio is at the forty-second milestone on the Sublacensian Way, in the district of Simbruvium. The water is taken from the river, which, even without the effect of rainstorms, is muddy and discoloured, because it has rich and cultivated fields adjoining it, and in consequence loose banks. For this reason, a settling reservoir was put in beyond the inlet of the aqueduct, in order that the water might settle there and clarify itself, between the river and the conduit. But even despite this precaution, the water reaches the City in a discoloured condition whenever there are rains. It is joined by the Herculanean brook, which has its source on the same Way, at the thirty-eighth milestone, opposite the springs of Claudia, beyond the river and the highway. This is naturally very clear, but loses the charm of its purity by admixture with New Anio. The conduit of New Anio measures 58,700 paces, of which 49,300 are in an underground channel, 9,400 paces above ground on masonry; of these, at various points in the upper reaches are 2,300 paces on substructures or arches; while nearer the City, beginning at the seventh milestone, are 609 paces on substructures, 6,491 paces on arches. These are the highest arches, rising at certain points to 109 feet.’

   b. Suetonius Claudius 20
   c. Pliny Natural Histories 36.122-4:

‘The preceding aqueducts, however, have all been surpassed by the costly work which was more recently commenced by the Emperor Caius, and completed by Claudius. Under these princes, the Curtian and Caerulean Waters, with the New Anio, were brought from a distance of forty miles, and at so high a level that all the hills were supplied with water, on which the City is built. The sum expended on these works was three hundred and fifty millions of sesterces. If we only take into consideration the abundant supply of water to the public, for baths, ponds, canals, household
purposes, gardens, places in the suburbs, and country-houses; and then reflect upon the distances that are traversed, the arches that have been constructed, the mountains that have been pierced, the valleys that have been levelled, we must of necessity admit that there is nothing to be found more worthy of our admiration throughout the whole universe.’

2. What picture of Claudius emerges from his undertaking to drain the Fucine Lake?
   a. Pliny NH 36.123-4
   ‘Among the most memorable works, too, I, for my own part, should include another undertaking of the Emperor Claudius, although it was afterwards abandoned in consequence of the hatred borne him by his successor; I mean the channel that was cut through a mountain as an emissary for Lake Fucinus;40 a work which cost a sum beyond all calculation, and employed a countless multitude of workmen for many years. In those parts where the soil was found to be porous, it was necessary to pump up the water by the aid of machinery; in other parts, again, the solid rock had to be hewn through. All this, too, had to be done in the midst of darkness within; a series of operations which can only be adequately conceived by those who were witnesses of them, and which no human language can possibly describe.’
   
   b. Pliny NH 33.63:
   ‘I have seen Agrippina, the wife of the emperor Claudius, at a show where he was presenting a naval battle, seated by him, wearing a military cloak made entirely of gold cloth.’
   
   c. Suet. Claud. 20.1-2, 21.6, 32; cf. Caes. 44.3
   
   d. Tacitus Annals 12.56
   
   e. Dio 61.33.305

Why did Claudius drain the Fucine Lake and who benefitted directly from this engineering project? What does this imperial interest in central Italy reveal specifically?

Why did Claudius host a naumachia (sea-battle) to open the event, and why are there discrepancies in the traditions about this? Consider the naval battles put on by Julius Caesar and by Augustus. For references to naumachiae, follow the link to Platner/Ashby:

What do these engineering works reveal about Claudius’ powers of organisation and his concern for matters outside Rome? What do they suggest about Tacitus’ literary focus?

Ancient Sources


http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/home.html

http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Tacitus/home.html
Modern Sources

Griffin, M. ‘Claudius in Tacitus’, *Classical Quarterly* 40 (1990) 482-501
Ramage, E. S. ‘Denigration of predecessor under Claudius, Galba and Vespasian’, *Historia* 32 (1983) 200-14
Thornton, M.K. ‘Julio-Claudian Building Programs: Eat, Drink, and Be Merry’, *Historia* 35.1 (1986) 28-44
Vessey, D.W.T.C. ‘Thoughts on Tacitus' portrayal of Claudius’, *AJPh* 92 (1971) 385-409
Aqueduct: Annio Novus

The Power of Pallas

Claudius’ freedman Pallas plays a prominent role throughout the *Annals*. Historically he was a go-between in the conspiracy of Sejanus and he was prominent under Gaius. According to Tacitus and Suetonius, he gained extraordinary power during the reign of Claudius. Tacitus goes so far as to suggest that Pallas was instrumental in uniting Agrippina to Claudius, and he gives many hints that Pallas was Agrippina’s lover. In the reign of Nero too, Pallas was believed so powerful that he could defy his senatorial enemies and even the emperor himself.

Tacitus claims that, in the senate in AD 52, Claudius praised Pallas as the author of a decree concerning the punishment of women (free) involved in sexual relations with slaves (*Annals* 12.53).

One of Tacitus’ contemporaries and correspondents, Pliny (the Younger) gives us further insights into the role of Pallas, during the reign of Claudius, and how this was viewed by men of his class and character.

Read what Tacitus has to say on the matter (*Ann. 12.53*):

At the same time, he submitted a motion to the Fathers, penalizing women who married slaves; and it was resolved that anyone falling so far without the knowledge of the slave’s owner should rank as in a state of servitude; while, if he had given sanction, she was to be classed as a freedwoman. That Pallas, whom the Caesar had specified as the inventor of his proposal, should receive the praetorian insignia and fifteen million sesterces, was the motion of the consul designate, Barea Soranus. It was added by Cornelius Scipio that he should be accorded the national thanks, because, descendant though he was of the kings of Arcadia, he postponed his old nobility to the public good, and permitted himself to be regarded as one of the servants of the emperor. Claudius passed his word that Pallas, contented with the honour, declined to out step his former honest poverty. And there was engraved on official brass a senatorial decree lavishing the praises of old-world frugality upon a freedman, the proprietor of three hundred million sesterces.

Compare his account with two other references given to this incident in Pliny’s *Letters*:

**Pliny Letter 7.29.2:**

To his friend Montanus

‘You will laugh, you will then be angry, but then you will laugh, should you read what you cannot credit unless you read it. On the road to Tibur, less than a mile out, I recently noticed the tomb of Pallas with the inscription: ‘For his loyalty and devotion to his patrons, the Senate decreed to him the insignia of a praetor, together with 15 million sesterces, but he was satisfied merely with the distinction.’ I myself have never admired distinctions which originated from fortune rather than good judgement. But this inscription reminded me above all how ridiculous and pointless are those which from time to time are wasted on such slime and filth. That scoundrel had the audacity both to accept and to refuse distinctions, and even to present the proffered gifts before posterity as a model of modesty. But why should I feel angry? It is better to laugh, in case such people think they have obtained something important, when by such luck they attain the status of laughing stock. Farewell.’

**Pliny Letter 8.6.4**

To his friend Montanus

‘You must now be aware from my letter that I recently noticed Pallas’ tomb bearing the inscription: ‘For his loyalty and devotion to his patrons, the Senate decreed to him the insignia of a praetor, together with 15 million sesterces, but he was satisfied merely with the distinction.’ Later I decided that it was worthwhile to look out the senatorial decree. I found it so verbose and effusive that the supreme arrogance of the inscription seemed modest and humble by comparison. I pass over the men of old like Africanus, Achaicus, and Numantius; those of most recent date, men like Marius, Sulla, and Pompey (I am reluctant to go on) should assemble and intermingle; they will fail to rise to the glories of Pallas. Am I to regard those who passed that decree as men of wit or poor wretches? I would call them men of wit, if wit were appropriate in the Senate; or wretched, except that no man is so wretched as to have that measure foisted upon him. So was it ambition, or lust for advancement? But who is so lunatic as to desire advancement by way of personal and civic shame, in a city in which exploitation of the most illustrious distinction lay in being able to be first to praise Pallas in the Senate?’

*I pass over the fact that praetorian insignia were offered to Pallas, a slave, for those who offered them were slaves; I pass over the fact that they decreed that he should be not merely encouraged, but even compelled to wear a gold ring, for it would have been an affront to the majesty of the Senate for a praetorian to wear an iron one. These are minor issues to be passed over; what must be mentioned is that the Senate in Pallas’ name (and the Senate House was not*
subsequently purified), in Pallas’ name the Senate gave thanks to Caesar both because Claudius himself had attached the highest honour to mention of his name, and because he had granted the Senate the opportunity of attesting their good will towards him. For what more splendid gesture could the Senate make, than to show itself suitably grateful to Pallas? Appended to the decree are these words: ‘That Pallas, to whom all confess their obligation as best they can, should most deservedly obtain the reward for his unique loyalty and unique diligence.’ You would think that he had extended the boundaries of empire, or brought armies back safely to the state! Subjoined to those words we read: ‘Since the Senate and the Roman people could have no more welcome means of showing their generosity than if they had been able to lend support to the wealth of the most abstemious and reliable guardian of the resources of the princeps.’ This was the prayer of the Senate at that time, this was the special source of joy of the people, this was the most welcome opportunity for their generosity, that they should enrich Pallas’ resources by disbursing public funds.

‘Then what came next? That the Senate sought to decree that 15 million sesterces be awarded him from the treasury, and the further his disinclination withdrew him from base longings of that kind, the more earnestly to beg the father of the state to force him to yield to the wishes of the Senate. The only thing lacking was that there should be discussion with Pallas by the authority of the Senate; that Pallas should be requested to yield to the Senate, and that Caesar as sponsor should be called on to counsel him in that most arrogant self-denial, so that he would not refuse the 15 million sesterces. He did refuse them; when such great wealth was offered him by the state, this was the only way he could have acted more arrogantly than by accepting it. Yet the Senate greeted even this gesture with praises in tones of complaint with these words: ‘Since the best of emperors and the father of the state, on the plea of Pallas, desired that the section of the proposal referring to the gift to him of 15 million sesterces should be rescinded, the senators bore witness that they had willingly and deservedly taken steps to decree this sum to Pallas, together with the other distinctions, to mark his loyalty and his conscientiousness, but that they were obeying the wish of the princeps in this matter, since they believed that it was not right to oppose him in any issue.’

‘Just picture Pallas vetoing, so to say, the senatorial decree, restricting the honours conferred on him, and rejecting the 15 million sesterces as excessive, after accepting the praetorian insignia as of lesser account! Just picture Caesar deferring to the plea, or rather the command, of a freedman in the presence of the Senate (for it was a command which the freedman imposed on his patron, when he made the request in the Senate). Just imagine the Senate going so far as to bear witness that it had begun, deservedly and willingly, to decree this sum to Pallas, together with the other distinctions, and that they would have proceeded with this had they not deferred to the wishes of the emperor, for it was not right to oppose him on any issue! So what was necessary to prevent Pallas obtaining the 15 million sesterces from the treasury was his own deference and the obedience of the Senate, who especially in this matter would not have obeyed had they not thought it right in no respect to refuse their obedience.

‘Do you think this is the end of the story? Hold on, and hear the major part. ‘In particular, since it is expedient that the benevolence of the emperor, which shows the greatest alacrity in praising and rewarding those who deserve it, should be famed everywhere, especially in those places where men charged with the administration of his affairs could be fired to imitate him, and the well-tried loyalty and integrity of Pallas could by his example incite enthusiasm to emulate such honourable conduct, the statement read out by the best of emperors before our most distinguished order on 23rd January last, together with the decrees of the Senate on these matters, should be engraved in bronze, and this bronze tablet should be affixed to the mailed statue of the deified Julius.’ So it seemed insufficient that the Senate House should witness scenes of such disgrace. The most crowded place in Rome was chosen where they were displayed to be read by contemporaries, and read too by posterity. It was decreed that all the honours of this most arrogant slave should be inscribed on bronze, both those which he had rejected and those which he sported so far as the proposers envisaged it. The praetorian insignia of Pallas were incised and inscribed on bronze, both those which he had willingly and deservedly taken steps to decree this sum to Pallas, together with the other distinctions, and the father of the state, on the plea of Pallas, desired that the section of the proposal referring to the gift to him of 15 million sesterces should be rescinded, the senators bore witness that they had willingly and deservedly taken steps to decree this sum to Pallas, together with the other distinctions, to mark his loyalty and his conscientiousness, but that they were obeying the wish of the princeps in this matter, since they believed that it was not right to oppose him in any issue.’

‘How consoling it is that I had no experience of those times, of which I am ashamed as if I lived during them! I have no doubt that your reaction is like mine. I know how lively and noble you are in mind, so that though I have perhaps at some points let my anger transgress the bounds of a letter, you may more easily believe that my resentment is understated rather than excessive. Farewell.’

Questions

What are the differences between the two sets of accounts? Why are they different? What do these writers reveal about current attitudes to Claudius’ freedmen and to later attitudes?
Ancient Sources
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Comment on TWO of the following passages, taken from the three most recent tutorials. Each commentary should be approximately 500 words long (total 1000 words)

Do not link the passages you have chosen for your commentary.

1. Suetonius *Gaius* 43

   Gaius had only a single taste of warfare, and even that was unpremeditated. At Mevania, where he went to visit the river Clitumnus and its sacred grove, someone reminded him that he needed Batavians recruits for his bodyguard; which suggested the idea of a German expedition. He wasted no time in summoning regular legions and auxiliaries from all directions, levied troops everywhere with the utmost strictness, and collected military supplies of all kinds on an unprecedented scale.

2. Suetonius *Claudius* 20.1

   The public works which he completed were great and essential rather than numerous; they were in particular the following: an aqueduct begun by Gaius; also the outlet of Lake Fucinus and the harbour at Ostia, although in the case of the last two he knew that Augustus had refused the former to the Marsians in spite of their frequent requests, and that the latter had often been thought of by the Deified Julius, but given up because of its difficulty. He brought to the city on stone arches the cool and abundant founts of the Claudian aqueduct, one of which is called Caeruleus and the other Curtius and Albudignus, and at the same time the spring of the new Anio, distributing them into many beautifully ornamented pools.

3. Tacitus *Annals* 12.53

   A rider to the motion, that Pallas ne giovce official thanks, was proposed by Cornelius Scipio on the grounds that, though descended from Arcadian royalty, Pallas saw his ancient nobility as secondary to the common good, and permitted himself to be regarded as one of the emperor’s servants. Claudius stated that Pallas was satisfied with the honour paid to him, and would remain within the bounds of his earlier modest condition.
4. Tacitus *Annals* 12.57

But when, on the conclusion of the spectacle, the passageway was opened for the waters, defects in the construction became clear, for it had not been excavated deeply enough to reach the bottom of the lake. And so, later on, the tunnel was dug deeper and, in order to bring together a crowd once again, a gladiatorial display was put on with pontoons set down for an infantry battle. In fact, there was even a banquet laid out at the outlet of the lake, and there was intense alarm amongst all present because the force of the gushing waters swept away everything close by, and areas further off were shaken or filled with terror from the crashing and roaring. At the same time Agrippina took advantage of the emperor’s fright to accuse Narcissus, the man responsible for the scheme, of avarice and fraud. And Narcissus did not remain silent, either, criticizing her typically female lack of restraint, and her inordinate ambition.
Tutorial 10 (Week 11)

Murder of Agrippina

Examine the Tacitean version of the murder of Agrippina.

Are there any notable inconsistencies in terms of overall plot and characterisation?

Identify any signs that Tacitus has shaped the narrative for literary effect.

What purpose has Tacitus attempted to achieve?

Assess the reliability of Tacitus’ narrative.

Ancient Sources (for bibliographical details, see p.8):

Tacitus *Annals* 13.12-22, 13.58; 14.1.13
Suetonius *Nero* 9, 28, 34
Dio Cassius Epitome of Book 62.11-17 (from A.D. 58-9)

Biographies of Nero:

On the murder:
Dawson, A. ‘Whatever happened to Lady Agrippina?’, *CJ* 64 (1969) 253-67
Katzoff, R. ‘Where Was Agrippina Murdered?’, *Historia* 22 (1973) 72-8

On Nero’s helpers:
Kleijwegt, M. ‘Nero’s Helpers’, *CLRe* 7 (2000) 72-98
(http://www.ucd.ie/classics/2000/kleijwegt.html#fn6)
Mc Dermott, W.C. ‘Sextus Afranius Burrus’, *Latomus* 8 (1949) 229-54

On methodology
Who was responsible for the fire of AD 64? Why did Nero burn to death those whom he held to be responsible for the fire?

What can we determine about Roman attitudes to Christians in the time of Nero and into the early second century?

Ancient Sources:

Tacitus Annals 15.38-44.1-8;
Suetonius Nero 11, 16, 38-39, 43
Dio 62.16-18

Note previous references to fires recorded by Suetonius: Aug. 28, 30, 57; Tib. 50; Gaius 16, 31, 59; Claud. 6, 18, 21 (punishment by fire) and 25

Regions of Rome.
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At this session we will discuss the overall importance of the Julio-Claudian dynasty.

Nero, a digital reconstruction. (Richard Sebring)