SUETONIUS
CALIGULA

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION
AND COMMENTARY
BY HUGH LINDSAY

PUBLISHED BY BRISTOL CLASSICAL PRESS
GENERAL EDITOR: JOHN H. BETTS

This impression 2002
First published in 1993 by
Bristol Classical Press
an imprint of
Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd.
61 Frith Street, London W1D 3JL
Tel: 020 7434 4242
Fax: 020 7434 4420
inquiries@duckworth-publishers.co.uk
www.ducknet.co.uk

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 1 85399 375 1

Printed in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Ltd, Eastbourne

Contents

Preface

This edition of Suetonius' *Life of Caligula* is intended to be of use to those who are interested in both historical and literary questions relating to the Suetonian life. Although it is primarily a commentary on the Latin text I hope that it may be of some use to those who are not able to read Suetonius in the original.

The work is a much revised and altered version of a Master's thesis submitted to the University of Western Australia in 1979. I am very grateful to Professor Brian Bosworth who supervised the original work. My subsequent debts are numerous, and I can name only a few. My colleagues at the University of Queensland listened to several seminars on aspects of Suetonius, and their encouragement helped me to bring the work to completion. I single out for special mention Brian Jones, who read my material on the career of Suetonius, and made valuable comments on its inadequacies. Most recently Professor Godfrey Tanner has read my view of Seneca's impact on the tradition about Caligula, and helped with a textual problem. The reader for BCP, Brian Warmington, has been helpful in suggesting ways of improving the Introduction. None of the above should be held responsible for the shortcomings of the work, but I am pleased to acknowledge their help. To all the others who have contributed in any way I extend my warmest thanks.

H.M.L.
Newcastle (NSW) 1992

Abbreviations

Standard abbreviations for Greek and Latin authors have been used, and periodicals generally follow the conventions of *L'Année philologique*. The name-date system has been used for all books cited. Full details of articles and books cited can be found in the bibliography.

AE *L'Année epigraphique* (Paris, 1888-).

AFA *Acta Fratrum Arualium quae supersunt*, ed. W. Henzen (Berlin, 1874).

ANRW *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. H. Temporini (Berlin, 1972-).

BMC *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, ed. H. Mattingly (London, 1923-40).

CAH *Cambridge Ancient History* (1923-).

CIL *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (Berlin, 1869-).

CIS *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, ed. J.-B. Chabot (Paris, 1926).

D & S *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines* (Paris, 1877-1919).

EJ V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, *Documents illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1976).

HA *Historia Augusta*.

HRR *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* (Stuttgart, 1967).

IGR *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes*, ed. R. Cagnat (Paris, 1906-27).

ILAf. *Inscriptions latines d'Afrique*, eds R.Cagnat, A. Merlin, L. Chatelain (Paris, 1923).

ILS *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, ed. H. Dessau (Berlin, 1892-1916).

Inscr. Ital. *Inscriptiones Italiae*, vol. 13, ed. A. Degrassi (Rome, 1937-63).

PECS *Princeton Encyclopaedia of Classical Sites*, ed. R. Stillwell (Princeton, 1976).

PIR 2 *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I, II, III*, 2nd edn (1933-70).

P. Oxy. *Oxyrhyncus Papyri*.

P. Ryl. *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester*, ed. A.S. Hunt and others (Manchester, 1911-).

RE *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. A. Pauly, G. Wissowa (Stuttgart, 1894-).

SIG *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 4 vols, 3rd edn (Leipzig, 1915-21).

StR *Römisches Staatsrecht*, T. Mommsen (Leipzig, 1887).

TLL *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1900-).

Introduction

The career of Suetonius and the publication of the *De Vita Caesarum*

1. The career of Suetonius has been the focus of an enormous amount of attention over the last generation. Much of this has been prompted by a resurgence of interest in the biographies, which are now beginning to be judged on their own merits rather than merely criticised for their facile inclusion of sensational material.[1] There has also been the need to integrate into the existing corpus of knowledge the inscription relating to his career discovered at Hippo Regius in North Africa.[2] Some pitfalls have emerged from detailed analysis of the career, notably interpretations which fail to place Suetonius in his context as an influential courtier, and imply that his life can be treated in a vacuum without reference to his literary output.[3]

2. Suetonius' family had lived at Rome since at least the time of his grandfather (Suet. *Cal.* 19.3), but little else can profitably be deduced about the origins of the family.[4] His equestrian father, Suetonius Laetus, fought for Otho on the losing side at the battle of Bedriacum under the legate Vedius Aquila (Suet. *Otho* 10.1; Tac. *Hist.* 2.44.1; 3.7).[5] We should expect Suetonius to have been born at Rome, since he was educated there (Suet. *Gramm.* 4);[6] his birth date has been extensively canvassed, and estimates range from soon after AD 62-72. AD 69 is commonly cited. This must be close to the reality.[7]

3. Pliny's patronage brought certain advantages to Suetonius, but the letters have also provided the basis for modern suppositions about a timid Suetonius, originating in the work of Macé at the turn of the century. Lounsbury has shown how insubstantial this portrait is, and emphasises that there is no evidence to support the view that Suetonius' superstitions ended a legal career hardly begun.[8] We are not to imagine him as a man found a farm by his patron for escape to scholarly seclusion, but rather to enable retreat from the rigours of a busy schedule in an active public life (*Ep.* 1.24). Similarly the tribunate discarded shortly before AD 103 may be explained not as an evasion of responsibility by a shy and retiring man, but more plausibly as a response to a superior opportunity in some other sphere of public life (*Ep.* 3.8.1).[9] Too much has also been made of the letter in which Pliny issues a mild

rebuke to Suetonius for slowness in publishing a work (*Ep.* 5.10).[10] Overall, the picture of the shy scholar does not mesh with the successful courtier revealed to us by the Hippo inscription.

4. In about AD 111 Pliny obtained for his childless friend the *ius trium liberorum*.[11] A strong case has been mounted to support the notion that Suetonius accompanied Pliny to Bithynia.[12] Certainly the request for the *ius trium liberorum* emanated from that province, and Pliny claimed close contact with the biographer. Pliny died during his second year of office,[13] and it may be that Suetonius on return to Rome came under the patronage of Septicius Clarus.[14] It should nevertheless be emphasised that by this stage Suetonius was a figure in his own right, if as argued below, he immediately acceded to the posts of *a studiis* and *a bibliothecis*. Friendship rather than patronage may be more relevant. We need not predicate Suetonius' advance on that of Clarus. Clarus was a literary figure of substance, who had been the dedicatee of Pliny's letters.[15] He was to become the recipient of at least some of Suetonius' imperial biographies during his tenure as praetorian prefect. As a result of the tale of their joint fall from grace, the closeness of their relationship has tended to be exaggerated by some modern critics.[16]

5. The Hippo inscription does little to illuminate the early career of the biographer. It furnishes no indications of military service and poses one particularly important question. Why was an honorary inscription to Suetonius erected at Hippo Regius? This has been answered by the suggestion that his family had an African origin or the possibility that he died there. The latter is worth considering. Hadrian visited Hippo in AD128,[17] and if Suetonius was still in his service as *ab epistulis* he would certainly have been in the emperor's company.[18]

6. The nature of the flaminate and the pontificate of Vulcan recorded on the inscription have been much debated, to little avail.[19] That he may have been one of the *iudices selecti* under Trajan would merely confirm that he did not completely abandon his legal aspirations after the episode recorded by Pliny (*Ep.* 1.18).[20] The major posts are more revealing. Marec and Pflaum thought that all three posts were held under Hadrian,[21] but this creates chronological problems if we accept that Suetonius and Septicius Clarus were removed from office in AD 122. Even if this early date is doubted, an attractive suggestion is that the posts of *a studiis* and *a bibliothecis* should be dated under Trajan. In fact there is a lacuna in the first half of l. 6 which appears to have recorded a further administrative post, perhaps that of *a libellis*.[22]

7. The *a studiis* was the emperor's advisor on literary and scientific matters, probably with charge over the emperor's private library.[23] The public collections at Rome were in the hands of the *a bibliothecis*.[24] In about AD 112-113 the *bibliotheca Ulpia* was completed within Trajan's new forum

(dedicated in January AD 112). This seems a suitable context for the appointment of the equestrian Suetonius as *a bibliothecis* to organise the collection, replacing freedmen procurators.[25] He could have held the post at the same time as that of *a studiis* and *a libellis*. This would be immediately after his return from Bithynia, soon after the grant of the *ius trium liberorum*. His literary reputation must have been thoroughly established by this time. The long list of publications provided by the Suda is suggestive of a lengthy literary career.[26] It must be emphasised that others would be seeking the patronage of a Suetonius so favoured by Trajan, and he should not be seen as a minor figure struggling for recognition. Even the grant of the *ius trium liberorum* is said to have been handed out sparingly by Trajan. The posts in themselves are acknowledgment of his literary achievement, and Suetonius provided a precedent for a successor, L. Iulius Vestinus, who held the same run of offices.[27]

8. The advance to the highly influential court position of *ab epistulis*[28] is indicative of Suetonius' favour in the eyes of Hadrian, and ensured his membership of the *consilium principis*.[29] The position involved reception of embassies to the emperor as well as management of official communications throughout the empire, including military correspondence.[30] Control over imperial correspondence had been entrusted to freedmen until the time of Vitellius, when equestrians begin to be employed. The further division of the bureau into two sections, one Greek and the other Latin, each under an equestrian secretary, seems to have occurred later than the reign of Hadrian. The appointment of an important literary figure such as Suetonius to handle both Greek and Latin correspondence had a precedent in the form of Titinius Capito, who held office under Domitian, Nerva and Trajan, and only resigned the job when he obtained advancement to the prefecture of the *uigiles* under Trajan.[31] The *Historia Augusta* (*HA*) mistakenly credits Hadrian with being the first to choose an equestrian *ab epistulis*.[32]

9. Capito is revealed to us by the letters of Pliny as the author of works on the *exitus illustrium uirorum* and as a man with a passion for the past – he had celebrated heroes of the Republic in verse and collected their *imagines*. He was a member of Pliny's circle and involved in the literary life of the city, opening his house for literary recitations.[33] Despite or perhaps because of this obsession with the past he managed to survive the transition from Domitian to Nerva, and again from Nerva to Trajan. Suetonius bridged the reign of two emperors, but his fate is less sure.

10. The dismissal of Suetonius and Septicius Clarus from their respective posts is recorded in a problematic passage in the *HA*.[34] Two approaches have undermined the credibility of the passage. The first of these questions is whether the passage is correctly positioned within the narrative.[35]

Alternatively an extreme view has seen the incident as the fabrication of an inventive biographer.[36]

11. If the passage is correctly positioned, chronologically reliable and credible, then dismissal took place in Britain in AD 122. At that time the emperor would have been accompanied on his travels by his consort, the *ab epistulis*, and by one of the two prefects of the guard. This then has consequences for the date of the *De Vita Caesarum*, which will have appeared at least in part between AD 119-122, since it was dedicated to Septicius Clarus during his prefecture.

12. However, the problem presented by the inconsistency of the passage in the *HA* should be reiterated. Our faith in the chronological accuracy of the *HA* should be seriously shaken by other slips in the life of Hadrian.[37] Such errors may be caused by the author's careless combination of two sources, rather than some subsequent confusion in the textual history of the *HA*.[38] The dismissal passage occurs after a description of Hadrian's reform of the army during AD 121. The purpose of this reform is said to have been to allow Hadrian the freedom to correct abuses in Britain. Before the author treats Hadrian's return to Gaul from Britain, we find this controversial passage about the dismissal, and some general remarks about Hadrian's sexual *mores*. This makes it possible to argue for the passage as a misplaced insertion by the biographer, as was first suggested by Crook.[39]

13. The internal content of the passage strikes a discordant tone. Hadrian is supposed to have dismissed Suetonius for flouting court etiquette or for a sexual indiscretion with the empress.[40] As Syme commented, the value of this is diminished by its apparent reflection of speculation within the tradition about the removal of Septicius and Suetonius. Moreover, stories about Hadrian's relationship with Sabina are notoriously suspect.[41] Other incidents suggest that Hadrian was not an easy man for scholars to get along with, and we can only speculate whether Suetonius and Septicius failed to meet Hadrian's exacting standards intellectually or socially.[42]

14. The passage is unlikely to be mere fabrication, but the suggestion of Crook that the dismissal should be dated to AD 128 (or soon after) is still attractive. It helps to explain the erection of an honorary inscription for Suetonius at Hippo, and allows Suetonius to have written his *Caesares* some years after the publication of Tacitus' *Annales*.[43] This is desirable since there are elements in Suetonius which seem to be a response to Tacitus.[44] It is indeed possible that Suetonius chose to start writing on Julius Caesar and Augustus to fill the gap created by Tacitus who had chosen AD 14 as his starting point.[45] The remaining lives from Tiberius to Domitian could then be seen as supplementing and occasionally correcting aspects of Tacitus' presentation from the rather different perspective provided by the biographical genre. The practice

of reciting literary works at Rome before publication could of course allow for virtually contemporaneous production of works with allusions of this type. The idea that Suetonius might represent an equestrian point of view at odds with that of Tacitus has, however, been discredited, and in general he appears sympathetic to senatorial attitudes. A successful equestrian courtier would surely have shared in the elite view of Roman society. Unlike Tacitus he places little emphasis on politics.

15. Since the opening segment of the life of Caesar is missing, firm evidence for the date of publication of the *Caesares* is confined to the short observation in Lydus that the work was dedicated to Septicius Clarus as praetorian prefect.[46] This does not amount to much. Clarus may not have been the recipient of the entire series, and the only evidence for the end of his tenure as prefect is the *HA*. The first two lives are fuller than their successors, and could have been published separately. It was suggested by Townend that Suetonius was prevented from making such extensive use of archives after his dismissal from the post of *ab epistulis*, but it is probably worth noting that an *ab epistulis* to Hadrian is likely to have travelled so much that use of archives at Rome would always have presented problems.[47] Other explanations apart from the dismissal must be found to account for the slighter bulk of the later lives. Wallace-Hadrill has shown that Suetonius had a special interest in the Ciceronian and Augustan periods as revealed by his preoccupations in the *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*, and this may be sufficient explanation for the change in scale of treatment.[48]

16. Septicius Clarus was appointed to the praetorian prefecture along with Marcius Turbo in AD 119. Turbo seems to have enjoyed a long tenure in the position, and no other commander of the Guard is attested until a year after the death of Hadrian.[49] There is thus no impediment to the idea that the *HA* has misplaced the dismissal of Clarus. The Hippo inscription can then be fitted into the same context as the honorary inscription erected in favour of Marcius Turbo at Utica.[50] Both inscriptions should be associated with Hadrian's visit to Africa in AD 128, when Suetonius will have been accompanying the emperor in his role as *ab epistulis*. On this view Septicius Clarus can be expected to have remained at Rome while Turbo participated in the African tour.

17. The result of this conclusion for Suetonius' *Caesares* is that at least one book of the work was dedicated to Septicius Clarus at a date after AD 119, and probably before AD 128. The sacking of Suetonius and Clarus perhaps occurred after the African visit in AD 128. A novel thesis, now discarded, was that the lives from Galba to Domitian were composed first, at a Trajanic date.[51] There is a reference in the life of Titus which in fact supports the proposed later Hadrianic date.[52] Domitia Longina is referred to as though she were no

longer alive, and her death is placed in AD 126.[53] This has been used as evidence that at least some of the lives were not published until after Suetonius' dismissal. But it becomes possible that all the lives were published together if we date their appearance close to AD 128.

Suetonius and biography in the early 2nd century AD

18. The breadth of Suetonius' interests is illustrated by the list of works provided in the Suda, and by incidental references in later literature. The importance of these other works for an understanding of the *Caesares* is hard to assess, since they have not survived in more than the most fragmentary form. What we can conclude is that he engaged in an encyclopaedic type of composition, which included works on Greek and Roman games, types of clothing, and the Roman Calendar. Some of these were written in Greek, and we should expect his antiquarianism to be permeated by the Graeco–Roman heritage. There are clear signs of the use of some of the encyclopaedic works in the biographies.

19. His excursion into the field of biography began with the *De Viris Illustribus*, a series of literary biographies classified under five headings: poets, orators, historians, philosophers, grammarians and rhetoricians. Only the *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* has survived in any substance, although certain extant lives of poets are also ascribed to Suetonius. The monumental scale of the *De Viris Illustribus* should be emphasised. Wallace-Hadrill has shown how its concentration on the Ciceronian and Augustan period reflects Suetonius' interest in cultural history and in the absorption by the Romans of Greek education.[54] That age had resulted in a growth in the prestige of scholarship which was exemplified by Suetonius' own career.

20. Greek and Roman biography are not well represented in the extant literature from antiquity and this has consequences for any assessment of Suetonius' models. Suetonius names some of his predecessors in literary biography in the preface to his *De Viris Illustribus*. Their names have been preserved for us in the preface to Jerome's work of like name. The names mentioned by Jerome are Hermippus, Antigonus of Carystos, Satyrus, and Aristoxenus, all literary biographers. As is to be expected the roots of Roman biography are Greek. Roman predecessors are also acknowledged in the form of Varro, Santra, Nepos and Hyginus. These Roman authorities wrote primarily about literary figures (Varro had restricted himself to poets), and there is scant evidence for the popularity of political biographies in the Hellenistic age. Nepos included generals in his massive series on famous men. Greek generals are the main survivors. Hyginus had written on Scipio Africanus, but

his further coverage is uncertain. A recent suggestion has been that Nepos was the originator of the genre of political biography, and this approach has gained some support.[55] But Nepos' life of Atticus, his most developed surviving biography, is far closer to *encomium* than anything surviving from the pen of Suetonius.[56] Hyginus' work may have followed the same adulatory tradition.

21. A key point is that Suetonius started with literary lives which unquestionably had Greek models. When he started to write about political figures he appears to have adapted and expanded the same scheme. Greek biography is then a major influence, and Suetonius had available as models three main schemata:

1) Encomiastic biography in which highly formalised eulogies of dead heroes or significant living figures were presented (e.g. Isocrates *Evagoras*; Xenophon *Agesilaus*).

2) Peripatetic biography in which a man's character was illustrated by his actions.[57]

3) Alexandrian biography in which an attempt is made to assess conflicting source material at the expense of treatment of character and ethics.

22. Lives of emperors: Suetonius provides the earliest example of Imperial biography in Latin; he was preceded some 20 years by Plutarch who wrote eight lives from Augustus to Vitellius,[58] perhaps completing them soon after the death of Domitian. The exact date of Plutarch's composition eludes detection, although there is agreement that the *Caesares* preceded his series of Parallel lives.[59] Only the lives of Galba and Otho survive; these are closer to narrative history than biography, although this may be caused by the complexities of the political history of AD 68-69, and gives little idea of the structure of the lives that have perished. We must turn to the Parallel lives, and particularly that of Caesar, to give flesh to speculation.

23. Plutarch professes to be concerned only with notable actions and experiences of the Caesars (*Galba* 2.5), making a traditional contrast between himself and the historians. For Plutarch use of personal details is only as a guide to inner character (*Alex.* 1). The focus is on moral instruction rather than on antiquarian or informatory considerations. Political analysis was not the central issue any more than it was for Suetonius. Suetonius carries this development further, and expands the role of what Stuart describes as 'informatory' material.[60] But it is not possible to prove that Suetonius knew of Plutarch's work, nor that he at any point reacts to the earlier biographies of Galba or Otho.[61]

24. An immediate antecedent to Suetonian biography was the genre known as *exitus illustrium virorum*, celebrating the Stoic martyrs.[62] It would seem that its scope was far narrower than the Suetonian genre, concentrating on a death narrative. The attention paid to the death scene by Suetonius

suggests influence from this quarter, but with no surviving example of the 'exitus' literature, it is hazardous to carry this argument too far. Wallace-Hadrill points out a confusion by Suetonius over which biography Arulenus Rusticus wrote, something which suggests no intimate knowledge of the genre.[63] Nonetheless it is to be expected that Suetonius knew Titinius Capito, an interesting proponent of the genre, who also corresponded with Pliny. His career and the similarity of his background to that of Suetonius have been outlined above. His interest in *exitus* literature was pursued in safety through his *amicitia* with the *princeps*.

25. Suetonius' *Caesares* thus were written under Hellenistic influences,[64] but he was also heavily indebted to the methods of the rhetorical schools. The Suetonian scheme generally avoided a chronological approach,[65] and a system of rubrics illustrating personal qualities is adopted.[66] The scheme was flexible, and allowed for different categories for different subjects. Some elements are universal to any biographical scheme, and it is inevitable that there should be some emphasis on ancestry,[67] followed by a summary of the subject's life up to the time of accession. The reign is then treated topically, often as in the *Caligula* with a sharp division between phases of the reign (22: *hactenus... reliqua ut de monstro*).[68] This analysis of the virtues and vices of the subject is an element influenced by the traditions of the *encomium* and funeral *laudatio*, and most importantly by the rhetorical schools.[69] The attributes of the tyrant are outlined with customary *uituperatio*.[70] This blend may be a Suetonian creation. Next follows a treatment of the emperor's physical characteristics, his literary and artistic tastes, and a detailed treatment of his death and omens associated with it. Each aspect is handled in such a way as to support a moralising and fixed characterisation.[71] The *Caligula* is predictably hostile on every aspect of any importance.

The historiography of the reign of Caligula

26. Tacitus' Annals opens with a traditional justificatory preface, which includes the famous characterisation of Julio-Claudian historiography:

> *Tiberii Gaique et Claudii ac Neronis res florentibus ipsis ob metum falsae, postquam occiderant, recentibus odiis compositae sunt.*

Three points emerge which are relevant to the tradition about Caligula:[72]

1) The adulatory tradition of which Tacitus talks has sunk with almost no trace. Suetonius alludes to it once (8.2). For the reign of Tiberius it is most clearly represented in the pages of Velleius Paterculus.

2) A negative tradition preponderates in our sources, few of which are anything like contemporary. Those which are (Philo; Seneca) have ulterior motives (*recentibus odiis*) in their presentation of the emperor.

3) The loss of Tacitus' own account in Annals 7 and 8 impedes appreciation of his approach to Caligula. There are a few indications in the latter part of Book 6, which discuss Caligula's youth and his relationship with Tiberius. In Book 13 (13.3), he covers Caligula's ability as an orator and notes that he was mentally unbalanced. None of this suggests that Tacitus would have corrected the hostile tradition. Despite his claim to write *sine ira et studio* Tacitus does not embark on a radical reinterpretation of the Julio-Claudians.

27. The sources lying behind both Tacitus and Suetonius have been much discussed. The question is vexed by the fact that no unpolluted example of Julio-Claudian historiography is intact.[73] We have little more than a list of names and some sparse fragments. Quintilian gives some notion of the relative importance of writers of this period (*Inst.* 10.1.101-4). Seruilius Nonianus and Aufidius Bassus are seen as the shining lights, but much doubt remains about the scope and interpretation to be expected from these writers. Seruilius' writings probably did get as far as Caligula, but Bassus is thought to have ended with the fall of Sejanus in AD 31. Pliny the Elder's history took over from where Bassus left off (*Ep.* 3.5.5). Quintilian does not refer to this work, but it must have been influential, since it was used by both Tacitus and Suetonius. Suetonius appears to use the *Bella Germaniae* for his discussion of the birthplace of Caligula, but we cannot doubt that he has also consulted the *A fine Aufidi Bassi*.[74] Cluuius Rufus and Fabius Rusticus made a contribution to which Quintilian does not refer, which may have been important to Tacitus and particularly Suetonius.[75]

28. Turning to extant sources, contemporary sources inspire little confidence. The Jewish writer Philo had a vested interest in sharpening the contrast between Caligula and Claudius, but he is an unlikely influence on our other sources.[76] Seneca's Caligula is the archetype of a tyrant, and his picture of Caligula has been influenced by rhetorical models. His credibility as a source is severely impugned by his involvement in contemporary politics. Tacitus can be presumed to refer to him when he talks of accounts influenced by *recentibus odiis*. There is evidence to suggest that the tradition has been polluted by his opinions. It is possible that the entire tradition and treatment of Caligula as a tyrant has been moulded under his influence. This is not to deny that some of the tyrannical tales first appear in Seneca simply because he is our earliest source.

29. Thus we can trace back to Seneca many of the stories exemplifying the tyrannical trait of *saeuitia* in both the public and the private sphere. Bloodthirstiness is first attributed to Caligula by Seneca, and he can also be

shown to be the originator of the story that Caligula enjoyed humiliating fathers by making them attend the execution of their sons (the story of Pastor).[77] The story is enhanced by setting it at a banquet which is a reminder of the tyrannical vice of gluttony, a theme reflected in the Suetonian treatment[78] although it cannot be directly traced back to Seneca's influence. Extravagance and a passion for dicing are additional tyrannical indulgences.[79] Allegations of torture and use of the penalty of cremation can be found, as well as the classic story that Caligula originated the saying *utinam p. R. unam ceruicem haberet!*[80] Seneca is the first to draw our attention to Caligula's unpredictable attitude to his ancestry, a theme faithfully retailed by Suetonius and other sources.[81] What is more, Caligula's envy of reputations, as illustrated by his removal of *cognomina* from the illustrious, is first encountered in Seneca.[82] The theme of envy reappears to explain Caligula's animus against the son of Pastor.[83] Timpe even believed the stories about the ill-treatment of Claudius to have a Senecan origin,[84] and it is again Seneca who recounts the tyrannical treatment of the wife of Caligula's friend Valerius Asiaticus, a topos, it would appear, from the rhetorical schools.[85]

30. The crazed grief Caligula is supposed to have exhibited after the death of his sister Drusilla is also subjected to vituperation by Seneca.[86] Other passages in his works reinforce a picture of a power crazy despot. Examples here are the story that he liked to call Jupiter to combat, and the threat to destroy the entire senate.[87] Only a mad autocrat would build a bridge such as that at Baiae,[88] while Rome itself starved. Even the moralistic description of Caligula's physique found in Seneca seems to have been taken up by the later tradition, and is an important influence on Suetonius.[89] The effeminacy of Caligula's clothing is first attacked by Seneca.[90] The assassination did not escape Seneca's pen. It is he who produces the highly suspect item about the motivation of Chaerea for killing the tyrant. Predictably a personal motive, the taunt of homosexuality, is put to the fore,[91] and we can suspect that Seneca had motives for muddying the waters over Chaerea's backers. He handles the assassination itself as a classic example of revenge on the tyrant.[92]

Seneca's own career can explain these extreme attitudes. According to Dio Seneca lost favour through pleading a case well in the Senate in the presence of Caligula. His execution was ordered, but he was saved by alleged imminent death.[93] He gave up pleading cases, and kept a low profile.[94] His only extant work from this period is the *Consolatio ad Marciam* written between AD 39 and Seneca's exile in AD 41. The works from which his tyrannical Caligula emerges were not surprisingly written in the age of Claudius. The *De Ira* probably belongs to the early years of Claudius, and the *De Constantia Sapientis* is also Claudian, dating from sometime after AD 47.

31. When the Jewish writer Josephus wrote his *Bellum Judaicum* some-

time between AD 75-79, he exhibited little interest in Caligula, and only briefly touches on his impact on Jewish affairs (*BJ* 2.178-203). Some 20 years later, when he came to compose his Jewish Antiquities, the reign of Caligula had been developed into a warning against moral defectiveness. Book 19 is devoted to the death of Caligula and the accession of Claudius.[95] This account has long been considered heavily dependent on some Roman source – Cluuius Rufus, or on another view, Fabius Rusticus.[96] Caligula's reign was not directly related to Jewish history, but it provided a pretext for preaching the doctrine that fate catches up with moral transgressors, especially when the transgressions are committed against Jews. The role attributed to Chaerea in the assassination appears exaggerated, apparently to point the contrast between the tyrant and the virtuous soldier.[97] What is unclear is whether this feature of the narrative is inherited from Josephus' source, or his own contribution. If Rusticus is the source, the role given to Chaerea could be explained as an attempt to conceal the role of his compatriot Seneca in the assassination, and in general to diminish senatorial responsibility for the plot.[98]

32. Apart from the account of Suetonius, the only major source unaccounted for is Dio Cassius. His work depended on the same body of secondary literature as Tacitus and Suetonius and his importance lies in providing a chronological basis for the reign, which is absent from Suetonius because of his biographical aims. In addition to his uncritical acceptance of his sources, Dio is vitiated by the fact that in many places we are reliant on insubstantial epitomes.

33. Suetonius seldom cites historical authorities in the *De Vita Caesarum*, and it is usually difficult to identify his source. In the Caligula we can detect three of the five authorities named in the lives from Tiberius to Domitian (Seneca the Younger on the death of Tiberius [12.2]; Gaetulicus and Pliny on the birthplace of Caligula [8.1-2]). Not all of Suetonius' information came from literary sources. Some verbal sources are cited (*Cal.* 19.3; *Otho* 10.1), and further unacknowledged use of hearsay is probable. The *acta* are quoted in the life of Caligula to settle the dispute over Caligula's birthplace, and more extensive use of this source can be presumed.

34. Wiseman has recently supported the idea that Cluuius Rufus is the major source behind Josephus' narrative of Caligula's assassination and the accession of Claudius.[99] This has important consequences for the Suetonian life if it is accepted in the form first proposed by Townend.[100] He believed that the strong contrast between the ideal of Republican liberty and the autocracy of Caligula to be found in Josephus originated with Cluuius, and that the story of the imperial banquet at which Caligula quoted the autocratic Homeric line cited by Suetonius originated in the Cluuian treatment.[101] This is not an impossibility, but it can be noted that Suetonius' entire characterisation of

Caligula underlines his autocratic tendencies, and that the sayings attributed to Caligula by Suetonius reinforce the characterisation. Suetonius may have found it difficult to escape from a consensus view of Caligula as promoted by senatorially biased sources.

Suetonius on imperial taste in literature

35. Suetonius uses anecdotal material about imperial attitudes to literature and intellectual matters as a method of developing character portrayal.[102] When Caligula was promoting the new regime Suetonius ironically notes his restoration of the works of Titus Labienus, Cremutius Cordus and Cassius Seuerus on the grounds that it was in his interest that all the facts be handed down to posterity.[103] As we have seen an Homeric line is employed by Suetonius as one method to develop the theme of autocracy. In the same section Caligula's extensive knowledge of Homer is used to demonstrate his hubris towards Jupiter.[104] When Suetonius is illustrating the tyrannical vice of *saeuitia* Caligula's attitude to a double-entendre at an Atellan farce is important, since he responds with the severe penalty of cremation.[105] The most important section on Caligula's literary attitudes claims that Caligula wanted to destroy the works of Homer and that he envied the reputations of Livy and Vergil.[106] Here again the aim is reinforcement of characterisation by illustrating both Caligula's quirky sense of humour about literary questions and his envy of the illustrious. In fact there is some inconsistency in Suetonius' treatment since elsewhere he has Caligula quoting verses of both Homer and Vergil.[107] Suetonius appears amused by the extreme attitudes he highlights, and we can add to those already cited Caligula's judgement that the work of Seneca was sand without lime.[108] Although some of Caligula's literary interests, such as his fondness for the Accian tag *oderint, dum metuant*, are cited to illustrate his vices, his malicious sense of humour is frequently illustrated in the biography, sometimes with a touch of amusement.[109] There seems no doubt that Suetonius expected his audience to be both amused and shocked by the idea that a figure of imperial status could hold such heterodox views.

The value of the Suetonian life

36. The question of the extent to which Suetonius borrowed from earlier writers is closely linked to an appreciation of Suetonius' literary technique. There is now a growing body of opinion which operates on the assumption that Suetonius attempted to organise material within each category to illus-

trate his own conception of the personality of the subject. This approach rejects the view of the biographer as an uncritical compiler operating a fixed set of categories in the manner of a card-index. It is quite consistent with the unhistorical approach of Suetonius whose biographical interests have not always corresponded with those of his readers.

37. Although Suetonius seems from a modern perspective naive and uncritical in his approach to the tradition about Caligula, it must be appreciated that his main concern is the delineation of character. Even from this point of view his handling of the genre of biography may seem unsatisfactory since there is little sign of contemporary preoccupations with influences such as heredity, education and environment.[110] The whole picture is based on an evaluation of the virtues and vices of the subject which is far from objective. More positive aspects of Caligula's reign are only introduced to highlight his baseness in destroying his Germanican inheritance. The most valuable aspect of the life is somewhat negative. It gives us a comprehensive idea of aspects of imperial behaviour which met with disapproval from the elite.[111] But in the course of presenting this picture Suetonius gives us multifarious insights into the nature of court life in the early empire, and many modern authorities still accept the main thrust of his portrait.[112] It can be appreciated that the picture of the bloodthirsty monster presented by Suetonius reflects the view of the elite group in Roman society. Their view must to some extent be a distorting influence, since they had an interest in portraying as victims individuals who genuinely represented a threat to the emperor's security.

Notes to Introduction

1. The best modern work on Suetonius is A.F. Wallace-Hadrill (1983). Appearing at about the same time was B. Baldwin (1983), which, however, cites little literature appearing after 1976. See reviews by A.R. Birley, *JRS* 74 (1984) 245-51, and K.R. Bradley, *CPh* 80 (1985) 254-65. Gascou, after earlier articles on the career of Suetonius, published a major work evaluating the biographer as an historian in 1984, reviewed by Wallace-Hadrill in *CR* 36 (1986) 243-5. Cizek (1977) also examines Suetonius' career, although he is more interested in structural questions. R.C. Lounsbury (1987) 1-26 engages in an iconoclastic but useful review of earlier approaches to the career.

2. *AE* (1953) 73: C Suetoni[o] Tran[quillo f]lami[ni adlecto] int[er selectos a Di]uo Tr[aiano Parthico] Pont. Volca[nal]i [a] studiis a byblio[thecis ab e]pistulis [Imp. Caes. Trai]ani Hadriani [Hipponenses Re]gi DDPP. Useful contributions on this much discussed inscription include E. Marec and H.G. Pflaum, *CRAI* (1952) 76-85; G.B. Townend, *Historia* 10 (1961) 99-109; C.

Baurain, *LEC* 44 (1976) 124-44.

3. Most recently underlined by R.C. Lounsbury (1987) 1-26.

4. An Italian origin for the family has been favoured by several authorities. Lanuuium was the *patria* of his *propinquus* Caesennius Siluanus (Plin. *Ep.* 3.8.1; *ILS* 7212). Syme favoured Pisaurum (*Tacitus* II [1958] 780). Ostia's claim can now be discounted (F. Zevi, *MEFR* 82 [1970] 302-3; cf. F. Grosso, *RAL* 14 [1959] 263-96; R. Meiggs [1973] 514-17). Hippo Regius seems superficially attractive, but other Suetonii in Africa are probably also Italians (M.G. Jarrett, *Historia* 12 [1963] 210, basing argument on W. Schulze [1904] 300). However there have been dissentients. Syme thought that C. Suetonius Ianuarius, a military man from Theveste, could have been African born (*CIL* VIII 17589). The strongest argument for an African origin has been mounted by Birley, who also doubts whether Suetonius' grandfather necessarily heard court gossip about the Baiae bridge at Rome. See *JRS* 74 (1984) 245-51.

5. Vedius Aquila was deprived of his officers by Vitellius and sent to Pannonia (Tac. *Hist.* 3.1). Suetonius' father appears to have remained loyal to the memory of Otho (Suet. *Otho* 10). See Macé (1900) 34. Syme saw significance in the *cognomina* Laetus and Tranquillus – the former indicating birth at the time of the joyous accession of Caligula, the latter during the calm in the aftermath of Vespasian's accession. See *JRS* 67 (1977) 44.

6. The teacher of the imperial biographer was aptly named Princeps! However Macé urges caution over the role of Princeps in Suetonius' education (*Essai sur Suétone* [1900] 45). But an education in rhetoric and active involvement in the legal and literary world of Rome is a postulate of his successful rise to imperial posts under Trajan and Hadrian.

7. The early date has been favoured by those who have attached particular significance to Pliny's reference to him as a *contubernalis* (Plin. *Ep.* 1.24; 10.94. Pliny was born in AD 61 or 62). See B. Baldwin, *Acta Classica* 18 (1975) 61-70; for AD 69 or 70 see Macé (1900); G.B. Townend, *Historia* 10 (1961) 99-109. Lounsbury sees that the reference to *contubernium* is a metaphor for patronage (op. cit. 20), but still tends towards the earlier date (op. cit. 14).

8. Plin. *Ep.* 1.18 shows him shrinking from a court appearance because of a dream. On this see Lounsbury, op. cit. 4ff. The most extreme versions of the timid Suetonius can be found in T.F. Carney, *PACA* 11 (1968) 7-21; R.F. Newbold, *Latomus* 43 (1984) 118-32.

9. The opportunity was in Britain under L. Neratius Marcellus (*CIL* XVI 48, 19th January AD 103; Syme, *Tacitus* I [1958] 91). Suetonius requested that the office be transferred to a relative, Caesennius Silvanus (Plin. *Ep.* 3.8.1). On the operation of patronage see H.M. Cotton, *Chiron* 11 (1981) 229-38, esp. 235f. For the date of Pliny's letter see A. Birley (1981) 88.

10. This letter is dated to AD 105. Some authorities think the work was the *De Viris Illustribus*, and this may well be correct, but there is nothing in Pliny's letter to confirm it. Although there is no effective method for dating any of Suetonius' earlier works, this letter at least provides evidence that his literary activity was under way in the age of Trajan.

11. Plin. *Ep.* 10.94.

12. First proposed by Syme in *Tacitus* II (1958) 660, 779; see *Hermes* 109 (1981) 107.

13. Eck places his tenure of Bithynia-Pontus in AD 110-112. See *Chiron* 12 (1982) 349-51.

14. The only evidence to support this contention is the statement of Lydus (*De Mag.* 2.6) that the *De Vita Caesarum* contained a dedication to Septicius Clarus as praetorian prefect, and the evidence about their joint fall from grace (*HA Hadr.* 11.3). Della Corte (1967) 22 believed that Septicius took over from Pliny as Suetonius' patron, and used this to support the now discredited idea that Suetonius was seeking an equestrian audience.

15. Plin. *Ep.* 1.1. His nephew Erucius Clarus was to become Prefect of the City under Antoninus Pius. Erucius was another member of Pliny's equestrian literary acquaintance (Plin. *Ep.* 1.16; 2.9.4).

16. An extreme view of the nature of the relationship was taken by E. Cizek (1977) 181ff., namely that the client Suetonius was so influenced by the patron Septicius as to join a faction critical of the emperor, eventually getting into trouble for an attempt to subvert the imperial system with the assistance of the empress Sabina. The assumption that Septicius was patron of Suetonius has been treated sceptically recently by Lounsbury (1987) 14ff.

17. For Hadrian's visit to Africa in AD 128 see R.H. Chowen, *CJ* 65 (1969-70) 323-4.

18. First suggested by Syme, *Tacitus* II (1958) 779, and taken up by Crook in *PCPhS* n.s. 4 (1956-7) 18-22. But I believe the inscription was purely honorary, as outlined below.

19. At one time it was thought that the office referred to in l. 5 was that of *pontifex Volcani* at Ostia, but see F. Zevi, *MEFR* 82 (1970) 302-3. However, a *pontifex* of Vulcan has not been found outside Ostia. There has also been discussion over whether the flaminate might be a local office at Hippo or would be more plausible as a post at Rome. His equestrian status excludes a Roman flaminate (Baurain, *LEC* 44 [1976] 129).

20. On adlection *inter selectos* see F. Millar (1977) 90f.; 282-4. It must be emphasised that the restoration of this post on the Hippo inscription is far from certain.

21. Op. cit. (n. 2).

22. A later example of this career pattern is the case of L. Volusius

Maecanius, under Antoninus Pius (*CIL* XIV 5347; *AE* 1955, 179). See E. van't Dack, *Historia* 12 (1963) 179. Notice also the inaccurate statement at *HA Hadr.* 22.8: *ab epistulis et a libellis primus equites Romanos habuit.* On the actual role of the *a libellis* see Millar, op. cit. 249-51. The evidence shows that dealing with *libelli* could fall within the scope of the duties of the *a studiis*, at least when freedmen held these posts.

23. His precise sphere is unknown. For discussion see E. van't Dack, *Historia* 12 (1963) 177-84; F. Millar (1977) 90f.

24. The idea of using a leading intellectual for this type of post may have had a precedent if we accept that Tacitus had been a librarian to Titus. See N. Reed, *CQ* 26 (1976) 309-14; R.P. Oliver, *CQ* 29 (1979) 224-5.

25. Various freedmen held posts controlling libraries, both public and imperial. The title *procurator bibliothecarum* seems to have been interchangeable with a *bibliothecis*. See E. van't Dack, op. cit. 177-84.

26. Suda s.v. Τράγκυλλος.

27. *CIG* 5900. See H.G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières Procuratoriennes Equestres* (1960-1) no. 105. Note, however, the scepticism of N. Lewis (1981) 149-66, who thought most imperial *literati* were appointed for political rather than cultural reasons.

28. See G.B. Townend, *Historia* 10 (1961) 375-81; Millar, op. cit. 224-8.

29. Lounsbury (1987) 11-12 rightly emphasises the favour involved, and points out that the appointment of Suetonius under Trajan, and his continuation under Hadrian represent the beginning of the regular advance of equestrians into the *officia palatina*.

30. Statius *Siluae* 5.1.86ff.

31. See Pflaum, op. cit. (1960-1) no. 60, and discussion in Lounsbury (1987) 9-11.

32. *HA Hadr.* 22.8.

33. Plin. *Ep.* 1.17.1-2; *Ep.* 8.12.1.

34. *HA Hadr.* 11.3.

35. First argued by J.A. Crook, *PCPhS* n.s. 4 (1956-7) 18-22.

36. Espoused by B. Baldwin, *Acta Classica* 18 (1975) 61-70.

37. For example, *HA Hadr.* 12.1, which misplaces the news about the rediscovery of the Apis bull in Egypt at a date after the sacking of Suetonius and his colleagues. This item should belong in AD 118. See Benario (1980) 90.

38. There seems no doubt that the author of the life of Hadrian intended to present his material in its present order. See G. Alföldy, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 233-53, esp. 250ff.

39. Benario in his edition of the *Vita Hadriani* allows that there are such insertions within the life, but does not believe that the present passage is one of them (Benario [1980] 12, 89).

40. M.T. Boatwright (1987) 97-8, accepting the tradition, suggests that the divine status of the imperial family was the bone of contention.

41. Despite what the *HA* says about Hadrian's relationship with Sabina, she was posthumously deified. See A. Carandini (1969) 98-101; Eck, *RE* Suppl. 15 (1978) 914.

42. See G.W. Bowersock (1969) 50ff.; Syme (1983) 175f.

43. Dated by Syme to AD 123 (*Tacitus* I [1958] 473, 782). It should be noted, however, that a date under Trajan still has supporters, with Tacitus possibly dying c. AD 116, before he completed the Annals. See R.P. Oliver, *ICS* 2 (1977) 289-314.

44. See Suet. *Cal.* 8.1ff., discussing D.W. Hurley, *AJPh* 110 (1989) 316-38; see also 10.2 on Passienus Crispus; for apparent responses by Suetonius to allegations in the later books of the Annals see J. Beaujeu, *REL* 38 (1960) 234-5, accepted by J. Gascou, *Latomus* 37 (1978) 443.

45. As suggested by Birley, *JRS* 74 (1984) 249.

46. Lydus *De Mag.* 2.6. See J.D. Morgan, *CQ* 36 (1986) 544-5.

47. G.B. Townend, *CQ* 9 (1959) 285-93. For reservations over Townend's approach to Suetonian use of archives see Baldwin (1983) 48, 134ff.; Wallace-Hadrill (1983) 89-95; Mottershead (1986) x.

48. Wallace-Hadrill (1983) 56-7.

49. On the guard prefects of Hadrian see Syme, *JRS* 70 (1980) 64-80; Syme (1983) 168-79.

50. See *ILAf.* 421: Q(uinto) M[a]rcio| Turbon[i]| praefecto| praetorii| d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica). This was pointed out by J. Gascou, *Latomus* 37 (1978) 441-2.

51. See G.W. Bowersock, *Hommages à Marcel Renard* I (1969) 119-25, and compare K.R. Bradley, *JIES* 1 (1972) 257-63.

52. Suet. *Tit.* 10.2.

53. *CIL* XV 554; see *PIR* 2 D 181; Syme, *JRS* 60 (1970) 39.

54. See A. Wallace-Hadrill (1983) ch. 3, 50-72.

55. See J. Geiger (1985); for criticism see J.L. Moles, *CR* 39 (1989) 229-33. Recent research has focused on the relationship between Nepos' biographies and the contemporary political scene. See F. Millar, *G & R* 35 (1988) 40-55; A.C. Dionisotti, *JRS* 78 (1988) 35-49.

56. See now the edition by N. Horsfall (1989).

57. Geiger (1985) 30-65 attacks the idea that Peripatetic biography covered political subjects.

58. Lamprias Catalogue nos 26, 27, 29-33.

59. On the chronology of Plutarch's works see C.P. Jones, *JRS* 56 (1966) 61-74; he discusses the lives of the Caesars in Plutarch and Rome (1971) 72-80, arguing for a Flavian date. Syme has preferred to date the work under

Nerua. See *MH* 37 (1980) 104-28, esp. 105-10.

60. D.R. Stuart (1928) 251-2.

61. An unconvincing attempt to show that Suetonius reacts to Plutarch was made by Baldwin (1983) 88; and more cautiously 526-46. Common sources can account for all similarities.

62. See F.A. Marx, *Philologus* 92 (1937) 83-103.

63. It is in fact represented to us only by the names of its most famous proponents: Fannius who wrote on the victims of Nero (Plin. *Ep.* 5.5.3); Junius Arulenus Rusticus on Thrasea Paetus (Tac. *Agric.* 2.1; cf. Suet. *Dom.* 10.3); and Titinius Capito (Plin. *Ep.* 1.17.3; 8.12.4); Herennius Senecio on Helvidius Priscus (Tac. *Agric.* 2.1).

64. Momigliano (1971) 86-8 is sensible on this subject, in contrast to Leo (1901) who is confident that Greek influences predominate.

65. The first 44 chapters of the life of Caesar are an exception. In his case a larger part of his career preceded his rise to solo rule. In the imperial lives the treatment is chronological up till accession. This corresponds to the *acme* in Hellenistic biography.

66. This approach is outlined at *Aug.* 9: *proposita uitae eius uelut summa, partes singillatim neque per tempora sed per species exsequar, quo distinctius demonstrari cognoscique possint.*

67. This was a key element in the *laudatio funebris*. Some hints at this influence are to be found in Suet. *Iul.* 6.

68. Cf. *Nero* 19.3: *Haec partim nulla reprehensione, partim etiam non mediocri laude digna in unum contuli, ut secernerem a probris ac sceleribus eius, de quibus dehinc dicam.*

69. On Suetonian virtues and vices see Mouchova (1968) 42-51; and especially A. Wallace-Hadrill (1983) ch. 7, 142-74, following earlier articles in *Historia* 30 (1981) 298-325; *JRS* 72 (1982) 32-48. A suggestion to be rejected is that of Carney who sees criticism of Hadrian in the values espoused by Suetonius. See *PACA* 11 (1968) 7-21. Rather we should imagine Hadrian, who was not related to the Caesars of whom Suetonius writes, acknowledging the weaknesses of his predecessors, in the knowledge of his own conspicuous superiority.

70. For discussion of the tyrant's attributes as rehearsed in the rhetorical schools see J.R. Dunkle, *TAPhA* 98 (1967) 151-71; *CW* 65 (1971) 12-20.

71. Character-development in the ancient world is best discussed by C.J. Gill, *CQ* 33 (1983) 469-87; of some interest is L.R. Cochran, *Biography* 3 (1980) 189-201, attempting to apply the methods of social psychology to Suetonian character analysis.

72. Modern discussion started with H. Willrich, *Klio* 3 (1903) 85-118, 288-317, 397-470; T.S. Jerome (1923) 381-421; A. Momigliano, *RAL* 8

(1932) 293-336; M.P. Charlesworth, *CHJ* 4 (1933) 105-19. Most recently see brief observations in Barrett (1989) xx-xxiii.

73. I discount Josephus *AJ* 19.1-273, discussed below.

74. See commentary on 8.1ff. On the lost Julio-Claudian historians the best survey is that of J.J. Wilkes, *CW* 65 (1972) 177-92, 197-203. On Seruilius Nonianus see Syme (1970) 91-109.

75. See below Introduction 32.

76. See editions of the *Legatio* by E.M. Smallwood (1970) and the *In Flaccum* by H. Box (1939).

77. Bloodthirstiness: Sen. *De Ben.* 4.31.2. See 30.2 below. Humiliation: Sen. *De Ira* 2.33.4f. See 26.3, 35.2.

78. See 32.1.

79. Extravagance: Sen. *Cons. ad Helu.* 10.4; see 37.1. Dicing: Sen. *Cons. ad Polyb.* 17.4; see 41.2.

80. Torture: Sen. *De Ira* 2.33.4ff. Cremation: Sen. *De Ira* 3.19; see 27.4. Quip: Sen. *De Ira* 3.19.2. See 30.2.

81. Sen. *De Const. Sap.* 18.1. See 23.1

82. Sen. *Apocol.* 11.2 . See 35.1.

83. Sen. *De Const. Sap.* 2.33.4f. See 35.2 on his envy of fine locks.

84. See 23.3 and Timpe, *Historia* 9 (1960) 481. His view is, however, now doubted by Levick (1990) 26ff.

85. See 36.2 and M. Flory, *TAPhA* 118 (1988) 352ff.

86. Sen. *Cons. ad Polyb.* 17.4-5. See 20, 24.2

87. Jupiter: Sen. *De Ira* 1.20.8. See 22.4. Senate: Sen. *De Ira* 3.19.2. See 48.2. Also note Sen. *De Ben.* 2.12.1-2. See 26.2.

88. Sen. *De Breu. Vit.* 18.5. See 19.1, 43.

89. Sen. *De Const. Sap.* 18.1. See 50.

90. Sen. *De Const. Sap.* 18.3; *De Ben.* 2.12.1. See 52.

91. Sen. *De Const. Sap.* 5.2, 18.3. See 56.2

92. Sen. *De Const. Sap.* 18.3. See 58.3

93. Dio 9.19.7-8. See also Sen. *Ep.* 78. On the nature of Seneca's illness see Griffin (1976) 42 n.10. For Seneca's career under Caligula see G.W. Clarke, *Latomus* 24 (1965) 62-9.

94. Sen. *Ep.* 49.2; for his political allegiances at this time see Griffin (1976) 54f.

95. See now edition by T.P. Wiseman (1991) with introduction and notes, especially useful on the source problems.

96. D. Timpe, *Historia* 9 (1960) 474-502; L.H. Feldman, *Latomus* 21 (1962) 320-33; H.W. Ritter, *RhM* 115 (1972) 85-91. Cluuius returns to favour in Wiseman (1991) xii ff., 111-18.

97. This is noticed by Barrett (1989) 161.

98. Some recent views have suggested the unlikelihood that Josephus used a Latin source. See L.H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (1937-80; 1984) 821, 836, 842; T.R. Martin, *AJAH* 8 (1983) 181. If, as Martin suggests, we are dealing with an oral source in the form of Agrippa II (op. cit. 188 n.26), his father, Agrippa I, who was his informant, might have had motives for diminishing senatorial involvement in the plot against Caligula. He had been present in the senate at the time of the Claudian accession debate, and was presumably involved in the intrigues (see Jos. *BJ* 2.210, 213). But regardless of all this Wiseman (1991) xii ff. has shown that the single source theory is unnecessary and implausible, and that we should return to the idea of a main Roman source supplemented by other materials including oral sources such as Agrippa II.

99. Wiseman (1991) xii ff.; Appendix 2, 111-18.

100. G.B. Townend, *Hermes* 88 (1960) 98-120.

101. Suet. *Cal.* 22.1.

102. On Caligula's tastes in literature see F.R.D. Goodyear, *ANRW* II.32.1 (1984) 603-10.

103. Suet. *Cal.* 16.1.

104. Suet. *Cal.* 22.1, 22.4. Suetonius uses Homeric quotations to illustrate personality traits throughout the *De Vita Caesarum*. See J.-P. Berthet, *REL* 56 (1978) 314-34.

105. Suet. *Cal.* 27.4

106. Suet. *Cal.* 34.2.

107. See note 104 above and Suet. *Cal.* 45.2.

108. Suet. *Cal.* 53.2.

109. Suet. *Cal.* 30.1.

110. As already observed by J.C. Rolfe, *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.* 52 (1913) 206-25, esp. 214.

111. The propaganda of Claudius had an important influence here. See E.S. Ramage, *Historia* 32 (1983) 201-14.

112. The two most recent modern biographies in English have both reacted against the apologetic approach of Balsdon (1934). Barrett (1989), who is close to my own view, believes that the tradition is thoroughly unreliable on particular issues, but that we should accept that Caligula was unbalanced. Ferrill (1991) is prepared to accept far more of the hostile tradition than seems warranted.

Analysis of the *species*

1-7	Biography of Germanicus
8	Birth of Caligula
9-11	Early life
12	Accession
13-14	Popularity through Germanican inheritance
15-16	*Prima acta*
17	Consulships
18-21	Administration of the city – *spectacula*-building programme
22	The diuisio – *superbia* – autocracy
23-6	Treatment of relatives
27-35	*Saeuitia* and *atrocitas*
36-7	Unchastity and extravagance
38-42	*Rapinae*
43-9	*Militiae* and aftermath
50	Physique and health
51	Character
52-5	Attitudes and preoccupations
56-60	Death and public response