

CASSIUS DIO ON AUGUSTUS: A POVERTY OF ANNALISTIC SOURCES?

P. M. SWAN

WHEN MOUNT VESUVIUS ERUPTED, portending the downfall of the great Plautianus in 205, the roaring volcano could be heard in Capua—some twenty miles away. So Dio tells us. He possessed this special knowledge because he had chosen Capua for a retreat so that whenever he was in Italy and free from affairs in Rome he could work uninterrupted on his *Roman History* (76.2.1–2). To make provision for studious quiet was the mark of a serious historian. So was the decade of research and the still longer period of writing which he devoted to his history of Rome from its beginnings down to his own time (72.23.5), a work which, if we had it all, would run more than 3,000 pages.

But the serious historian needs more than a place and a will to work. He needs books. Dio nowhere mentions his Capuan library. Still it would have been consistent with his historiographic ambition and industry—and with the outlay on his sanctuary—for him to have a good one.¹ One may be forgiven, then, for entertaining doubts about a standard notion that, in treating the reign of Augustus, Dio was hard up for annalistic sources.

In his pioneering book on Dio, Millar describes the account of Augustus (Books 51–56) as “a medley of diverse elements, among which only a very thin chronological narrative can be discerned” (100). By “chronological narrative” (it seems clear) Millar means the *annalistic* element in Dio. He thinks this element is so thin because Dio did not have a detailed annalistic source, and he suggests the lack may explain why Dio draws so much on “subsidiary sources” and on “his own knowledge.” “He may have had no choice.”² Millar is followed by Manuwald in his important book on Dio’s treatment of Augustus: Dio’s annalistic source was “sehr wenig detailliert.”³ Millar and Manuwald both show the influence of Andersen’s thesis that the annalistic sections in Dio’s account often have their origin not in the annals of a

The following works will be cited by author’s name alone: F. G. B. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford 1964); B. Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus: Philologische Untersuchungen zu den Büchern 45–56 des dionischen Geschichtswerkes* (Wiesbaden 1979, Palingenesia 14); H. A. Andersen, *Cassius Dio und die Begründung des Principates* (Berlin 1938); C. Questa, “Tecnica biografica e tecnica annalistica nei libri 53–63 di Cassio Dione,” *Studi Urbinati* 31.1–2 (1957) 37–53; J. Ginsburg, *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus* (New York 1981); A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius* (London 1983); R. Syme, “How Tacitus Wrote *Annals* I–III,” *Historiographia Antiqua* (Louvain 1977, Commentationes Lovanienses).

¹Cf. E. Champlin, “The *Suburbium* of Rome,” *AJAH* 7 (1982; publ. 1985) 97–117, at 106.

²Millar 87–92; the quotations at 88.

³Manuwald 105–106, 127–128, 276–277; the quotation at 276.

precursor but in Dio's combining material from a narrative source with material from *non*-annalistic sources, among them a work containing lists of senatorial decrees.⁴ Also visible is the influence of Questa's demonstration that, in important respects, Dio was the biographer of emperors as much as he was the historian of their reigns, and that in search of information proper to biography he used accessory sources more than has generally been recognized.⁵ The position taken by Millar and Manuwald has implications for our estimation of Dio as a source for the reign of Augustus, of which his is the most extensive ancient account we have, and one fundamental to the chronology: if Dio's own annalistic source(s) had little detail to offer him, it is hard to see how his knowledge of public events, which are the staple of annals, could be well grounded, and his testimony and chronology must accordingly be approached with the greater caution. Such caution is of course a widespread attitude among scholars, so that Millar and Manuwald could be said to have provided a theoretical justification for it.

Now it would be perverse to deny that the label "very thin" fits the annalistic element in Dio's Augustan account. But this fact is in itself a slender basis for hypothesizing about the *source* of that element. A thin account does not necessarily come from a thin source, as the *argumenta* of Greek tragedies or the *periochae* of Livy suffice to show; besides, the view of Dio as short of sources is not easily reconciled with what he himself says about having read extensively in Roman history (fr. 1.2; 72.23.5).

The essential test of the "thin source" theory (or of any alternative to it) is to ask how well it "saves the phenomena," how well it explains the nature of the numerous texts which make up the Augustan annalistic element in Dio. But before applying this test, it is necessary, as a first step, to identify the annalistic texts, for there is nowhere (to my knowledge) a full or representative register of them. It is to establishing such a register or "corpus" that the next paragraphs are devoted. The corpus will be confined to sections which treat *urban* affairs since it is primarily on urban texts—in fact on a small selection of them—that Millar and Manuwald base their view.

I THE URBAN ANNALISTIC ELEMENTS

IN BOOKS 51–56

The character of urban annalistic material is amply illustrated in Livy and Tacitus and is not a topic of scholarly debate.⁶ It consists above all else of the

⁴Andersen 9–48; cf. Millar 87, 90; Manuwald 113–119.

⁵See esp. Questa 52; cf. Millar 87 and Manuwald 128–130. Questa appears not to have made use of Andersen's work.

⁶R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 266–269, 295–296, 305; cf. P. G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge 1961) 175; Millar 40, 55–56, 87–92, 100; T. J. Luce, *Livy: The Composition of His History* (Princeton 1977) 83–84, 191–192; Ginsburg *passim*. Cf. A. H. McDonald, "The Style of Livy," *JRS* 47 (1957) 155–172, at 155–159; B. W. Frier, *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition* (Rome 1979) 268–275.

annual record of public transactions: elections, proceedings in the Senate, legislation, trials, the business of magistrates and priests, festivals, shows, governmental largess, and the like; under the empire official dynastic events also come to have their place. The account of each year in Roman annals contains one or two "constellations" or "clusters" of such material (when there are two the second closes the year), and it is these more than anything else that are the hallmark of the annalistic genre. The clusters⁷ are factually dense and specific, and on the whole take events in chronological order. Unity of the year tends to prevail over unity of theme, so that an event or development covering more than a year is usually treated in fractions, each fraction under its own year. In its purest form an urban annalistic cluster is a staccato row of discrete, heterogeneous items, and the passage from one item to another may be abrupt or may occasion an obvious transition; the space given to different items is seldom nicely gauged to correspond to their importance.⁸ Urban material which has been reduced to a fluent and measured narrative is either not annalistic at the root or has lost its annalistic character through reworking.⁹

If one scrutinizes Books 51–56 year by year (30 B.C. – A.D. 14) and line by line for passages that fit the foregoing description, many clusters of urban annalistic material come to light—not that the boundaries of each can be defined so precisely as to rule out dispute. The typical cluster is a mosaic set of notices on public events which are specific to the given year while adumbrating larger themes of concern to Dio, such as the nature of Augustan monarchy, the role of the imperial Senate, or the evolving topography of imperial Rome. There are recurrent reports on votes of powers, honours, and military distinctions to Augustus; on precedent-setting spectacles and benefactions; on the careers of princes; on reviews of the Senate, modifications in the functions of Republican magistracies, and the elaboration of new senatorial boards; on dedications of temples and monuments. From a register of all these clusters (for which see Appendix) it emerges that they are persistent features amid the variety in Dio's account of the reign.¹⁰ Only one year clearly lacks an identifiable cluster (excluding the more fragmentary years

⁷The term "cluster" suits the varied and irregular shapes in which urban annalistic material occurs.

⁸The pure form is easier to illustrate from Livy than from Tacitus, who more often interlards urban annalistic material with material of a different genre; for example, with biographic sketches or with narratives of court politics.

⁹The terms "narrative" and "chronological narrative" are best avoided in speaking of urban annalistic material. Cf. Wallace-Hadrill 10.

¹⁰This observation, it should be noted, is *not* at odds with Questa's thesis that when Dio's *History* reached imperial times he subsumed the annalistic principle of organization under a biographic principle. That thesis rests above all else on the observation that Dio's accounts of the reigns of Augustus and his successors open with a biographic section (typically on the character and *modus operandi* of the emperor) and close with a schematic necrology. Questa concerns himself little with what lies between accession and death.

where the manuscript fails).¹¹ By contrast there are thirty-two years that have one.¹² In most of these the cluster is a main structural element.¹³ Often its presence is confirmed by an explicit transitional formula as Dio moves either from the urban cluster to the narrative of external (notably military) affairs which is a feature in most year accounts, or vice versa. Thus under 24 B.C. (53.29.1) one finds: ἐν μὲν οὖν τῇ πόλει ταῦτα τότε ἄξια μνήμης ἐγένετο· οἱ δὲ δὴ Κάνταβροι Or under A.D. 11 (56.25.4), after an account of campaigning in Germany: ἐν δὲ δὴ τῇ Ῥώμῃ Δροῦσος . . . ἐταμίευσε.¹⁴

In something over half of Dio's year accounts an urban cluster takes the initial position.¹⁵ Often it opens (after the naming of the consuls) with an event from the threshold of the official year: in 29 and 24 B.C. the ratification of Augustus' *acta* on New Year's Day (51.20.1, 53.28.1); in 7 B.C. Tiberius' convening of the Senate on the same day (55.8.1); in 21 and 19 B.C., the situations faced by the consuls M. Lollius and C. Sentius Saturninus (respectively) on entering office *sine collega* as a consequence of election strife (54.6.2, 54.10.1; cf. 22 B.C., 54.1.2); in 14 B.C. a bye-election for curule aediles, the original election having been voided (54.24.1). When Dio, like Tacitus, places an annalistic cluster in second position in the year account, the reason is usually plain. Thus the necrologies of Agrippa, Drusus, and Augustus take pride of place in three years;¹⁶ in other years a military campaign or an imperial progress abroad has precedence,¹⁷ often continuing an account which stood last in the previous year.

It is Livy's custom, after composing the year-opening urban cluster and the narrative of external affairs, to append a *second*, year-closing, urban cluster treating a selection of recurrent events, typically the annual elections of magistrates to take office the next year, the death and succession of priests, prodigies, temple dedications, and festivals (among others).¹⁸ (Ginsburg has termed this device an "end chapter.") Tacitus, though he imposes

¹¹No identifiable cluster: 10 B.C. (but cf. Appendix). The following fragmentary years are excluded: 6, 5, 1 B.C., A.D. 1, 2, 3, 10. (Also 31 B.C., most of which falls in Book 50.) No trace appears to remain of 4 and 3 B.C. For a year in Tacitus without an urban cluster see *Ann.* 2.53–58 (A.D. 18).

¹²30–28, 25–11, 9–7, 2 B.C., A.D. 4–9, 11–14. In two other years (27 and 26 B.C.) one can be less certain.

¹³25 and 11 B.C. should be excluded.

¹⁴See also 21 B.C. (54.7.1), 20 (54.9.1), A.D. 7 (55.32.3), 8 (55.34.4), 9 (56.11.1). Cf. 53.19.5, with Manuwald 106, n. 26.

¹⁵Sixteen (of the thirty-two) clusters are in the initial position (29, 28, 24, 22, 21, 19, 17, 14, 13, 8, 7 B.C., A.D. 5, 6, 9, 12, 13), two others virtually so (16 B.C., A.D. 7); two are acephalous because of *lacunae* (2 B.C., A.D. 4).

¹⁶12, 9 B.C., A.D. 14.

¹⁷E.g., 25 (Salassi; Augustus in Spain), 20 (Augustus in the East), 11 B.C. (Drusus in Germany), A.D. 8 (war in Illyricum). For displacement of the urban cluster from first position in Tacitus see Ginsburg 131–142; for an instance in Livy see 185 B.C. (39.23.5–32.15).

¹⁸For a brief sample see the following years in Livy. Priests: 196 B.C., 180, 177. Dedications: 194, 193 (35.9.6), 189. Festivals: 196, 194, 189, 187, 179, 174. Elections: *passim*.

great variety on the regular Livian pattern of year-accounts, also employs an “end chapter” in a majority of years in the *Annals*.¹⁹ There are differences, however: he gives elections and prodigies a small space, extends and varies the obituary notices greatly, and in general adapts the end chapter freely to his own purposes.²⁰

It has not been recognized that there are also end chapters in Dio, though they occur sporadically and are much briefer than those in Livy or Tacitus. To list Augustan years only, they can be made out under 23, 15, 11, 8 B.C., A.D. 6 and 12,²¹ where they reveal themselves through notices on standard topics: deaths of notable personages under 15, 11, and 8 B.C.; mid-year successions of magistrates under 23 B.C. and A.D. 6; dedications of buildings under A.D. 6 and 12; festivals under 23 B.C. and A.D. 12 (*tris*). In four of these six Augustan end chapters one also finds, in Greek translation, characteristic temporal phrases used by Livy and Tacitus in introducing end-chapter items: *κάν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ ἔτει* (23, 15 B.C.), cf. *eodem anno*; *ἐν τῷ ἔτει ἐκείνῳ* / *τούτῳ* (11 B.C., A.D. 6), cf. *eo anno*; *κάν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ χρόνῳ* (11 B.C.), cf. *per idem tempus*.²² The infrequency of Dio’s end chapters shows that he did not view their inclusion in his year accounts as *de rigueur*, so that where they do occur they are perhaps to be seen as vestiges of his annalistic source more than as something of his own construction.

Consistently as urban annalistic clusters in Dio bear certain identifying features, they exhibit a variety of structure, function, and length that resists easy taxonomy. In some ways they are little compositions in themselves, resembling their freely composed counterparts in Tacitus more than the regular clusters in Livy.²³ Dio’s cluster for 28 B.C., on the one hand, is typical of the pure annalistic genre, a dozen curt items touching on diverse public matters such as the census, dedication of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, festival events, state finances, grain distribution, subsidies to impoverished senators, the election and duties of magistrates, policy on Egyptian cults, or temple repairs.²⁴ Under A.D. 5, on the other hand, although he registers several heterogeneous urban items, the cluster is briefer, and he attaches to the third-last item—retirement bounties for soldiers—an excursus on imperial military forces three times as long as all the urban annalistic material together (55.23.2–24.8). Under A.D. 7 he subordinates the urban cluster to his narrative of the war in Illyricum, choosing items that illustrate

¹⁹Ginsburg, esp. 128–130.

²⁰Ginsburg *ibid.*; R. Syme, “Obituaries in Tacitus,” *AJP* 79 (1958) 18–31.

²¹23 B.C.: 53.33.3–5. 15: 54.23.1–8. 11: 54.35.4–36.1. 8: 55.7.1–6. A.D. 6: 55.27.4–6 (the end chapter precedes rather than follows the account of external affairs; cf. 36 B.C., 49.16.1–2). A.D. 12: 56.27.4–5. Cf. 16: 57.16.1–4.

²²Cf. Ginsburg 33–35, 128–130.

²³On Tacitus see Ginsburg 96–100.

²⁴Tacitus’ cluster of A.D. 57 (*Ann.* 13.31–33) is comparable.

this theme (e.g., the posting of Germanicus to the front as quaestor), or forcing the heterogeneous into the same mould (e.g., the banishment of Agrippa Postumus). Because Dio's stylistic proclivity is towards the smooth, flowing narrative—he would approve Lucian's precept (*Hist. conscr.* 55) that in history succeeding topics should be welded together and not merely “be neighbors”—, he often strives to temper the naturally abrupt style of annals by selecting for his cluster items with a common theme or by contriving transitions. Also he often elaborates urban annalistic clusters with non-annalistic matter such as digressions, his own observations, anecdotes, and glosses.

II THE SOURCE(S) OF THE URBAN ANNALISTIC ELEMENT IN BOOKS 51–56

It goes without saying that the unrelenting series of clusters which make up the corpus of urban annalistic material in Dio 51–56 (see Appendix) is the work of an annalist. But to what extent was that annalist Dio? Did *he* constitute the annalistic element independently out of his sources? Or are his clusters in their essentials taken over from the annals of his predecessor(s)? Although the matter is not susceptible of proof, it is hard to see how, even had he wanted to, Dio could have worked up his annalistic element in any thoroughgoing way from *non*-annalistic sources. The scale and schedule of his undertaking left little time for that: it is unlikely that he could have allotted to a given Augustan book the *otium* of more than a few months out of the twenty-two years it took him to compose the seventy-six books which carried his *History* down to the death of Septimius Severus (72.23.5). For an *annalist* with a millennium of history to cover, the efficient thing—and one conducive to accuracy—was to rely extensively on *annalistic* predecessors who had already fixed events in their chronological and historical context.²⁵

This argument from convenience weighs heavily against Andersen's thesis that Dio composed his annalistic sections by incorporating items from subsidiary sources in a narrative frame. Andersen holds, in particular, that where Dio lists honours and powers voted to Julius Caesar and Augustus he must have drawn on “a documentary work” (“eine aktenmässige Publikation”) listing senate decrees.²⁶ But lists of votes are *not* foreign to Roman annals. They are easily found in Livy,²⁷ and Tacitus several times lists *adul-*

²⁵See Dio's own remarks on the daunting range of imperial history (53.19.4–5). On the chronology of composition see T. D. Barnes, “The Composition of Cassius Dio's *Roman History*,” *Phoenix* 38 (1984) 240–255. On the *otium* of senators, which can be overestimated, see R. J. A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton 1984) 215–216.

²⁶Andersen 9–48; 22 on *aktenmässige Publikation*.

²⁷E.g., 33.43.1–9; 39.14.5–9, 18.8–19.7; 45.2.8–11.

ationes decreed by the Senate: on the suppression of conspiracies by Libo Drusus in A.D. 16 (*Ann.* 2.32.1–2) and Piso in 65 (15.74.1, cf. 3); on the death of Germanicus in 19 (2.83.1–4); on the birth and death of Nero's daughter in 63 (15.23.2–3). So nothing forbids thinking that where Dio gives a list of honours or powers he has used an annalistic rather than a documentary source, and that its author had already done much of the work of integration which Andersen attributes to Dio himself.²⁸ Also the notion that Dio relied on annalistic sources explains more naturally than his own *akribeia* why, though he sometimes nods, his record for chronological accuracy is a respectable one.²⁹

If the presence of urban annalistic clusters throughout Dio's Augustan account marks their source as an annalist,³⁰ it is in the detailed composition of the clusters that we must look for clues about the character of that source. To examine Dio's corpus of about thirty clusters together *as a set*, apart from the other components of his medley, is to be struck by how minute or specialized is much of the information he has chosen to convey and how germane to his own concerns as a consular senator. One may take, for example, certain reports about electoral aberrations, each (note well) registered in its own year: in 23 B.C. the replacement of a plebeian aedile who had died in office by a former curule aedile (53.33.3); in 19 B.C. the abdication of an aedile voluntarily because of penury (54.11.1); in 14 B.C. the re-election, at a new meeting of the *comitia*, of the curule aediles, who had abdicated

²⁸How Tacitus performed this work of integration can be seen by comparing his account of the honours voted posthumously to Germanicus in the Senate (*Ann.* 2.83.1–4) with the fragmentary text of the original votes as inscribed on the recently published *tabula Siarensis* (J. González, "Tabula Siarensis, Fortunales Siarenses et Municipia Civium Romanorum," ZPE 55 [1984] 55–100). So close are the parallels between the two texts as to remove all serious doubt that Tacitus' condensed version came directly from the *acta senatus*. The reason for thinking that Dio did not proceed in the same way (using the *acta*) or in a similar way (using extracts from the *acta*) is simply that he had to treat events in a fraction of the time and space. Livy allotted ten books to the years 30–9 B.C. compared with Dio's four (including Book 52, mostly given over to the Agrippa–Maecenas dialogue). Tacitus allotted six books to the reign of Tiberius compared with Dio's two. See also section III below.

Andersen believes that when Dio from time to time lists decrees which there is reason to doubt were implemented he must have been using the *aktenmässige Publikation*: this source did not distinguish which decrees Augustus accepted and which not, leaving Dio to rely on his own knowledge. But uncertainty over acceptance or non-acceptance of senate votes may have exercised not only Dio but even the historian using the *acta senatus*, given the practice, now illustrated in the *tabula Siarensis*, of referring to the emperor a slate of votes from which he would select those he pleased. Cf. *Ann.* 6.45.2; Dio 56.47.1.

²⁹On the risks of error in working up city annals independently, see Syme's remarks on Tacitus in "Tacitus: Some Sources of his Information," *JRS* 72 (1982) 68–82, at 76.

³⁰I use the singular, annalist, for convenience. The question whether the urban annalistic clusters of Books 51–56 derive from a single annalist or from more than one (in series or parallel) baffles inquiry. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.1.2: *temporibusque Augusti dicendis non defuere decora ingenia*.

vitio facti (54.24.1); in A.D. 11 the election of sixteen praetors rather than the usual twelve (56.25.4). Or certain *recherché* particulars about proceedings in the Senate: in 13 B.C. the consul Tiberius' putting the question first to Cornelius Balbus as a mark of honour on the dedication of the *theatrum Balbi* (54.25.2); in the same year Augustus' giving the account of his *acta* to his quaestor to read in the Senate, having lost his own voice to laryngitis (54.25.5); in A.D. 5 the admission to the Senate, as spectators, of equites whose daughters were candidates for sortition as Vestal Virgins, but the exclusion of freedman fathers (55.22.5); in A.D. 12 Germanicus' reading of one of Augustus' speeches because the aged princeps could no longer make himself heard (56.26.2). It is some measure of how far Dio was able to indulge his special interest in selecting these eight events for his *History* (and indirectly a measure of how much material his annalistic source offered him) that none of the eight found its way into Suetonius' biography of Augustus, and that Xiphilinus and Zonaras, *epitomators of Dio*, omit seven and eight of the events respectively. How likely is it that the author of a meagre annalistic source, "wenig detailliert," would preserve them?

Dio's close knowledge of governmental enactments, which by deep-rooted historiographic tradition were at the heart of city annals, casts revealing light on his source. If his reports of these enactments are typically brief, they are nonetheless quite precise and specific, and perspicuous enough to suggest he drew his information from an intelligible context. Now to read Dio literally would be to take a great many enactments as actions of Augustus. He sees Rome as a monarchy and the monarch as directing events, and is inclined to attribute to Augustus any action he had the power to motivate, whatever the legal formalities. Besides, it is a convenient way of organizing history to focus on a dominant figure. But on closer enquiry most measures reveal themselves by word or context as corporate acts, above all else as senate decrees, even where Dio describes Augustus as commanding, forbidding, vouchsafing, or executing something.³¹

There is to be sure nothing remarkable in Dio's relating enactments of exceptional interest or importance like the senate decree of 22 B.C. nominating Augustus dictator, passed while the Senate was under violent siege by the populace (54.1.3). An epitomator could be counted on to do as much. What is significant is that Dio can adduce so many *forgettable* particulars of *minor* enactments. He knows, for example, by what provisions a shortage of quaestors to serve in the provinces and a shortage of candidates for the tribunate were met in 24 and 12 B.C. respectively (53.28.4; 54.30.2);³² the

³¹Cf. A. Momigliano, *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford 1977) 372; P. A. Brunt, "The Role of the Senate in the Augustan Regime," *CQ* NS 34 (1984) 423–444.

³²See 54.26.7 and 56.27.1 for other measures against the chronic shortage of candidates for the tribunate. Cf. C. Nicolet, "Le cens sénatorial sous la république et sous Auguste," *JRS* 66 (1976) 20–38, at 35, n. 55. Dio's source kept him *au courant* of solutions to this problem.

number of lictors voted to the ex-praetors given responsibility for road-building in 20 B.C. (54.8.4), to the senatorial delegates dispatched in 19 B.C. to Augustus (54.10.2), to the *vicomagistri* on their creation in 7 B.C. (55.8.7), to the members of the board responsible for administering the *aerarium militare* founded in A.D. 6 (55.25.2), and to the widowed Livia in A.D. 14 in her capacity as priestess of the deified Augustus (56.46.2). He knows how the composition of the board responsible for grain distribution was fixed in 22 B.C. and modified in 18 (54.1.4, 54.17.1); through what failing of the tribunes and aediles the archival care of *senatus consulta* was removed from their hands in 11 B.C. (54.36.1);³³ how the lack of a quorum of senators was accommodated during the famine of A.D. 6 (55.26.2); what arrangement was made for the administration of Achaia after its governor died in mid-term during the same year (55.27.6); why in A.D. 11 Augustus forbade provinces to bestow honours on governors either during their tenure or in the sixty days thereafter (56.25.6); which magistrates convened the Senate in A.D. 14 and asked it to consent to raising the pay of a striking actor (56.47.2; cf. 56.46.4).³⁴

Dio's reports of governmental enactments are not all equally brief. Occasional lengthier pieces suggest that where his interest quickened the annalistic material in his source allowed him to expatiate. His acephalous summary of an enactment on the uses of the temple of Mars Ultor, dedicated in 2 B.C., records some ten separate provisions (55.10.2–5). Under A.D. 12 he gives the following account of regulations intended to cramp the life of exiles (56.27.2–3):³⁵

[Augustus] ordered that no one who had been barred from fire and water should live either on the mainland or on any of the islands less than four hundred stades from the mainland, except Cos, Rhodes, Samos, and Lesbos; why he made an exception of these alone I do not know. Besides this he ordered that they should not cross the sea to any other place, should not own more than one thousand-amphora freighter and two oared ships, should not employ more than twenty slaves or freedmen, and should not possess property worth more than 500,000 sesterces. He warned that the exiles themselves as well as their accomplices would be punished for any breach.

The legal detail which obtrudes itself here—despite Dio's Atticizing restraint—offers a glimpse of the fuller texture of his annalistic source. One catches a

³³Cf. R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore 1969) 9.

³⁴What has been given here is a sample that could be multiplied from other urban annalistic texts (see Appendix). Needless to say, reports of enactments are not confined to annalistic texts. Many (though fewer) have been subsumed by Dio (or his source) under *other* elements of the Augustan account, for example, the votes of triumphal honours annexed to narratives of campaigns.

³⁵On Mars Ultor cf. Suet. *Aug.* 29.2. On the regulations regarding exiles, B. Levick, "*Poenae legis maiestatis*," *Historia* 28 (1979) 358–379, at 376–377.

like glimpse under 22 B.C., where Dio treats economies in public entertainments (54.2.3–4):

Having assigned responsibility for all the festivals to the praetors, Augustus ordered a sum to be paid to them from the *aerarium*, and forbade any one of them to spend more on the festivals than the other from his own means or to give a gladiatorial combat under any circumstances other than if the Senate decreed it, or oftener than twice each year, or with more than one hundred and twenty men.

Or under A.D. 13, where he records a vote defining the authority of Augustus' *consilium* (56.28.2–3):

It was also voted that all measures should be valid, as if approved by the whole Senate, which were resolved upon by Augustus in deliberation with Tiberius and them [i.e., his "twenty annual counsellors"], as well as the consuls in office at the time and the consuls designate, together with his grandchildren—the adoptive ones, clearly—and such others as he might on each occasion call on for advice.

In the light of texts like these, we can better understand why, in his personal comments, Dio gives more signs of having to deal with a surfeit than with a poverty of annalistic detail. The most explicit of these signs are remarks about limiting himself to what is "worthy of record," as in his prefatory piece on the changed conditions of historiography under the empire (53.19.6) or when he introduces the first urban annalistic cluster under the Augustan Principate (53.22.1).³⁶ His *apologia* for treating Augustan legislation summarily is of special import (53.21.1–2):

I need *not* set forth [his laws] in detail one by one, but only those which are useful for my history; and I shall follow the same course also in the case of his later enactments, in order not to become wearisome by introducing all that kind of detail which not even the very men who are expert in such studies know with precision.³⁷

These are not the words of an author short of annalistic material.³⁸ Dio can later be observed keeping to his promise not to weary the reader: when,

³⁶There is a similar statement at 57.14.1 (under Tiberius). Cf. 55.28.2–3, instructive though treating military affairs; also 57.23.1–2 on handling *maiestas* trials ἐν κεφαλαίῳ. Such statements are commonplace in history (G. Avenarius, *Lucians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* [Meisenheim 1956] 129–130). That is not to say they are untrue. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.65.1, 13.31.1.

³⁷Οὐδὲν δὲ δέομαι καθ' ἕκαστον ἀκριβῶς ἐπεξημένα, χωρὶς ἢ ὅσα τῇ συγγραφῇ πρόσφορά ἐστι. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα πραχθεῖσι ποιήσω, ἵνα μὴ καὶ δι' ὄχλου γένωμαι πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπεσφέρων ἃ μὴδ' αὐτοὶ οἱ πάνυ αὐτὰ μελετῶντες ἀκριβοῦσιν. Cf. 38.7.6 on the legislation of Julius Caesar in 59 B.C.: "Since these [laws] are very numerous and contribute nothing to this history, I will omit them." Also 60.11.6 on Claudius' laws. Cf. Millar 43–44.

³⁸Dio does remark on deficiencies in his information on imperial history: many events are kept secret; those that are not are given the official construction; fiction breeds; much goes unreported; the magnitude of the empire and the multitude of events make an accurate know-

under 9 B.C., he records Augustus' regulation of the quorums needed for the various species of *senatus consulta* (55.3.2), he explains that he is summarizing (ὡς γε ἐν κεφαλαίοις εἰπεῖν). Even in his fuller than usual account of the restrictions imposed on exiles in A.D. 12 (above), he limits himself to what is "essential for history" (56.27.4, ὅσα γε καὶ ἐς ἱστορίαν ἀναγκαῖά ἐστι). And in registering a benefaction of Augustus to Paphos, afflicted by earthquake, he hastens to disabuse his reader of any notion that there were not many other like benefactions to stricken cities by Augustus and the Senate before and after this: "if an author mentioned them all, the task of writing history would be endless" (54.23.7–8, ὥν εἴ τις ἀπάντων μνημονεύοι, ἀπέραντον ἂν τὸ ἔργον τῆς συγγραφῆς γένοιτο).

III THE URBAN ANNALISTIC ELEMENT IN DIO AND TACITUS, A.D. 15–16

Any inquiry into the nature of Dio's Augustan sources is hampered greatly by the lack of a substantial history of the reign with which to compare his own. Only his account of events surrounding the death of Augustus (56.29.1–47.2), which Tacitus also treats in the *Annals*, offers much opportunity for direct comparison. Even here Dio has composed his necrology largely on narrative rather than annalistic lines, so that comparison can prove little about his *annalistic* source. For want of an apt *Augustan* text to compare with Dio, the next best thing is to compare parallel texts from just beyond the limit of the reign, namely the urban annalistic clusters of A.D. 15 and 16 in Dio and in Tacitus' *Annals* (in the course of Dio's account of 17 the *codex Marcianus* breaks off, and we recover his original only under 31). Assuming for the moment that Dio's historiographic practice remained reasonably constant as he passed from the reign of Augustus to the next, comparison of his and Tacitus' city annals for the same Tiberian years may shed a helpful, if indirect, light on the materials he used for the preceding Augustan years.³⁹

Dio opens his account proper of the reign of Tiberius with a study of the emperor thirteen chapters long (57.1–13), the kind of biographic introduction that Questa has shown typically heads each reign in the *History*. Then

ledge hard to obtain (53.19.1–5). However, it is not official information which he misses (and most urban annalistic material is by nature official under the empire), but what has been suppressed or gone unrecorded. In the odd passage he notes a lack of specific information: 51.22.9 (why a certain festive event was held); 53.1.2 (details of Augustus' conduct as consul); 54.28.4 (explanation of funeral taboo); 56.27.2 (allowed places of exile); cf. 55.10a.2 (causes of a migration of the Hermunduri), 55.24.5, 8 (complements of military forces).

³⁹There is no lack of comparisons of Dio and Tacitus on 15 and 16. See Syme; cf. *id.*, "Vibius Rufus and Vibius Rufinus," *ZPE* 43 (1981) 365–371; *JRS* 72 (above, n. 29) 73, 78; *Athenaeum* 61 (1983) 3. The purpose in adding another here is not to correct but to focus on Dio rather than (as usual) Tacitus, and to illuminate Dio's *Augustan* account.

he resumes, under the consuls of 15, the familiar annalistic pattern: "I will relate in chronological order the various events of the reign, at least in so far as they are worthy of record" (57.14.1). Of some 40 and 60 Boissevain lines which Dio devotes to 15 and 16 respectively about one-third makes up the urban annalistic cluster of each year. The two clusters offer everything that is expected. The topics are familiar from the Augustan books: public games (twice), the administration of senatorial provinces (thrice), a death in the dynasty, a Tiber flood, establishment of senatorial boards (twice), senate decrees (at least twice), senatorial debate (at least twice), a fire.⁴⁰ Moreover, Dio composes this material with the same free hand as before.⁴¹ The first Tiberian clusters simply continue, without visible deviation in approach, his long series of Augustan clusters.

Tacitus' urban annalistic clusters of 15 and 16 are readily identified by the same criteria as Dio's—indeed they exemplify the species better and are infiltrated less by non-annalistic material. It is no surprise, given the narrower chronological limits of the *Annals*, that the clusters run much longer, and that the number of annalistic items registered in them is much greater than the dozen registered by Dio in the same two years.⁴² *Tacitus'* items are usually (not always) more circumstantial, affording a better picture of the interaction of personalities, interests, and ideas. A case in point is his extended account, under 15, of the deliberations in the Senate on the control of Tiber floods, including hearings of embassies from Florence and other communities likely to be affected should tributaries of the Tiber be diverted artificially (*Ann.* 1.76.1; 1.79; cf. Dio 57.14.7–8).⁴³

Brief as Dio's urban annalistic clusters are when compared with *Tacitus'*, *he often approaches Tacitus closely in the density and precision of details*, though these details are not always in common. Both register under 15 games presided over by Drusus in his own and Germanicus' name (57.14.3; cf. *Tac. Ann.* 1.76.3–4), Dio alone noting that Tiberius debarred an *eques* who had killed a peer from further gladiation. Both treat the sumptuary measures voted by the Senate in 16, their summaries of the enactment almost passing as translations of each other, so close is the correspondence—though they diverge in recounting the debate in the Senate, Dio focusing on Tiberius' refusal to admit the Greek word *emblema* (inlaid relief) in the text of the decree (57.15.1–2), *Tacitus*, who is fuller, on Asinius Gallus' justification

⁴⁰A.D. 15: 57.14.3–8 (in part). A.D. 16: 57.15.1–2, 5, 8–9 (in part); 16.1–2.

⁴¹Thus, under 16, he arranges his material so as to illustrate Tiberius' inconsistency (οὐχ ὁμολογούμενον, 57.15.4). It may be this that caused him to depart from chronological order (though not from the proper year) in recording sumptuary measures ahead of the trial of Libo Drusus (cf. *Tac. Ann.* 2.32–33), and to detach that trial from the related punishment of astrologers (cf. *Ann.* 2.32.2–3).

⁴²Cf. Syme 237.

⁴³See F. R. D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus* 2 (Cambridge 1981) 171–172.

of luxury as a balm for the cares of the ruling order (*Ann.* 2.33.1–4). Both record punishments inflicted in 16 on astrologers and magicians (Dio 57.15.8–9; Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.3), each account exhibiting correspondences with Ulpian's;⁴⁴ only Dio, however, tells us that, except for the veto of a tribune, citizen practitioners—even recidivists—would have been acquitted (while *peregrini* were executed): so the Senate had resolved, on the motion of the single-minded Cn. Calpurnius Piso (*cos.* 7 B.C.), over the wishes of Tiberius and Drusus.

There are also four reports, all “senatorial,” in Dio’s annalistic clusters of these two years which find *no* mention in Tacitus: that in 15, on the death of its governor, Crete was assigned for the unexpired term to his quaestor and legatus (57.14.4); that by a measure of the same year proconsuls were instructed to depart for their provinces by 1 June (57.14.5); that in 16, because the number of quaestors in office did not suffice to fill the vacancies in the provinces, ex-quaestors who had held office the year before were called into service (57.16.1); that in the same year “as many of the public records had either perished completely or had at least grown dim with time, three senators were appointed to copy those that were still extant and to search out the texts of the others” (57.16.2).⁴⁵

It is now arguable, thanks to our Tacitean control, that Dio’s lost annalistic source for 15 and 16 was not markedly less copious than the surviving account of Tacitus, since even in Dio’s compendious clusters so many precise annalistic items or details turn up to supplement Tacitus. That is the fundamental point. But it can be built on. The case for Tacitus’ *direct* use of the *acta senatus* as a source, especially in the early books of the *Annals*, has been argued often and persuasively by Syme.⁴⁶ An attractive way of explaining (1) the preponderance of *senatorial* business in Dio’s two Tiberian clusters and (2) the patchwork of coincidence and divergence between him and Tacitus is to posit that he (like Tacitus) owes much of his material to the *acta senatus*. It would of course be mistaken to think that Dio consulted the *acta senatus* directly (see note 28), not so to think he was following an annalist who, like Tacitus, had the *acta* among his sources. From that voluminous record, it may be conjectured, the nameless annalist drew material for his city annals of 15 and 16.⁴⁷ Tacitus did the same—but with a more critical,

⁴⁴*De officio proconsulis* 7 in *Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio* 15.2.1; cf. Goodyear (above, n. 43) 284–285.

⁴⁵Cf. 57.15.5, where Dio notices, on the occasion of the condemnation of Libo Drusus, a vote of a thanksgiving on behalf of Tiberius, Augustus, and Julius Caesar—Tacitus records votes on the same occasion, but different ones (*Ann.* 2.32.1–2), though Dio’s thanksgiving may well be the same thing as Tacitus’ *supplicationum dies*.

⁴⁶Syme 231–263; *JRS* 72 (1982) 72–82. Cf. R. Martin, *Tacitus* (Berkeley 1981) 201–207.

⁴⁷Cf. Syme *JRS* 72 (1982) 73 (on 15 B.C.): “Dio went back to one of the annalistic predecessors of Tacitus who had made a selection notably different, and inferior in point and value.” Also 78.

revisionist intent (cf. *Ann.* 1.1.2–3). Sometimes their selections coincided, sometimes not.⁴⁸ What we have in Dio's urban annalistic clusters of these two years is in the main what he took from the selection made by his annalistic predecessor.⁴⁹ Reduced to the few highly particular items on which his own interest fastened and which the pace of his work would admit, Dio's clusters give the impression of coming from a source that was "clearly something of a rag-bag," Goodyear's epithet.⁵⁰ That is probably a false impression: the rags are of Dio's own making, the product of abridging his source remorselessly.

The argument can be summed up thus. (1) The similarity in form and content between Dio's first two Tiberian clusters and his series of Augustan clusters confirms the expected: Dio did not alter *modus operandi* and materials fundamentally as he turned to the reign of Tiberius. (2) Comparison with Tacitus indicates that Dio's annalistic source for the Tiberian clusters was ample and closely informed about governmental transactions—and may have drawn directly on the *acta senatus*. (3) It follows (*mutatis mutandis*) that the same was probably true of the source of Dio's *Augustan* clusters⁵¹ (which may well be the same source).

If Dio's annalistic source on Augustus consulted the *acta senatus*, that is far from meaning that everything in the urban annalistic clusters of Books 51–56 should be traced back to that archive. Just as Tacitus consulted the *acta diurna* as well as the *acta senatus* (*Ann.* 3.3.2; cf. Pliny *Ep.* 7.33.3), it would be natural for Dio's annalistic source to do the same (though for Dio to use the *diurna* himself would have been impractical).⁵² This gazette could provide detailed information on governmental business, including trials, on events of the court, on public works and spectacles (here Dio is very well informed), on prodigies, in addition to events of unusual popular interest.⁵³ As the case of Livy (or Dio) proves, there could also be *literary* sources of *annalistica* (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.88.1).

⁴⁸Do some coincidences in the choice of events to record arise through Tacitus' adopting the *anonymus* as a "guide" to the *acta senatus*? For a small fragment of the *acta*, preserved in a papyrus from Egypt, see R. J. A. Talbert, "Commodus as Diplomat in an Extract from the *Acta Senatus*," *ZPE* 71 (1988) 137–147.

⁴⁹No doubt the whole truth, which is hidden from us, is more complex than this: by his own statement, Dio consulted more than two sources for 15 (57.14.3).

⁵⁰Goodyear (above, n. 43) 2.136.

⁵¹This conclusion complements Brunt's thesis (above, n. 31), which rests extensively on *testimonia* from Dio, that Augustus' "new system involved continual reference of all sorts of measures to the senate for its approval in accordance with Republican practice" (444).

⁵²Dio mentions the *acta diurna* several times in recounting imperial events, but not as a source: 57.12.2, τὰ δημόσια ὑπομνήματα; 57.21.5 (Xiph.); 57.23.2 (Xiph.); 60.33.1 (*Exc. Val.*); 67.11.3 (*Exc. Val.*); cf. 53.19.2.

⁵³See B. Baldwin, "The *acta diurna*," *Chiron* 9 (1979) 189–203.

IV ON IDENTIFYING DIO'S ANNALISTIC
SOURCE(S) FOR AUGUSTUS

Dio nowhere says on whose annals he based his own briefer Augustan account. Among known names three possibilities are most often ventured. One is Livy, whose history reached 9 B.C. A second is Cremutius Cordus; in recording his suicide under Tiberius, Dio mentions (though not as a source) the history which Cremutius "had long since written on the deeds of Augustus and which Augustus himself had read."⁵⁴ Aufidius Bassus is the third. It was to his annals that Cassiodorus turned in the *Chronica* for the names of *consules ordinarii* from 8 B.C., Livy's history having left off. That could mean a work *a fine Livii*. However, since Seneca the Elder cites Aufidius on the death of Cicero, the history probably took an earlier starting-point and included the whole reign of Augustus.⁵⁵

For none of these candidates can a strong positive case be made. Books 133–142 of Livy (31–9 B.C.) are lost, and the extant summaries, which amount to just 50 lines, offer the sort of correspondences with Dio that could arise simply because both authors treat the same events. The Augustan fragments of Cremutius and Aufidius are exiguous: from Cremutius there is a single report, transmitted by Suetonius, about senators being searched for weapons during a *lectio senatus* (*Aug.* 35.2); from Aufidius three bald notices inserted by Cassiodorus into his list of consuls.⁵⁶

Elusive as the *name* of Dio's annalistic source may be, a *terminus ante quem* can be fixed. There are numerous contacts, long since recognized, between Dio's Augustan account and Suetonius' *Augustus* and *Tiberius*.⁵⁷ These point to material in common, necessarily predating Suetonius' *Lives*.⁵⁸ However, since both authors drew on sources in various genres, it remains to establish that they used an *annalist* in common. For this purpose parallel texts that are anecdotal, biographic, narrative, or *kata genos*, and may therefore derive from a *non*-annalistic source, are of little use (of the Augustan parallels adduced by Millar and Manuwald in illustrating the relationship between Dio and Suetonius almost all are of this sort).⁵⁹ What is needed is to locate *annalistic* material in common, sufficient in quantity and distribution

⁵⁴57.24.2–4; Tac. *Ann.* 4.34.1 terms the work *annales*.

⁵⁵*Chron.* p. 659 Mommsen, cf. 630 = *HRR* 2.96 fr. 3; Sen. *Suas.* 6.18, 23. The Emperor Claudius treated Augustan history *a pace civili* (Suet. *Cl.* 41.2).

⁵⁶Manuwald 168–254 rejects all views that Dio depended on Livy. The case for Cremutius is given briefly by Millar 85; cf. Manuwald 254–257. Syme (above, n. 6) 274–276, 697–700 proposes Aufidius (also in *Athenaeum* 61 [1983] 9–10); cf. Manuwald 257–258.

⁵⁷For a collection of such contacts see Millar 85–87; most of these were already noted *ad locc.* in Reimar's edition of Dio (Hamburg, 1750–52).

⁵⁸Manuwald 267–268, who lays to rest the notion that Dio made significant use of Suetonius in treating Augustus. Cf. L. De Coninck, *Suetonius en de Archivalia* (Brussels 1983) 217–218; Wallace-Hadrill 64–65.

⁵⁹Millar 85–87; Manuwald 260–267. Of Millar's and Manuwald's Augustan pairs only two are definitely annalistic (55.3.1, *Aug.* 35.3; 55.6.6–7, *Aug.* 31.2).

DIO AND SUETONIUS: ANNALISTIC PARALLELS

Event	Text in Dio; Year	Text in Suetonius; Rubric
Notes held by <i>aerarium</i> burnt	53.2.3; 28 B.C.	Aug. 32.2; reform of abuses
Senators' <i>proedria</i> in theatres affirmed	53.25.1; 26 B.C. ⁶⁰	Aug. 44.1; shows under Augustus
Delisted senators conceded privileges	54.14.4; 18 B.C.	Aug. 35.2; Augustus' rehabilitation of the Senate
Terms of military service fixed	54.25.5–6; 13 B.C. ⁶¹	Aug. 49.2 (first sentence); the armed forces under Augustus
Equites made eligible for tribunate	54.30.2; 12 B.C.	Aug. 40.1; Augustus and the equites
Regular meetings of Senate scheduled	55.3.1; 9 B.C.	Aug. 35.3; Augustus' rehabilitation of the Senate
Month Sexilis renamed August	55.6.6–7; 8 B.C. ⁶²	Aug. 31.2; reforms in the state religion
Temple of Mars Ultor dedicated	55.10.2–3; 2 B.C.	Aug. 29.2; public works of Augustus
Measures taken against famine	55.26.1; A.D. 6	Aug. 42.3; liberality of Augustus
Temple of Castor and Pollux dedicated	55.27.4; A.D. 6 ⁶³	Tib. 20; Tiberius' career from A.D. 4
Tiberius returns victorious from Pannonia	56.1.1; A.D. 9 ⁶⁴	Tib. 17.2 (<i>urbem praetextatus</i> , etc.); Tiberius' career from A.D. 4
Temple of Concord dedicated	56.25.1; A.D. 10 ⁶⁵	Tib. 20; Tiberius' career from A.D. 4
Sumptuary measures enacted by Tiberius	57.15.2; A.D. 16	Tib. 71; Tiberius' use of Greek

⁶⁰See J. M. Carter, *Suetonius. Divus Augustus* (Bristol 1982) 159. Dio's ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἀρχῇ αὐτοῦ = "in the entire domain of the *populus Romanus*" (*contra* Loeb and Penguin translations).

⁶¹Compare *inter alia*: διέτροξε / *ad certam formulam adstrinxit*; τὰ ἔτη / *stipendiorum*; τὰ χρήματα etc. / *praemiorum*; ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς / *definitis* etc.; ὅπως . . . μηδὲν τοῦτων γε ἕνεκα νέωτερότερον / *ne aut aetate aut inopia sollicitari ad res novas possent*.

⁶²The case for a date of 8 B.C. (rather than 27, with Livy *Per.* 134) is argued decisively by A. B. Bosworth, "Augustus and August. Some Pitfalls of Historical Fiction," *HSCP* 86 (1982) 151–170, at 164 ff.

⁶³On the date see W. Vogt, *C. Suetonius Tranquillus, Vita Tiberii: Kommentar* (Würzburg 1975) 101; also Appendix under A.D. 6. The present parallel (Temple of Castor and Pollux) is to be linked with that at n. 65 (Temple of Concord).

⁶⁴See Vogt (above, n. 63) 95 on the date.

⁶⁵For the date see *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.1.114–115 = Ej² p. 45.

to point unambiguously to a common annalistic source. The accompanying table attempts to do this by marshalling twelve pairs of parallel Augustan texts (and one Tiberian pair) from Dio and Suetonius. In each pair a text from an urban annalistic cluster in Dio is matched with a text from Suetonius in which there are verbal or other correspondences consistent with both having a common source. In Dio the annalist, it will be seen, each item is in its proper year; in Suetonius the biographer each is ranged under a topical rubric as he uses what Wallace-Hadrill calls his "characteristic process"—"the dissolution of narrative into fragments, and their reconstitution under heads of analysis."⁶⁶ As will occur in authors making independent use of a common source, the one retains details not to be found in the other. Suetonius specifies certain privileges retained by delisted senators where Dio does not (*Aug.* 35.2, cf. 54.14.4), Dio specifies "sceptre and crown" where Suetonius gives "insignia of triumphs" (55.10.3, cf. *Aug.* 29.2), and so forth. The texts from Dio are widely distributed in the annalistic clusters of his Augustan account from 28 B.C. to A.D. 10, while those from Suetonius appear under a variety of rubrics. Both authors, it follows, were using the common source systematically. That there are not more or longer corresponding *annalistic* pairs is hardly surprising. For much that the one author took from the common source the other will have had no use, given their different purposes and genres.⁶⁷ Either could alter the common material beyond recognition in reworking it.

Beyond thus fixing a Suetonian *terminus ante quem* for Dio's annalistic source one can move only tentatively. It is probable on general grounds that Dio used annals composed not long after the reign of Augustus. But clear evidence for this is hard to come by. To return at length to Capua and the threatening presence of Mount Vesuvius, where we started, it was clearly not because of a gap in his villa library that Dio gave small space to the annalistic element in recounting the reign of Augustus. He wrote his "very thin chronological narrative" with at least one full-scale annalistic work before him, vestiges of which stand forth prominently in the form of annalistic clusters—outcroppings from a historiographic landscape now lost to sight. The knowledge that Dio saw the larger landscape, even if he reproduces only snap-shots of it rather than the panorama, gives assurance that in what he does record in annalistic form, however selectively, the focus is clear and his bearings straight.⁶⁸

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SASKATOON, S7N 0W0

⁶⁶Wallace-Hadrill 13. On the term "narrative" see the remark in n. 9 above.

⁶⁷One would not expect Suetonius, as a biographer, to make as much use of an annalistic source as Dio. Cf. Wallace-Hadrill 64.

⁶⁸The criticisms of the referees and editors of *Phoenix* have done much to improve this article.

APPENDIX

This appendix records tentatively the location, according to my conservative judgment, of the urban annalistic “clusters” in each complete (or largely complete) year of the Augustan books (51–56). It lists sections of Dio’s text which belong in whole or in part to a cluster (e.g., it lists 53.1.5 even though part of this section is Dio’s own gloss). On the term urban annalistic cluster see the text at notes 6 ff.

30 B.C.: 51.19.4–7. I exclude the annalistic matter in 51.19.1–3 which, for thematic reasons, Dio has imported from the previous year.

29 B.C.: 51.20.1–4; 21.1–22.6; 22.9; 52.42.1–6, 8; 43.1–2.

28 B.C.: 53.1.1, 3–6; 2.1–5.

27 B.C.: 53.22.1–2. Apart from this, only the odd vestige of an annalistic item punctuates the long account of 27, which contains Octavian’s *recusatio imperii*, an excursus on the provinces and their government, analysis of the emperor’s powers, a sketch of Augustus’ manner of rule, etc.

26 B.C.: 53.23.1–2; 25.1. From the former of these texts—on Agrippa’s dedication of the *saepia Iulia*—Dio digresses on the modest comportment of Agrippa, contrasting it with the insubordination of Cornelius Gallus and Egnatius Rufus, then returns in the latter text to an annalistic item.

25 B.C.: 53.27.6. I omit 53.26.5, which, though it records votes of honours, Dio annexes to his account of external affairs, and (more diffidently) 53.27.1–3, 5 because of the biographic preoccupation.

24 B.C.: 53.28.1–4.

23 B.C.: 53.32.2–5; 33.1–3, 5. What precedes these passages under 23 is a narrative of Augustus’ illness and of the crisis of state which it produced (53.30.1–32.1). Some urban annalistic items are incorporated in it (e.g., in 53.30.3, 6).

22 B.C.: 54.1.1–4; 2.1, 3–5; 4.1–2. Diffidently, I omit the trial of M. Primus and the conspiracy of Murena and Caepio because Dio uses them *kata genos* in illustrating the moderation of Augustus and because his account is more narrative than annalistic in character—though it contains annalistic items, e.g., the enactments on Augustus’ right to convoke the Senate (54.3.3), on verdicts in undefended cases (54.3.6), and on a thanksgiving to mark the suppression of the plot (54.3.8). The characteristic transition from urban to external affairs is made at 54.5.1.

21 B.C.: 54.6.2–3, 6.

20 B.C.: 54.8.4–5. I have excluded the annalistic material of 54.8.2–3, which Dio has reworked in treating Augustus’ Parthian “victory.”

19 B.C.: 54.10.1–6; 11.1.

18 B.C.: 54.16.1–2, 7; 17.1–4. I have excluded, sometimes very diffidently, the annalistic material interlaced in 54.12.4–15.8, a medley of narrative, anecdotes, editorial remarks, etc. Among the excluded items are grants of powers to Augustus and Agrippa and details of the *lectio senatus*.

17 B.C.: 54.18.1–3.

16 B.C.: 54.19.4–8.

15 B.C.: 54.23.1, 7. In Dio's year account for 15, 54.23.1–8 is the end chapter (see at nn. 18 ff.), which includes a long obituary of Vedius Pollio.

14 B.C.: 54.24.1–2.

13 B.C.: 54.25.1–26.3, 8. I have excluded 54.27.1–4 as *kata genos*.

12 B.C.: 54.30.1–3, 5. Cf. Andersen 37 for the view that the reports in 54.30 belong under 11 B.C.

11 B.C.: 54.35.1–2, 4–5; 36.1. I omit urban annalistic items subsumed under accounts of external affairs at 54.34.1–2, 4, 7; 36.2.

10 B.C.: No urban annalistic cluster, though 54.36.4 looks like a jejune summary of urban *annalistica* from Dio's source.

9 B.C.: 55.3.1–3, 6; 4.1, 4. I omit urban annalistic items subsumed under the account of Drusus' death (55.1–2).

8 B.C.: 55.5.1–6.1; 6.5–7. The account of external affairs leads into the second of these two passages, which is followed by an end chapter under the form of a long obituary of Maecenas (cf. 15 B.C. above).

7 B.C.: 55.8.1–3, 5–7.

I omit 6–3 B.C. since little of Dio's text survives.

2 B.C. (both the beginning and the end of Dio's account are lost in *lacunae*): 55.10.2–11, 14–15. Dio has not observed strict chronological order throughout. Thus the conferring on Augustus of the title *pater patriae* on 5 February (*Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.1.119, *fasti Praen.*) is placed later in the account (55.10.10) than one would expect.

I omit the fragmentary years 1 B.C., A.D. 1–3.

A.D. 4 (acephalous): 55.13.2–7.

A.D. 5: 55.22.3–23.1; 24.9.

A.D. 6: 55.25.1–26.4; 27.1–4, 6. The dedication of the temple of Castor and Pollux (55.27.4) is recorded in an end chapter, as is frequent in annals in the case of dedications, obituaries, festivals, etc. (see at nn. 18 ff.). Such end chapter items do not necessarily come from the close of the year, so that there is less difficulty in the fact that the *fasti Praenestini* date the dedication 27 January (*Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.1.116–117).

A.D. 7: 55.31.1–2, 4; 32.2.

A.D. 8: 55.34.2–3. Some urban annalistic material will have been lost in the lacuna preceding 54.34.1.

A.D. 9: 56.1.1–2; 10.1–3. Annalistic items in 56.17.1–3 and 23.2–24.1 are subsumed under the narrative of external affairs.

I omit the fragmentary year A.D. 10.

A.D. 11: 56.25.4–7.

A.D. 12: 56.26.1–2; 27.1–5.

A.D. 13: 56.28.1–4. 28.5–6 should perhaps be included.

A.D. 14: 56.46.1–47.2. I exclude the long necrology of Augustus (56.29.2–45.3). Although it contains many urban annalistic items, it is essentially a narrative—into which Dio works the set funeral speech of Tiberius (56.35.1–41.9), the obituary assessment of Augustus (56.43.4–45.3), etc.