



The Correspondence of Augustus: Some Notes on Suetonius, Tiberius 21. 4-7

R. A. Birch

The Classical Quarterly, New Series, Volume 31, Issue 1 (1981), 155-161.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-8388%281981%292%3A31%3A1%3C155%3ATCOASN%3E2.0.CO%3B2-L>

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The Classical Quarterly is published by The Classical Association. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/classical.html>.

The Classical Quarterly

©1981 The Classical Association

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2003 JSTOR

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF AUGUSTUS: SOME
NOTES ON SUETONIUS, *TIBERIUS* 21. 4–7

Suetonius quotes at *Tiberius* 21. 4–7 a number of passages from letters of Augustus to Tiberius showing the high regard in which he professed to hold him, despite his reservations about the darker side of his character, once he had decided to adopt him ‘rei publicae causa’ in A.D. 4. They seem to have attracted little critical comment, although Seager¹ connects them with the handling by Tiberius of the Pannonian revolt in A.D. 6–9, suggesting that in view of their fulsome character they were probably written towards the end of this period, when the crisis was past, rather than earlier when Augustus may (Dio 55. 31) have been critical of Tiberius’ caution in prosecuting the war. But he does not attempt a more detailed appraisal of the possible dates of the individual letters quoted. Sections 21. 4 and 5 in particular present interesting textual difficulties, mainly arising from the transmission of Greek in a predominantly Latin text: this article discusses these with a view to throwing greater light on the historical significance of the letters.

First, the text, to which I have appended a limited apparatus which concentrates on the points of greatest difficulty (the manuscript references are as in Ihm’s edition).

Suetonius, *Tiberius* 21. 4–7

4. Vale, iucundissime Tiberi, et feliciter rem gere,

ἐμοὶ καὶ ταῖς ἐμαῖς

σαῖς τε στρατηγῶν.

iucundissime et, ita sim felix, vir fortissime et dux νομιμώτατε, vale.

5. Ordinem aestivorum tuorum ego vero ***, mi Tiberi, et inter tot rerum difficultates καὶ τοσαύτην ἀπροθυμίαν τῶν στρατευομένων non potuisse quemquam prudentius gerere se quam tu gesseris, existimo. Ii quoque qui tecum fuerunt omnes confitentur, verum illum in te posse dici: unus homo nobis vigilando restituit rem. 5

6. Sive quid incidit de quo sit cogitandum diligentius, sive quid stomachor, valde medius fidius Tiberium meum desidero succurritque versus ille Homericus: 10

τούτου γ’ ἐσπομένοιο καὶ ἐκ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο

ἄμφω νοστήσαιμεν, ἐπεὶ περίοιδε νοῆσαι.

7. Attenuatum te esse continuatione laborum cum audio et lego, di me perdant nisi cohorrescit corpus meum, teque oro ut parcas tibi, ne si te languere audierimus, et ego et mater tua expiremus et summa imperi sui populus R. periclitetur. Nihil interest valeam ipse necne, si tu non valebis. Deos obsecro, ut te nobis conservent et valere nunc et semper patiantur, si non p. R. perosi sunt. 15 20

2–3. Scripsi; emendationem in versuum adhuc incerti auctoris fragmenta distinxit M. West. ἐμοὶ καὶ ταῖς †μουισασαῖστ στρατηγῶν Ihm; ΜΟΥΙΣΑΣΔΙΣΤΕΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΝ M et sim. rel. (A pro Δ habent GX’Y; ΤΕΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΝ VLS, in quibus ss. ‘mihī et meis tuisque commilitibus gere’); ταῖς Μούσαις στρατηγῶν editores; post Μούσαις legunt καλὰ vel ἄριστε Turnebus, ἄριστα Casaubon, αἰεὶ Bentley; ταῖς *μου ἴσα σαῖς τε Roth; ταῖς<ἐ>μου πασαῖς Bücheler.

¹ R. Seager, *Tiberius* (London, 1972), pp. 41–2.

4. *νομμώτατε* ed. a. 1480; *NOMIMΩΜΑΤΕ Ω* ('legitimate' ss. in VLS): *μονμώτατε* Casaubon; sed lectio non turbanda.
5. Supplendum quicquid videtur: proposuerunt 'laudo' post 'Tiberi' Stephanus; 'verso' pro 'vero' Bücheler (sed pro 'ego vero' cf. *Div. Claud.* 4. 5). Forsitan exciderit linea archetypi, velut 'haudquaquam improbo'.
6. *ἀπροθυμίαν* Pithoeus; *ΑΠΟΘΥΜΕΙΑ ML, ΕΙΑΝ* rel.; *ἀπροθυμίαν* Salmasius, Roth, Ihm; *ἀπείθειαν* Bentley; an *λιποθυμίαν* quaesivit Ihm, vix recte; ss 'et tantam defectionem militantium' in VLS.
9. Enn. *Ann.* 370 Vahlen (ubi tamen alii testes 'cunctando' pro 'vigilando' consentientes exhibent).
- 13–14. *Iliadis* 10. 246–7.

How many letters are there and in what order?

There is nothing in Suetonius to indicate how many letters are cited (save that several are implied by his words), or if they are in chronological order: he says only 'cum... epistulis aliquot (Tiberium) prosequatur. Ex quibus in exemplum pauca hinc inde subieci' (21. 3). It is however likely that the letters were extracted by Suetonius from an official archive, and quite possible that they were preserved in chronological order.² As to the number of letters, the sections 4–7 in the conventional paragraphing serve as reasonable divisions, having regard to the context, and one may infer that not less than four are cited. The discussion makes this assumption.

21.4

(a) *The text*

The sense of this passage is obscured by the corrupt state of the Greek in the first sentence. The emendation of the crux to "*Μούσαις*", adopted commonly by various editors, is unsatisfactory in failing to account adequately for the manuscript text. It also lacks point in a passage which is otherwise clearly military and political ("*νομμώτατε*" – see below) in context, despite Tiberius' cultural interests attested elsewhere by Suetonius.³

Some manuscripts of Suetonius (VLS) contain Latin glosses on the Greek passages in *Tib.* 21. 4 and 5; these are more or less accurate translations in the instances where the sense of the Greek is not in doubt. The gloss on the passage in question reads 'mihi et meis tuisque commilitibus gere', which would suggest something like "*ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς σοῖς τε συστρατιώταις ἡγοῦ*". But this is rather a long way from the received text; and against the possibility that "*συστρατιώταις*" is latent in the text is Suetonius' note (*Div. Aug.* 25. 1) that after his revolutionary youth Augustus never used the word 'commilitones' ('comrades') and forbade his sons and stepsons to use it, as being bad for military discipline, the civil peace, his own dignity and that of his house.⁴ It therefore seems likely that the gloss represents an unsuccessful attempt to make sense of an obscure text.⁵

² The received order of Cicero's correspondence does not encourage such optimism; but Cicero's letters were not preserved officially.

³ Suet. *Tib.* 70. 1: 'Artes liberales utriusque generis [i.e. Greek and Latin letters] studiosissime coluit.'

⁴ 'Neque post bella civilia aut in contione aut per edictum ullos militum commilitones appellabat, sed milites, ac ne a filiis quidem aut privignis suis imperio praeditis aliter appellari passus est, ambitiosius id existimans quam aut ratio militaris aut temporum quies aut sua domusque suae maiestas postulare.'

⁵ Nor would such a reading sit well in the syntax of the sentence as a whole, which seems to require a participial clause; the fact that the Latin gloss repeats the better reading 'gere' (now extant only in M) from the main text is perhaps contributory evidence that the scholiast found the Greek baffling.

Of the various previous attempts to reduce the received text to passable Greek Roth's at first seemed to offer the best prospects, with *μου amended to ἐμοῦ as being closest to the MSS. The passage would then mean 'commanding in the field for me and for those who are equally my – and your – womenfolk'. But I am indebted to Sir Kenneth Dover for making the point that "ταῖς ἐμοῦ" would not be a natural alternative way of saying "ταῖς ἐμαῖς"; the existence of such apparent parallel Greek usages as "τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ" and "οἱ ἐκείνου" does not help because there is no possessive adjective related to ἑαυτοῦ or ἐκείνος corresponding to ἐμός in its relation to ἐγώ. Nor was he particularly happy with ἴσα . . . τε, though this could perhaps be defended on the stylistic ground that there is already one καὶ co-ordinating ἐμοί with ταῖς κτλ.

It seemed better therefore to seek a more radical amendment to the copyists' pie. An original reading of *ΤΑΙΣΕΜΑΙΣΣΑΙΣΤΕΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΝ* could have been corrupted easily enough into (a) *ΤΑΙΣΜΑΙΣΑΙΣΤΕΤΡ* . . . , and (b) *ΤΑΙΣΜΟΥΙΣΑΣΑΙΣΤΕΤΡ* (with misreading of *ΙΣΑ* as a separate word, followed by reduplication of *ΣΑ* to restore sense to the following letters and *ΜΟΥ* as a remedy for the residual *ΜΑ*). I have accordingly adopted this amendment in the text and am indebted to Professor West, whom I consulted about the palaeographical plausibility of the successive corruptions suggested above, for pointing out that the amendment represents the end of one iambic trimeter and the start of another. This may be taken as offering a useful confirmation of the proposal; we doubtless have a quotation (cf. the lines from the *Iliad* in 21. 6). As Professor West suggests, the original may have been "τοῖς ἐμοῖς σοῖς τε"; though this is not necessarily the case, 21. 5 shows Augustus quite happy to adapt a well-known line of Ennius to make it fit the context.

The meaning would be similar to that suggested for Roth's (amended) reading. But why 'womenfolk', and who were they? The readings "ταῖς" and "σαῖς" are well embedded in the received text and there seem no good grounds for amending to the easier masculine form (which was apparently read by the author of the Latin scholia, he – or his text – perhaps being under the influence of the supposed reading "συστρατιώταις"). Consideration of this question cannot be separated from that of the date of 21. 4.

(b) *The date of 21. 4*

The terms of *Tiberius* 21. 2, 3 make it clear that the date of the quoted letters cannot be earlier than the adoption of Tiberius by Augustus on 26 June A.D. 4 (*Fasti Amit. CIL* i. 243 – ms of Velleius 2. 103. 3 has 27 June). There were, however, several occasions in Tiberius' career from 4 on when Augustus could have written a letter of farewell and good wishes for military success.

Following his adoption he departed 'forthwith' ('protinus' VP 2. 104. 2, cf. also 2. 104. 3) for Germany. His campaign went on until December (VP 2. 105. 3) when he returned to Rome in the depth of winter, returning in the early spring of 5. VP 2. 107. 3 shows that he returned to Rome in winter 5/6 after a successful campaign season. There is an 'argumentum a silentio' from the text of Velleius that Tiberius did not return for the winter of 6 to 7, supported perhaps by Dio 55. 30. 6 and 31. 1 (recording after the change of year to 7 Augustus' suspicion of delay by Tiberius). VP 2. 113. 3 may however imply a return in the winter of 7 to 8.⁶ In 8–9 Dio 56. 1. 1 makes him return "μετὰ τὸν χειμῶνα" and later in 9, after the 'Variana clades',

⁶ 'Legatos, inter quos fuimus, partitis praefecit hibernis'; cf. notes ad loc. in Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus* 2. 94/131 (Cambridge 1977).

'revolat ad patrem Caesar' (VP 2. 120. 1) before returning again to Germany to contain the crisis.

Certainly 21. 4 could date from Tiberius' initial departure in 4, although departure in 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 would also be possible. A relatively early date is perhaps suggested by the calm tone of the letter. A more specific argument in favour of an early date may however be derived from Augustus' description of Tiberius in the passage as "νομιμώτατε", a curious designation ('wholly customary, lawful') requiring explanation, which may lie in the events of Tiberius' life before 4.⁷ When during Tiberius' exile in Rhodes his tribunician power had expired in 1 B.C., Augustus offensively refused to let him return to Rome, compelling him to remain in Rhodes after barely being persuaded by Livia to draw a decent veil over this disgrace by appointing him 'legatus Augusto'.⁸ Tiberius' subsequent rehabilitation, his adoption by Augustus, the renewal of his trib. pot. in A.D. 4, and his renewed military command can scarcely have obliterated his resentful recollection of what had gone before and of the spurious appointment as 'legatus Augusto'. He may well have morosely drawn Augustus' attention to the contrast, and Augustus' letter can be read as assuring him that he is 'commander absolutely regularly and lawfully appointed'. Although it could be argued that such a reassurance might have been given after one of Tiberius' subsequent returns to Rome, (especially if we accept Dio's suggestion that the real reason for these was insecurity)⁹ it seems more reasonable, if "νομιμώτατε" has the significance suggested here, to assign the letter to the initial departure in 4.

(c) *The 'womenfolk'*

Who then are the 'womenfolk' who 'belong equally both to Augustus and Tiberius'? At this date such a reference would certainly exclude the disgraced elder Julia; the obvious reference would be Livia (cf. also the letter quoted at 21. 7). It may well be unnecessary to look for any further name to justify the plural; like the use of Greek (see below) the plural may have been intended to conceal what was being said from at least some prying eyes. But if further women are needed, they are readily to hand. As Barbara Levick points out,¹⁰ the settlement of A.D. 4 was dynastic in purpose; before Tiberius was adopted by Augustus he was 'coactus prius ipse Germanicum fratris sui filium adoptare' (Suet. *Tib.* 15. 2). At about this time, Germanicus married Agrippina, daughter of M. Agrippa and Julia, and granddaughter of Augustus; Tiberius' own son Drusus married his cousin Claudia Livilla, daughter of the elder Drusus and of Antonia minor, sister of Germanicus, previously betrothed to C. Caesar, and granddaughter of Livia. The interlocking is striking, and the conclusion compelling that these matrimonial arrangements were part of the settlement itself.

When did the marriages take place? There is no certainty, except that Drusus cannot have married Claudia Livilla until after the death of Gaius Caesar on 21 February

⁷ There seems no good reason for doubting that "νομιμώτατε" is the correct reading despite the slight corruption present in all MSS. (For what it is worth the Latin scholiast so took it too.) Casaubon's amendment is unnecessary, serving merely to avoid the problem of interpretation.

⁸ Suet. *Tib.* 11. 5, 12. 1: 'Sed neque impetravit ultroque etiam admonitus est, dimitteret omnem curam suorum, quos tam cupide reliquisset. remansit igitur Rhodi contra voluntatem, vix per matrem consecutus ut ad velandam ignominiam quasi legatus Augusto abesset.'

⁹ Dio 55. 27. 5: "τά τε γάρ τῶν πολέμων ἅμα διώκει καὶ εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ὅποτε παράσχοι, συνεχῶς ἐσεφοίτα, τὸ μὲν τι πραγμάτων τινῶν ἕνεκα, τὸ δὲ δὴ πλείστον φοβούμενος μὴ ὁ Αὔγουστος ἄλλον τινὰ παρὰ τὴν ἀπουσίαν αὐτοῦ προτιμήσῃ." (Of whom was he afraid? Agrippa Postumus?)

¹⁰ B. Levick, 'Drusus Caesar and the Adoptions of AD 4', *Latomus* 25 (1966), 227.

A.D. 4 (*ILS* 140).¹¹ It is possible that, as Syme suggests,¹² Germanicus had already been betrothed to Agrippina in parallel with the betrothal of Claudia Livilla to Gaius Caesar. But as to the date of their marriage, the first child of Germanicus and Agrippina was probably born in 6;¹³ in view of the evident fecundity of this pair (9 children by A.D. 19) it is a fair inference that the marriage was in 5 rather than in 4. But we cannot infer in turn from this that the letter at *Tib.* 21. 4 was written in 5 rather than 4; whenever the actual marriages took place (perhaps together in early 5 on Tiberius' return from Germany), the arrangements are likely to have been completed in 4 (perhaps on 26 June) and it would therefore have been legitimate for Augustus, writing 21. 4 in that year, to have referred to all three women (Livia, Agrippina and Livilla) as 'belonging equally to him and to Tiberius'.

(d) *Summary*

While therefore there can be no certainty as to the date of the letter, 4 or 5 seem the most likely years, and 4 more probable than 5 (on or just after 26 June). If the suggested interpretation is correct the letter has a much more substantial character than the conventional interpretation allows.

Matrimonial arrangements are fundamental to the existence and form of the ruling dynasty, but Tiberius is its military leader, on whom it depends for its cohesion and continuance – a point to be forcibly demonstrated by events in the next few years. His position has been questionable or worse in the last few years but now he is fully rehabilitated (“νομιμώτατος”). However equivocal Augustus' personal feelings about Tiberius may have been (*Tib.* 21. 2, 3) he is now acting 'rei publicae causa'. Accordingly, with elegance and discretion (on the use of Greek see below) he refers to Tiberius' importance in constitutional, military and family terms (considerations of coequal significance for the survival of the Principate), and goes so far as to address him twice in the short fragment we have by the improbable adjective 'iucundissime'.

21. 5

(a) *The text*

(i) The first words of 21. 5 are lacking in a verb.¹⁴ No certain restoration is possible but the place for it would be either after 'vero' or after 'mi Tiberi'. An amendment such as Stephanus' 'laudo' may well be right, but would require to be placed before rather than after 'mi Tiberi' to provide a sound palaeographical reason for its loss. 'Vero' should however be conserved; for the phrase 'ego vero' in another letter of Augustus, see Suet. *Div. Claud.* 4, 5. It may well have material significance in interpreting the letter (see below). A longer insertion, such as 'haudquaquam

¹¹ There is little other evidence bearing on the date of either marriage except that the marriage of Nero Julius Caesar, Germanicus' eldest son, to Julia, daughter of Drusus, took place in 20 (*Tac. Ann.* 3. 29. 3), implying that the marriages of their respective parents cannot have taken place long after 4; cf. *PIR* 4, p. 174 and note 13.

¹² R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), p. 422.

¹³ For the argument see Mommsen in *Hermes* 13 (1878), pp. 246–7. The child's birth in 5 or even 7 would be possible but the key seems to be Tacitus' clear implication in *Ann.* 3. 29 ('iam ingressum iuventam', 'iam puberem'), that he came of age in the normal way (at age 14 in A.D. 20). By contrast, Tacitus makes a point here of the request for an early quaestorship and cf. *Ann.* 12. 41. 1 which is explicit ('toga virilis maturata') about the early coming-of-age of the future emperor Nero at age 13.

¹⁴ Roth, and Ihm's first (1907) edition deal with the difficulty by taking 'Ordinem aestivorum tuorum!' as an exclamatory phrase. This seems unlikely, as the following sentence ('I, however, think you have done splendidly') makes it difficult to understand. Ihm seems to have given this idea up in his shorter (1908) edition.

improbo' after 'vero', might be in order on the assumption that a whole line of an early archetype might have fallen out.

(ii) A reading of "ἀποθυμίαν" in line 8, first suggested by de Saumaise and Roth and adopted by Ihm as his first choice, while strongly indicated by the MSS, is questionable as an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, though in defence of "ἀποθυμίαν" Dover comments that Augustus (or someone) might have coined it on the analogy of προθυμία, rather than with the adjectives ἀποθύμιος/καταθύμιος in mind. Ihm's alternative "λιποθυμίαν" is possible but this word has a medical flavour with the meaning 'faint', 'physical collapse' which is not the sense required here. A much better reading, which I have adopted, is Pithou's "ἀπροθυμίαν", a word preserved in Souda¹⁵ as an alternative for "ἄρρωστία" as used by Thucydides in a military context with the meaning of 'loss of morale'. That 'lack of morale' or 'loss of morale' is the sense required here seems beyond doubt.

(b) *The date of 21. 5*

The reference in 21. 5 to 'lack of morale' may offer a clue as to the date of this letter. Dio 55. 23 refers to disaffection in the army over pay in A.D. 5; this is presented by him as a general discontent with poor rewards for wars which had been undertaken at that time, which was resolved by payments to the Praetorian Guard after 16 years and to other soldiers after 20 years. There is no reference to Germany, but doubtless the recent German wars were a major factor.¹⁶ Velleius¹⁷ refers in general terms to Tiberius' handling of unrest in the army in Pannonia and Dalmatia; and Dio 56. 12. 2 more specifically to unrest in the army in Dalmatia in 9 which he attributes to a desire by the soldiers to get on and finish the war somehow ("διαπολεμησαί πως ἐπιθυμοῦντας"). Whether the unrest described by Velleius – which is mentioned in the course of the eulogy of Tiberius inserted into his narrative for the year 8 – is the same as Dio's unrest in 9 is unclear. Dio's account seems specifically to rule out 'lack of morale', a term which would, however, (like 21. 5 as a whole), fit his account of 5 well enough. 'Lack of morale' could also have been at the root of the action described by Velleius if this differs from that in Dio; but it is impossible to judge from the generality of Velleius' statement, which also contains a substantial element of conventional writing appropriate to an eulogy.¹⁸ In so far as there are any positive indications, they favour 5 rather than 8 or 9 for this letter.

21. 6 and 21. 7

The passage at 21. 6 has interest mainly as suggesting quite amiable personal relations such as appear also in other fragments of letters from Augustus to Tiberius which are preserved in Suetonius.¹⁹ That at 21. 7 (whether it contains a part of one or of more letters) is however of much more significance because of what it reveals, not only about Tiberius, who is evidently on a long and exhausting campaign, but also about Augustus' fears for himself and Livia, which are real and insistent, with a suggestion of profound despondency in the final 'si non p. R. perosi sunt'. Tiberius has evidently

¹⁵ Souda: 'Ἀρρωστία: ἡ ἀσθένεια. Ἀρρωστία δὲ τοῦ στρατεύειν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπροθυμία. Θουκυδίδης (3. 15. 2, cf. also 7. 47).

¹⁶ cf. Tacitus, *Annals* 1, 16 ff. on the mutinies in Pannonia and Germany in 14.

¹⁷ Vell. Pat. 2. 114. 3 (eulogy of Tiberius): 'Non sequentibus disciplinam, quatenus exemplo non nocebatur, ignovit; admonitio frequens, interdum et castigatio, vindicta rarissima, aegabque medium, plurima dissimulantis, aliqua inhihentis.'

¹⁸ Woodman, *op. cit.*, ad loc.

¹⁹ *Div. Aug.* 51. 3, 71. 2, 71. 3, 76. 2.

asked about Augustus' health – 'nihil interest valeam ipse necne, si tu non valebis'. This material could date either from the Pannonian revolt or from the years after the 'Variana clades'; evidence survives of the magnitude of the blow inflicted on Rome and Augustus by each setback in turn.^{20,21} There is no necessary historical link between 21. 7 'ne si te languere audierimus et ego et mater tua exiremus' and Pliny's allegation of a partial attempt by Augustus at suicide ('destinatio expirandi') by starvation (which we may infer took place in 6 or perhaps 7 rather than later). If the letter belongs to the Pannonian revolt the length of campaign implied by the text of 21. 7 may indicate a date of 7 or possibly 8. Whether however the letter dates from then or later, we can infer that when Augustus expresses the fear that he and Livia would die if they heard Tiberius was ill 'and the Roman people would be in peril of the heart of their empire', this is more than an expression of parental affection. The prospect of revolution (cf. Dio 55. 27, also the disgrace of Agrippa Postumus and the fall of the younger Julia),²² civil strife and violent death, whether self-inflicted or otherwise, must have been frequently present in Augustus' mind from 6 onwards.

The use of Greek in these letters

Certain parts of these letters with great political significance, on the interpretation suggested in this article, are in Greek. The use of Greek was normal in correspondence between educated Romans; an example of this without any ulterior significance is found in the two lines of the *Iliad* in 21. 6. But the use of Greek in 21. 5 to refer to 'such great lack of morale among the troops' suggests a more specific purpose. It may have been employed out of tact in what can be read (if 'vero' is right in line 6) as a refutation of criticism of Tiberius which may have been Augustus' own. Another purpose may have been to ensure that this Imperial frankness about army morale did not spread too far in the camp to which the letter was presumably sent. Use of Greek by Augustus in a context suggesting a need for tact and discretion is also found in his letters quoted by Suetonius at *Div. Claud.* 4, dealing with the embarrassing problem of the unpromising young Claudius.²³ A similar explanation may underlie the use of Greek in 21. 4; the object would have been discretion in conveying the centrality of Tiberius' importance to Augustus and his dynastic arrangements, and in the reassurance about his position offered to his still battered pride.

Oxford

R. A. BIRCH

²⁰ (Effect of Pannonian revolt) Velleius 2. 110. 6: 'quin etiam tantus huius belli metus fuit ut stabilem illum et formatum tantorum bellorum experientia Caesaris Augusti animum quateret atque terreret. (111. 1) habiti itaque delectus, revocati undique et omnes veterani, viri feminaeque ex censu libertinum coactae dare militem. audita in senatu vox principis, decimo die, ni caveretur, posse hostem in urbis Romae venire conspectum. senatorum equitumque Romanorum exactae ad id bellum operae.' Cf. also Dio 55. 26 (A.D. 6) – continued problems of military finance, introduction of 5 per cent death duty, famine and fire in Rome, all of which lead (55. 27) to revolutionary talk and bill posting. Also Pliny, *NH* 7. 149: 'Iuncta deinde tot mala: inopia stipendi, rebello Illyrici, servitiorum dilectus, iuventutis penuria, pestilentia urbis, fames Italiae, destinatio expirandi et quadridui inedia maior pars mortis in corpus recepta'.

²¹ (Clades Variana): Suet. *Aug.* 23 1–2.: 'Hac nuntiata excubias per urbem indixit, ne quis tumultus existeret, et praesidibus provinciarum propagavit imperium, ut a peritis et assuetis socii continerentur... Adeo denique consternatum ferunt ut per continuos menses barba capilloque summisso caput interdum foribus illideret vociferans, Quintili Vare, legiones redde! diemque cladis quotannis maestum habuerit ac lugubrem'. Pliny, *NH* 7. 150 (immediately following passage quoted in note 20): 'Iuxta haec Variana clades et maiestatis eius foeda suggillatio'.

²² B. Levick, 'The Fall of Julia the Younger', *Latomus* 35 (1976), 301.

²³ See especially *Div. Claud.* 4. 1, 2, 5 and 6. This was clearly an exceptionally delicate family problem.