

XVII.—Caesar's Regnum (Suet. *Iul.* 9.2)

WALTER ALLEN, JR.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Ciceronian fragment in Suet. *Iul.* 9.2 is of more than passing interest because every work on Caesar either deals with it or ought to deal with it. Suetonius is there treating the matter of Caesar's participation in the so-called First Catilinarian Conspiracy:

Meminerunt huius coniurationis Tanusius Geminus in historia, Marcus Bibulus in edictis, C. Curio pater in orationibus. De hac significare videtur et Cicero in quadam ad Axium epistula referens Caesarem in consulatu confirmasse regnum de quo aedilis cogitarat.¹

While the present paper will not take up the question of Caesar's complicity in the First Catilinarian Conspiracy,² we may observe that Suetonius, in the fashion of the Roman historian when treating doubtful events, in 9.2 f. adduced his authorities by name together with the statements for which each one was responsible. Although Suetonius is clear as to what each of the other authorities said and meant, he is uncertain (*videtur*) as to the significance and applicability of Cicero's comment. In addition, as F. E. Adcock says in another connection (*CAH* 9.718), "no historian will be easy in mind when he has to use Suetonius as the touchstone of truth."

It is my purpose to investigate some meanings of the word *regnum* as containing a solution to the problem of the significance and applicability of Cicero's comment,³ for it is erroneous to assume

¹ There are further details in the rest of § 9 which do not especially concern us here. The sources cited in 9.2 are obviously contentious and hence do not inspire confidence in the reader: H. Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte* (Munich 1938) 107 f.; L. R. Taylor, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar* ("Sather Classical Lectures" 22 [Berkeley and Los Angeles 1949]) 229 f., note 24.

² The most recent discussions, which are useful for the collections of ancient references and modern opinions, are: F. L. Jones, "The First Conspiracy of Catiline," *CJ* 34 (1938/39) 410-22; H. Frisch, "The First Catilinarian Conspiracy: A Study in Historical Conjecture," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 9 (1948) 10-36. Frisch very sensibly minimizes the whole notion of a First Conspiracy and of Caesar's complicity in it. The activities of Crassus and Caesar from 66 to 62 are the special concern of E. T. Salmon, "Catiline, Crassus, and Caesar," *AJP* 56 (1935) 302-16.

³ I disregard the very literal meaning of *regnum* exemplified by Cic. *Rep.* 1.42: "Quare cum penes unum est omnium summa rerum, regem illum unum vocamus et regnum eius rei publicae statum." The odium with which the Roman regarded a real

that Cicero meant that Caesar in 59 became a veritable *rex* of the Romans or that he had aspired to that station in 65. Yet it is also necessary to call attention to the nature of the *regnum* which Cicero wrote that Caesar had contemplated in his aedileship and accomplished in his consulship.

We may first consider some samples of modern interpretations; further opinions can be found in the first two articles cited in my footnote 2. Some authorities do not discuss the Axius letter at all because they largely dismiss the whole First Conspiracy on the grounds of insufficient evidence, as G. Boissier, *La conjuration de Catilina*² (Paris 1908) 50 f.; and some authorities devote themselves mostly to the denial of the complicity of Caesar (or of Caesar and Crassus) in the First Conspiracy, as W. Drumann-P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* 2.439 (cf. 438, note 6), 3.165, note 4; M. Cary, *CAH* 9.475–481, 488. E. G. Hardy, *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context* (Oxford 1924) 16, does not press the phrase *regnum cogitasse* [sic], which he says “might as well or better refer to the attempt on Egypt in 65,” an opinion which is shared by Butler and Cary in their edition of Suet. *Iul.* (Oxford 1927) xviii–xx. In Butler and Cary’s edition of the *De provinciis consularibus* (Oxford 1924) 101, there is the suggestion that by *regnum* Cicero meant “personal despotism,” and in note 1 on p. 101 the Axius fragment is dated in 59 B.C. H. Ailloud, in vol. 1 of the Budé Suetonius (Paris 1931), translates *regnum* as *la souveraineté* and says nothing more about it; he translates the similar *regnum* of *Iul.* 49.2 as *la royauté*. Professor L. R. Taylor, in her review of H. Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte*, in *CP* 36 (1941) 413 f., did not wish to discount Suet. *Iul.* 9.2; in her important article on “Caesar and the Roman Nobility,” *TAPA* 73 (1942) 16 f., 23 f., she does not believe that Caesar was then working closely with Crassus. R. Syme, in his review of Gelzer’s *Caesar* in *JRS* 34 (1944) 96 f., disbelieved in the report of joint or individual revolutionary activity by Caesar and Crassus in 66/65. J. Carcopino, in *Les secrets de la correspondance de Cicéron* (Paris 1947) 2.450 f., translated the *regnum* of our passage as *la royauté*.⁴

regnum is well illustrated at the beginning of the article by K. von Fritz, “Leges Sacrae and Plebei Scita,” *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson* 2 (St. Louis 1953) 893–905.

⁴ Carcopino goes too far when he uses “le *regnum* de César” as his rubric on p. 728 of his *César*³ (Tome II, 2^e section [Paris 1943] of the *Histoire Romaine* in the *Histoire Générale* fondée par Gustave Glotz), and when he speaks of *royauté* in his text. He did

H. Frisch, in the article cited in my footnote 2, spent pp. 21–28 discussing the extent to which modern scholars believe or disbelieve in Caesar's complicity in the First Conspiracy, and the seriousness with which they accept or refute Suet. *Iul.* 9, but Frisch never questioned the meaning of *regnum*. M. I. Henderson, in "*De commentariolo petitionis*," *JRS* 40 (1950) 13 f., discards the whole Suetonius passage on the principle that other ancient writers did not regard this "more exciting version" of the First Conspiracy as serious history, with the wise comment on p. 13: "Suetonius, as he proudly indicates, excavated the story by original research into the lost libels of 59 preserved in forgotten authors." G. Walter, in the English version of his popular but acute *Caesar* (New York 1952) 51–53, accepts Caesar's participation in the First Conspiracy but shies away from mentioning the *regnum*.

The most important and relevant book is H. Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte* (Munich 1938),⁵ who also falls short of disposing of our sentence on pp. 48–50, 59 f., 107 f. He writes (108 f.):

Der Briefstelle Cic. ad Axium: *Caesarem in consulatu confirmasse regnum, de quo aedilis cogitarat* hat Sueton zuviel untergelegt; Cicero bezeichnet nichts als Caesars präventives Auftreten als Aedil, das öffentliche Beunruhigung schuf, so z. B. den Senat veranlasste, die Zahl der für Spiele zulässigen Gladiatoren generell zu begrenzen (Suet. 10.2).

While Strasburger makes a good point here, he does not explain the significance of Cicero's use of the word *regnum*, nor does he explain the applicability of the remark to Caesar's consulship as well as to his aedileship, nor does he adequately explain why this particular sentence was mistakenly inserted by Suetonius in this context.

No doubt some of the authorities on Caesar could explain this passage, and they perhaps have simply assumed that everyone is as well informed as they.⁶ The fact remains, however, that no one,

so on the strength of the sentence from *Att.* 2.12.1 quoted in his footnote 305: "hoc vero regnum est, et ferri nullo pacto potest." It is unfair that he omitted to quote also the preceding sentence: "Negent illi Publium plebeium factum esse?" All Cicero meant was that a state of *regnum* existed when *iura divina et humana* were subverted (*Off.* 1.26), as certainly happened in the matter of Clodius' adoption. Carcopino would have been better advised to have quoted *Att.* 2.13.2, but even that would not have supported his translation of *regnum*, since there Cicero spoke of Pompey and Crassus rather than of Caesar.

⁵ Some disagreements with Strasburger, with which I do not concur, are expressed by O. Seel, "Zur Kritik der Quellen über Caesars Frühzeit," *Klio* 34 (1941/42) 196–238.

⁶ There are, of course, good brief discussions of the meaning of *regnum*, but they do not apply the knowledge to this passage, perhaps because the glamor attaching to

to my knowledge, has tried to explain this sentence in Suet. *Iul.* 9.2 in the way I am here undertaking. Miss Taylor, for instance, says only, and not in reference to this passage: "The optimate orators also spoke steadily of tyranny, *dominatio*, or more often *regnum*, which in Roman tradition was a tyrannous form of government. Every important popular leader from Tiberius Gracchus to Caesar was accused of attempting to set up a *regnum*."⁷ It would therefore seem advisable to spell out in some detail the meanings of the word *regnum* in political jargon and in some related areas, for so important a passage warrants fuller treatment.

Suetonius himself gives valuable assistance. In *Iul.* 49.1 he again used Curio *pater* as a source, and in 49.2 he wrote: "Missa etiam facio edicta Bibuli, quibus proscripsit 'collegam suum Bithynicam reginam, eique antea regem fuisse cordi, nunc esse regnum.'" Bibulus would here mean, as part of a double entendre in his edicts of 59, a *regnum* at Rome, as Cicero did, rather than the already Roman kingdom of Bithynia. *Iul.* 49 also bears a further resemblance to § 9 in that it also has a quotation from Cicero in 49.3. Thus § 49 would incline us to date the letter to Axius around 59 B.C.

In § 30 Suetonius was discussing the reasons why Caesar began the Civil War, and in 30.5 he wrote:

Quidam putant captum imperii consuetudine pensitatisque suis et inimicorum viribus usum occasione rapiendae dominationis, quam aetate prima concupisset. Quod existimasse videbatur et Cicero scribens de Officiis tertio libro semper Caesarem in ore habuisse [est in Phoenissis: εἴπερ γὰρ ἀδικεῖν χρή, τυραννίδος πέρι κάλλιστον ἀδίκημα· τὰ δ' ἄλλα εὐσεβεῖν χρεῶν] Euripidis versus, quos sic ipse convertit:

'Nam si violandum est ius, regnandi gratia
violandum est: aliis rebus pietatem colas.'

Suetonius here again misunderstood Cicero who in *Off.* 3.82 was discussing rather Caesar as triumvir than Caesar as dictator, although in 3.83 Cicero did go on to call Caesar *rex* in his capacity as

Caesar's name always leads us to look for something more striking: F. E. Adcock in *CAH* 9.727, who points out that *regnum* conveyed "the reproach of tyranny," while it did not have "the force of a legal or constitutional definition"; W. Kroll, *Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit* (Leipzig 1933) 1.11-15, with the pertinent *Anmerkungen*; Ch. Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate* (Cambridge 1950) 62-64, 87 f.; and in another connection I also discussed some uses of *rex* and *regnum* in *TAPA* 75 (1944) 5-7.

⁷ L. R. Taylor (above, note 1) 23. On p. 194, note 67, she discusses Cinna's *regnum* or *dominatus*.

dictator; Suetonius has consequently again inserted (with a *videbatur*) a passage from Cicero in a false context. Certainly Suetonius is in error in thinking that Julius had early aspired to supreme power.⁸

These two passages from Suet. *Iul.*, together with 9.2, show that Suetonius' theory of Julius' life was that he early aimed his career at monarchy. Suetonius consequently assembled what passages he could, even distorting some from Cicero, in order to maintain this thesis. Plutarch did the same thing in *Cic.* 20.3 where he suggested that even in 63 Caesar had it in mind to turn the Roman government into a monarchy (*μοναρχία*) some day. In *Caes.* 6.1–3, as I shall show presently, at least Plutarch's terminology was more accurate (*τυραννίς*).

There are two other passages in Suetonius which are of less distinct assistance to us, but which surely supplement the ones already listed. In *Iul.* 22.2 we learn that in 59 someone alluded to the Nicomedes slander when Caesar was inclined to boast after he had been assigned his great commands. Caesar is said to have replied: "in Suria quoque regnasse Sameram in magnamque Asiae partem Amazonas tenuisse quondam." This might concern a *regnum* at Rome, or it might be the sort of idea that Verres had when he called himself King of the Sicilians (*Verr. Act.* 2.3.77; cf. *Leg. agr.* 2.43), the latter idea being much less common than the former. The nature of Caesar's boast would seem to show that he meant a *regnum* at Rome. The final passage we should mention is §§ 79 f., the chapters about his regal aspirations just before the assassination, which show that Suetonius there knew that Caesar did not have a real *regnum* and that he was not a real *rex* (cf. *Fam.* 11.27.8).

We ourselves can comprehend the contemporary connotation of *regnum*, however, only by an examination of Latin passages, for the lexica are helpful but not entirely adequate for this purpose. The word was actually in common use.

There are several harmless uses of *regnum* or *regnare*, wherein there is reference only to an individual's pre-eminence in some sphere. Thus Aquilius had his *regnum iudiciale* (*Att.* 1.1.1), and Cicero in 46 could speak with fond regret of his *amisso regno forensi*

⁸ Certainly modern opinion is opposed to this view: e.g., Ed. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus*² (Stuttgart and Berlin 1919) 342 f.; Strassburger (above, note 1) 137–41. F. E. Adcock, in *CAH* 9.718–35, shows that even at a later date Caesar did not aspire to royal status.

(*Fam.* 9.18.1), or recollect in 45 the period *cum regnare existimabamur* (*Fam.* 7.24.1). Vatinius was similarly not annoyed if the year of his tribunate was termed a *regnum* (*Vatin.* 19). More innocent was the reference to a villa as a *regnum* (*De or.* 1.41; *Att.* 14.16.1). Another meaning, less innocuous but still not uncomplimentary, is found in *Fam.* 11.16.3 to D. Brutus: “. . . equitum centurias . . . in quis regnas.”

There are several other meanings of *regnum* which were not kindly meant. The most conspicuous of these was the charge of excessive influence in the courts, where such words were used as *regnum*, *regnare*, *dominatio*, and *rex*. Good typical passages are: *Verr.* Act. 1.35 (*omnis dominatio regnumque iudiciorum*); *Sulla* 20 f., 26 f., 48; *Att.* 1.16.10. In *Sulla* 21 Cicero's consular conduct was described as a *regnum*.

Cicero applied to the ten commissioners of the Rullan bill the clause *X reges aerari, vectigalium, provinciarum omnium . . . orbis denique terrarum domini constituerentur* (*Leg. agr.* 2.15) because they were to have such widespread powers, and he charged that the intention was to subvert liberty and establish a *regnum* (*Leg. agr.* 2.8, 2.24, 2.35, 2.75) or *regnum Xvirale* (*Leg. agr.* 1.24). There is a clause in the same vein in *Off.* 2.21: “. . . cum reges popularesve homines largitiones aliquas proponunt. . . .”⁹ Such passages demonstrate that one meaning of *regnum* could be that by courting the populace an unscrupulous politician, or group of politicians, could attain enormous personal power in the state.

Other passages from Cicero indicate that the charge of *regnum*, in the sense in which it is employed in *Suet. Iul.* 9.2, was not limited to popular leaders. In *Amic.* 41, it is true, we find: “Ti. Gracchus regnum occupare conatus est, vel regnavit is quidem paucos menses” (cf. *Sall. Iug.* 31.7 f.); and in *Nat. deor.* 3.81: “. . . Cinna regnavit.” But Cicero also spoke of Sulla's powers in the same terms (*Phil.* 5.44), and he regarded a *regnum* as the aim of both Caesar and Pompey in the dispute of 50–49 (*Att.* 7.7.5, 10.8.2), with Pompey especially in search of a Sullan *regnum* (*Att.* 8.11.2, where he mentions both *Sullanum regnum* and *dominatio* and *regnare*; *Att.* 9.7.3, 9.10.6, 10.7.1). In *Phil.* 5.17 Cicero described Cinna, Sulla, and Caesar as aspirants to *regnum* and as men who *plus potuerunt quam universa res publica*. In *Har. resp.* 54 he said, using the examples of

⁹ Cicero regarded *largitio* as the peculiar characteristic of the politics of the *populares*: *Leg. agr.* 2.10; *Cat.* 4.10; *Att.* 2.18.1; *Fam.* 3.8.8; cf. *Sall. Cat.* 52.11.

Sulla and Marius and of Octavius and Cinna, that the outcome of dissension between prominent men is *aut universus interitus aut victoris dominatus ac regnum*. There was even the case of Clodius, noted in *Mil.* 43, *qui se ipse interfecto Milone regnaturum putaret!*

The true political connotation of the word *regnum* in the Ciceronian Period is to be found neatly in Sallust. In *Cat.* 5.6 Sallust informs us that Catiline was seeking a *regnum*, certainly not a monarchy but nevertheless an objective with which we do not normally credit him: "Hunc post dominationem L. Sullae lubido maxuma invaserat rei publicae capiundae; neque id quibus modis adsequeretur, dum sibi regnum pararet, quicquam pensi habebat." (It appears that Catiline's *regnum* was dependent upon election to a magistracy in which he could pass popular laws to increase his influence.) Alongside this passage we should set Sall. *Cat.* 47.2, which contains Lentulus' remarks: "ex libris Sibyllinis regnum Romae tribus Corneliis portendi: Cinnam atque Sullam antea, se tertium esse, cui fatum foret urbis potiri." We are certain that Sallust was reporting Lentulus accurately because we have two confirmatory statements by Cicero, with verbal resemblances to the Sallustian passage: "Lentulum autem sibi confirmasse ex fatis Sibyllinis haruspicumque responsis se esse tertium illum Cornelium ad quem regnum huius urbis atque imperium pervenire esset necesse: Cinnam ante se et Sullam fuisse" (*Cat.* 3.9, cf. 4.2); "cum vero mihi proposui regnantem Lentulum, sicut ipse se ex fatis sperasse confessus est . . ." (*Cat.* 4.12).

There is even a definition of *regnum* inserted by Sallust in Memmius' speech in *Iug.* 31.26: "Nam impune quae lubet facere, id est regem esse." This sort of *regnum*, then, is not monarchy, but excessive power in a republic, the sort of power which Suetonius (*Iul.* 20.2) ascribes to Caesar in 59 after Bibulus had shut himself up in his house: "Unus ex eo tempore omnia in re publica et ad arbitrium administravit." Without declaring for or against the authenticity of the second Sallustian *Epist. ad Caes.*, we can still note with profit that in 3.3 there is the phrase *iudicia . . . idem illi factiosi regunt*,¹⁰ which clearly implies that it was possible to have a plurality of *reges* at one time. In the same work (6.1, cf. 6.5) we

¹⁰ L. R. Taylor (above, note 1) 9 f., 13 f., 153 f., 187-89, 221, points out that *factio* is the term applied by the *populares* to the aristocrats, to actual or potential oligarchs. There is nothing very helpful to our present considerations in K. Hanell, "Bemerkungen zu der politischen Terminologie des Sallustius," *Eranos* 43 (1945) 263-76.

learn that it was a *regnum* to have too great power as the result of the grant of citizenship and the establishment of colonies, a variety of power which was certainly similar to Caesar's agrarian legislation. In 7.11 the author wrote: "Sed de magistratu facile populi iudicium fit: iudices a paucis probari regnum est, ex pecunia legi inhonestum." It should thus be established that Caesar, in seeking a *regnum*, was not necessarily seeking to establish a monarchy, but that this was to be a *regnum* within the Roman Republic, and nothing so simple as complicity in the abortive and Balkanesque First Catilinarian Conspiracy.

Even the Latin authors of the Empire understood the meaning of *regnum* under the Republic. A glance through *A Concordance of Lucan* by Deferrari, Fanning, and Sullivan (Washington 1940), supplies descriptions of the final collapse of the Triumvirate in such terms as *rupto foedere regni* (1.4), *feralia foedera regni* (1.86),¹¹ *nulla fides regni sociis* (1.92), *dividitur ferro regnum* (1.109), etc. Since both Cicero and Lucan (1.334 f.) regarded Sulla's dictatorship as a *regnum*, we might recall, as I have noted above, that in late 50 and early 49 Cicero repeatedly wrote that Caesar and Pompey were each seeking a *regnum*, and that Pompey was seeking a *regnum* on the Sullan style. Lucan has Pompey say in 2.562 f.:

'Quo potuit civem populus perducere liber,
Ascendi, supraque nihil, nisi regna, reliqui.'

Florus too was able to write of the Gracchan period in 2.1 (3.13): ". . . ut senatu regente provincias ordinis equestris auctoritas saltem iudiciorum regno niteretur."

It is sometimes useful to see what the Greeks made of a Latin word. Plutarch *Public.* 12.1, by comparison with Livy 2.8.2, and also 2.2.5, demonstrates that *regnare* is translated as *τυπάρνειν*. Oddly enough, it does not appear generally to have been stressed that Plutarch in *Caes.* 6.1-3 relates that Caesar was thought to be seeking a *τυπάρνις* in his aedileship by his restoration of the trophies and statues of Marius, a passage which thereby demonstrates that Suetonius was in error in thinking that Cicero had reference to Caesar's complicity in a conspiracy.

We should obtain a considerable advantage if we could date the letter to Axius by some external criterion, since a date before 49

¹¹ Kroll (above, note 6) 1.62 f. is informative on political *amicitia* as a *foedus*.

would operate in favor of my discussion, but such a criterion is impossible because the correspondence with Atticus mentions Axis from 61 to 46.¹² There is also no helpful internal evidence, for Cicero could have written this comment equally well after 59 or after 49. In fact, the passages I shall quote presently from after 49 B.C. indicate that Cicero, since he was still using *regnum* in the republican sense, failed to comprehend fully the nature of Caesar's government.¹³

My own inclination is to date the Axis fragment in 59 or before Cicero's exile in 58. Suetonius shows that Bibulus was accusing Caesar of a *regnum* in 59, and it would seem to have been in the air to speak of Caesar's *regnum* then. It is also true that Suetonius in both passages was using the same sources, a factor which might incline us to think that in both passages he was using sources which referred to the same date. The remark in the Axis letter would seem to be too mild after 49 and to be more of an historical nature if it were made then.

It is impossible to declare positively for 59, however, since in his third passage Suetonius quoted from Cicero *Off.* And earlier in the same autumn of 44 Cicero had written the *Second Philippic* in which he had remarked (§ 116) that Caesar had *multos annos regnare meditatus*.¹⁴ More of *Phil.* 2.116 f. is worth quoting, for in it Cicero spoke both of Caesar's power and of the means he had used to rise to power:

Fuit in illo ingenium, ratio, memoria, litterae, cura, cogitatio, diligentia; res bello gesserat, quamvis rei publicae calamitosas, at tamen magnas;

¹² Klebs, "Q. Axis," *RE* 2 (1896) 2633 f.; K. Büchner, "M. Tullius Cicero (Briefe)," *RE* 7A (1939) 1203 f. Ed. Meyer (above, note 8) 601, note 1, 605 thought that the possible initial date of Cicero's correspondence with Axis would not be before the 50's, while the concluding date would be after the time of Caesar's death. Fragments of the correspondence are found in Tyrrell and Purser, *The Correspondence of Cicero* 6².367 f.

¹³ It is remarked by W. W. How and A. C. Clark that Caesar, like Sulla, was basing his power on the dictatorship: *Cicero: Select Letters* (Oxford 1947) 2.449-52. Certainly in this there was a similarity to the *Sullanum regnum*, although we may note that on 2.452 How and Clark write of "the autocracy embodied in permanent dictatorship," along with their remark "that Caesar hoped at least to convert his own personal autocracy into a hereditary monarchy is clearly indicated by the events and rumours of the last few months of his life." Tyrrell and Purser (above, note 12) are perhaps right, moreover, when in the notes on *Fam.* 6.19.2 and *Att.* 13.37.2 they observe that it was apparently on August 2, 45 B.C., that Cicero first called Caesar *rex*.

¹⁴ Strikingly but wrongly translated as "having for many years aimed at a throne" by Walter C. A. Ker (Loeb Classical Library).

multos annos regnare meditatus, magno labore, magnis periculis quod cogitarat¹⁵ effecerat; muneribus, monumentis, congiariis, epulis multitudinem imperitam delenierat; suos praemiis, adversarios clementiae specie devinxerat. Quid multa? Attulerat iam liberae civitati partim metu partim patientia consuetudinem serviendi. Cum illo ego te dominandi cupiditate conferre possum, ceteris vero rebus nullo modo comparandus es.

We should also adduce three other passages written in 44 B.C.: “. . . non regno sed rege liberati videmur” (*Fam.* 12.1.1); “. . . non modo regno, quod pertuleramus, sed etiam regni timore sublato” (*Phil.* 1.4); “memineramus Cinnam nimis potentem, Sullam postea dominantem, modo Caesarem regnantem videramus” (*Phil.* 2.108). The third passage in particular is interesting because it shows that, since on other occasions Cicero accused Cinna and Sulla of *regnum*, all three participles here have much the same meaning.

Our conclusions, then, are that we cannot date the fragment of Cicero's letter to Axius but that we must remove that sentence of Suet. *Iul.* 9.2 from its unreasonable connection with what we call the First Catilinarian Conspiracy, and that we must, at least as far as the three sentences from Suetonius are concerned (9.2, 30.5, 49.2), cease to find in him support for the notion that Caesar was an incipient dictator from infancy. We have too strong a tendency, when dealing with Caesar, to look for the insidious, the diabolical, the mysterious, the marvelous; in the instance of this sentence from Suet. *Iul.* 9.2 we find that we have in reality only a rather commonplace use of a word from contemporary political jargon. The well-known acts and methods of Caesar's excessively “popular” aedileship and consulship are all that were meant by the use of the word *regnum*;¹⁶ there is no need to search for something esoteric.

¹⁵ It is probably incorrect to associate this *cogitarat* with the one in Suet. *Iul.* 9.2 since *cogitare* is also the verb used in a passage referring to the major Catilinarian Conspiracy in *Off.* 2.84: “At vero hic nunc victor tum quidem victus, quae cogitarat, cum ipsius intererat, tum ea perfecit, cum eius iam nihil interesset.” Cf. also the similar phrasing in *Att.* 7.11.1.

¹⁶ For the aedileship see W. Drumann-P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* 3.137–40; Groebe, “Iulius (Caesar),” *RE* 10 (1919) 190 f.; L. R. Taylor, “Caesar and the Roman Nobility,” *TAPA* 73 (1942) 1–24, esp. 15; cf. L. R. Taylor, “Caesar's Early Career,” *CP* 36 (1941) 124 f., 131 f., where she shows the extent to which Caesar was a prominent *popularis* when he came to his aedileship. G. Walter, *Caesar* (New York 1952) 54–60, knows how to play down the *tyrannis* of Plut. *Caes.* 6.1–3.

The *regnum* of Caesar's consulship is shown by the discussion of Caesar's acts and methods in L. R. Taylor, “On the Chronology of Caesar's First Consulship,” *AJP* 72 (1951) 254–68.