the things *that are contingent on the peculiar sensibles*, i.e. the essences in which these sensibles exist—and here the falsehood is greater, e.g. that this white is the son of Diares [cf. 418a21] (for judgement as to the fact that it is white is not false, since it is one of the peculiar sensibles, but that[5] it is the son of Diares or someone else admits of falsehood)—or it is in the common and general things in most of sensation, e.g. movement and magnitude—and here especially occur deception and falsehood regarding perception (160.l9–161.8).

The italics mark the Arabic equivalent of ἃ συμβέβηκε τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς present in the translator's Vorlage where Bywater wished and absent from where he had excised the phrase. It is in the nature of paraphrase that part of Aristotle's text (e.g. συμβεβηκέναι) is omitted while part is expanded (e.g. the inclusion of the son of Diares; see the translation above).

Armed with the evidence of the Arabic, we now see that the text of Themistius in Heinze seems also to reflect Bywater's transposition, especially if we follow Todd and delete καὶ after τοῖς ἰδίοις:[6]

... ἡ αἴσθησις τῶν μὲν ἰδίων ἀληθής ἐστιν ἢ ὅτι ὀλίγιστον ἔχουσα τὸ ψεῦδος, δεύτερον δὲ τῶν ὑποκειμένων τοῖς ἰδίοις [καὶ] οἷς ἐκεῖνα συμβέβηκε, καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἤδη ἐνδέχεται διαψεύδεσθαι (ὅτι μὲν γὰρ λευκὸν τὸ προσιόν, ὀρθῶς καὶ κρίνει καὶ ἀποφαίνεται, ὅτι δὲ Σωκράτης ὁ προσιών, διαμαρτάνει), τρίτον δὲ τῶν κοινῶν καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις συναπτομένων, λέγω δὲ οἷον κινήσεως καὶ μεγέθους καὶ ἀριθμοῦ καὶ σχήματος·[7] περὶ ἃ μάλιστά ἐστιν ἀπατηθῆναι κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν, ὅταν τὸ πλειόνων ἔργον μιᾷ τινὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιτρέπωμεν.
(93.9–16)

There is no allusion to the phrase ἃ συμβέβηκε τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς before περὶ ἃ κτλ., and so no reason to assume that it stood there in Themistius' text of Aristotle. Todd translates τῶν ὑποκειμένων τοῖς ἰδίοις [καὶ] οἷς ἐκεῖνα συμβέβηκε as '[there is perception] of the substrates of the special objects, [the ones] to which those [substrates] are incidental' (116), and he notes that ὑποκειμένων here stands for συμβεβηκότων (185, n. 46). If he is right, and if his deletion of καὶ is accepted, then Themistius' words can be taken as a paraphrase of τοῦ συμβεβηκέναι ταῦτα <ἃ συμβέβηκε τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς>. Note also that Themistius' συμβέβηκε seems to have been lifted directly from Aristotle.[8]

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign   GERALD M. BROWNE

[5] Read *ammâ* instead of the ed.'s *immâ* (161.5).
[6] See Todd (n. 4), 185, n. 46. For his translation of the passage, see 116–7.
[7] *Sic interpunxi*: σχήματος περὶ Heinze.
[8] I am grateful to Professor Lyons for reading over a draft of this note and checking my translation of the Arabic presented above.

THE YEAR OF LIVIA'S BIRTH

The year of Livia's birth is nowhere explicitly recorded in any ancient sources, and can be determined only by calculating back from the date given in the sources for the year of her death. Both Tacitus and Dio place that death securely in A.D. 29. Tacitus limits himself to the observation that by then she had lived into extreme old age, *aetate extrema*, but Dio adds the more precise and useful information that at the time of her death

she had lived for eighty-six years: ἐξ καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ἔτη ζήσασα.[1] Less usefully, Pliny the Elder states that Livia herself attributed her eighty-*two* years to her consumption of Pucine wine, which she drank exclusively (although in a different section Pliny adds his own observations on the beneficial effect of her daily dose of elecampane). Whatever the merits of Pliny's health tips, his chronological information is of little service in determining when she was born. Her comment need not have been made in the year of her death, and if it was, the figure of eighty-two must be misreported. Her first son Tiberius was born on 16 November 42 B.C., which effectively rules out a birth for Livia in 55/54, which is where it would fall if she died at eighty-two in A.D. 29.[2]

The month and day of Livia's birth are established by inscriptions of the post-Julian period as a.d.III Kal. Febr., usually expressed as 30 January in the modern calendar system.[3] When this last piece of evidence is correlated with Dio's testimony that she had passed her eighty-sixth birthday in A.D. 29, we are left with a birthday on 30 January in either 59 or 58 B.C., depending on precisely when in 29 she died.[4] Modern authorities do not, however, reflect this uncertainty. The year 58 B.C. is given universally for her birth; it appears without reservation in the entries in standard works of reference like Kienast's *Kaisertabelle*, *RE*, and *PIR*, as well as in the general treatments of Livia.[5] It is not clear why this should have come about. It is possible that at some early stage 58 B.C. was selected on the thinking that there is a more or less eleven-to-one chance that she died between 30 January and 31 December of A.D. 29 rather than during the first twenty-nine days of the year. This casual assumption might then been inherited by later scholars.

A more careful study of the question suggests that this general supposition is not warranted. One of the *consules ordinarii* for 29 was C. Fufius Geminus. Tacitus makes it quite clear that Fufius was still in office when Livia died, since Tiberius criticized him, as consul, in the letter that the emperor wrote to the senate excusing his own absence from his mother's funeral.[6] This cuts down the odds considerably, since we could normally expect Fufius and his colleague L. Rubellius Geminus to have vacated office by no later than 30 June, to be replaced by the suffects for that year, L. Nonius Asprenas and A. Plautius. That this did in fact happen is confirmed by inscriptional evidence that the suffects were in office by no later than 6 July.[7] Thus Livia's death came in the first rather than the second half of the year. One might go further. Tacitus mentions the death as the very first item of A.D. 29 (Dio at this point survives only in

---

[1] Tac. *Ann.* 5.1.1; Dio. 58.2.1 (Xiphilinus); Zonaras' summary is slightly different.

[2] Pliny, *N.H.* 14.60 (cf 19.92); V. Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit* (Leipzig, 1896), 2.2, 633–4. Tiberius' birth: *ILS* 108, Suet. *Tib.* 5. K. Nipperdey (Leipzig, 1851–2) on Tac. *Ann.* 5.1.1 emends Pliny's LXXXII to LXXXVI.

[3] *AFA* (Henzen) XXXIV (A.D. 27), XLIII (A.D. 38). Using a somewhat different logic, D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle* (Darmstadt, 1990), 83 defines Livia's birthday as 28 January. There is in fact no truly satisfactory way of expressing Livia's birth in the modern calendar, since in the pre-Julian period January had only twenty-nine days. None of this has any effect on the substance of this note.

[4] That Dio referred to the completion of whole years can be shown by his usage in other similar contexts: 56.30.5 (Augustus), 58.28.5 (Tiberius), Claudius (60.34.3).

[5] D. Kienast, loc. cit. (n. 3); L. Petersen, *PIR²* (1970), L 301; L. Ollendorf, 'Livia Drusilla', *RE* (1926), 13.901; among the innumerable modern authorities: H. Willrich, *Livia* (Leipzig, 1911), 8; W. Suerbaum, 'Merkwürdige Geburtstage', *Chiron* 10 (1980), 336; C.-M. Perkounig, *Livia Drusilla-Iulia Augusta* (Vienna, 1995), 35, n. 153; J. M. Carter, *Suetonius: Divus Augustus* (Bristol, 1982), 183 gives the years as 58 or 57 B.C.

[6] Tac. *Ann.* 5.1.2.   [7] *ILS* 6124; *CIL* IV.15555.

epitomes). Now the order of events in Tacitus is not determined solely by chronology. Dramatic and literary effect can also play their part. But enough of *Annals* 5 has survived to show that the narrative of 29 presents a natural sequence of events all following, rather than preceding, the announcement of Livia's death.[8] These considerations suggest that death before 30 January, A.D. 29, should be considered very possible, with the consequence that Livia would have reached her eighty-sixth birthday on 30 January, A.D. 28, and thus have been born not in 58 B.C. but in the previous year, 59 B.C.

Unfortunately, there are no datable events in Livia's career that allow the question to be settled definitely. But one event can be said to accord very happily with a birth in 59 B.C. In 13 B.C. the senate voted to consecrate the Ara Pacis, one of the great monuments of Augustus' regime, as a memorial to his safe return from Spain and the pacification of Gaul. The *constitutio*, the rite associated with the enactment of the senatorial decree, fell on 4 July of that year, while the dedication waited until some time after it was finished. The dedication would represent the *dies natalis* of the altar, commemorated with sacrifices on its anniversary. The Ara Pacis was finally dedicated in 9 B.C., on 30 January.[9] The day, which is also the birthday of Livia, cannot have been accidental. But we may also have an explanation for the year. The length of time, almost three and a half years, between *constitutio* and *dedicatio* has attracted comment in the past and Fishwick has suggested that the delay might be explained in part by a postponement until 30 January to coincide with Livia's birthday. One might go even further and suggest that Augustus could have sought to emphasize the honour to Livia by dedicating the altar not simply on her birthday, but on the fiftieth anniversary of her birth.[10]

This apparent anniversary may be nothing more than coincidence, resulting from a delay in the dedication attributable to other causes.[11] Thus on the basis of the current evidence we cannot yet state with certainty the precise year of Livia's birth. But the above considerations demonstrate that at the very least the year should be entered not as 58 B.C. but as 59/58 B.C.

University of British Columbia, Vancouver   ANTHONY A. BARRETT
                                                              aab@interchange.ubc.ca

[8] The desire to reconcile the seemingly inconsistent reports of the fall of Agrippina the Elder and the death of Livia has in the past led some scholars to doubt Tacitus' sequence of events. N. Cortellini, 'A proposito di alcune date incerte dell' ultimo decennio del regno di Tiberio', *Riv. Stor. Ant.* 3.1 (1898), 19, places her death at the end of the year, and is followed by R. S. Rogers, 'The conspiracy of Agrippina', *TAPA* 62 (1931), 157. Such a drastic solution is not necessary; see especially E. Meise, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Julisch-Claudischen Dynastie* (Munich, 1969), 237–44.

[9] *RG* 12.2; Ehrenberg-Jones, *Docs.*, 46, 49; Ovid, *Fast.* 1.710.

[10] See H. Riemann, 'Pacis Ara Augustae', *RE* 18.2 (1942), 2095; D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* (Leiden, 1987) 1.2, 205, n. 47 (=*Britannia* 3 [1972], 164–81). For other possible 50-year anniversary observations by Octavian/Augustus, see M. Grant, *Roman Anniversary Issues* (Cambridge, 1950), 16–18, 25–9.

[11] See G. Herbert-Brown, *Ovid and the Fasti. An Historical Study* (Oxford, 1984), 219 for the haphazard commemoration of anniversaries in the calendars.