

## THE BEGINNING OF TIBERIUS' CAREER

Suet. *Tib.* 8:

Civilium officiorum rudimentis regem Archelaum Trallianos et Thessalos, varia quosque de causa, Augusto cognoscente defendit; pro Laodicens Thyatirens Chiis terrae motu afflictis opemque implorantibus senatum deprecatus est; Fannium Caepionem, qui cum Varrone Murena in Augustum conspiraverat, reum maiestatis apud iudices fecit et condemnavit. interque haec duplicem curam administravit, annonae quae artior inciderat, et repurgandorum tota Italia ergastulorum . . .

The trials of Archelaus, the Trallians, and the Thessalians are usually assigned to the period 27–23 B.C.: their position in Suetonius' account of Tiberius' early career seems to offer support to this view, though Stein<sup>1</sup> connected the trial of Archelaus with Octavian's settlement of the East after Actium.<sup>2</sup> Tiberius had been born only in November 42, and Gelzer<sup>3</sup> more plausibly suggested that the trials occurred in Spain, where Tiberius was serving as *tribunus militum* during the Cantabrian war. The earthquake that Suetonius mentions in the following sentence took place in 27,<sup>4</sup> and Tralles, which had been affected along with Laodicea, Thyatira, and Chios, sent an embassy to Augustus in Spain to ask for help.<sup>5</sup>

Professor G. W. Bowersock<sup>6</sup> has queried the date conventionally assigned to these trials, and has arrived at a new date for at least one of them, if not all. His persuasive arguments, which are set out with a rich and lucid discussion on the political circumstances of the persons and places involved, are as follows (for the most part I shall cite them verbatim). First, the pleas for the cities stricken by the earthquake were, in fact, heard in the senate at Rome, therefore after Tiberius' return from Spain—in 24 at the earliest. The trials cannot be left in Spain. Secondly, Suetonius' reliability in matters of chronology is difficult to assess, but he knows how to indicate temporal relations when he wants to. Chapter 8 contains the words 'inter haec' (i.e. the trials, pleas, and prosecution of Caepio) in respect to Tiberius' administration of the grain supply and an investigation of the Italian *ergastula*. The date of his *cura annonae* is assigned by Velleius Paterculus<sup>7</sup> to his quaestorship, which occurred in 23 B.C.,<sup>8</sup> but Velleius says that he was nineteen years old at the time. Since Tiberius became nineteen some time in the year 23 B.C. and a severe shortage of

<sup>1</sup> *P.I.R.*<sup>2</sup> A 1023. Professor G. W. Bowersock has kindly read a version of this paper and has saved me from some gross errors; that is not to say that he concurs in the views put forward. I should also like to record my gratitude for generous editorial help; it has enabled me to make many improvements, especially in the second half of the paper.

<sup>2</sup> Dio 51. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *R.E.* x. 480.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. *Chron. Hier.*, p. 164 Helm, gives the year and puts the earthquake between the death of Cornelius Gallus, itself an event of which the date is contested (see S. A.

Jameson, *J.R.S.* lviii [1968], 79) and the embassy of Indi, assigned to 26; one MS. (*M*) gives 26 for the earthquake. Orosius 6. 21. 19 says that the embassy found Augustus at Tarraco where, according to Suet. *Div. Aug.* 26 (cf. Dio 53. 25), he entered upon his eighth and ninth consulships (26, 25 B.C.).

<sup>5</sup> Agathias 2. 17; Agathias remarks that large areas of Aeolis and Ionia had been devastated, and Strabo, p. 579, associates Tralles and Laodicea in the catastrophe.

<sup>6</sup> *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965), Appendix iii.

<sup>7</sup> 2. 94.

<sup>8</sup> Dio 53. 28.

grain is recorded for 22 B.C.,<sup>1</sup> Tiberius' *cura annonae* is unlikely to have come at the beginning of 23 and probably *did* come nearer the end of it. The date of his investigation of the *ergastula* is indeterminate. Accordingly two items, one of which can be dated to late 23, fall chronologically among certain events which include the trials. Of these events, the plea for the stricken cities cannot be before 24; the prosecution of Caepio cannot be before 23, and it may belong to 22. If the trials are to be dated to the mid or early 20s, it would produce the odd result that Suetonius described something from late 23 as falling *inter* a set of events of which the latest belongs itself to 23 or at best to 22, while the next latest belongs to 24 at the earliest. In view of the date of Tiberius' *cura annonae*, Suetonius' 'inter haec' must mean that at least one or more of the preceding events in this chapter occurred *after* 23. It is probable that the prosecution of Caepio is such a later event.

Thirdly, there is a case for putting the trial of Archelaus later than 23. Archelaus grovelled before Tiberius to gain his assistance as advocate.<sup>2</sup> The occasion may be surmised. When Tiberius went to Armenia in 20 B.C. to install Tigranes II on the throne, Archelaus went with him.<sup>3</sup> It was in 20 B.C. that Augustus presented Archelaus with Rough Cilicia and Lesser Armenia, and this indication of imperial favour may have piqued the opposition to the king at home. If this date for Tiberius' support of Archelaus is accepted, the subsequent history of the two men falls into place. M. Titius was governor of Syria when the Parthian king handed over his sons as hostages:<sup>4</sup> that happened in 10-9 B.C.;<sup>5</sup> Archelaus and Titius were on bad terms, but Herod of Judaea succeeded in reconciling the two men while Titius was still governor of Syria.<sup>6</sup> This reconciliation will have been the time of Archelaus' desertion of Tiberius: Titius cannot have been a friend of Tiberius.<sup>7</sup> Presumably the trial took place before Augustus in Rome, as the itineraries of the Emperor and his stepson in the East were not the same. In 16 B.C. Tiberius went with Augustus to Gaul.<sup>8</sup> Therefore the trial will have occurred between 19 and 16, most probably *c.* 18 B.C.

Fourthly, if Archelaus took advantage of Tiberius' presence in the East to seek his aid in court, others such as the Trallians and the Thessalians did so as well. Tiberius was accessible to embassies from such peoples: he exhibited his virtues to several provinces of the East on his way to Armenia,<sup>9</sup> and on his return he paused at Rhodes.<sup>10</sup>

I shall review these arguments in order. If I understand the first correctly (that if Augustus referred the appeal of the stricken cities, including Tralles, to the senate, who heard it not earlier than 24, he would have referred the trials of Tralliani, Archelaus, and Thessali to Rome also), it is not overwhelmingly strong. Two assumptions underly it: first, that all the stricken cities, including Tralles, made their appeals simultaneously to Augustus in Spain in 26, and all were heard by the senate in Rome not earlier than 24; but that is not what the sources tell us: Tralles appealed to Augustus in Spain, says Agathias; the other pleas were heard by the senate (so Suetonius). Second, that because Tiberius did not speak for the Trallians after the earthquake, he could not already have represented them at their trial. There will be more to say on these points later.

<sup>1</sup> Dio 54. 1.<sup>2</sup> Dio 57. 17.<sup>3</sup> Jos. A.J. 15. 105.<sup>4</sup> Strabo, p. 748.<sup>5</sup> Liv. Epit. 141.<sup>6</sup> Jos. A.J. 16. 270.<sup>7</sup> Cf. Velleius 2. 79.<sup>8</sup> Dio 54. 19.<sup>9</sup> Velleius 2. 94.<sup>10</sup> Suet. Tib. 11.

The second argument has as a starting-point the view that 'inter haec' refers to 'the trials, pleas, and prosecution of Caepio'. This is giving the phrase too precise a reference. It seems equally possible for it to refer to the prosecution and condemnation of Caepio *only*,<sup>1</sup> and indeed to imply no more than an overlapping of prosecution and *duplex cura*. I take 23 to be the year of the trial of Caepio, accepting the arguments put forward by Miss S. A. Jameson.<sup>2</sup> On this view, Suetonius is saying that while he was prosecuting Caepio and getting him convicted, Tiberius was in charge of the corn supply and possibly purging the *ergastula* as well. Was this the case? Professor Bowersock argues that Tiberius' *cura annonae* belongs to the latter part of the year 23, and that it is connected with the shortage of corn reported under 22; Tiberius was appointed to relieve precisely that shortage. This is to assume that Tiberius held an independent *cura annonae*, distinct from his quaestorship. That is certainly suggested by the phrase used by Suetonius and by his separate mention of the quaestorship in chapter 10; and perhaps Suetonius thought that the two functions were separate. But then Tiberius might be holding three distinct posts at once, a feat even for a man of his energy and conscientiousness: quaestorship, with *provincia* unknown, *cura annonae*, and perhaps inspection of the *ergastula*. We may legitimately ask what kind of quaestorship Tiberius was holding. Some, as is well known, were more honorific than others, and more suitable to a patrician and to a member of the imperial family. But the language of Velleius seems to answer the question: Tiberius was quaestor Ostiensis, 'mandatu vitrici' (i.e. 'extra sortem senatus consulto et auctoritate Augusti'), and therefore to some degree responsible for maintaining the flow of corn to Rome. This was the view of the passage taken by Mommsen, Stein, Furneaux, and Koestermann.<sup>3</sup> It was not the easiest or the most honorific of the quaestorships, but a successful incumbent won the gratitude of the senate, and Cicero, *pro Mur.* 8. 18, calls it 'illam cui . . . etiam acclamari solet, Ostiensem non tam gratiosam et illustrem quam negotiosam et molestam'. Nor can we argue from the language of Velleius that the appointment to a *cura* was caused by a corn shortage arising late in 23, for Velleius does not say that Tiberius was nineteen at the time he took up the *cura annonae*, but that 'quaestor, undevicesimum annum agens, capessere coepit rempublicam, maximamque difficultatem annonae . . . moderatus est': 'As quaestor, in his nineteenth year,<sup>4</sup> Tiberius entered public life and relieved an extreme shortage of corn . . .' Tiberius may have been called upon to relieve a shortage which had been in existence when he came into office as quaestor Ostiensis, ('quae artior inciderat', Velleius) and that would be a good reason for his being assigned that position. Even Velleius does not claim that Tiberius was completely successful; there would still have been a shortage when Tiberius went out of office in December 23. His failure to deal adequately (or permanently?) with the problem of the corn supply caused the people to offer Augustus himself the job early in 22.<sup>5</sup> The Emperor's greater

<sup>1</sup> See Lewis and Short, s.v. *inter* II C (e). P. A. Brunt, *J.R.S.* li (1961), 235, and M. Swan, *H.S.C.P.* lxxi (1966), 241, take 'inter haec' in the same way as Professor Bowersock.

<sup>2</sup> *Historia*, xviii (1969), 219 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Staatsrecht*, ii.<sup>3</sup> 571 n. 1; *P.I.R.*<sup>2</sup> C 951; *ad Tac. Ann.* 4. 27. Suetonius' distinction of *cura* from quaestorship is not surprising if his

source was worded like Velleius and he was writing *κατὰ γένος*.

<sup>4</sup> For this phrase, used here with precision, since Tiberius attained the age of eighteen on 16 November 24, see *Latomus*, xxv (1966), 238 f.

<sup>5</sup> Dio 54. 1; *Res Gestae Divi Aug.* 52; for the time of year, Jameson, loc. cit. 221 f.

resources soon proved effective. Tiberius was not the first quaestor Ostiensis to fail in his task: there had been the momentous case of Appuleius Saturninus eighty years before,<sup>1</sup> but Tiberius perhaps did not fail completely, and in any case would not be treated like Saturninus. At some time while he was quaestor, Tiberius was entrusted with the task of purging the *ergastula*. That may have been a separate *cura*, and if it was there is no need to suppose that it came to an end with Tiberius' quaestorship. For our purposes it does not matter if it did. All we can tell from Suetonius' account is that during his quaestorship and while he was in charge of the corn supply (and of purging the *ergastula*?) Tiberius secured the conviction of Fannius Caepio. On Miss Jameson's chronology, that should have been towards the end of September 23. 'Inter haec', we have to conclude, tells us nothing about the date of the other trials; but what Professor Bowersock says about Suetonius' handling of chronology will prove extremely helpful if we examine the structure of this chapter and of those surrounding it.

Suetonius is arranging his material *κατὰ γένος*. Chapter 7 introduces Tiberius' career after he assumed the *toga virilis*, the first section of the account being devoted to family affairs, as far as we can tell in strict chronological order (we do not know the dates of the games held for Tiberius' father and grandfather, or of his other *ludi*). Chapter 8, the chapter under discussion, deals with 'civilium officiorum rudimenta'. Chapter 9: 'stipendia prima', the military career, in strict chronological order: Spain, the East, Gallia Comata, wars in the Alps, Pannonia, and Germany, rewards won on service. Chapter 10: magistracies, again in chronological order, closing with the first grant of tribunician power (6 B.C.). Suetonius is writing by topics, but within those topics he is, at least in chapters 7, 9, and 10, keeping to chronological order. In Chapter 8 the headings are 'Augusto cognoscente defendit . . . senatum deprecatus est . . . apud iudices . . . (interque haec) duplicem curam'. We may expect, if Suetonius is true to the scheme he seems to be adopting at this point in the biography, that the first item under each heading is earlier in time than the first under the next, and earlier than those that follow it under the same heading.<sup>2</sup> Thus the defence of Archelaus should precede that of the Tralliani and Thessali, the plea for the stricken cities follow the defence of Archelaus but not necessarily that of the Tralliani and Thessali, and the prosecution of Caepio should follow the plea for the stricken cities, but not necessarily the defence of the Tralliani and Thessali. Our fixed points are the plea for the stricken cities, made before the senate at Rome late 25 (when Augustus, if he had not been prevented by illness, would have returned to Rome for the marriage of his daughter to Marcellus;<sup>3</sup> presumably Tiberius was present at the ceremony) or 24; and the trial of Caepio, late summer 23. The defence of Archelaus should come before this, say 26 or 25; we have no clue to the date of the defence of the Tralliani and Thessali, except that they should be later than 26 or 25.

<sup>1</sup> Diod. 36. 12; Cic. *de Har. Resp.* 20. 43, where the phrase 'frumentaria procurazione' is used, finding an echo in Suetonius; *pro Sest.* 17. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Earlier too, one might expect, than the events that open the succeeding chapter. We may well have to put the trial of Archelaus later than the beginning of Tiberius' military service (see below, p. 483 n. 5); but

if we count with Suetonius from the assumption of the *toga virilis*, Tiberius'  *tirocinium fori* (see Regner, *R.E.* viA, 1450), which was the prelude to 'civilium officiorum rudimenta', must have preceded his military service. Such an arrangement would be the result of ordering by topic material that was in purely chronological order in Suetonius' source.

<sup>3</sup> Dio 53. 27.

A further argument may be drawn from Suetonius' arrangement of his material by topic. His subject in the chapter under discussion is 'civilium officiorum rudimenta'. It very properly contains events of Tiberius' early youth, when he was preparing himself for the important magistracies mentioned in chapter 10, which begin with the quaestorship. The oratorical 'rudimenta' conclude with the prosecution of Caepio, which took place in the year of the quaestorship. That is appropriate; but what Tiberius did after 20 B.C., when he was already a *quaestorius* of two years standing and had achieved a brilliant success in the field of foreign policy, can hardly be called 'rudimenta'.

In his third argument, Professor Bowersock looks for an occasion for Archelaus to seek Tiberius' aid, and this is a very profitable line of attack. I would agree, too, that 20 B.C. provides just such an occasion. Tiberius was in the East; he was now no unknown youth eclipsed by the favoured Marcellus but a brilliant rising star in his own right; and he was on his way to win further glory in Armenia. Besides that, there are changes in the territories entrusted to Archelaus, reported by Dio precisely under the year 20 B.C. (though he surely did not get Rough Cilicia in that year, as Stein supposed).<sup>1</sup> But some of the advantages of 20 vanish if we can provide Archelaus with a strong motive for approaching Tiberius, rather than another advocate, at any crisis of his own career, and other occasions when he might have had reason to do so. I should not agree that putting the help given to Archelaus in 18 B.C. (rather than seven or eight years earlier) makes it easier to understand the subsequent history of the two men. It is in any case hard to believe that the reconciliation between Archelaus and M. Titius, governor of Syria, in about 9 B.C., necessarily led to the client king's estrangement from Tiberius; that was a year when it should have been clear to all that empire was going to devolve upon Tiberius and his brother Drusus or, if Drusus had already died, upon Tiberius alone. There is no evidence at all that Archelaus was on bad terms with Tiberius before the sojourn on Rhodes. Indeed, what evidence there is about Archelaus' relationships suggests that he and Tiberius were on good terms after 9 B.C. There is his second marriage (on which see below, p. 484), and his friendly dealings, attested between the years 9 and 7 B.C., with C. Iulius Eurycles, the dynast of Sparta.<sup>2</sup> The Spartans, who were in the *clientela* of the Claudii, had given refuge to Livia and the infant Tiberius after the Perusine war.<sup>3</sup> Further, both Dio and Tacitus expressly say that the origin of Tiberius' grudge against Archelaus was the king's neglect of him while he was on Rhodes.<sup>4</sup> At that time, apparently, Tiberius might still expect 'officio coli', but he was disappointed. It is not hard to see why. By the end of the decade Archelaus found that he had to choose between offending Tiberius, now a virtual exile, and offending Gaius Caesar and his powerful supporters, perhaps Augustus himself.

We must ask, first, whether there were occasions other than the changes reported under 20 B.C. when Archelaus might have needed help. Professor Bowersock mentions one: from Dio<sup>5</sup> we learn that allegations of insanity were made against Archelaus, as a result of which Augustus was obliged to appoint a procurator over his kingdom. The date of this incident is unknown. But

<sup>1</sup> *P.I.R.*<sup>2</sup> A 1023.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. *A.J.* 16. 302; *B.J.* 1. 516 (ψευ-  
σάμενος). For the dates, A. H. M. Jones, *The*  
*Herods of Judaea* (Oxford, 1938), 127; G. W.  
Bowersock, *J.R.S.* li (1961), 115 f.

<sup>3</sup> Dio 54. 7. 2; Suet. *Tib.* 6. For further  
ties, see Bowersock, loc. cit. 112 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Dio 57. 17; Tac. *Ann.* 2. 42.

<sup>5</sup> Dio 57. 17.

Archelaus reigned for a long time and was clearly unpopular with some of his subjects, including his brother;<sup>1</sup> there was a long period available for prosecution between 36 B.C., when Antony probably put him on the throne,<sup>2</sup> and his death in A.D. 17. Stein, as we have seen, thought of the settlement after Actium. There would be alterations in the boundaries of Archelaus' kingdom besides the addition of Lesser Armenia in 20, and any of them might have sparked off a prosecution. There was the take-over of Rough Cilicia, for example, which we have seen reported by Dio also under 20 B.C., but which should have followed closely upon the death of Amyntas, King of Galatia.<sup>3</sup> That event is conventionally dated to 25 B.C., but it may have taken place a year or so earlier: the dating of Dio's narrative guarantees 25, but only for the creation of the province of Galatia, not for Amyntas' death.<sup>4</sup> An attack on Archelaus was just as likely in 26 or 25 as it was in 20.<sup>5</sup> Next, to obviate the difficulty of Archelaus' appealing to a boy of seventeen who was in a secondary position in the imperial household, we should do well to establish a pre-existing connection between Tiberius and Archelaus. There does seem to have been such a connection, even perhaps one of hereditary patronage. Archelaus' grandfather had been created high priest at Comana Pontica by Pompey.<sup>6</sup> Later he had become fatally involved in an Egyptian adventure: in 56 he gave out that he was the son of Mithridates the Great, and offered himself as consort to Berenice, daughter of the exiled King Ptolemy Auletes. His reign lasted only six months; Gabinius invaded Egypt in the following year, 55, with the object of restoring Ptolemy, and Archelaus was killed.<sup>7</sup> Dio and Strabo say that Gabinius killed Archelaus in battle, and Dio claims that Gabinius treacherously allowed Archelaus to embark on his adventure in the hope of extracting more money from Ptolemy when he restored him. When Gabinius returned to Rome from his governorship, Ti. Nero, father of the Emperor, was one of those who sought to prosecute him;<sup>8</sup> Cicero was pleased with Nero for his 'mira contentio'.

Tiberius can be shown even more decisively to have been connected with the people of Nysa near Tralles. Professor Bowersock has drawn attention to one of the pieces of evidence that attest this connection: *S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup> 781, mentioning a priest of Tiberius at Nysa at the time of his exile on Rhodes. He suggests that Tiberius had successfully defended the eminent Trallian family of Chaeremon and Pythodorus against another faction in the city (Nysa, a dozen miles away, was their ancestral seat; they migrated to Tralles before 60 B.C.,<sup>9</sup> but

<sup>1</sup> Jos. *B.J.* 1. 507.

<sup>2</sup> See D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, ii. 1286.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo, p. 535; cf. B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 29 n. 5.

<sup>4</sup> It was Miss Jameson who first suggested to me that the death of Amyntas may have taken place before 25; for the principle involved, see R. Syme, *Klio*, xxvii (1934), 130. Note also that the grant of the title 'friend and ally' to Polemo I of Pontus is recorded by Dio under the year 26 (53. 25; cf. W. Schmitthenner, *Historia*, xi [1962], 49 f., n. 43). That could be a reaction to Amyntas' death. Coins of Amyntas, if dated by regnal year *IB* = 12, do not guarantee his survival beyond 27.

<sup>5</sup> It is tempting to suggest the year 27.

That would mean that the first events mentioned in chapters 7-10 of Suetonius' biography were themselves in chronological sequence; but the temptation must be resisted. Both Tiberius' extreme youth and the long interval which would have to elapse between the death of Amyntas and the creation of the Galatian province make 27 unlikely.

<sup>6</sup> Strabo, p. 558.

<sup>7</sup> Magie, *Roman Rule*, ii. 1234, with reference to Strabo, pp. 558, 796; Plut. *Ant.* 3; Dio 39. 57 f.; *Liv. Epit.* 105; Val. Max. 9. 1. *ext.* 6.

<sup>8</sup> Cic. *ad Q. Fr.* 3. 1. 15, 2. 1.

<sup>9</sup> *Ad Fam.* 13. 64. Augustan coins of Nysa mention a Chaeremon (*Rev. suisse de Num.* xiv [1908], 11, no. 2).

presumably they still had land there and had not severed the connection altogether). With this view one must concur. But it does not afford a date for the defence. Again Professor Bowersock offers the year 20 B.C. But if Nysa is relevant to the present inquiry—and the connections between that city, Tralles, and Tiberius are very suggestive—we can trace its relations with the Claudii Neronēs far beyond 20 B.C. In 51 Cicero wrote to P. Silius Nerva, governor of Bithynia and Pontus: <sup>1</sup> ‘Nysaeos, quos Nero [i.e. Tiberius’ father] in primis habet necessarios diligentissimeque tuetur ac defendit, habeas tibi commendatissimos, ut intellegat illa civitas sibi in Neronis patrocínio summum esse praesidium.’ Nero was a young man at the time (‘adulescens’), and Cicero goes on to confirm what one would suspect, that his connection with Nysa was hereditary: ‘amplissimas clientelas *acceptas a maioribus* confirmare poterit et beneficiis suis obligare.’ The connection cannot be traced with certainty beyond Tiberius’ father; but three members of the family of the Claudii Neronēs are to be found in Asia: Appius Claudius Nero (*R.E.* iii. 2773, no. 245) was a member of the ten-man commission of 189; <sup>2</sup> Ti. Nero (no. 251) was sent with two other diplomats to Asia in 172 to secure the free states and islands against Macedon; they spent most of their time on Rhodes; <sup>3</sup> C. Nero P. f. (no. 247) was governor of Asia in 80 after his praetorship, and certainly struck up relations with Ilium. <sup>4</sup> However far it went back, the connection with the people of Nysa is secure. Tiberius was the obvious person for them to ask for help at any point in his career; his fortunes, like those of his clients, had not suffered through Antonian connections and even by the mid twenties were rising fast. Not, however, so fast as to dispense those who do not accept Professor Bowersock’s chronology from seeking some pre-existing relationship between Tiberius and his first clients. Even Cicero did not accept his first brief until he was twenty-four or twenty-five years old, though L. Crassus had prosecuted at twenty-one and Nero was to plead for more than one community before he came to the throne; <sup>5</sup> and if Archelaus and the Trallians wanted a youthful counsel with high connections they did not have to look beyond Marcellus. Professor Bowersock is absolved from any such quest, and he can accept the connection while retaining his chronology; but his view does involve another difficulty which is similar: why the people of Laodicea, Thyatira, and Chios sought Tiberius’ aid and not, say, Marcellus’, after the earthquake of 27. That is easily explained if he had *already* shown himself a successful advocate of Archelaus and the Trallians; similarly, if the pre-existing relationship between Tiberius and Nysa is not to be accepted as the reason for his being offered a brief by the Trallians, there is another at hand: his success in the case of Archelaus. For, as we have seen, the appeal from Tralles will have come after the trial of Archelaus; it may be assigned to 26 or 25 (Augustus returned to Rome in the course of 24, in time to celebrate the *Feriae Latinae* in June, if he had not been prevented by illness). <sup>6</sup> It is a striking coincidence that for his second marriage, not earlier than 8 B.C., Archelaus chose Pythodoris, widow of Polemo I of Pontus, who was herself a member of the same famous family of

<sup>1</sup> Cic. *pro Flacco* 52; Strabo, p. 649.

<sup>2</sup> Livy 37. 55. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Pol. 27. 3. 1 ff.; Livy 42. 19. 7, 45. 1 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cic. 2 *Verr.* 1. 28. 71 ff.; H. G. Lolling, *Ath. Mitt.* ix (1884), 30.

<sup>5</sup> Crassus: Cic. *de Or.* 3. 74; Nero: see

*P.I.R.* <sup>2</sup> D 129; generally: Quint. 12. 6; but cf. Cic. *ad Att.* 3. 17. 1, with T. P. Wiseman, *H.S.C.P.* lxxiv (1970), 207.

<sup>6</sup> *Inscr. Ital.* xiii. 1, p. 151: between Nones and Ides of June.

Tralles;<sup>1</sup> and it would be agreeable to believe that even then the good relations between the two monarchs and their patron and protector still persisted. That they did, on the side of the family of Pythodorus as well as on that of Archelaus of Cappadocia, is suggested by the cult offered Tiberius by Nysa at the time of his sojourn on Rhodes.

As to the Thessalians, I have no specific answer to Professor Bowersock's remarks; they are the last of the three clients whom Tiberius defended before Augustus, and Professor Bowersock may well be correct in ascribing their appeal to the occasion of Tiberius' march to the east, on which he followed the Via Egnatia;<sup>2</sup> on the other hand, if the argument drawn above from Suetonius' phrase 'civilium officiorum rudimentis' holds good, this trial too will have to be put back to 23 at the latest.

Two minor puzzles arise. First, why did the Trallians not employ Tiberius as their advocate after the earthquake, if he was already known to them and if they approached him with their political problems? Second, we know from Agathias that the Trallians sent an embassy to Augustus in Spain after the earthquake; why did Tiberius put the case of Laodicea, Thyatira, and Chios to the senate? The first question is puzzling only if we admit that, because the Laodiceans, Thyatirans, and Chians employed the services of a Roman intermediary in making their plea to the senate, the Trallians would have done the same in appealing to Augustus. But they could speak to the Emperor man to man,<sup>3</sup> and if Tiberius or any other Roman gave them support, that was a very different matter from convincing a large body of senators meeting in formal assembly—different too from convincing the Emperor when he was presiding over a court of law ('cognoscente Augusto'). It seems that Augustus took speedy and far-reaching emergency measures to restore the town of Tralles, perhaps without consulting the senate.<sup>4</sup> Seeing the success of Chaeremon's hazardous mission, the people of other cities were encouraged to put in their own appeals (25?). But Augustus was now alarmed—either by the extent of the intervention in the province of Asia that would be entailed by satisfying them, or by the gathering strength of hostile senatorial opinion. He told them to approach the senate, offering the advocacy of Tiberius, who was now at Rome, on their behalf (unless it was their own idea to seek it). Their plea was heard late in 25 or 24. In support of this view a striking feature of Agathias' account of the embassy may be mentioned: his emphasis on the daring nature of the journey, on the hazards it involved, and on the uncertainty of success—suggesting that Chaeremon was a pioneer in the appeal for help.<sup>5</sup>

It seems that we cannot date the trial of the Trallians much more closely than before. It came after that of Archelaus in 26. 25 remains the likeliest date: Tiberius was still in Spain during part of the year, and the Emperor had not

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, pp. 556 and 649.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dio 54. 9.

<sup>3</sup> See F. G. B. Millar, 'Emperors at Work', *J.R.S.* lvii (1967), 9 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo, p. 579; T. R. S. Broughton, 'Some non-colonial Coloni of Augustus', *T.A.P.A.* lxvi (1935), 21. Cf. *ἀντίκα δὴ μάλα* in Agathias, if anything is to be made of that overworked phrase.

<sup>5</sup> We should date the Trallian embassy to 26 rather than to 25. Can we adduce another feature of Agathias' narrative? Chaeremon

approached Augustus in Cantabria, and the war in Cantabria belongs to 26 rather than to 25 (R. Syme, *A.J.P.* lv [1934], 303); in any case Augustus took no active part in the second year's operations (id. ib. 310). But both parts of the war could loosely be called 'Cantabrian': see W. Schmitthenner, *Hist.* xi (1962), 59 n. 28, 61 n. 36. The hazardous journey would not have been undertaken in the winter season. Probably Chaeremon set out in the spring of 26.



sensed a change in the mood of the senate. The trial may or may not have had some connexion with the earthquake. It is not hard to imagine political controversy and litigation arising in the aftermath of the catastrophe: allegations, for example, that funds intended for relief were being diverted into the pockets of an individual, group, or class.<sup>1</sup>

The conclusions reached in this paper are as follows: first, there is no need (though it is still perfectly legitimate) to seek in Tiberius' journey to the east in 20 the occasion for his being offered briefs by provincial cities and a client king, for he was already connected with at least one of the first clients listed (probably it is significant that they *are* the first: other cases would follow from his original successes). Secondly, in chapters 7–9 of his biography of Tiberius, Suetonius, though arranging his material by topic, is also preserving a chronological order: 26 may be postulated for the defence of Archelaus, 25 for the defence of the Trallians, 24 for the speech on behalf of the stricken cities. If these conclusions are correct, two further points may be made. The early career of Tiberius illustrates the survival (in favourable conditions) of relations of client and patron established by great families under the Republic. And the 'constitutionally disquieting' consequences of this chronological scheme (Augustus' intervention in the affairs of client kings and senatorial provinces), to which Professor Bowersock alludes, must stand. It was after all precisely in these years that there grew up a feeling of disquiet on just that point; it culminated in the test case brought against Marcus Primus in 23.

*St. Hilda's College, Oxford*

BARBARA LEVICK

<sup>1</sup> It may be relevant that Agathias calls Chaeremon ἀγροικόν τινά φασι τούτων δὴ τῶν γεηρόνων, perhaps with reference to a distinct social class (cf. γεωμόροι: Herod. 7. 155; Thuc. 8. 21). Γεηρόνος can have a pejorative sense and itself was hardly a term used technically of the landowning classes. It is a poetical word, and Agathias was fond of such (A. Cameron, *Agathias* [Oxford, 1970], 31 f.); his source here was the epic poet Christodorus, who wrote a history of Tralles (F. Bücheler, *Klein. Schr.* ii [Osnabrück, 1965], 453 = *Rhein. Mus.* xxxvii [1882], 331 f.). For γεωπονία used in

a group of Syrian epigrams in connection with substantial property, see L. Robert, *Rev. de Phil.* xxxi (1957), 20 = *Opera Minora Selecta* (Amsterdam, 1969), 386 n. 5: he cites Kaibel, *Epigr. gr.* 446 (fourth century A.D.), 452 (third), 453. Certainly when Chaeremon gave help to the Roman armies at the time of the Mithridatic War it was in the form of grain supplies (*S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup> 741) and it was land worth 2,000 talents that Caesar confiscated after the battle of Pharsalus (Strabo, p. 649). (I am indebted to Miss L. H. Jeffery for help with this note.)