Summary: Whereas many aspects of the Augustan age continue to enjoy ongoing or renewed interest, the early careers of Tiberius Claudius Nero (born 16 November 42 BCE) and Nero Claudius Drusus (March/April 38 BCE), Livia’s sons from her marriage to Ti. Claudius Nero (pr. 42), have not been subject to much discussion or controversy of late. On the one hand, this could, perhaps, be explained in that they were quite young during the formative stages of the so-called Augustan monarchy, the critical settlements being those of 27, 23 and 19 BCE, the eye-catchers par excellence in the political history of the early Augustan era. On the other hand, Livia’s sons only really emerge into the spotlight of both ancient sources and modern scholarship after the untimely passing of M. Vipsanius Agrippa in 12 BCE. This paper aims at revisiting the evidence for Tiberius’ and Drusus’ careers in the decade or so before the latter’s premature death in Germany in 9 BCE, the period preceding the rapid rise (and demise) of Gaius and Lucius Caesar. There are, indeed, strong indications that Livia’s sons played a far more important part than has hitherto been recognized, both in terms of their official position and their role in assisting Augustus with one of his most important political objectives, namely the imperial monopolization of the public triumph.
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1. Introduction

In the last two decades, the matter of the early careers of Tiberius Claudius Nero and Nero Claudius Drusus has been somewhat neglected in modern scholarship. Furthermore, there continues to exist considerable disagreement on the main stages of their *cursus honorum* – as well as such key details as, for example, their first imperatorial salutations – until the latter’s untimely death in 9 BCE and the former’s second consulship in 7 BCE.¹ In her incisive and inspiring study of the Boscoreale Cups, Ann Kuttner makes the following discerning observation, well worth quoting in full:

“the place of Tiberius and Drusus in Augustus’ political projects and dynastic plans has seldom been properly estimated; the position of Drusus the Elder has hardly been considered at all. This has been a flaw in historical, literary, and art-historical scholarship, misdirection and omission in any one sphere tending to reinforce those faults in other spheres. Hence this chapter [viz. chapter 8, ‘Tiberius and Drusus in Augustan Propaganda and the Prototype for the Boscoreale Cups’] […]. Some of this presentation has a polemic character. If it provokes anyone to a more broadly founded analysis of the roles of Augustus’ chosen assistants and relatives, and of the artistic evidence for this, I will be delighted. I am not trying to make out that Drusus and the younger Tiberius were the heirs of Augustus, at the expense of Agrippa or Gaius and Lucius, for instance; rather, in a given period they were preeminent, as others necessarily were at other times. The mechanisms by which Augustus delegated power, and tried by its orderly transmission to assure the continuation of pax after his own death, cannot be understood if the Claudii Nerones are ignored. Most of all, I wish here to say of historical interpretation what I maintain throughout of iconographic interpretation: hindsight is a dangerous, usually illegitimate tool for analysis of motive and intention. Failed projects, cropped-off careers, cannot be treated by the serious historian as if they had never been; yet this has overwhelmingly been the case with the career of Drusus the Elder up to his death in 9 B.C. and with that of his brother Tiberius up to his self-imposed exile in 4 B.C. On Augustus’ predilections in these years, let Plutarch speak: first place in Augustus’ estimation was held by Agrippa, but next after Agrippa he esteemed the sons of Livia [i.e., Plut. Ant. 87.1].”²

¹ Compare also the observations of Seager 2005, 214: “The military honours awarded to Tiberius and his brother Drusus for their campaigns in Germany and Pannonia before Drusus’ death in 9 BC are also a matter of inconclusive controversy”; and Syme 1978, 60 n. 2: “The position of Tiberius and Drusus in the years 12–9 has not always been properly estimated by scholars” as well as 1979, 314: “The *imperium* of the two Claudii has not always received a satisfactory explanation from scholars and historians in the recent time.” All dates in this study are BCE unless otherwise indicated. All translations are derived from the LCL, modified where necessary.

² Kuttner 1995, 172f. Although Hurlet’s most impressive and roughly contemporary study on “Les collègues du prince sous Auguste et Tibère” (Rome 1997) to a significant extent filled this gap by offering comprehensive and insightful discussions of the early careers of the Claudians and their position within the *domus Augusta*, his views concerning the official status of both men before 10 BCE mostly align with prior arguments, regardless of minor variances: cf. *infra* (e.g. n. 141).
Held against the light of chapter 4 of my monograph on the Roman high command ("The summum imperium auspiciumque and the ius triumphi"), a comprehensive reappraisal of the extant sources should indeed significantly alter our current understanding of the issue, reinforcing Kuttner's contention that the role of the Claudii Nerones within the domus Augusta and Augustan dynastic policy in the period here considered has been significantly underrated. If it could be argued that Livia’s sons held far more prominent positions in the Augustan military and political machinery than hitherto accepted this would have important further ramifications for our understanding of early imperial history. First, this would require us to recalibrate our views on their relative position of power within the domus Augusta. Second, it would also cast a new light on how Augustus converted the public triumph into the exclusive reserve of the imperial house.3

2. Tiberius’ Career up to 20 BCE

Octavianus’ marriage to Livia Drusilla on the 17th of January 38 set the stage for the meteoric careers of Tiberius Claudius Nero (born 16 November 42) and Nero Claudius Drusus (between 18 March and 13 April 38), Livia’s sons from her marriage to the noble Ti. Claudius Nero (pr. 42).4 Tiberius and Drusus were thus scions of both the Claudii Nerones and the Claudii Pulchri, some of the most prominent patrician families of the Roman Republic. Although Caesar Octavianus obviously

3 This study is thus chiefly concerned with the official positions of Tiberius and Drusus as these can be gleaned from the extant sources and the immediate ramifications for our appreciation of Augustan dynastic and triumphal policy, and not so much with the wider issues of historiography. On some of the key literary sources, see, for example, Baar 1990 and Cowan 2009a and b. Similarly, the much-debated issue of Augustan policy in Gaul, Germany and Pannonia will mostly be discussed in relation to source materials relevant to the central issues at stake here, as deeper discussion of, and comprehensive engagement with, the relevant scholarship on Augustan military strategy in north-western Europe is beyond the scope of this inquiry.

4 On whom Münzer 1897, cols. 2777 f. For the respective birthdays of Livia’s sons, see Hurlet 1997, 82. Drusus was born Decimus Claudius Drusus – cf. Suet. Claud. 1.1: patrem Claudi Caesaris, olim Decimum mox Neronem praenomine. Hurlet (loc. cit. n. 18) rightly doubts Simpson’s speculative argument (in 1988, 173–175) that Drusus took this praenomen when he assumed the toga virilis in 24 or 23 BCE. Since Tiberius and Drusus remained with their father Ti. Claudius Drusus until his death in 33, after which they passed into the guardianship of (the future) Augustus (Dio 48.44.4–5 and Hor. Od. 74.26–28), it is more likely that Livia’s youngest son then abandoned a praenomen odious to her new husband because of his opponent Decimus Iunius Brutus Albinus (pr. 45 and cos. des. 42). Comp. also Suet. Tib. 6.3: around the time of his mother’s marriage to Octavianus, Tiberius was adopted by the senator M. Gallius and accepted the inheritance but soon gave up the name as the latter had been an adversary of his new stepfather.
had ambitious plans for his nephew M. Claudius Marcellus (42), son of his sister Octavia Minor and C. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 50), there is every indication that he also envisaged a brilliant future for Livia's offspring. In 33 BCE, at the age of nine, Tiberius made his first public performance delivering a eulogy for his dead father from the Rostra. In spite of their fathers’ strong hostility towards Iulius Caesar and Caesar Octavianus successively, Marcellus and Tiberius alike were given the extraordinary honour of riding the right and the left trace-horse respectively in Octavianus’ triple triumph of 13–15 August 29. Shortly after Octavianus’ third triumph, Tiberius presided at the City festival (the ludi astici) and prominently featured in the game of Troy during the performances in the circus, leading the turma puerorum maiorum.5 In 27, following the historic creation of the Augustan New Order in January, Tiberius assumed the toga uirilis and staged a series of large-scale public displays, including a couple of gladiatorial shows in memory of his father and his maternal grandfather, M. Livius Drusus Claudianus († 42, Philippi), in the Forum and the amphitheatre, at the expense of his mother and his stepfather.6 Both Marcellus and Tiberius served as tribuni militum in Augustus’ campaign against the Cantabrians and received the honour of presiding over the ludi castrenses he put on in 25 in honour of his ‘victory’, “as though they were aediles”.

It was, however, Marcellus’ star par excellence that was in the ascendancy. Back in Rome, Marcellus was married to none other than Iulia, Augustus’ daughter by Scribonia, his second wife, and his only biological child. As illness prevented Augustus from attending the marriage in Rome, he had it celebrated by Agrippa in his absence. 8 In 24, no doubt on the motion of Augustus, the Senate granted Marcellus membership of the Senate with praetorian rank as well as the privilege to stand for the consulship ten years before the statutory minimum age. After this, Marcellus was promptly elected curule aedile.9 In 23, Marcellus handsomely used this office to give exceptionally magnificent games. In the course

5 Suet. Tib. 6.4. That Marcellus rode the right trace-horse while Tiberius rode the one of the left perhaps was the first public display of Octavianus’ preferential treatment of Marcellus. For Marcellus’ father’s hostility vis-à-vis Caesar, see MRR, 247. Although Tiberius’ father Ti. Claudius Nero had been a partisan and quaestor of Caesar, he abandoned his cause after the Ides of March and turned against the Triumvirs Rei Publicae Constituenda around the end of his praetorship in 42, first siding with L. Antonius (cos. 41) in the bellum Perusinum and next seeking refuge with Sextus Pompeius and Marcus Antonius successively before returning to Rome on the occasion of the Treaty of Puteoli in 39 BCE: Suet. Tib. 4–6.
6 Suet. Tib. 7.1.
7 Suet. Tib. 9.1; Dio 53.26.1.
8 Dio 53.27.5.
9 Dio 53.28.3–4.
of the same year, he was furthermore co-opted into the prestigious pontifical college, where he would rank alongside his father-in-law Augustus. If we may believe Cassius Dio, Marcellus’ rise was so meteoric that the young prince reportedly began to take offence at Agrippa’s prominence, causing Augustus to invest the latter with a special command in Syria in the late spring of 23 BCE.\textsuperscript{10} As Magie suggests in his study of Agrippa’s first independent \textit{imperium} since the triumviral era,\textsuperscript{11} he was probably sent on a discreet diplomatic mission to pave the way for Phraates’ return of the Roman standards and men taken in the defeats suffered by Crassus and M. Antonius.\textsuperscript{12}

Although Marcellus was the clear favourite, the very beginnings of Tiberius’ public life show that this did not prevent Augustus from rapidly advancing the careers of Livia’s sons, too.\textsuperscript{13} In 24, at the same time it granted the aforementioned privileges to Marcellus, the Senate also decreed that Tiberius, then in his nineteenth year, could stand for each office five years in advance of the age prescribed by law, after which he was at once elected quaestor.\textsuperscript{14} In this capacity,

\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{10}] Dio 53.31.2–32.1; Pliny Nat. 7.149 (negatively termed \textit{Agrippae ablegatio}). For Agrippa’s first quinquennial grant of consular \textit{imperium}, see, amongst others, Mommsen 1878, 2, 1151f. n. 5; Hanslik 1961, cols. 1251–1253; Reinhold 1933, 168f.; Roddaz 1984, 339–351; Hurlet 1997, 36–55; comp. also Syme 1979, 308 (“invested with the \textit{imperium} of a proconsul”). Dio in 53.32.1 has no details whatsoever on Agrippa’s official position and merely recounts that Augustus sent him to Syria and that he decided to keep a low profile, remaining in Lesbos and instead sending his \textit{legati} ahead. Since Augustus abdicated his eleventh consulship shortly thereafter at some point between 14 June and 1 July 23 during the Latin Festival on the Alban Mount (Dio 53.32.3, with a useful discussion of the date, venue and circumstances of Augustus’ abdication in Rich 1990, 168f.), it follows that Agrippa received his first quinquennial grant of consular \textit{imperium} in the late spring of 23 BCE.
\item [\textsuperscript{11}] Though probably not invested with independent \textit{imperium auspiciumque} between his first and second consulships of 37 and 28 BCE, the issue of Agrippa’s official position in 36–34 and 32–29 is beyond the scope of this inquiry. All we know with absolute certainty is that he was aedile in 33: MRR, 415.
\item [\textsuperscript{12}] Magie 1908. Dio recounts in 53.18.2–3 that Augustus in 23 decided to send back Phraates’ son (whom he had received as a hostage in 30: 51.18.2–3 and Just. 42.5.6) with a demand for the restoration of the captives and military standards taken in the disasters of M. Crassus and M. Antonius. Since Syria harboured a formidable military garrison, Agrippa’s decision to halt in Lesbos may have served the dual purpose of not needlessly provoking the Parthian king and allaying possible suspicions in Rome about his own ambitions.
\item [\textsuperscript{13}] Comp. also Brandt 1995, 16, who, following a close analysis of Marcellus’ political career, suggests that “über gewisse, nicht eindeutige Ehrungen ist Augustus im Falle seines ersten Schwiegersonhnes nicht hinausgegangen, und er hat auf diese Weise wohl gezielt einen Schwebezustand konserviert, der charakterisch war für sein Lavieren zwischen monarchischen Neigungen und republikanischem Habitus in den Jahren 29–23 v. Chr.”.
\item [\textsuperscript{14}] Tac. Ann. 3.29.1; Dio 53.28.3–4; Vell. 2.94.1.
\end{itemize}
he assumed his first major public commissions well before Marcellus’ untimely death late in 23, as he was put in charge of the faltering grain supply as well as a wide investigation into malpractices in Italy’s slave-prisons.\textsuperscript{15} According to Velleius Paterculus, Tiberius acted on his stepfather’s direct orders and impressed with the way in which he relieved the corn scarcity at Ostia and in Rome.\textsuperscript{16} Since Augustus himself would assume the powerful \textit{cura annonnae} in 22 in a sort of carefully planned ‘coup de théâtre’ Tiberius’ real brief clearly was to set the stage for a flawless and efficacious takeover by his stepfather.\textsuperscript{17} In 22, Tiberius also played a notable role in the resolution of another delicate crisis of the greatest importance as he personally arraigned Fannius Caepio, who had conspired with L. Licinius Varro Murena against Augustus, before the \textit{quaestio maiestatis}, easily securing his condemnation \textit{in absentia}.\textsuperscript{18} Throughout 23 and 22, Tiberius thus acted as Augustus’ close confidant and trusted aide in difficult and important matters of state, conspicuously displaying his loyalty to Rome’s new strongman.\textsuperscript{19} The strongest possible indication that the premature death of Marcellus would boost the fortunes and positions of Livia’s sons, however, was to be Tiberius’ next brief, a commission of the utmost importance to his stepfather.

\textsuperscript{15} Suet. Tib. 8. Whilst the chronology in Tib. 8 is inaccurate, Velleius Paterculus 2.94.3–4 (quoted in the following note) unequivocally attests that he was charged with the \textit{cura annonnae} while quaestor in 23. For Marcellus’ untimely death of some illness late in 23, see Dio 53.33.4. On Tiberius’ quaestorship, see Badian 1974.

\textsuperscript{16} Vell. 2.94.3–4: \textit{quaestor undevicesimum annum agens capessere coepit rem publicam max-
imamque difficultatem annonnae ac rei frumentariae inopiam ita Ostiae atque in urbe mandatu uitrici moderatus est, ut per id, quod agebat, quantus euasurus esset, eluceret: “Quaestor at the age of nineteen, he began to devote himself to public affairs, and on the orders of his stepfather he so managed the most difficult problem of the grain supply and a shortage of wheat in Ostia and Rome that through his achievements he illuminated just how great a man he would turn out to be.”

\textsuperscript{17} On (the circumstances of) Augustus’ \textit{cura annonnae} of 22 BCE, see Vervaet 2010a, 138f. Whereas Velleius’ testimony suggests Tiberius craftily paved the way for Augustus’ assumption of the \textit{cura annonnae} in 22, in blantant breach of an \textit{s.c.} decreed in 43 BCE (Dio 46.39.2–3), Dio 54.1 omits any mention of Tiberius in his quite detailed précis of Augustus’ takeover of the \textit{cura annonnae} at some point early in 22 – amongst other things, Dio records that Augustus ordered that every year two men should be selected from those who had held the praetorship five or more years earlier to supervise the distribution of the grain.

\textsuperscript{18} Suet. Tib. 8; Dio 54.3.4–5.

\textsuperscript{19} Compare also the telling anecdote in Suet. Aug. 51.2–3. When Augustus dropped a case against Aemilius Aelianus of Corduba, who had been accused of slander, and Tiberius filed another written complaint about him with the same accusations, the former reportedly replied: “My dear Tiberius, do not be carried away by the ardour of youth in this matter, or take it too much at heart that anyone speaks evil of me; we must be content if we can stop anyone from doing evil to us.”
3. From the Parthian Frontier to the *praetura urbana* (20–16 BCE)

Impressed with Tiberius’ handling of a number of tricky commissions in 23 and 22, Augustus now decided to charge him with a task of the greatest possible importance, catapulting the young Claudian to the forefront of imperial foreign affairs. Probably still in 21 BCE, Augustus took the decision to send Tiberius with an army to inspect and arrange the Eastern provinces, and, more importantly, restore Rome’s position in Armenia and consequently also vis-à-vis the Parthians. Since Augustus planned on securing an honourable peace with the Parthians by means of military diplomacy rather than war,20 Tiberius’ diplomatic skills would be just as important as his military capabilities. This suggests that Augustus must have been suitably impressed with his conduct of affairs in 23 and 22, especially considering his relative juniority. As Suetonius recounts in Tib. 8, Tiberius had already acquired some experience in dealing with foreign royalty as he had begun his civil career by defending king Archelaus, the people of Tralles and those of Thessaly in court, *Augusto cognoscente.*21

The fullest account of Tiberius’ first major military command can be found in Velleius Paterculus 2.94.4, where we are told the following:

*Nec multo post missus ab eodem uitrico cum exercitu ad uisendas ordinandasque, quae sub Oriente sunt, provincias, praecipuis omnium uirtutum experimentis in eo tractu editis, cum legionibus ingressus Armeniam, redacta ea in potestatem Populi Romani regnum eius Artauasdi dedit. Quin rex quoque Parthorum tanti nominis fama territus liberos suos ad Caesarem misit obsides.*

“Shortly afterwards (i.e., *post quaesturam*) he was sent by his stepfather with an army to visit the Eastern provinces and restore them to order, and in that part of the world gave splendid illustration of all his strong qualities. Entering Armenia with his legions, he brought it once more under the sovereignty of the Roman People and gave the kingship to Artavasdes [sic, really: Artavasdes’ son Tigranes]. Even the king of the Parthians, awed by the reputation of so great a name, sent his own children as hostages to Caesar.”22

---

20 On Augustus’ resolve to settle differences with Parthia by diplomacy rather than war, as he would not risk all he had achieved through so dangerous an undertaking, see Timpe 1975, 155–169; Sherwin-White 1984, 323–341; Brunt 1990, 456–464; Campbell 1993, 220–228; Gruen 1996, 158–163.

21 See Dio 57.17.3 for the fact that Tiberius secured acquittal for the Cappadocian sovereign.

22 Comp. also Tac. Ann. 2.3: *datus a Caesare Armeniis Tigranes deductusqeu in regnum a Tiberio Nerone.*
Tiberius’ success in Armenia probably earned Augustus his ninth imperatorial salutation.  

Thanks to Suetonius (Tib. 9.1), we furthermore know that the young prince – who was twenty-one years of age at the time – played a prominent role in what Augustus was quick to sell as the glorious highlight of his Parthian settlement, viz. the return of the standards lost in the defeats and reverses suffered by M. Licinius Crassus (cos. 70, 55) in 53, L. Decidius Saxa in 40, and M. Antonius (cos. 44, 34, des. 31; triumvir r.p.c 43–30) in 36, an event that in all likelihood took place shortly after he had put Tigranes (III) on the Armenian throne:  

dein ducto ad Orientem exercitu regnum Armeniae Tigrani restituit ac pro tribunalu diadema imposuit. Recepit et signa, quae M. Crasso ademerant Parthi.

“then [i.e., after his first stint of military service in Spain] he led an army to the Orient and restored the throne of Armenia to Tigranes, crowning him on the tribunal. He also recovered the standards which the Parthians had taken from Marcus Crassus.”

All other sources invariably feature Augustus as the recipient of the standards. This impression is reinforced by Augustus’ Res Gestae, where he carefully distinguishes between the Parthian and Armenian settlements. On the one hand, he in 27.1 duly acknowledges Tiberius’ assistance in sorting out the situation in Armenia Maior:

---

23 RIC I2 Aug. nos. 518–520 = BMC 1 Aug. nos. 671–678 (comp. 679–682, 703). Mommsen 1883, 13 and Barnes 1974, 21 attribute this salutation to the Parthian settlement. Syme 1979, 310, however, believes the salutation was for the joint settlements as the eastern mints celebrated both signis receptis and Armenia capta in conjunction with Augustus ninth salutation. I am inclined to follow Combès 1966, 461; Ritter 1978, 380f. and Rich 1998, 76f., who argue that the salutation was triggered by the recovery of Armenia: this settlement had more of a military aspect, as Tiberius invaded the kingdom at the head of an army and the appearance of IMP VIII on Pergamene denarii celebrating the recovery of Armenia may imply that success occasioned the salutation – comp. also BMC loc. cit., nos. 676–678. Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017, 58 tentatively date Augustus’ ninth salutation to “12. Mai (?) 20 v. Chr. (vgl. Ovid. Fasti 5, 545 ff.).”

24 For the fact that Augustus made wide use of literary, numismatic and artistic means to propagate his bloodless ‘victory’ over the Parthians, see Rich 1998, 73.

25 On the basis of Ovid, Fasti 5.545–598; Barnes 1974, 21; Levick 1976, 234 n. 38 suggest 12 May 20 as the day these standards were recovered. As cogently argued by Rich 1998, 83–85, however, Ovid here refers to 12 May 2 BCE as the day the temple of Mars in the Forum Augustum was dedicated, not coincidentally the day of the (only) festival of Mars Ultor.

26 Strab. 16.1.28; Vell. 2.91.1; Suet. Aug. 21.3; Dio 54.8; Just. 42.5.10–12. Whereas the summaries of Books 136 and 137 are missing, Liv. Per. 141 mentions the return of the standards lost by Crassus and M. Antonius out of context, under the years 11 and 10 BCE, with no mention of either Augustus or Tiberius.
Armenian maiorem interfecto rege eius Artaxe, c[u]m possem facere provinciam malui maiorem nostrorum exemplo reg[u]m id Tigrani, regis Artuasdis filio, nepoti autem Tigranis regis, per T[iberium] Ne[ronem trad]e qui tum mihi priu[ig]nus erat.

“Greater Armenia I might have made a province after its king Artaxes had been killed, but I preferred, following the model set by our ancestors, to hand over that kingdom to Tigranes, son of King Artavasdes and grandson of king Tigranes, with the assistance of Tiberius Nero, who was then my stepson.”

On the other, he unflinchingly takes sole credit for the return of the standards captured by the Parthians in R. Gest. div. Aug. 29.1–2:

Signa militaria complur[a per] atios d[u]ces am[ssa] deuicti[s hostibu]s re[ci]raui ex Hispania et [Gallia et a Dalm]ateis. Parthos trium exercitu[m Romanorum spolia et signa re[ddere] mihi supplicesque amicitiam populi Romani petere coegi. Ea autem si[gn]a in penetrali, quod e[s]t in templo Martis Vltoris, reposui.27

“By victories over enemies I recovered in Spain and in Gaul and from the Dalmatians several standards lost by other commanders. I compelled the Parthians to restore to me the spoils and standards of three Roman armies and to ask as suppliants for the friendship of the Roman People. Those standards I deposited in the innermost shrine of the temple of Mars Ultor.”

Given that Tiberius’ eulogist Velleius Paterculus, too, remains silent on the issue, some scholars believe Suetonius to be mistaken.28 If, however, we accept that Augustus granted Tiberius the signal honour of receiving the standards on his behalf, in his presence and that of his legions, there need be no contradiction whatsoever.29

27 As in all my recent work, I have used (and much benefitted from) John Scheid’s outstanding edition of the *Res Gestae* (2007, Paris – Les Belles Lettres).

28 So, for example, Gelzer 1918, col. 481; Krämer 1973, 363; Levick 1976, 234 with n. 38; Woodman 1977, 98 n. 2; Syme 1978, 32; Rich 1990, 181 and 1998, 77 n. 24. Cooley 2009, 243 remains silent on the issue.

29 Seager 1977, 201f. mounts a convincing argument to accept Suetonius’ version of events, amongst other things pointing to Woodman’s discerning observation (1977, 101) that “there is almost certainly a lacuna in [Vell. Pat.] 2.94.4 at precisely the point where a mention of the recovery of the standards would appear”. In my view, however, this conclusion runs counter to Seager’s argument in 2005, 14 that Velleius exaggerates Tiberius’ brief and that his mission was strictly limited to Armenia. That Velleius’ narrative of Tiberius’ activities in 20 BCE is not infallible is also shown in the fact that he mistakes Tigranes III for Artavasdes II in 2.94.4 (cf. *supra* p. 127). Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017, 70 likewise deem it possible that Tiberius received the *signa* in 20: “Empfang der Partherfeldzeichen?”. 
Dio’s summary of what happened in the eastern Mediterranean and along the eastern frontier in 21 and 20 likewise centres almost entirely on Augustus. After narrating his activities in Sicily, Greece, Asia, Bithynia and Syria in 22, 21 and 20 and Phraates’ decision to return the lost standards, Dio briefly digresses on the ensuing Parthian honours and some other business in the City (e.g. the birth of Gaius Caesar). Only as he resumes his survey of Augustus’ arrangements for the Eastern provinces does Dio recount how Augustus decided to send Tiberius to Armenia Maior because the Armenians there had denounced Artaxes and sent for his brother Tigranes, who was in Rome, with the brief to expel the former and restore the latter to the throne. Although Dio downplays Tiberius’ achievements, he nonetheless provides us with a further useful clue as to his official position:

καὶ ἐπράχθη μὲν οὐδὲν τῆς παρασκευῆς αὐτοῦ ἄξιον· οἱ γὰρ Ἀρμένιοι τὸν Ἀρτάξην προσπέκτειναν· ὁ δὲ σὺν Τιβέριος, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἑπεδικήθη θυσίαι ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἐφημησθήσαν, ἐκεμενύνετο ὡς καὶ κατ’ ἀρετήν τι ποιήσας. καὶ ἤδη γε καὶ περὶ τῆς μοναρχίας ἐνενόει, ἐπειδὴ πρὸς τοὺς Φιλίππους αὐτοῦ προσελαύνοντος θὸρυβός τέ τις τὰς τῶν μάχης χωρίων ὡς καὶ ἐκ στρατοπέδου ἡκούσθη, καὶ πῦρ ἐκ τῶν βωμῶν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου ἐν τῷ ταφρεύματι ἱδρύθηντων αὐτόματον ἀνέλαμψε. Τιβέριος μὲν δὲ ἐγαυροῦτο.

“Tiberius accomplished nothing worthy of his preparations, for the Armenians killed Artaxes before he arrived. However, he gave himself airs as though he had achieved some feat of valour, especially as supplicationes (θυσίαι) were voted for the event. The thought that he might attain the monarchy had already occurred to him by now, for, when he was approaching Philippi, a noise like that of an army was heard from the battle-site and fire flared up of its own accord from the altars which Antonius had set up in the camp entrenchment. So Tiberius was exultant over these events.”

Since the sources regrettably maintain a deafening silence on Tiberius’ official position as he led his legions East in 20 BCE, those few scholars who hazard a guess assume that he did so as a legatus Augusti pro praetore. In my view, there are nonetheless serious grounds for abandoning this well-entrenched view in

30 Dio 54.3.4–8, 4.2–4, 6.1, 7–8; comp. Dio 53.33.1–2; continuation of Augustus’ reorganization of the East: Dio 54.9. On Augustus’ Parthian honours, see Rich 1998.
31 Quoted from Dio 54.9.5–7. Dio’s representation leaves no doubt that these supplicationes were voted in his name, too, and not only that of summus imperator Augustus – comp. also 54.24.7, where Dio similarly records that “supplicationes were made in Agrippa’s name” (καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς θυσίαι μὲν τῷ Ἀγρίππα ὀνόματι ἐγένοντο) for his success against the Bosporans in 14 BCE.
32 See, for example, Levick 1976, 26 (“no doubt with the title legatus Augusti pro praetore”); Kuttner 1995, 123 (“the special legate responsible for bestowing the kingship of Armenia on Rome’s candidate for rule there”); and Hurlet 1997, 84 n. 35: “La fonction de légat n’est pas attestée par les sources, mais elle ne fait aucun doute.” Bleicken 1998, 357 even suggests that Tiberius “die Interventionsarmee von sechs Legionen ohne Zweifel unter dem Kommando erfahrener Legaten
favour of Weingärtner’s clever conjecture that Tiberius undertook his first major military command as a proconsul.\(^{33}\) First, it is important to consider that he would shoulder an immense responsibility in achieving a mission that was of the utmost importance to his stepfather. The young prince would, therefore, need every bit of official authority and dignity Augustus could muster on his behalf, especially as Tiberius would be dealing directly with the royalty of Armenia and the Parthian Empire. Second, one should not forget that in terms of dynastic hierarchy, Tiberius now ranked second only to Agrippa, who had received an extraordinary proconsulship in 23 and went on to marry Iulia in 21 BCE, at the behest of Augustus himself.\(^{34}\) In both these respects, it is well worth pointing to a couple of close parallels. In 1 BCE, the Armenians rebelled and promptly received Parthian support. Augustus, greatly distressed at this news, eventually decided to send out his (grand)son Gaius Caesar (\textit{cos}. 1 CE) as Tiberius was still in Rhodes and he “did not dare send any other influential man” – ἄλλον δὲ τινα πέμψαι τῶν δυνατῶν οὐκ ἐτόλμα. Amongst other things, Augustus promptly invested Gaius with full \textit{imperium pro consule} so as to make sure he would go to Syria with the necessary authority.\(^{35}\) Although the Armenians themselves would not give in without a fight,\(^{36}\) the Parthian king Phraataces quickly came to terms with the Romans, “hearing that Gaius was in Syria and holding the consulship”: τὸν Γάιον ἔν τῇ Συρίᾳ ὄντα καὶ ὑπατεύοντα.\(^{37}\) That Gaius’ position was further enhanced with an eponymous consulship in 1 CE should not surprise at all since Dio explains that he was deemed still “young and inexperienced in public affairs” when

\(^{33}\) Weingärtner 1969, 37 ff., with reference (only) to Vell. 2.94.4, quoted supra p. 127. Weingärtner thus puts Tiberius’ command on par with those given to Agrippa and Gaius Caesar in 23 and 1 BCE respectively.

\(^{34}\) For Agrippa’s marriage with Iulia Augusti, see Dio 54.6.5.

\(^{35}\) Velleius in 2.101.1 merely records that C. Caesar “was sent to Syria”: \textit{in Syriam missus}. Cf. nn. 158 and 211 \textit{infra} for the fact that Augustus also made sure to escort Gaius Caesar with a number of seasoned \textit{comites et rectores}. Comp. also Eck 2018a, 14: “Augustus vermied, wo immer möglich, einem Nicht-Familienmitglied ein für eine Offensive ausgerüstetes großes Heer anzutrauen.”

\(^{36}\) A fight that would ultimately cost Gaius Caesar his life: Dio 55.10a.5–9.

\(^{37}\) Dio 55.10.18–19, 10a.4, the respective quotes in ancient Greek taken from 10.18 and 10a.4 (cf. \textit{infra} p. 158 for a full quote of 55.10.18). In 55.10a.2–3, Dio explains that the threat of war with Parthia so preoccupied Augustus that he paid little or no attention to the precarious situation in Germania Magna in 1 CE, where L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (\textit{ord}. 16 BCE) had managed to cross the Albis (erecting an altar to Augustus on the further bank of the river) before suffering a reverse emboldening the Germans and causing them to hold the Romans in contempt.
entrusted with the Armenian question\textsuperscript{38} and happened to be Augustus’ grandson and adopted son. Some five years later, in 4 CE, a more or less similar situation would again force Augustus’ hand in taking consequential decisions to shore up his regime. After the untimely demise of Gaius and Lucius Caesar and faced with the outbreak of war in Germany, the ageing princeps decided to adopt Tiberius, who was promptly entrusted with the command against the Germans as well as invested with a decennial grant of tribunicia potestas.\textsuperscript{39} In a further move to strengthen the position of his prospective adoptive father, Tiberius himself had first adopted Drusus’ eldest son Nero Claudius Drusus, who assumed the name of Germanicus Iulius Caesar following Augustus’ ensuing adoption of Tiberius. Only now, so we are told by Dio, did Augustus take courage, “feeling that he had successors and supporters”, and set about reorganizing the Senate once more.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{38} Dio 55.10.18: in contrast to his appraisal of Tiberius in 21, Augustus in 1 BCE deemed both Gaius and Lucius Caesar young and inexperienced in public affairs – νέοι καὶ πραγμάτων ἐτύγχανον ἄπειροι.

\textsuperscript{39} Velleius 2.103.1–3 records that Tiberius returned from Rome in the consulship of P. Vinicius (ord. January–June 2 CE), before the death of L. and C. Caesar, and that he was adopted on 26 June 4 CE. Velleius’ narrative suggests that Tiberius had received the tribunicia potestas after Gaius’ death but shortly before his adoption, a possibility that cannot be ruled out altogether. For Tiberius’ adoption being announced as rei publicae causa by Augustus, in contrast to his simultaneous adoption of Agrippa Postumus, see Vell. 2.104.1–2. Like Dio, Velleius recounts in 2.104.2 that Tiberius’ was promptly sent to Germany following his adoption. According to Velleius, the war in Germany broke out three years before and had already earned M. Vinicius (suff. 19) the ornamenta triumphalia.

\textsuperscript{40} Tacitus (Ann. 1.3.5: Germanicum [...] per adoptionem a Tiberio iussit), Suetonius (Tib. 15.2: coactus prius ipse Germanicum fratris sui filium adoptare), and Dio 55.13.1a–3 all suggest that Augustus compelled Tiberius to adopt Germanicus before he would adopt Livia’s only surviving son. Dio further suggests that Tiberius’ own adoption was due to Augustus’ old age, the outbreak of war in Germany and his daughter’s Iulia’s influence(!), and that he forced Tiberius to adopt his nephew because he feared Tiberius too “would lose his poise somehow or other” and feared he might even commence a rebellion. Although this representation is often adopted uncritically by modern scholars (e.g. Hurlet 1997, 165 and Eck 1998, 111), Levick 1966 (esp. 227–233) and 1972a (comp. also 2010, 184f.) explodes this representation, arguing amongst other things that Tiberius was legally debarred from adopting anyone after his own adoption. In my view, it simply strains belief that Augustus would have had Tiberius adopt Germanicus against his will. Tiberius’ adoption of Drusus’ eldest son doubtlessly was the result of a gentleman’s agreement made between him and the ageing Augustus and served to kill two birds with one stone: yet another signal posthumous indication of Tiberius’ (and, for that matter, Augustus’) undying affection for his late sibling (in 10 CE, Tiberius had restored and dedicated the temples of Concordia as well as that of Castor and Pollux in his own name and that of his late brother: Suet. Tib. 20; Dio 56.25.1 and Ovid. Fast. 1.637) as well as a significant reinforcement of the Augustan dynasty, since Tiberius could now boast two adult sons rather than one, a rationale recognized by Tacitus (loc. cit.: sed quo pluribus munimentis insisteret: “but so that he might depend on additional
Third, the fine detail provided by Dio (supra p. 130) indicates that the supplications decreed on account of the successful investiture of Tigranes in Armenia were decreed on behalf of Tiberius, too, and not just in honour of Augustus as holder of the *summum imperium auspiciumque*.\(^41\) Traditionally, only holders of independent *imperium auspiciumque* qualified for such honours as supplications, imperatorial salutations, ovations and triumphs, and this was after all a time when Augustus was trying hard to administer the provinces *more maiorum*.\(^42\) In light of these considerations, it is, therefore, far more likely that Augustus himself or, perhaps more probably, the consuls of 21, M. Lollius and Q. Aemilius Lepidus, passed a law investing Livia’s oldest son with full consular *imperium*.

In all likelihood Tiberius’ first extraordinary *consulare imperium* was modelled on that granted to Agrippa in the late spring of 23, and this in terms of both duration and scope. As such, he would have received it in *quinquennium*, rather than in *annum* or *ad tempus incertum*.\(^43\) Consequently, Tiberius would continue to hold his consular *imperium* from 1 January 20 to 31 December 16. On the analogy of Germanicus’ authority under the (in all likelihood consular) law documented in the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisonis Patre* (of 10 December 20 CE), Augustus’ *imperium* would certainly have been defined as *maius quam* in any official business vis-à-vis that of Tiberius.\(^44\) However, since Agrippa’s *imperium* was probably not statutorily defined as *maius quam* that of the regular proconsuls before possibly 18 and certainly 13 BCE,\(^45\) Tiberius’ *imperium* would not have been legally

---

\(^41\) This vote of supplications on account of events in Armenia further substantiates the suggestion that Augustus had received his ninth imperatorial salutation on account of this victory: cf. supra n. 23.

\(^42\) Comp. Dio 54.9.1 (20 BCE). For independent *imperium*, complete with the *ius auspicii*, being condition *sine qua non* for supplications, imperatorial acclamations and triumphal honours, see Vervaet 2014, 78–93. For Augustus’ position that his solution of the Armenian question aligned with ancestral precedent, see R. Gest. div. Aug. 27.1, quoted in full supra p. 129.

\(^43\) The first legally guaranteed quinquennial command had been created by virtue of the Vatinian Law on behalf of Caesar in the early months of his first consulship in 59 BCE: see MRR, 190. For the historic precedent, see Vervaet 2011.

\(^44\) For the evidence on the superiority of Tiberius’ *imperium* vis-à-vis that of Germanicus as per the statute law recorded in the *S.C. de Cn. Pisonis Patre*, see the quote in n. 47.

\(^45\) Cf. n. 90 f. infra.
maius quam that of the proconsuls in charge of the individual public provinces. Rather, he would have been entitled to the summum imperium in whatever province he found himself in all affairs pertaining to his prouincia, his official administrative brief, and this either e lege, ex iussu Augusti, or ex s.c., on the formal proviso that Augustus’ imperium invariably remained maius.\textsuperscript{46} In all likelihood, the law creating Tiberius’ imperium would also have left the matter of his prouincia(e) entirely to the discretion of Augustus and the Senate, who could define and redefine his operational brief as dictated by circumstances and expediency.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{46} It follows from this argument that I do not accept Eck’s suggestion in 2018a, 28 f. that the clause in the law empowering Germanicus which stipulated the unqualified superiority of Tiberius’ imperium vis-à-vis that of Germanicus (see the following note) was tantamount to the “rechtliche Fixierung der Angst des Tiberius vor Germanicus” (i.e., triggered by the attempt of the Rhine legions in 14 CE to make Germanicus emperor) and therefore unprecedented. For an earlier version of this argument, see also SCPP, 160, where it is argued that the de facto relationship that had existed earlier between for example Augustus and Tiberius and Tiberius and Germanicus (i.e., resulting from the latter’s investiture in 14 CE, cf. n. 123 \textit{infra}) was now for the first time hardened into statute law because of what had happened in Germany in 14–16 CE: “Aber möglicherweise war durch die Vorgänge in Germanien in den Jahren 14–16 das Bedürfnis entstanden, das faktische Hierarchieverhältnis auch in rechtliche Formen zu kleiden.” Neither do I believe that the statute constituting Germanicus’ imperium was passed on the occasion of Tiberius’ decision to send Germanicus to the transmarine provinces, as surmised in e.g., SCPP, 159 (comp. also Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017, 73 f.: Germanicus received his first \textit{imperium maius quam} on “17 Sept. 14” and his second in “Herbst 17”) and Hurlet 1997, 190 f. (comp. 568). Whilst Germanicus’ official brief was indeed formally (re)defined in 17 by decree of the Senate (see the ensuing note), he was still holding the quinquennial imperium he had assumed in 16 CE: as recorded (rather inaccurately) in Tac. Ann. 1.14.3 (quoted in n. 48 \textit{infra}), Tiberius shortly after Augustus’ decease and his own accession asked SPQR for a cumulative second quinquennial imperium (i.e., commencing in January 16, after the expiry of the first one granted in 10 CE and beginning in January 11 CE: Dio 56.25.2), See Dio 54.12.4–5 (quoted in n. 65 \textit{infra}) for the fact that Augustus had received two consecutive and cumulative quinquennial extensions of his provincial command in 18 BCE.

\textsuperscript{47} For a substantial discussion of the stages of investiture with imperium (i.e., extra ordinem, outside of the regular \textit{cursus honorum} and prouinciae, see Hurlet 1997, 240–277 (comp. 190–195). Comp. Dio 53.32.1: Augustus sent Agrippa to Syria in 23 BCE; 54.11.1–2: after having been sent to Rome from Sicily in 21 BCE (comp. 6.5), he “was assigned” the provinces of Gaul in 19 BCE; Strab. 17.1.54: Augustus (while in Samos) sent Tiberius to Armenia before travelling to Syria; Vell. 2.104.2: Augustus sent Tiberius to Germany in 4 CE; 2.111.2: Augustus dispatched Tiberius to Pannonia in 9; 2.123.1: Augustus had sent Germanicus Caesar to Germany (in 11 CE: Dio 56.25.2) and was “on the point of sending his son Tiberius to Illyricum” (in 14) when these plans were thwarted by Augustus’ illness and decease at Nola on 19 August 14 CE; Vell. 2.129.3: Tiberius sent Germanicus in transmarinas [...] prouincias in 17 CE. The fact that these imperia were constituted and defined by means of statute law (passed \textit{ex s.c. ex auctoritate principis}), following which the Senate would define the provincial scope (in this instance probably not directly \textit{de sententia principis} but following a formal motion by one of the consuls of 17 on his behalf: SCPP, 159;
A further clue as to the nature of the extraordinary consular imperium granted to Tiberius⁴⁸ can be found in Ann. 12.41.1–2, where Tacitus records that:

_Ti. Claudio quintum Servio Cornelio [Orfito] consulibus, virilis toga Neroni maturata, quo capessendae rei publicae habilis uideretur; et Caesar adulationibus senatus libens cessit, ut uicesimo aetatis anno consulatum Nero iniret atque interim designatus proconsulare imperium extra urbem haberet ac princepsiuuentutis appellaretur._

“In the consulship of Ti. Claudius (for the fifth time), and Servius Cornelius (Orfitus) [i.e., in 51 CE], the toga of manhood was made ready for Nero before his time, so that he would be considered fit for conducting public affairs. And Caesar happily yielded to the Senate’s toady by agreeing that Nero would become consul in his twentieth year and in the mean-

comp. 161) is unequivocally recorded in SCPP, ll. 29–36 (p. 40): _cum deberet meminisse adiutorem se_ [i.e., Cn. Calpurnius Piso, cos. 7 BCE] _datum / esse Germanico Caesari, qui a principe nostro ex auctoritate huius ordinis ad rerum transmarinarum statum componendum missus esset desiderantium / praesentiam aut ipsius Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti) aut filiorum alterius utrius, neclecta / maiestate domus Aug(ustae), neclecto etiam iure publico, quod adlect(us) pro co(n)s(ule) et ei pro co(n)s(ule), de quo / lex ad populum lata esset, ut in quamcumq(ue) prouinciam uenisset, maius / ei imperium / quam ei, qui eam prouinciam proco(n)s(ule) optineret, esset, dum in omni re maius imperi / um Ti. Caesari Aug(usto) quam Germanico Caesari esset (etc.) – “who, when he should have remembered that he had been given as an assistant to Germanicus Caesar (who had been sent by our princeps in accordance with the authority of this order to settle overseas affairs that required the presence of either Ti. Caesar Augustus himself or of one or the other of his two sons), ignoring the majesty of the imperial house, and also ignoring public law – having been attached to a proconsul and indeed to a proconsul about whom a law was put before the People providing that in whatever province he entered he had greater imperium than the proconsul (officially) in charge of that province, with the proviso that in every case Ti. Caesar had greater imperium than Germanicus Caesar (etc.)”. Comp. also Tab(ula) Siar(ensis) frg. 1, 23–24 (after Lebek 1991, 114): _[in iis regionibus, quorum] curam et tutelam Germanico Caesari ex auctori[tate senatus mandasset] and Tac. Ann. 2.43.1: tunc decreto patrum permisae Germanico prouinciae quae mari diuiduntur, maiusque imperium quoquo adisset, quam iis, qui sorte aut missu principis obtinerent. On the discrepancies between Tacitus’ representation and the text of the SCPP, see SCPP, 116 and Hurlet 1997, 195–197. That Tiberius would also continue to issue precise directives (mandata) to Germanicus concerning the exercise of his provincial mandate is attested in, e.g., Tab. Siar. frg. 1, 21–22 (AE 1984, 508).

⁴⁸ Like Agrippa before him in 23 BCE, and – as will be discussed shortly – a few years after him also his younger brother Drusus, and later also Gaius Caesar, Germanicus (cf. *infra* p. 158 f.), and Drusus Caesar (comp. Ann. 2.44.1–2, 64.1; 3.11.1, 19.2–3) and even L. Aelius Seianus (Dio 58.74, 31 CE). Following amongst others Levick 1966, 240, Syme 1979, 325, and Hurlet 1997, 215 (with n. 37 for some further scholarship in this sense – comp. also Pettinger 2012, 187 n. 10) and 571, I at first believed (see Vervaet 2014, 85) that Drusus Caesar (_ord. 14, II 21_) received his first quinquennial imperium at some point in the spring or summer of 17 CE. However, as his career closely – and no doubt intentionally – mirrored that of his slightly older adoptive brother Germanicus Caesar (_ord. 12, II 18_), his first quinquennial imperium was probably awarded at some
Tacitus’ careful wording strongly suggest that Nero’s (doubtlessly quinquennial) consulare imperium did not entail any of the prerogatives strictly tied to the nomen consulis, the consulship proper, such as the ius habendi senatus and agendi cum populo. The imperia of special proconsuls like Agrippa, Tiberius and Nero could, however, be carried intra urbem and, provided they received express authorization ex s.c./iussu principis, used to command troops or exercise any other proconsular prerogatives there, but no more. Here lies the key distinction with the privileged consular imperium of Augustus, who had ever since its enhancement by virtue of the measures of 19 BCE possessed all the prerogatives of the consuls as well as the continuous summum imperium auspiciumque in the City in the capacity of proconsul, symbolized by the right to carry the fasces anywhere and any time and sit between the consuls of the day. This also explains why Tiberius convened the Senate shortly after Augustus’ decease by virtue of his tribunicia potestas rather than his enhanced consular imperium: whereas his imperium had indeed been made equal to that of Augustus in omnibus provinciis in 12 or 13 CE, he still lacked the extraordinary prerogatives added to Augustus’ imperium in 19.50

point in 13 CE (perhaps when Tiberius’ imperium was substantially enhanced, on which see Vervaet 2014, 272f.) and would have spanned the years 14–18 CE. Tacitus’ representation of events in Ann. 1.14.3 (At Germanico Caesari proconsulare imperium petiuit, missique legati qui deferent [...]) Quo minus idem pro Druso postularetur, ea causa quod designatus consul Drusus [...] erat) betrays his confusion by the fact that Tiberius only asked for a second quinquennial imperium for Germanicus Caesar in September 14 CE, causing him to believe that this was Germanicus’ first such grant and that Drusus was yet to receive this authority, and to explain the seeming omission of a similar request for the latter on the grounds that he was consul designatus – comp. also the observations in n. 46 supra and 123f. infra. That Tiberius at this stage only asked for a further quinquennium for Germanicus can be explained in that the latter’s first quinquennium was to expire in December of the next year, whereas Drusus Caesar was only into the first year of his (first) quinquennium. An early and cumulative renewal of Germanicus’ authority would have had the advantage of strengthening the position of Tiberius and the domus Augusta at a tricky time of transition and amounts to a clever exploitation of the young prince’s popularity.

49 Comp. also Ann. 13.21.3, where Agrippina takes credit for having effectuated amongst other things Nero’s adoption, his proconsulate as well as his designation to this first consulship: cum meis consiliis adoptio et proconsulare ius et designatio consulatus et cetera apiscendo imperio praepararentur. For a similar grant of imperium to Marcus Aurelius in 146 CE, see SHA Marc. Ant. 6.6: et suspensa filia tribunicia potestate donatus est atque imperio extra urbem proconsulari (etc.).

50 On all of which see Vervaet 2014, 265–275 and n. 156 of p. 261. Nero Caesar doubtlessly received these additional prerogatives as part of the senatus consulta passed in the afternoon of 13 October 54 following his acclamation by the praetorian cohorts: sententiam militum secuta partum consulta (Ann. 12.69.2). At all events, we are told in Suet. Nero 7.2 that, following the
At some point early in 19, shortly after he had designated Q. Lucretius to the vacant consulship he himself had refused to accept, Augustus had SPQR confer praetorian rank on Tiberius and grant Drusus the right to stand for the various offices five years earlier than was legally permissible. In 17, Tiberius was nonetheless elected to hold the office of praetor urbanus, a magistracy he would thus combine with the consular imperium he could only lawfully exercise in his designated provincia of the moment, if any. Much later, in 70 CE, Domitianus Caesar would find himself in a not entirely dissimilar position when he received the praetura urbana consulari potestate – the main difference being that he would have been authorized to exercise his enhanced imperium in his capacity as urban praetor. After Tiberius and Drusus had been allowed by the Senate to stage glad-

measures of 51 CE, Nero led a parade of the praetorian guard, shield in hand, and Tacitus (Ann. 12.41.2) further adds that he subsequently appeared in the pompa circensis in triumphal dress, decked out like an imperator (Nero triumphali ueste [...] decore imperatorio) – on this episode and the circus procession as dynastic ceremony in the court of Claudius, see G. Sumi (forthcoming). For a grant of imperium similar to that held by Tiberius following the measure of 12 or 13 CE, comp. also SHA Ant. Pius 4.6–8: adoptatus est V. kal. Mart. die, in senatu gratias agens quod de se ita sensisset Hadrianus, factusque est patri et in imperio proconsulari et in tribunicia potestate collega – “He was adopted on the fifth day before the Kalends of March [i.e., 25 February 138 CE], while returning thanks in the Senate for Hadrian’s opinion concerning him, and he was made colleague to his father in both the proconsular and the tribunician power.” This brief analysis of the imperium of Tiberius (and others before and after him) significantly qualifies the views of, amongst others, Béranger 1953, 95 f., who is adamant that such imperium “n’est valable que hors la Ville”, and not, as opposed to the imperium proconsulaire of the emperor, “à l’intérieur du pomérium”; comp. also id. 1980 (where Béranger develops an artificial distinction between the proconsulare ius = the limited imperium extra urbem proconsolare and the full proconsulare imperium of the emperors) and Syme 1958, 409 n. 3: “In 51 the boy Nero was granted proconsulare imperium extra urbem (XII. 41. 1). Now proconsular imperium by its very nature ought to be valid only extra urbem. The addition of the phrase in this passage implies that the central imperial power was normally conceived as a proconsular imperium which had been domiciled and legitimized there.” Koestermann 1967, 178, for his part, seems somewhat surprised that the term “proconsulare imperium extra urbem wird in keinen Inschriften erwähnt”. Since it concerns a literary paraphrase rather than a technical term this is entirely unsurprising.

51 Tac. Ann. 3.29.1; Dio 54.10.4.
52 Tiberius’ praetura is also on record in an inscription from Tarraco: [Ti. C]laudio / [Ti. f.] Neroni / [p]ontif., pr., / . . . manus (CIL 2, 6080 = ILS 146).
53 As Mommsen points out in 1887, 2, 650, Domitianus is the only praetor on record ever to have received consular imperium for use in Rome (in 70 CE): see Suet. Dom. 1 (honorem praeturae urbanae consulari potestate suscepit) and Tac. Hist. 4.3 (praetura Domitian et consulare imperium decernuntur). It is quite likely that Domitianus’ consular imperium too was granted in quinquennium with the proviso that he could use it intra urbem for the exercise of his duties as urban praetor. By virtue of this unprecedented measure, he was thus authorized to exercise his
atorial combats on his behalf at some point early in 16, Augustus entrusted the City and Italy to Ti. Statilius Taurus (suff. 37, II ord. 26) (since he had sent Agrippa to Syria again and had – allegedly – fallen out with Maecenas over the latter’s wife) and departed for Gaul, on the pretext of the renewed outbreak of war there. He also decided to take Tiberius with him, despite the fact that he was holding the praetorship. By decree of the Senate, Drusus was authorized to carry out all the duties of his brother’s office, acting as a result as a sort of pro praetore urbano. These events further underscore that Tiberius came second only to Agrippa and that Drusus’ star, too, was now rising rapidly, regardless of the birth of Agrippa’s second son Lucius early in 17 BCE and Augustus’ prompt – and highly significant – decision to adopt both Gaius and Lucius “as successors to his powers, so that there might be less plotting against him”.

As regards the precise nature of Tiberius’ position in Gaul in between his service in the East (supra) and his campaigns against the Raeti and the Vindelici (infra), the only tangible clue is offered by Suetonius in Tib. 9.1. Here it is recounted that he governed Gallia Comata for about a year, which was in a state of unrest through German inroads and the dissensions of its chiefs at the time: *Post hoc Comatam Galliam anno fere rexit et barbarorum incursionibus et principum discordia inquietam*. It arguably strains belief that Tiberius would have governed the whole of Gallia Comata on behalf of Augustus in the mere capacity of *legatus Augusti pro praetore*. In this respect, it is also well worth noting that, in 20 BCE, the proconsul Agrippa had likewise briefly been charged with the command of Gaul. According to Dio, Agrippa had been sent there from Rome in order to complete the task of quelling internal unrest and ending Germanic urban praetorship on a par with the regular consuls, exercising consular rather than praetorian *imperium*, whereas Tiberius would have exercised his *praetura urbana* with praetorian *imperium*, since he was not legally authorized to exercise any magisterial, ‘urban’ prerogatives by virtue of his extraordinary proconsulship, largely intended for extra-urban use in the provinces as per the instructions of the Senate and Augustus (cf. supra n. 47).

54 Dio 54.19.1–6, esp. 6: τὸν δὲ δὴ Τιβέριον καίτοι στρατηγοῦντα παραλαβὼν ἐξώρμησεν. ἔστρατήγησε γὰρ καίπερ τὰς στρατηγικὰς τιμὰς ἔχων· καὶ τήν γε ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν ὁ Δροῦσος ἐκ δόγματος διήγαγεν. On Maecenas’ position in this period, see now Mountford 2019, 22f., 40–42 and 58–62.

55 Dio 54.18.1–2.

56 See Thomasson 1991, 33 for the fact that, during his triennial stay in Gaul, Augustus oversaw its division into three separate provinces, Aquitania, Gallia Lugdunensis and Belgica, each administered by a *legatus Augusti pro praetore*. In the context of a discussion of Germanicus’ *imperium* in 14 CE, Syme 1979, 320 discerningly observes that “he held authority over Tres Galliae. Proconsular *imperium* was requisite”. By analogy, the same was true for Tiberius in Gaul in 16 BCE.
harassment before he was tasked with the command against the Cantabrians.\(^57\) Eck, however, cogently argues that Agrippa’s commission in Gaul was to commence preparations for Augustus’ (and his) grand plan to secure Italy’s northern and eastern periphery for once and all by conquering transrhenian Germania and expanding Roman power in Illyricum all the way to the Danube, in the aftermath of Augustus’ conquest of northern Hispania in 25 BCE. Amongst other indications, Strabo (in 4.6.11) records that Agrippa built four major roads from Lugdunum, chosen because of its strategic and central location: one to Aquitania, another to the Rhine, a third to the Channel coast and a fourth to the Massilian seaboard.\(^58\) Since Tiberius’ brief in Gaul must have been very similar to Agrippa’s, furthering his work, and both men operated under Augustus’ overarching \textit{summum imperium auspiciumque}\(^59\), it is not unreasonable to suggest they both held the rank of proconsul.

\(^{57}\) Dio 54.11.1–2. Although Dio recounts this in the course of his narrative of events of 19 BCE (which spans 54.10.1 to 12.3), it clearly concerns a commission held between his conduct of affairs in Rome and his stint in Spain to crush the Cantabrian revolt. In 21, Agrippa had indeed been sent to Rome from Sicily to smother the civil strife surrounding the election of a colleague for the consul M. Lollius, who alone had assumed that office following Augustus’ refusal to accept his election to the office: Dio 54.6. Following his Roman and Gallic commissions, Augustus in 19 decided to send Agrippa to Spain to crush the final uprising of the Cantabri: Dio 54.11.1–6.

\(^{58}\) Eck 2018a, 8 f., 2018b, 131 f. Agrippa also resettled (part of) the Ubians on the western shores of the Rhine, and probably oversaw the relocation of a number of legions into Gaul, some coming from Hispania after the end of major warfare there, some of which were stationed along the Rhine. Comp. also Roddaz 1984, 389–394 and Dalla Rosa 2015, 464: “Il est hors de doute qu’Auguste et Agrippa avaient élaboré un plan pour la conquête de ce territoire, car autrement on ne pourrait pas expliquer les efforts coordonnés et systématiques sur les fronts du Rhin, des Alpes et du Danube dans les années 19–18 av. J.-C.” For a further number of scholars who argue that Augustus decided on a great expansion in central Europe as early as c. 20 BCE, see Rich 2012, 76 n. 103 and Dalla Rosa 2015, 464 n. 2 – Wolters 2017, 28, however, believes the movement of troops to the Rhine occurred in the aftermath of the \textit{clades Lolliana}. Dalla Rosa (op. cit. 475) plausibly suggests that the sweeping consolidation of Rome’s northern frontiers provided due justification for the renewal of Augustus’ vast provincial command in 18. Rich 2012, 75 f., however, argues that Augustus would have requested another ten-year extension of his provincial command in 18, rather than the five years he then asked for, if he had already been planning on conquering Germany at that time, and suggests that he only changed his plans, including a request for an additional five years, following the invasion of Gaul by the Sugambri, Usipetes and Tencteri in 16. Cf. \textit{infra} p. 140 f. (with n. 65) for some further discussion of the issue of, and motives for, the staggered renewal of Augustus’ decennial provincial command in 18 and shortly thereafter.

\(^{59}\) See Vervaet 2014, 253–288.
The rationale for Augustus' speedy adoption of Agrippa's sons early in June 1760 invites closer scrutiny of the political constellation at the time of Tiberius' appointment to, and his tenure of, an extraordinary quinquennial proconsulate. A careful look at the precise circumstances of this period indeed lends further credibility to the suggestion that the domestic situation, too, offered good reasons for Augustus to have Tiberius invested with consular imperium, on the model of what had already been decreed in 23 on behalf of Agrippa.

As recorded in Cassius Dio, the years 22–18 were marked by political upheaval and real or alleged conspiracies. After Augustus had assumed the cura annonae in 22 amidst popular riots, the consular elections for both 21 and 19 were marred by violence and civil strife. In 21, the electoral violence was such that Augustus decided to commission none other than the proconsul Agrippa with the task of restoring law and order in the City. Whilst he succeeded in quelling these disorders, even he failed to check a disturbance about the appointment of a praefectus feriarum Latinarum, resulting in the post remaining vacant for the entire year. In addition, the years 22 and 18 saw political trials and conspiracies, probably triggered by Augustus' assumption of lifelong and therefore plainly autocratic powers and privileges in 23 and 19.

In 22, M. Primus stood trial for having attacked the Thracian Odrysae as proconsul of Macedonia and brazenly claimed he had been authorized to do so by both Augustus and the late Marcellus. Primus' counsel Licinius Murena stood in open defiance of Augustus and quite a few of the jurors even voted for acquittal. This incident was followed by – and may well have been the immediate cause of – the conspiracy of Fannius Caepio, who was joined by others, allegedly also Murena. All of these men eventually fled and were tried and convicted in absentia, only to be killed shortly after. Augustus reportedly incurred sharp criticism for allowing supplications to be voted and carried out “as though for a victory”.

At the end of his summary of events of 19, Dio furthermore recounts that Augustus was in fear of conspiracy and therefore felt that the breastplate which he often wore under his robe, even in the Senate, provided insufficient protection. “Accordingly,” Dio goes on to explain,

>”he first took the leadership for a further five-year term, since his ten-year term was now about to expire (for these developments took place in the consulship of Publius and Gnaeus

---

60 Hurlet 1997, 113, 428 f. (with n. 55) and 557, plausibly argues for 26 June as the date of adoption.

61 Dio 54.1; 6.1–3 and 10.1–2. See Vervaet 2010a, 136–144.

62 Dio 54.6.4–6.

63 On the novel, wholly ‘unrepublican’ empowerments of 23 and 19, see Vervaet 2014, 258–275.

64 Dio 54.3.
Lentulus), and then gave Agrippa various powers almost equal to his own, including the tribuni
cian power for the same period. He said then that this number of years would be
enough for them, but not long afterwards he took the other five years of the imperial power,
so that the total became ten again.”

His subsequent lectio senatus of 18 BCE, carried out in particularly difficult and
tense circumstances, reportedly triggered a great many accusations of conspiracy
against Augustus or Agrippa, whether true or false. The unambiguous associa-
tion between continued opposition and Augustus’ decision to shore up the posi-
tion of Agrippa is important for the sake of this argument. As for Agrippa: he
had already become so powerful that Maecenas in 21 reportedly advised Augustus
that he had “made him so great that he must either become your son-in-law
or be killed”. Significantly, Agrippa’s position as second-in-command had also
caused Marcellus enough grief for Augustus to decide to send the former to Syria
in the late spring of 23, “for fear that, if they remained in the same place, some
quarrel or altercation might occur”. Agrippa, however, reportedly kept a low
profile, as he instead decided to stay in Lesbos and sent out his legates to admin-
ister the province.

---
65 Dio 54.12.3–5: πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὸς πέντε τῆς προστασίας ἔτη, ἐπειδήθερ ὁ δεκέτης χρόνος
ἐξήκων ἦν, προσέθετο (ταῦτα γὰρ Πουπλίου τε καὶ Γναίου Λεντούλων ὑπατευόντων ἐγένετο),
ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ ἄλλα τε ἐξ ἴσου πῃ ἑαυτῷ καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τὴν δημαρχικὴν ἐς τὸν
αὐτὸν χρόνον ἐδωκε. τοσαῦτα γὰρ σφισιν ἔτη τότε ἐπαρκέσειν ἔφη· ὕστερον γὰρ οὐ πολλῷ καὶ
tά ἄλλα πέντε τῆς αὐτοκράτορος ἡγεμονίας προσέλαβεν, ὡστε αὐτὰ δέκα αὕτης γενέσθαι. Contra
Rich 2012, 71–75, who argues that Augustus in 18 BCE genuinely believed he only required five
more years “to finish the job”, his notable decision to secure his second decennial provincial
command by virtue of two successive and cumulative five-year grants should rather be inter-
preted as a deliberate political manoeuvre to reduce domestic tensions following his plainly
unrepublican and lifelong extraordinary empowerments of 23, 22 and 19 BCE: cf. Vervaet 2014,
258–272; comp. Vervaet 2010, 136–145.
66 Dio 54.13–15.4.
67 Dio 54.6.5: τηλικοῦτον αὐτὸν πεποίηκας ὥστ᾿ ἢ γαμβρόν σου γενέσθαι ἢ φονευθῆναι [in direct
speech].
68 Dio 54.31.3–32.1. Suetonius Aug. 66.3 rather makes Agrippa take offence because the young
Marcellus was exalted above him, whilst Velleius 2.93.1 says that men did not trust Agrippa’s
intentions and thought that he might well contest Marcellus’ succession to the imperial purple –
the sources are agreed that both men were not on good terms, despite Agrippa’s marriage to
Augustus’ niece Marcella: comp. also Plin. Nat. 7.149 (pudenda Agrippae alegatio). At all events,
shortly thereafter, in June 23, Augustus abdicated his eleventh consulship on the Alban Mount
(cf. supra n. 10). Earlier in 23, Augustus had fallen so gravely ill that he despaired of recovering
and, as Dio narrates in 53.30.1–2, “made arrangements for everything as though he were about
to die. Having gathered around him the magistrates and the other leading senators and equites,
he did not appoint any successor, although all expected that Marcellus would be chosen for this,
but addressed them about the affairs of state and then gave Piso [his colleague in the consulship
In the face of all these genuine and potential challenges to his supremacy, Augustus’ decision to bolster his regime by means of investing his loyal stepson Tiberius with a special proconsulate for the years 20 up to and including 16 makes perfect sense. Even if Agrippa would always remain Augustus’ foremost support, often in a conspicuously self-effacing fashion, there was no harm whatsoever in buttressing the position of another energetic and reliable mainstay. That Tiberius’ first quinquennium did not entirely coincide with that of Agrippa, which spanned the years 23–18, represented an additional safeguard.

The objection that Tiberius only was a quaestorian of 22 at the time he received his first proconsular command can easily be discarded. First, one should not forget that young C. Octavius himself was not yet twenty years of age when he first took the consular fasces on 19 August 43 BCE, whilst Marcellus had been authorized to stand for consul around the age of 30. Much earlier, in 210 BCE, P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus (cos. 205, II 194) had already been invested with an extraordinary consular imperium at the age of 26 as an aedilicius, whilst of that year] a book in which he had listed the forces and the public revenues and entrusted his ring to Agrippa”.

69 For Augustus’ strong attachment to Agrippa, see, e.g., Dio 54.28.3–29.1–6 and 54.31.1, with Dio’s own glowing eulogy for the man as Augustus’ most zealous and excellent supporter at 29.1–3.

70 Compare also the discerning observations of Kuttner 1995, 181f.: given that there was no such thing as an “office of emperor” (Augustus’ powers being a cumulation of special prerogatives granted to him nominatim), and “Augustus himself and the Roman people at large knew that Augustus was especially vulnerable to sudden sickness and death: he had always to keep in mind the contingency that the near-fatal illnesses of his youth and early middle age might recur. The principle in any Roman clan, and quite evidently in Augustus’, was to have as many arrows in the quiver as possible at any one time. Sons, stepsons, nephews, sons-in-law, were to be trained to ensure family dominance against the death of any one individual. Augustus did mark out single individuals to share the institutional bases of his power, especially the tribunicia potestas, and the holder of this at any one time can be regarded as the current ‘heir’; he must equally have expected that should he die, this ‘heir’ would soon himself find a colleague”.

71 All of this is not to say that Augustus would be able to put a definitive end to the problem of political conspiracy in this way. In Dio 55. 4.4, for example, we are told that in 9 BCE he punished an untold number of senators reported to be conspiring against him. Having more than one extraordinary proconsul at his disposal, however, would significantly strengthen his regime and the survival of his dynasty in the event of serious difficulties or even an outright challenge.

72 MRR 336.

73 See Vervaet 2012, 47–58.
C. Caesar, Augustus’ adoptive son, born between 14 August and 13 September 20 BCE, would receive a special grant of quinquennial consular *imperium* in January 1 BCE and assume the consulship one year thereafter in 1 CE.\(^74\) In January 11 CE, when he still was only twenty-five years of age, Germanicus Caesar, too, was invested with a similar grant of *consulare imperium*.\(^75\) In 12, he furthermore held the prior consulship throughout the year, without ever having held the office of praetor.\(^76\) At all events, a thorough reappraisal of the evidence concerning the official position of Tiberius and Drusus for the years 15 up to and including 11 BCE further corroborates the argument that Livia’s sons held authority far more powerful than has hitherto been assumed.

**4. Gallia, Germania and Pannonia (15–11 BCE)**

According to Cassius Dio, the crisis in Gaul triggered in 16 BCE by the so-called *clades Lolliana* quickly subsided as the invading Germanic tribes withdrew beyond the Rhine in the face of Lollius’ renewed preparations and Augustus’ decision to take the field himself, probably at some point shortly after 29 June of that year.\(^77\) Instead, they made peace and gave hostages. Augustus consequently spent the remainder of the year as well as the following settling other Gallic business.\(^78\) Given the resounding success of the Armenian and Parthian settlements, it should not surprise that Augustus now entrusted Tiberius with another formidable commission, this time in conjunction with his equally capable younger brother Drusus, viz. the conquest of much of the Alps and their immediate

---

\(^{74}\) Dio 55.10.17 and 10a 4 and Hurlet 1997, 127–141 (comp. 559). On Gaius Caesar’s date of birth, see Hurlet op. cit. 113.

\(^{75}\) Dio 56.25.1–2 (quoted in full *infra* p. 159) and Hurlet 1997, 168 f. (comp. 567). See n. 48 *supra* for the suggestion that Drusus Caesar in all likelihood became proconsul in January 14 CE, at the age of about twenty-seven.

\(^{76}\) Dio 56.26.1. In this respect, it is also well worth pointing to Augustus’ preference to work with those in the senatorial order who were thirty-five or younger: Dio 54.26.8 (in the context of his *lectio senatus* of 13 BCE).

\(^{77}\) As plausibly suggested by Rich 1990, 196 on the grounds that Augustus dedicated the rebuilt temple of Quirinus on 29 June 16 BCE: Ov. Fast. 6.795–6 and Degrassi Inscr. Ital. 13.2, 411–412 and 475 and accepted Dalla Rosa 2015, 476.

\(^{78}\) Dio 54.20.4–6 and 21.1. As Dio reports in 21.2–8, much of the internal distress in Gaul before the arrival of Augustus in 16 had been caused by the brazen predations of one Licinus. Originally a Gaul captured by the Romans, he had the good fortune of being made a slave of Iulius Caesar, who eventually set him free. Later, Augustus himself had appointed him to the powerful position of procurator of Gallia Comata.
periphery.\textsuperscript{79} As indicated in Velleius Paterculus 2.96.1, both brothers were now in for a real fight.\textsuperscript{80}

\textit{Reuersum inde Neronom Caesar haud mediocris belli mole experiri statuit, adiutore operis dato fratre ipsius Druso Claudio, quem intra Caesaris penates enixa erat Liuia. Quippe uterque e diversis partibus Raetos Vindelicosque adgressi, multis urbi\textsuperscript{um} et castellorum oppugnationibus nec non directa quoque acie feliciter functi gentes locis tutissimas, aditu difficillimas, numero frequentes, feritate truces maiore cum periculo quam damno Romani exercitus plurimo cum earum sanguine perdomuerunt.}

“On Nero’s return Caesar resolved to test his powers in a war of no slight magnitude. In this work he gave him as a helper his own brother Drusus Claudius, to whom Livia gave birth when already in the house of Caesar. The two brothers attacked the Raeti and Vindelici from different directions, and after storming many towns and strongholds, as well as engaging successfully in pitched battles, with more danger than real loss to the Roman army, though with much bloodshed on the part of the enemy, they thoroughly subdued these peoples, protected as they were by the nature of the country, difficult of access, strong in numbers, and fiercely warlike.”

Suetonius rather typically dedicates few words to this campaign and integrates it into his short précis of Tiberius’ military campaigns and distinctions prior to his notorious decision to retire to Rhodes in 6 BCE. For the sake of this argument, it is again useful to quote the relevant section from Tib. 9.1–2:

\textit{Exin Raeticum Vindelicumque bellum, inde Pannonicum, inde Germanicum gessit. Raetico atque Vindelico gentis Alpinas, Pannonico Breucos et Dalmatas subegit, Germanico quadraginta milia dediticorum traiecit in Galliam iuxtaque ripam Rheni sedibus adsignavit. Quas ob res et ouans et curru urbem ingressus est, prius ut quidam putant, triumphalibus ornamentis honoratus, novo nec anteia quicquam tributo genere honoris.}

“Next [i.e., following his stint in Gallia Comata] he carried on war with the Raeti and Vindelici, then in Pannonia, and finally in Germany. In the first of these wars, he subdued the Alpine tribes, in the second the Breuci and Dalmatians, and in the third he brought forty thousand prisoners of war into Gaul and assigned them homes near the bank of the Rhine. Because of these exploits he entered the City both in ovation and riding in a chariot, having previously, as some think, been honoured with the triumphal regalia, a new kind of distinction never before conferred upon anyone.”

\textsuperscript{79} In 26, Augustus’ plans to make an expedition to Britain had been thwarted by the outbreak of war with the Cantabri and the Astures as well as a revolt of the Alpine Salassi: Dio 53.25.2–5.
\textsuperscript{80} Comp. Eck 2018a, 11: “Die Kämpfe in den Alpen müssen zum Teil sehr heftig gewesen sein; doch der Erfolg der römischen Truppen war durchschiagend.”
The fullest account of this war can be found in Dio, on whom we ever rely when it comes to much of the fine detail of the Augustan era. As the predominantly Celtic Raeti, who inhabited the lands north of the Alps between Noricum and Gaul, were raiding northern Italy and harassed the Romans and their allies travelling through their territory and allegedly engaged in acts of outrageous cruelty, Augustus first sent Drusus against them. As he defeated one of their forces that had come to meet him in the Tridentine mountains, the Alpine range adjoining Italy, he was elevated to praetorian rank, again no doubt by decree of the Senate at the behest of Augustus. Despite being repulsed from northern Italy, the Raeti continued to press on Gaul, causing Augustus to send out Tiberius against them as well. As Dio goes on to recount, “the pair then launched simultaneous invasions of the enemy’s territory from different directions, both under their own command and that of subordinate commanders (αὐτοί τε καὶ διὰ τῶν ὑποστρατήγων), with Tiberius even crossing the lake in boats”. By means of this multipronged strategy, Tiberius and Drusus were able to defeat the Raeti piecemeal, in a series of set battles. Since the Raeti were rich in manpower and were considered prone to revolt, they deported most of the adult males, including the fittest, and left behind enough men to populate the land but too few to rebel. Although Dio narrates these events in his summary of 15 BCE and Horace Odes 4.14.14–40 records a great victory won by Tiberius over the Raeti in the summer of 15, it is quite possible that the Raetian wars of Drusus and Tiberius spanned the years 15 and 14, when Roman troops scored another major victory on the shores of Lake Constance.

81 Dio 54.22 – the quote attesting subordinate commanders sitting in 54.22.4.
82 Esp. 34–40: nam tibi, quo die / portus Alexandria supplex et uacuam patefecit aulam / Fortuna lustro prospera tertio / belli secundos reddidit exitus / laudemque et optatum peractis / imperiiis decus arrogavit – “Fifteen years from the day when Alexandria marked her submission by throwing open to you her ports and empty palace [1 August 30 BCE], propitious Fortune once again granted a successful outcome to war, and added this distinction and long-awaited glory to the campaigns already completed.”
83 Dio’s summary for 15 BCE runs from 54.21.1 through 23.8. In his concise précis of the Norican War, Florus in 2.22 ascribes the conquest of the Alpine Breuni, Ucenni and Vindelici to Drusus. Comp. also Suet. Tib. 9.3; Vell. 2.95.2; Liv. Per. 138 (Raeti a Tib. Nerone et Druso, Caesaris pruignis, domiti – “the Raeti were overcome by Tiberius Nero and Drusus, the stepsons of Caesar”); Strab. 4.6.9 anmd 7.1.5. On the military campaigns of Tiberius and Drusus in 15 and 14 BCE, see Schön 1986, 43–56 and Bernecker 1989, 1–97. On the grounds of the relatively late date of the Tropaeum Alpium, Eck 2018a, 11 suggests that “die lokale Unterwerfung, trotz der Verkündung des Sieges auf den Münzen, vielleicht doch etwas länger als ein Jahr gedauert hat”. In this respect, it is well worth noting that Dio records in 54.24.3 that the Maritime Alps, still under the independent rule of their inhabitants, the so-called Long-haired Ligurians, were reduced to subjection in 14 BCE.
At all events, Dio’s testimony that Tiberius and Drusus commanded a number of subordinate legati (ὑποστρατήγοι: presumably pro praetore) strongly suggests that both commanded as proconsuls in their own right.\footnote{A conclusion that runs counter to the communis opinio that the Claudian brothers fought this war as legati Augusti pro praetore: see, e.g., Rich 1990, 202 (“achievements won by Tiberius and Drusus as Aug.’s legates”); Crook 1996, 96 (“Augustus took an imperatorial salutation; the stepsons could have neither triumph nor ovation, for they were only legati Augusti”); Hurlet 1997, 86 (“En ce début de l’année 12, Tibère et Drusus portaient toujours le titre de légat d’Auguste, qui leur avait été conféré depuis le début de la campagne de pacification des Alpes, mais qui devenait désormais peu approprié et peu conforme à leur nouvelle position au sein de l’État et la famille impériale depuis la mort d’Agrippa.”); Dettenhofer 2000, 148 (“nur als legati Augusti”); Dalla Rosa 2015, 470: “Cassius Dion parle explicitement de l’action de ses légats contre les populations du Norique et de la Pannonie. Or un legatus Augusti pro praetore, étant lui-même un mandataire de l’empereur, n’avait pas la possibilité d’effectuer une délégation d’imperium; au contraire, un proconsul avait cette capacité en raison de son imperium consulaire.”} In 53.32.1, Dio records that Agrippa, following his investment with a special command in Syria in 23 BCE, “sent his legates there and stayed himself on Lesbos”: τοὺς ὑποστρατήγους ἐπέμψεν, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐν Λέσβῳ διέτριψε. In 54.20.1–3, in his narrative of 16 BCE, Dio likewise recounts that P. Silius Nerva (cos. 20), epigraphically attested as proconsul (of Illyricum)\footnote{Comp. also Hurlet 2006, 88: “Pour ce qui est de P. Silius Nerva, son statut et celui de sa province sont plus clairs: une inscription provenant d’Aenona fournit un renseignement capital en le qualifiant de proconsul d’Illyrie; s’y ajoute que selon le témoignage de Dion, il possédait ses propres légats, privilège qui n’était accordé qu’aux titulaires d’un imperium indépendant et était refusé à ce titre aux légats impériaux.”; and Dalla Rosa 2015, 470: “Cassius Dion parle explicitement de l’action de ses légats contre les populations du Norique et de la Pannonie. Or un legatus Augusti pro praetore, étant lui-même un mandataire de l’empereur, n’avait pas la possibilité d’effectuer une délégation d’imperium; au contraire, un proconsul avait cette capacité en raison de son imperium consulaire.”}, first (i.e., probably in 16) defeated the Camunni and Vennii, Alpine tribes. Therafter (i.e., probably in 15), Dio goes on to say, he “and his subordinate commanders” defeated the Pannonians as they overran Istria with the Noricans (καὶ αὐτοί τε πρὸς τε τοῦ Σιλίου καὶ τῶν ὑποστρατηγῶν αὐτοῦ κακωθέντες αὐθές ὑπολογῆσαν), following which he may well have crushed a rebellion in Dalmatia too.\footnote{Eck 2018a, 10: “Nach unseren heutigen Kenntnissen darf man die Eroberung des Alpengebiets in den Jahren 16 und 15 v. Chr. als Vorspiel der Eroberung des Landes bis zur Donau und östlich des Rheins auffassen.”} Furthermore, since Silius’ campaigns against a number of Alpine tribes probably represented the first stage of the plan to conquer the entire Alpine region\footnote{CIL III, 10017 = ILS 899 (Aenona, Dalmatia): P(ublio) Silio | P(ubli) f(ilio) proco(n)s(uli) | patron(o) | d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).} and he undertook these in the capacity of proconsul, it made perfect sense for the commanders involved with the next, arguably more challenging phase of operations, viz. the conquest of Raetia and Vindelicia, to hold the same position, especially as they were ranking members of the domus Augusta.
Having completed his extensive business in the Gallic, German and Hispanic provinces, Augustus left Drusus in charge of Gaul and Germany and returned to Rome in the consulship of Tiberius (for the first time) and P. Quinctilius Varus [i.e, 13 BCE]. Amongst other things, he went up to the Capitol on the day after arriving, removed the laurels from his fasces and placed them at Jupiter’s feet. While Tiberius zealously executed his functions as consul, Agrippa, now back from Syria, saw his status as first of the strongmen further enhanced. Before the close of 13, his tribunicia potestas was renewed for a further five years. Still according to Dio, he was also granted “power superior to that of the governors in every place outside Italy” and sent to Pannonia, then on the verge of war. Perhaps on the model of what had been decreed in 18 BCE, Agrippa thus received another quinquennial grant of consular imperium defined as maius quam that of any pro-consult whose province he would enter in the course of his tenure, provided his own imperium remained subordinate to that of Augustus, who had been invested with a universal imperium maius quam in the summer of 23 BCE. Regardless

88 Dio 54.25.1 and 4. Although Dio says ἐν τῇ Γερμανίᾳ (54.25.1) it is clear from 54.32.1 that he was also in command of the Tres Galliae. On Augustus’ activities with regard to these provinces, see also 54.23.7–8. Tiberius’ rapid progression in the cursus honorum is neatly summarized in Suet. Tib. 9.3: Magistratus et maturius incohauit et paene iunctim percucurrit, quaesturam praeturam consulatum.

89 See, e.g., Dio 54.25.2–3 and 271, where it is recorded that Augustus censured Tiberius for having seated Gaius at his side when giving the votive games for Augustus’ return. As Augustus, had been invested for life with all the consuls’ prerogatives as well as the summum imperium auspiciunque in Rome and Italy in 19 BCE, he was perfectly entitled to do so, being now consul maior in all but in name: Vervaet 2014, 265–275. For the fact that he had already been invested with lifelong, privileged tribunicia potestas in 23, see Vervaet op. cit. 259 f.

90 Dio 54.28.1: Κάν τούτω τὸν Ἀγρίππαν ἐκ τῆς Συρίας ἐλθόντα τῇ τε δημαρχικῇ ἐξουσίᾳ αὖθις ἐς ἄλλα ἐτη πέντε ἐμεγάλυνε καὶ ἐς τὴν Παννονίαν πολεμησείουσαν ἐξέπεμψε, μεῖξον αὐτῷ τῶν ἐκασταχθῶν ἐξω τῆς Ἰταλίας ἀρχόντων ἰσχύσει ἐπιτρέφας.

91 Vervaet 2014, 262f. n. 158, and, esp., 273f. n. 187. Lacking more precise indications in the sources, the possibility that Agrippa ever received an imperium similar to that given to Tiberius in 12/13 CE cannot be ruled out altogether – on Tiberius’ empowerment of 12/13 CE, see Vervaet 2014, 272f.; on the scope of Augustus’ imperium auspiciunque in the provinces as legally defined in 27 and 23 BCE, see Vervaet 2014, 254–263. In 23 BCE, shortly before the further enhancement of Augustus’ own imperium in the provinces, Agrippa had probably merely received the right to exercise the summum imperium auspiciunque in those public provinces who he would visit during his first quinquennial tenure of consular imperium (Dio 53.32.1: Agrippa; 32.5: Augustus), provided his own imperium auspiciunque remained subordinate to Augustus’ universal summum imperium auspiciunque, a bit on the model of the naval high command granted by Cn. Pompeius (in his capacity as overall commander-in-chief of the anti-Caesarian coalition) to the proconsul M. Calpurnius Bibulus (cos. 59) in 49 BCE (Vervaet 2006, 940). In my view, the fact that Dio uses almost identical language in defining (the terms of) Augustus’ maius imperium of 23 BCE (53.32.5:
of the fact that winter had already set in, Agrippa dutifully set out on campaign early in 12 BCE. However, before he reached his destination, the now terrified Pannonians abandoned their rebellion. Agrippa decided as a result to return and went to Campania, where he fell ill and died in March. Given the innocent ages of Gaius and Lucius Caesar, Livia’s sons now became the mainstays of the domus Augusta. As primus inter pares, Tiberius was now to bear the brunt. That much is clear from Dio 54.31.1–2, regardless of the historiographer’s discernable hostility vis-à-vis Tiberius:

'Ὅς δ’ οὖν ὁ Ἀγρίππας, ὃνπερ ποῦ δ’ ἀρετήν ἄλλ’ ού δ’ ἀνάγκην τινὰ ἡγάσα, ἐτεθνήκει, καὶ συνεργοῦ πρός τὰ πράγματα πολύ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τῇ τιμῇ καὶ τῇ δυνάμει προφέροντος, ὡστε καὶ ἐν καιρῷ καὶ ἔνει φθόνου καὶ ἐπιβουλῆς πάντα διάγεσθαι, ἐδεῖτο, τὸν Τιβέριον καὶ ᾧκων προσέλετο· οἱ γὰρ ἔγγονοι αὐτοῦ ἐν παισὶ ἔτι καὶ τότε ἦσαν, καὶ προαποσπάσασας καὶ ἐκεῖνον τὴν γυναίκα, καίτοι τοῦ τοῖς Ἀγρίππου θυγατέρας ἐξ ἄλλης τινὸς γαμετῆς οὖσαν, καὶ τέκνον τὸ μὲν ἢδη τρέφουσαν τὸ δὲ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσαν, τὴν τε Ἰουλίαν οἱ ἠγγύησε καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς Παννονίους αὐτὸν ἐξέπεμψα· τέως μὲν γὰρ τὸν Ἀγρίππαν φοβηθέντες ἠσύχασαν, τότε δὲ τελευτήσαντος αὐτοῦ ἐπανέστησαν.

καὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπηκόῳ τὸ πλεῖον τῶν ἑκασταχόθι ἀρχόντων ἰσχύειν ἐπέτρεψεν – compare 54.28.1, quoted in the previous note) does not necessarily signify that their maior imperia had identical geographical scopes. In 23, Augustus was authorized to exercise his maius imperium within the framework of the vast provincial command he had received in decennium in January 27. This comprised his own provinces (the so-called provinciae Caesaris, governed through legati Augusti pro praetore) as well as the right to wield the summum imperium auspiciiique in all public provinces alike, technically administered by other proconsuls (i.e., in alienis provinciis). Since his provincial command was universal in that it thus spanned the entire Empire, Augustus’ maius imperium would automatically apply across all individual public provinces alike, regardless of where he physically found himself. Perhaps already in 18 BCE and certainly in 13 BCE, Agrippa, for his part, was authorized to exercise his maius imperium within the framework of whatever provincia(e) he would receive from the Senate at the behest of Augustus. Whenever this official provincial mandate would include one or more public provinces, the clause paraphrased by Dio would automatically authorize him to exercise maius imperium vis-à-vis the incumbent proconsul(s), regardless of their locality, under the overarching (and now maius) imperium auspiciiique of Augustus. Since Agrippa in 23 BCE was authorized to govern Syria in absentia through legati (cf. Dio 53.32.1, discussed supra p. 141), the possibility that, at some stage, he also received the power to do so in regard to any public province(s) that happened to be part of his provincial brief cannot be excluded.

92 According to Dio 54.28.1, Agrippa set out on campaign in “the winter during which Marcus Valerius and Publius Sulpicius became consuls”. Although Dio in 54.28.2 suggests that Agrippa fell ill only after reaching Campania, his decision to return may well have been partially inspired by failing health and the intent to regain strength in a more wholesome environment. Whereas Syme 1979, 309 argues that Agrippa died on 12 March, Hurlet 1997, 78 (with n. 299) makes a more compelling case for 19/24 March.
“Now that Agrippa, whom he loved for his outstanding qualities rather than from any obligation, was dead, Augustus needed as a collaborator someone who was much superior to everyone else in honour and power and so able to deal with everything promptly and without becoming the object of jealousy and intrigue. Reluctantly, he chose Tiberius, for his grandsons were then still boys. He obliged him to divorce his wife, although she was the daughter of Agrippa by a previous marriage and was bringing up one child and pregnant with another. Then he betrothed Iulia to him and sent him out against the Pannonians. This people had been quiet for a while from fear of Agrippa, but after his death rebelled again.”

Despite his misgivings about being forced to divorce Vipsania and betrothe Iulia, Tiberius acquitted himself rather well of his task in Pannonia, where he probably commanded no less then five legions, the equivalent of Roman forces in Gaul. Aided by the neighbouring Scordisci, he laid the land to waste and reportedly inflicted much suffering on its inhabitants. He subsequently disarmed the Pannonians and sold the majority of the adult males as slaves for deportation. As recorded by Dio in 54.31.3–4, the Senate consequently “voted him a triumph for this, but Augustus would not allow him to celebrate it and granted him the ornamenta triumphalia instead”:

καὶ αὐτῷ διὰ ταῦτα ἡ μὲν βουλὴ τά γε ἐπινίκια ἐψηφίσατο, ὁ δ᾽ Αὔγουστος ταῦτα μὲν οὐκ ἐπέτρεψεν ἑορτάσαι, τὰς δὲ τιμὰς τὰς ἐπινικίους ἀντέδωκε.

According to Dio (54.32.1), “the same thing happened to Drusus as well” [i.e., in the same year 12 BCE]: τὸ δ᾽ αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ τῷ Δρούσῳ συνέβη. As indicated above, Augustus had left Drusus in charge of the newly reorganized Tres Galliae and their Germanic periphery in 13 BCE. As Kuttner observes,

“Drusus’ mandate was an important one, with three major parts. First, he was charged to initiate in 13 a full census of Gaul (Livy Per. 138); Augustus had carried out one in 27, but Drusus’ census was to include for the first time property and class evaluation. This task was not only formidable in purely bureaucratic terms, it also required firm, but sensitive, political handling: the first-time imposition of such a census in the new German province by Varus some twenty years later was to provoke unrest so severe as to destroy Roman rule altogether, and the Gauls did not take kindly to the new ways either. Second, he was charged to handle the preliminary organization of a new cult of Rome and Augustus at Lugdunum, a project brought to completion in 10 B.C. with the inauguration of the cult. It was to serve as a focus for Gallic loyalties to the Empire and to enhance a sense of solidarity among the tribes of three provinces: in it the primores Galliarum gathered together headed by priests chosen

93 At this stage, Augustus would have had no cause for reluctance, as the zealously loyal Tiberius made for a natural choice.
94 As plausibly argued by Hurlet 2006, 142–144 and accepted by Dalla Rosa 2015, 465.
95 Quoted from 31.4.
on a rotating basis from their number, and with it was to be associated the administratively empowered assembly of these *primores*, whose first recorded actions were connected, ironically, with funeral honors decreed for Drusus in 9. Finally, the best-known portion of Drusus’ mandate was to organize for a campaign across the Rhine into Germany, to implement a plan of conquest designed to bring Germany into the Empire as a province.”

In 12 BCE, Drusus had to master a twofold threat as the Sugambri and their allies took to arms because of Augustus’ departure and the Gauls rebelled against the census. Drusus first defused internal unrest by summoning the Gallic chiefs to Lugdunum on the pretext of the dedication of the altar of the divine Caesar there. He then attacked the Germans on both sides of the Rhine and invaded the territory of the Usipetes. From there he advanced alongside the Rhine into the land of the Sugambri, where he caused widespread destruction. Next, he sailed down the Rhine to the sea, won over the Frisii and with their aid invaded the land of the Chauci. Thanks to his Frisian infantry he was able to extricate his army from a tricky situation as his fleet had been stranded by the tide. As winter had set in, he withdrew and returned to Rome, where, “in the consulship of Q. Aelius Tubero and Paullus Fabius Maximus [i.e., 11 BCE], he was appointed *praetor urbanus*, although he already held praetorian rank”.

Drusus’ *praetura urbana* would prove to be almost entirely honorary, as the year of his tenure again saw vigorous military activity on the part of both Claudii. As soon as spring arrived, Drusus set out again for the war in Germany. He crossed the Rhine, subdued the Usipetes, bridged the Lippe and invaded the territory of the Sugambri. Crossing it unopposed, he entered the land of the Cherusci and advanced as far as the Weser. Drusus’ deep penetration of Germany was greatly facilitated by the fact that the Sugambri had invaded the Chatti, who alone among their neighbours had refused to ally with them. Dio goes on to recount that Drusus would have crossed this river, too, had not circumstances forced his hand. First and foremost, he ran out of supplies as winter set in. In addition, a swarm of bees was seen in his camp. At all events, on his way back, Drusus’ forces report-

---

96 Kuttner 1995, 118 f.
97 Liv. Per. 139 and Dio 54.32–33.1. A discussion of the controversy surrounding the dedication of the Altar of the Three Gauls (comp. Suet. Claud. 2.1) is beyond the scope of this enquiry. Dio’s narrative suggests that the post of *praetor urbanus* had been kept vacant in order for Drusus to be elected after returning to Rome. Drusus’ *praetura urbana* is epigraphically attested in AE 1985, 42 (Rome, Forum Augusti – quoted *infra* in n. 113) and 1988, 547 (Lucus Feroniae): *Neroni Claudio Ti(berii) f(ilio) / Druso, auguri, pr(aetori) ur[b(ano)] / patrono*.
98 Kehne 2002 310, 102 plausibly suggests that Drusus’ functions as *praetor urbanus* were executed by a third party in his absence, on the model of arrangements made during Tiberius’ *praetura urbana* in 16: cf. *supra* p. 137 f.
edly came close to complete destruction. The enemy (either the Sugambri and/or the Cherusci and their allies) continuously harassed him with ambushes and eventually managed to trap his army in a narrow valley. Had the Germans not become overconfident, charging in disorder in the conviction that the Romans were all but defeated, the result might well have been a catastrophe of the scale of what was to transpire in the Teutoburg forest some eighteen years later. After he had managed to turn the tables on his enemies in a remarkable victory and make a safe return to friendly territory, Drusus constructed a fort at the confluence of the Lippe and the Eliso, and another on the Rhine in the territory of the Chatti. As what follows is of particular interest to this enquiry, it is well worth quoting Dio’s summary in 54.33.5 in full:

“For these achievements he received the ornamenta triumphalia and the right to enter the City on horseback and to exercise the imperium of a proconsul when his term of office as praetor expired. Drusus then and Tiberius earlier were hailed as Imperator by their troops, but were not granted the title by Augustus, although he increased the number of his own salutations for both their campaigns.”

---

99 Pliny in Nat. 11.55 records the name of Arbalo for the site of this encounter. As Velleius records in 2.118.2 that Arminius had been fighting with the Romans for a long time (adstitus militiae nostrae prioris comes) before he turned hostile and the Germans would not repeat this mistake as they methodically destroyed Varus’ army over the span of three days (Dio 56.18–24 – contra Wells 2003, who instead argues for a single, decisive engagement) some twenty years later, I believe Arminius may have put the experience of 11 BCE to good use in the so-called battle of the Teutoburg Forest at Kalkriese. Even though he would have been young in 11 BCE, Arminius would have heard first-hand accounts of the battle. Wolters 2017, 43 suggests that Drusus’ army was ambushed by the Sugambri and possibly the Chatti. I am inclined to believe this near-catastrophic encounter occurred in the more remote territory of the Cherusci. For an excellent reappraisal of Varus’ generalship and tactics at Kalkriese, see Morgan 2019.

100 Dio 54.33.1–4. In Liv. Per. 140, we are merely told that Drusus subjugated the Cherusci, Tencteri, Chauci and other Germanic people across the Rhine.

101 Although Syme 1979, 310 correctly argues that the campaigns of Tiberius and Drusus in 12 and 11 BCE earned Augustus his 11th and 12th imperatorial salutations successively (a chronology also accepted in Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017, 58), Dio unequivocally records that Augustus took these salutations on account of the successes of both his stepsons in these years, and not first because of Tiberius’ victories of 12 and thereafter those of Drusus in the next year. Augustus could indeed well have decided to accept four salutations on account of the victories of his step-
As Drusus was thus engaged in Germany, the games attached to his praetorship were celebrated in the most costly way, while the birthday of Augustus was commemorated by the slaughter of wild beasts in the Circus and in many other parts of the City – this occasion reportedly marking the first time the *Augustalia* were held by formal decree of the Senate rather than through the voluntary initiative of one of the praetors, as had happened before 11 BCE. Also at this time, Dio goes on to recount, Tiberius subdued both the Dalmatians, who had risen in revolt, as well as the Pannonians, who had rebelled after them, taking advantage of the absence of the Roman commander and most of his army. Tiberius made war against both people simultaneously, shifting between the two fronts, “and so won the same rewards as Drusus” – ὥστε καὶ τῶν ἄθλων τῶν αὐτῶν τῷ Δρούσῳ τυχεῖν. As Cooley discerningly observes, Dio

“is mistaken in presenting these campaigns as mere suppression of revolts, misled by the assumption that Augustus’ earlier campaigns in the area in 35–33 BCE had advanced further than they had. Tiberius’ campaigns advanced Roman control considerably in the region to the south of the Danube, conquering the Breuci in the Save valley with the help of the Scordisci”.102

After Tiberius’ victories, Dalmatia was transferred to the *provinciae Caesaris*, “on the grounds that it required a permanent garrison both for its own sake and because of the neighbouring Pannonians”103.

In his summaries of 12 and 11 BCE, Dio thus provides some vital clues as to the official position of both Tiberius and Drusus, the sum of which would suggest the following reconstruction. In 12 BCE, Tiberius and next also Drusus were granted full public triumphs by the Senate, votes that no doubt also endeavoured to confirm their respective *salutatio imperatoria*. Augustus, however, vetoed these motions and instead moved to award first Tiberius and then also Drusus with the *ornamenta triumphalia*. In Tib. 9.2 (*supra*, p. 144), Suetonius expressly records that Tiberius was the first ever recipient of this novel distinction.104 In 11, then, Augustus prevented the ratification of the imperatorial salutations they had received in the field on account of their successes of that year. As it strains belief

---

102 Cooley 2009, 247, with further sources and scholarship.
103 Dio 54.34.1–4 – the quote being from 34.3.
104 Comp. Itgensholt 2008, 41: “Die erste zweifelsfreie Verleihung”. Itgensholt correctly observes (in n. 63) that Dio 54.24.7 cannot be interpreted as attesting that Agrippa would have first received this distinction in 14 BCE – *contra* Dart – Vervaet 2011, 280 n. 108, a misinterpretation corrected in Vervaet – Dart 2018, 328 n. 61.
that the Senate would decree triumphs without ratifying preliminary imperatorial salutations, it follows that Tiberius and subsequently Drusus, too, had also been denied senatorial ratification of their imperatorial salutations in 12. It is, moreover, quite likely that the Senate had again wanted to award Livia’s sons with curule triumphs in 11 as they moved to ratify their salutations of that year. Instead, doubtlessly at the motion of Augustus, both men were, yet again, granted the triumphal ornaments.\footnote{Many scholars will only allow for one denied salutation and one triumph as well as one grant of \textit{ornamenta triumphalia} to both brothers over the years 12 and 11 BCE. An early example is Stein. In PIR\textsuperscript{2} C 941 (p. 221), he suggests that Tiberius received the \textit{ornamenta} in 12 whilst being denied a triumph by Augustus, and that the latter in 11 refused to recognize Tiberius’ imperatorial salution by his army in the field. In PIR\textsuperscript{2} C 857 (p. 197), he asserts that Drusus received the \textit{ornamenta triumphalia} in 11 whilst being denied his imperatorial salutation by the army. On the basis of Tac. Ann. 1.3 and Val. Max. 5.5.3 as well as (posthumous) numismatic and epigraphical evidence (respectively discussed on pp. 165–167, 180 f., and in n. 113 \textit{infra}), however, Stein suggests that Augustus later in 11 BCE eventually moved to recognize this imperatorial salutation: \textit{postea tamen Augustus eum imperatorio nomine auxit}.} This time, however, they also received the right to celebrate an ovation\footnote{\textit{Contra} Gruen 1996, 175, who believes that Tiberius was awarded his ovation on account of his campaigns of 10 and/or 9 BCE.} as well an \textit{imperium pro consule} from 1 January 10 – the first two distinctions also being recorded in Suet. Claud. 1.2–3.\footnote{\textit{Is Drusus in quaesturae praeturaeque honore dux Raetici, deinde Germanici belli Oceanum septemtrionalem primus Romanorum ducum nauigauit transque Rhenum fossas naui et immensi operis effect, quae nunc adhuc Drusinae vocantur. Hostem etiam frequenter caesum ac penitus in intimas solitudines actum non prius destitit insequi, quam species barbarae mulieris humana amplior victorem tendere pultra sermone Latino prohibuisset. Quas ob res ouandi ius et triumphalia ornamenta percepit – “This Drusus, while holding the offices of quaestor and praetor, was in charge of the war in Raetia and later of that in Germany. He was the first of Roman commanders to sail the northern Ocean, and beyond the Rhine with prodigious labour he constructed the huge canals which to this very day are called by his name. Even after he had defeated the enemy in many battles and driven them far into the wilds of the interior, he did not cease his pursuit until the apparition of a barbarian woman of greater than human size, speaking in the Latin tongue, forbade him to push his victory further. For these exploits he received the honour of an ovation as well as the triumphal regalia.” The incident allegedly involving the tall Germanic woman, however, took place in 9 BCE: Dio 55.1.3. On this episode and the circumstances and representation of Drusus’ decision to halt at the Elbe, see Timpe 1967, who argues that this unmistakable instance of \textit{imitatio Alexandri} (halting the advance following a prodigious omen) is to be interpreted as indirect contemporary criticism of his unfettered aggression.} Given Tiberius’ seniority, he had probably received these honours before they were decreed to his younger brother, Drusus.\footnote{That Dio first mentions the honours voted to Drusus in 11 may well be ascribed to the thematic organization of the source he was drawing from, where Drusus’ campaigns in Germany during 12 and 11 where narrated as a unity, breaking up the narrative of Tiberius contemporary}
ovation on account of his successes over the Pannonians and the Dalmatians is also on record in Suetonius (Tib. 9.2, quoted supra p. 144), Dio 55.2.4 (infra p. 178 with n. 165), and Velleius 2.96.2.109 The precedence of Tiberius also makes perfect sense in that the Pannonian theatre of war arguably was more important, as recently argued by Eck: none less than Agrippa himself had been tasked with this commission in 13 BCE (supra, p. 147) and its strategic location close to Italy readily

109 In Per. 141, Livy’s epitomator merely records that Tiberius subdued the Dalmatians and Pannonians. Although Mommsen 1878, 466 n. 1 accepts Dio’s representation that first Tiberius and then also Drusus were first awarded with the ornamenta triumphalia in both 12 and 11 BCE, he seems to believe that only the latter was voted an ovation in 11: “Damals wurden sie wenigstens für Drusus mit der Ovation zugleich decretirt”. Neither can I accept Syme’s reconstruction of events. In 1979, 310 f., Syme interprets Dio 54.31.4, 32.1 and 33.5 (cf. supra pp. 149–152) as recording that the Senate first voted Tiberius a triumph in 12 following his acclamation by his army in Pannonia, a decision thwarted by Augustus who instead honoured Tiberius with the novel distinction of the ornamenta triumphalia (comp. also 314: “devised in the first instance for Tiberius in 12 B.C.”), and that “the same procedure followed for Drusus in the next year”. In n. 15, Syme accordingly explains that both Gelzer 1918, c. 483 and Jones 1934, 153 – and, apparently unbeknownst to Syme, also Boyce 1942, 134 f. – are wrong to believe that Tiberius was presented with the ornamenta twice (Jones, however, believes Drusus only to have received the ornaments once, in 11 BCE), observing that the “same interpretation of Dio would produce the same result for Drusus.” On the grounds of the correct “axiom” that “no triumph can be celebrated without an antecedent acclamation, no acclamation taken without the possession of a proconsul’s imperium”; comp. also Syme 1978, 60: “No triumph, it is clear, can be awarded without a salutation, no salutation accepted without possession of the imperium of a proconsul”, termed an “axiom” here), Syme furthermore argues that the honours voted in 11 and recorded in Dio 54.33.5 applied to Drusus only ("for he is named first") and were “for the future”, since Drusus and Tiberius were merely “legates in the provincia of Caesar” in 11, and “further defined the scope and potential of the honour (i.e., an ovation, not the full triumph) that might fall to Drusus if and when he earned a salutation. Compare the phrase of Suetonius [in Claud. 1.3, cf. supra n. 107]: Drusus before his consulate (in 9) had received the ouandi ius.” Strangely enough, Syme recognizes that Dio goes on to state (in 54.34.3, supra) that Tiberius “received the same honours as Drusus” and accepts that this entailed “proconsular imperium, likewise from the beginning of 10”. On the strength of Dio 54.36.4 (cf. infra p. 177), Syme nonetheless suggests that Tiberius earned his first imperatorial salutation as well as the ovation he would celebrate on 16 January 9 (cf. infra n. 166) in his “third campaign”, i.e., in 10 BCE. Combès 1966, 175 f., for his part, believes both Tiberius and Drusus secured their first official nomina imperatoria and ovations on account of victories won in Pannonia and Germany in the summer of 9 BCE. Hurlet 1997, 87 and 97 accepts Syme’s view that the ovation awarded to Drusus in 11 as recorded in Dio 54.33.5 concerned a future privilege, to be awarded following future successes in Germany. For a discussion of an inscription featuring Drusus as IMP III, cf. infra n. 117.
explains why the Romans spared no costs or efforts to regain full control of these lands during the great Dalmatian and Pannonian revolt of 6–9 CE, as opposed to their eventual retreat from transrhenian Germany following the clades Variana.\textsuperscript{110}

In light of this evidence, there is every indication that both Tiberius and Drusus operated as proconsuls in their own right in 12 and 11 BCE. Under the republican ius triumphi, only holders of independent imperium auspiciuque qualified for such honours as supplications, salutationes Imperatoriae, ovations and curule triumphs. The army and then the Senate so moved after their respective victories because they met this condition sine qua non in terms of official position. In 45 BCE, Caesar the dictator had admittedly allowed two of his legati pro praetore to receive and celebrate public triumphs, but this noted breach of custom had caused significant senatorial indignation.\textsuperscript{111} A repeat of this distasteful episode would, therefore, not have been in the best interest of Augustus and his crafty strategy of upholding mos maiorum whenever possible and politically expedient. The year 47 CE would witness the only known instance of a legatus Augusti pro praetore being granted the privilege of an ovation, viz. A. Plautius (suff. 29 CE), the man who had helped Claudius secure the military success he so desperately needed, namely the conquest of Britain.\textsuperscript{112}

That Drusus is epigraphically and numismatically recorded as IMP and IMP II (and, in one instance, even IMP III) further substantiates rather than complicates this reconstruction.\textsuperscript{113} As amply recorded in the sources, Augustus and the Senate

\textsuperscript{110} Eck 2018a, 9–11; Eck 2018b 133. In 2.96.2, Velleius emphasizes that the Pannonian war commenced by Agrippa and continued by Tiberius “was important and formidable enough, and on account of its proximity a menace to Italy”: magnum atroxque et perquam uicinum imminebat Italiae.

\textsuperscript{111} See Vervaet 2014, 81f.

\textsuperscript{112} See Vervaet 2014, 120 (with n. 158).

\textsuperscript{113} The epigraphic evidence: CIL 5, 3109 (Vicenza): [Nero]ni Claudio [Druso ---?] / [co(n)s(uli)] imp(eratori); AE 1934, 151 = 1985, 42 = 1987, 65c = Inscr. Ital. 13, 3, p. 15, no. 9, Drusus’ inscription found on his elogium in the Forum Augusti: [Nero] Cl[au]diu[s] Ti(berii) f(ilius) / [Dru]sus Ge[r]man[i]cus / [co(n)s(uli) pr(aetor) urb(ana) q(uaestor), aug(ur), imp(erator) / [app]ella[t] us in Germania; CIL 9, 2443 = ILS 147, l. 2, the dedication to Tiberius and Drusus set up between 27 June–1 July 2 BCE and 26/30 June 1 BCE at Saepinum on the porta di Boiano and di Benevento and authored by Tiberius himself: Ti. Claudius Ti. f. Nero pont. cos. II [imp. I] I trib. pot. V / Nero Claudius Ti. f. Drusus Germanicus augur cos. imp II / murum portas turris d.s.p.f.c., after the excellent reconstruction by Stylow 1977, 487–490; and the dedicatory inscription on the Temple of Castor, reconstructed and dedicated by Tiberius (on 27 January 6 CE), viz. the text on the right side of the frieze, as brilliantly restored by Alföldy 1992, 39–58 (comp. CIL 6, 40339): [Nero Claudius Ti(beri) f(ilius) Druus Germanicus] / [Augusti priuignus, co(n)s(uli), i]mp(erator) ite(rum), au[gur]. For numismatic evidence, see, e.g., RIC F Claud. no. 71 (aureus, 41–45 CE), the laureate head of Drusus on the obverse as well as the inscription NERO CLAVDIVS DRVSVS GERMANICVS.
posthumously honoured the unfortunate prince with a wide range of extraordinary distinctions, including the cognomen Germanicus,\textsuperscript{114} also bestowed upon his sons, a marble arch adorned with trophies on the Via Appia, statues, and a cenotaph on the bank of the Rhine.\textsuperscript{115} Even Livia was voted statues as well as the \textit{ius IMP} and a triumphal arch on the reverse, inscribed \textit{DE GERMANIS} and surmounted by an equestrian statue left between two trophies and right arm extended (comp. also RIC I Claud. no. 69, \textit{aureus} 41–45 CE); RIC I Claud. no. 70 (\textit{denarius}, 41–45 CE), featuring the laureate head of Drusus on the obverse, complete with the inscription \textit{NERO CLAVDIVS DRVSVS GERMANICVS IMP}, and a triumphal arch on the reverse, inscribed \textit{DE GERMANIS} and surmounted by an equestrian statue right between two trophies, each with seated bound captive at the foot, the rider holding a spear in his right hand (comp. also RIC I Claud. no. 72, \textit{denarius} 41–45 CE); RIC I Claud. no. 114 (\textit{sestertius}, 50–54 CE), the obverse featuring Drusus’ equestrian statue flanked by two trophies atop a triumphal arch with the inscriptions \textit{S C} and \textit{NERO CLAVDIVS DRVSVS GERMAN IMP}.

\textsuperscript{114} Florus’ claim in 2.30.28 that no other Roman general was ever honoured with an honorific name \textit{ex prouincia} by decree of the Senate is probably to be amended in that Drusus was the first ever Roman commander to receive this honour by decree of the Senate. In this respect, it is well worth reminding that Augustus’ triple Actium arch in the Forum Romanum was the first set up in Rome by public decree rather than at the initiative of the honorand or his family: Wallace-Hadrill 1990, 143–147, followed by Rich 1998, 114.

\textsuperscript{115} Suet. Claud. 1.3 and 5 and Dio 55.2.2–3. According to Tacitus Ann. 3.5, “every distinction which our ancestors had discovered, or their posterity invented, was showered upon him” – \textit{cuncta a maioribus reperta aut quae posteri inuenerint cumulata}. Suetonius and Dio also recount (in Claud. 1.3 and 55.2 respectively) that Augustus himself sent Tiberius to Drusus when he learned of the latter’s illness. After his brother had died, Tiberius had the body carried to Rome, first by the centurions and military tribunes as far as the winter quarters of the army, and thereafter by the foremost men of the \textit{municipia} and the \textit{coloniae}, where it was received by the decuries of the scribes – for the roughly similar procedures followed in the repatriation of the bodily remains of Gaius and Lucius Caesar and Augustus himself, see Dio 55.12.1 and 56.31.2. When the body was laid in state in the Forum, Tiberius pronounced the first eulogy there (also on record in Ann. 3.5), a second one being delivered by Augustus himself in the Circus Flaminius, as custom dictated he could not conduct the customary intrapomerial rites in honour of his exploits because he was in mourning (comp. also 55.4.4–5.1: “at the time in question he was unwilling to enter the City because of Drusus’ death”). The body was then borne to the Campus Martius by the equestrians, including those of senatorial families, after which the ashes were deposited in the sepulchre of Augustus. Comp. also the extremely terse summary in Liv. Per. 142: \textit{Corpus a Nerone fratre, qui nuntio ualetudinis euocatus raptim advcucurrerat, Roman peruectum et in tumulo C. Iulii reconditum. Laudatus est a Caesare Augusto ufficito. Et supremis eius plures honores dati}. Although it is impossible to rule out that Drusus had again been saluted \textit{Imperator} by his army in his final campaign, regardless of the lack of any evidence whatsoever, his tragic misfortune probably badly damaged morale in his army. That the army was grief-stricken may be inferred from \textit{Consolatio ad Liuiam} 169–172, where we are told that they had wanted to burn their commander on a funeral pyre in the camp in full armour, and that only Tiberius’ firm resolve ensured Drusus’ remains were returned to Rome for proper rites. The affection of the soldiers can also be inferred from Suet. Claud. 1.3: Drusus’ death in his summer camp caused it
trium liberorum by way of consolation.\textsuperscript{116} The above analysis suggests that Drusus was twice saluted Imperator by his victorious army in Germany, first in 12, when he was also decreed a curule triumph, and then again in 11. In both instances, his stepfather interfered to prevent senatorial ratification. Following his untimely demise, however, these Germanic salutations were posthumously ratified by the Senate as part of a wider package of posthumous triumphal honours, no doubt at the behest of Augustus himself.\textsuperscript{117}

to be given the name of “Accursed” (Scelerata), and after the departure of Drusus’ remains, the army raised a monument in his honour about which the soldiers were to make a ceremonial run each year thereafter, which, no doubt by decree of the Senate, the cities of Gaul were to observe with prayers and sacrifices.

\textsuperscript{116} Dio 55.2.5–6.

\textsuperscript{117} Contra Syme 1979, 313 f., who believes the epigraphic evidence quoted in n. 113 supra (which, incidentally, records two, rather than one, imperatorial salutations for Drusus) records a single acclamation that “may go back to 10 B.C. or belong to the last campaign, when Drusus set up a trophy at the Elbe”. The analysis above also signifies that I am at variance with Stylow 1977, 489, who argues that Drusus was twice saluted Imperator, in 11 and 9 BCE (speculating that Augustus hesitantly dropped his initial opposition against the first salutatio as recorded in Dio 54.33.5), “eine mal mehr als sein älterer Bruder, der erst 8 v.Chr. diese Ehrung erhielt”, and Rich 1990, 231, who believes that Drusus received an imperatorial salutation in both 11 and 9, as opposed to his older brother, who only received his first salutation in 9, and consequently struggles with the epigraphic record of Drusus’ salutations, observing that his first salutation “is recognized on inscriptions at Saepinum” whereas “only his salutation in 9 [...] is recognized on his elogium in the Forum of Aug.” Comp. also p. 220: Tiberius “must have received his first salutation as imperator in 9”; Drusus “must have been hailed imperator in the course of this year [i.e., also 9 BCE], his only officially recognized salutation”. Like e.g. Kienast 1990, 69, however, Hurlet 1997, 92, who duly accepts the “axiom” that “on ne peut être acclamé imperator et a fortiori célébrer uneovation ou un triumph que si on possède un imperium en propre” (p. 59, n. 182), suggests that Drusus was indeed twice saluted Imperator by his army: first at the end of his campaign of 10 BCE and then again following his expedition to the Elbe in 9 BCE. In my view, the discrepancy between Augustus’ veto against Drusus’ salutations in his lifetime and the Senate’s posthumous ratification of both his Germanic salutations may help to explain the variation in the epigraphic record with regard to the precise number of acclamations: cf. n. 113 supra. As opposed to the detailed Tiberius-inscriptions from Saepinum, where Tiberius was clearly keen to record that his brother too had earned an equal number of imperatorial salutations, Drusus’ elogium in the Forum Augusti puts the emphasis on the fact that he was acclaimed Imperator in Germany, not on his actual number of salutations. Although the funerary honours decreed in 9 BCE concern Drusus’ victories in Germania Magna in 12/9 BCE, both Tiberius and Drusus had possibly been already saluted Imperator by their armies following their victories in Raetia and Vindelicia. AE 1959, 278, an inscription found on the forum of Saepinum, may well provide some epigraphic evidence as it features Neroni Claudio / Ti. f. Druso Germ. / auguri cos. imp. III. Stylow 1977, 489 f. is skeptical, observing that imp III is incompatible with the Tiberius-inscription. Nonetheless, it may well be that the dedicators in their zeal decided to record all of Drusus’ salutations by the army in the field. Compare the commentary in AE loc. cit. that “La reconnaissance des habitants
The conclusion that Drusus operated in the Tres Galliae and its vast Germanic hinterland as proconsul during the years 13/11 BCE sits well with what we know about his impressive raft of activities and responsibilities there. In this respect, it is well worth calling to mind that, a few years before him, both Agrippa (in 20 BCE) and Tiberius (in 16 BCE) had held very similar briefs in the capacity of proconsul (supra, p. 138 f.). Furthermore, in the summer of 14 CE Germanicus Caesar, too, held a special proconsulship as he exercised the supreme command of the legions in both Germany Inferior and Superior whilst conducting another census in the three Gauls.

How, then, should we explain the fact that Dio’s representation in 54.33.5 (supra, p. 151) seemingly suggests that both men would hold their first proconsulates only from January 10 BCE? First, Dio’s wording here is quite different from the passages where he records Gaius Caesar and Germanicus’ first grants of imperium pro consule in unequivocal terms:

Τῶν Ἀρμενίων δὲ νεωτερισάντων καὶ τῶν Πάρθων αὐτοῖς συνεργούντων ἀλγῶν ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Ἀὔγουστος ἠπόρει τί ἂν πράξῃ· οὔτε γὰρ αὐτὸς στρατεῦσαι ὁδός τε ἐν διὰ γῆς, ὅ τε Τιβέριος, ὡς εἴρηται, μετέστη ἤδη, ἄλλον δέ τινα πέμψαι τῶν δυνατῶν οὐκ ἔτόλμη, ὁ Γάιος δὲ καὶ ὁ Λούκιος νέοι καὶ πραγμάτων ἐτύχανον ἀπειροί. ἀνάγκης δ᾿ ἐπικειμένης τὸν Γάιον εἵλετο, καὶ τήν τε ἐξουσίαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀνθύπατον καὶ γυναῖκα ἔδωκεν, ἵνα κάκ τούτου τι προσλάβῃ ἧξνωμα, καὶ οἱ καὶ συμβούλους προσέταξε.

[1 BCE] “When the Armenians revolted and the Parthians joined with them, Augustus was distressed and at a loss what to do. For he himself was not fit for campaigning by reason of age, while Tiberius, as has been stated, had already withdrawn, and he did not dare send any other influential man; as for Gaius and Lucius, they were young and inexperienced in affairs. Nevertheless, under the stress of necessity, he chose Gaius, gave him the proconsular authority and a wife, – in order that he might also have the increased dignity that attached to a married man, – and appointed advisers to him.”

de Saepinum est très comprehensible, car les deux frères, comme il est remarqué plus haut, on fait construire les murs du municipe”.

118 See Ann. 1.31.2 and 33.1. Compare also the observation of Syme as quoted in n. 56 supra. Although Kuttner 1995 aligns with the common opinion (cf. also n. 141 infra) that Augustus left Drusus behind in Gaul as he returned to Rome in 13 “as legate of the tres Galliae” (p. 118; comp. also 123: “Augustus’ legate in the West”, and 177: “the status of such Augustan legati”), the sheer magnitude of his stepson’s responsibilities surely warranted an extraordinary proconsulship. In point of fact, Kuttner’s attractive suggestion (p. 123) that the major event behind the Boscoreale Cups’ depiction may well have been chosen “to sum up Augustus’ achievements in the West, in a way similar to the use of the return of Crassus’ standards to sum up Augustan sway in the East” further strengthens the case for Drusus commanding as proconsul in Germany and Gaul as from January 15.

119 Dio 55.10.18.
In the consulship of Marcus Aemilius and Statilius Taurus [= 11 CE], Tiberius and Germanicus, the latter acting as proconsul, invaded Germany and overran portions of it."  

In the latter passage, any reader ignorant of Tiberius’ official position might just as well erroneously infer that, unlike his adoptive son Germanicus, Tiberius did somehow not hold proconsular power when they launched their joint invasion of Germany, especially as Dio in his account of Tiberius’ adoption and re-empowerment in 4 CE only mentions his decennial grant of tribunicia potestas. 

And surely no one would read Dio 55.13.5–6, where we are told that Augustus in 4 CE “assumed proconsular power for the purpose of completing the census and performing the lustratio” as evidence that he did not already hold the office of proconsul, a position he had occupied almost continuously ever since abdicating his 11th consulship in June 23 BCE. Second, Dio in 54.33.5 simply paraphrases two distinct, and yet very similar, packages of honours and privileges awarded successively to Tiberius and Drusus at different moments in the second half of 11 BCE. His précis does not at all preclude that both brothers already held quinquennial proconsulates when these honours were decreed: it merely shows that they received a(nother) five-year proconsular command as from the start of next year. In this respect, it is also well worth calling to mind that even in the case of

---

120 Dio 56.25.1–2.
121 Dio 55.13.1a–2. The same is true for Dio 56.28.1, where Dio duly mentions the renewal of Tiberius’ tribunician power in 13 CE but fails to say anything about the corresponding grant of overriding imperium over all the provinces and the armies recorded in both Vell. 2.121.1 and Suet. Tib. 21.1 (on which Vervaet 2014, 272f.). Dio also records that Drusus received the privilege to stand for the consulship two years later without ever having held the praetorship.
122 ἀνδρόπατον ἐξουσίαν πρὸς τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπογραφῶν καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ καθαρσίου ποίησιν προσέθετο. According to Dio (comp. also 54.1.5–2.1) Augustus decided to act as such as he was keen not to appear to be conducting this business in the capacity of censor.
123 Compare also Hurlet 1997, 168f., who rightly contests the view of a large number of scholars (referenced in n. 28 of p. 168) asserting that Ann. 1.14.3 (quoted in n. 48 supra), where Tacitus records that Tiberius asked the Senate to invest Germanicus with proconsular imperium following the death of Augustus, invalidates Dio’s evidence that Germanicus already held such imperium since 11 CE with the argument that “une telle interprétation donne toutefois au témoignage de Tacite un sens qu’il n’a pas: l’historien romain ne dit pas que Germanicus reçut alors un imperium pour la première fois; il rappelle plus exactement que ‘Tibère demanda pour Germanicus l’imperium proconsulaire’, ce qui est sensiblement différent. L’existence d’une salutation impériale décernée à Germanicus dès 13 infirme en outre l’idée que la première investiture date de septembre 14, puisque l’octroi d’une telle distinction militaire prouve que celui-ci était en possession de ses propres auspices avant cette dernière date”. Just as Tacitus’ (arguably confused...
Agrippa’s successive empowerments with consular imperium in 23, 18 and 13 BCE, Dio only provides very little information. Whereas he remains entirely silent as to Agrippa’s first extraordinary proconsulate of 23, he is tantalizingly vague about his second such commission of 18, and only provides more or less unequivocal evidence as regards the final grant of 13. That Dio bothers to mention at all that Tiberius and Drusus were to be invested (yet again) with consular imperium as from January 10 should probably be explained in terms of their enhanced relative importance following the untimely death of Agrippa the year before: regardless of Augustus’ plans for Gaius and Lucius Caesar, Livia’s sons now played first and second fiddle in his regime. It was also in 11 BCE that Augustus married Iulia to Tiberius and that, when his sister Octavia died, Drusus was granted the honour of delivering a second funeral oration for her from the Rostra.

Velleius Paterculus and Tacitus furthermore offer proof positive that Tiberius and Drusus had already been invested with independent imperium auspicii and que well before Agrippa’s death in 12 BCE. First, there is Vell. 2.122, again worth quoting in full given its particular interest to this argument:

Quis non inter reliqua, quibus singularis moderatio Ti. Caesaris elucet atque eminet, hoc quoque miretur, quod, cum sine ulla dubitatione septem triumphos meruerit, tribus contentus

and confusing: see n. 48 supra) representation here cannot be interpreted as conclusive evidence that Germanicus did not yet hold independent imperium in August 14 CE, especially in the face of Dio’s evidence in 56.25.2, so can Dio 54.33.5 (supra, p. 151) not be interpreted as showing that Tiberius and Drusus first received such imperium in 11/10 BCE, especially not in the light of a disjointed if significant body of indirect evidence that they had both long been invested with such authority. Similarly, one might just as well – but equally incorrectly, comp. nn. 46–48 and 121f. supra – interpret Tab. Siar. frg. 1, 19–20 (AE 1984, 508) as evidence that Germanicus only received consular imperium in 17 CE: ordinato / statu Galliarum, proco(n)s(ul) missus in transmarinas proquinencias (etc.). I do not, however, accept Hurlet’s suggestion (p. 168) that Germanicus campaigned in Germany from 11 CE onwards “sous ses propres auspices”: he indeed commanded propriis auspiciis but did so under the overarching auspices of Augustus; comp. also p. 161f. and n. 129.

124 Dio 53.32.1 (23 BCE); 54.12.4 (18 BCE) and 28.1 (12 BCE): cf. also n. 91 supra. Likewise, as Syme discerningly observes in 1979, 324, Tacitus did not bother registering that Drusus Caesar was sent to Illyricum in the capacity of proconsul in 17 CE even though he does record that both Germanicus and he were voted ovations in the course of 19 CE on account of their diplomatic successes in their respective provinces (Ann. 2.64.1). As Syme correctly notes, “ovations presuppose that imperium”. On the likely chronology of Drusus Caesar’s first quinquennial proconsulship, see also n. 48 supra.

125 Dio 54.35.3–4. Compare Vell. 2.96.1: Mors deinde Agrippae [...] adnuit proprius Neronem Caesaris: quippe filia Iulia eius, quae fuerat Agrippae nupta, Neroni nupsit: “Agrippa’s death then [...] brought Nero closer to Caesar, since his daughter Iulia, who had been the wife of Agrippa, now married Nero.”
quid dubitare potest, quin ex Armenia recepta et ex rege praeposito ei, cuius capiti
insigne regium sua manu imposuerat, ordinatisque rebus Orientis ouans triumphare debuerit,
et Vindelicorum Raetorumque victor curru urbem ingredi? Fractis deinde post adoptionem
continua triennii militia Germaniae uiribus idem illi honor et deferendus et recipiendus fuerit?
Et post cladem sub Varo acceptam, expectato ocius prosperrimo rerum evenuit excisa
Germania triumphus summi ducis adornari debuerit? Sed in hoc uiro nescias utrum magis
miseris quod laborum periculorum semper excessit modum an quod honorum temperaut.

“Among the other acts of Tiberius Caesar, wherein his remarkable moderation shines forth
conspicuously, who does not wonder at this also, that, although he unquestionably earned
seven triumphs, he was satisfied with three? For who can doubt that, when he had recov-
ered Armenia, had placed over it a king upon whose head he had with his own hand set the
mark of royalty, and had put in order the affairs of the east, he ought to have received an
ovation; and that after his conquest of the Vindelici and the Raeti he should have entered
the City as victor in a triumphal chariot? Or that, after his adoption, when he had broken the
power of the Germans in three successive campaigns, the same honour should have been
bestowed upon him and should have been accepted by him? And that, after the disaster
received under Varus, when this same Germany was crushed by a course of events which,
sooner than was expected, came to a happy issue, the honour of a triumph should have
been awarded to this consummate general? But, in the case of this man, one does not know
which to admire the more, that in courting toils and danger he went beyond all bounds or
that in accepting honours he kept within them.”

It is important to observe that Velleius elsewhere in his narrative unequivocally
demonstrates his perfect knowledge of the fact that a Roman commander had
to have conquered as a holder of independent *imperium auspiciumque* in order
to qualify for triumphal honours. As regards the brilliant successes gained by
M. Aemilius Lepidus (*ord. 6 CE*) during his service in Pannonia as *legatus Augusti
pro praetore* under the immediate command of Tiberius in 9 CE, Velleius indeed
makes the following insightful observation in 2.115.2–3:

---

126 After all, as we are told by Velleius himself in 2.104.3, he was sent to Germany with Tiberius
in 4 CE and served there for nine continuous years as prefect of cavalry and subsequently *legatus
legionis*. In 2.111.4, we learn that the great Pannonian revolt caused him to be sent there during
his quaestorship to serve on the staff of Tiberius as *legatus Augusti*, and in 2.123.4, we are told
that he and his brother were uniquely recommended by both Augustus and Tiberius Caesar for
the praetorship of 15, immediately “after those of noble families and those who had held the
priesthoods”.

127 See Vell. 2.114.5 for the fact that (the proconsul) Tiberius had charged Lepidus, attested as
*legatus Augusti pro praetore* in Vell. 2.114.5 and 115.3 (comp. 2.111.3–4: Velleius Paterculus himself
served under Tiberius in Pannonia as *legatus Augusti*), with the task of guarding Pannonia while
he turned his attention to the war in Dalmatia.
Initio aestatis Lepidus educto hibernis exercitu per gentis integras immunesque adhuc clade belli et eo ferox ac truces tendens at Tiberium imperatorem et cum difficulties locorum et cum ui hostium luctatus, magna cum clade obsistentium excisis agris, exsis aedificiis, caesis uiris, laetus victoria praedaeque onustus peruenit ad Caesarem, et ob ea, quae si propriis gessisset auspiciis, triumphare debuerat, ornamentis triumphalibus consentiente cum iudicio principum voluntate senatus donatus est.

“In the beginning of summer Lepidus led his army out of winter quarters, in an effort to make his way to Tiberius the commander, through the midst of peoples that were as yet unaffected and untouched by the disasters of war and therefore still fierce and warlike; after a struggle in which he had to contend with the difficulties of the country as well as the attacks of the enemy, and after inflicting great loss on those who barred his way, by the devastation of fields, burning of houses, and slaying of the inhabitants, he succeeded in reaching Caesar, rejoicing in victory and laden with booty. For these feats, for which, if he had achieved them with auspices of his own, he would duly have received a triumph, he was granted the ornaments of a triumph, the will of the Senate endorsing the recommendation of the Caesars.”

It was doubtlessly at the same meeting of the Senate that they duly granted Tiberius a public triumph over the Pannonians and the Dalmatians.\textsuperscript{128} Although Tiberius Caesar, too, was fighting under the auspices of Caesar Augustus at the time (i.e., \textit{alienis auspiciis}), he as proconsul still held independent \textit{imperium auspici-umque} of his own and therefore met all of the basic requirements. Regardless of the fact that ordinary senators had ceased to celebrate curule triumphs or ova-\textit{tions since 19 BCE}, Lepidus, by contrast, could not even be considered for full triumphal honours, as he had conquered \textit{sine propriis auspiciis}, without auspices of his own.\textsuperscript{129}

In light of these considerations, Velleius’ glowing testimony in 2.122 that Tiberius ought to have been awarded an ovation on account of his bloodless successes

\textsuperscript{128} Cf. \textit{infra}, p. 185, for the fact that, by force of circumstances, Tiberius would not celebrate this triumph before 23 October 12 CE, almost three years after it had been decreed.

\textsuperscript{129} See Vervaet 2014, chapter 7, sections 6f. for a comprehensive discussion of the high command under Imperator Caesar Augustus. Compare also Hurlet 2015, 290: “Cette precision [i.e. Vell. 2.115.3] signifie \textit{a contrario} que tous les généraux qui triomphèrent ou qui furent au moins salués \textit{imperator} au début de l’époque impériale étaient en possession de leur propre \textit{imperium} et avaient ainsi pris leurs auspices pendant leurs campagnes.” For the fact that Velleius was perfectly aware of the key distinction between proconsuls (normally appointed by the Senate using sortition) and imperial \textit{legates}, see, e.g., 2.99.4, where he records that Tiberius was visited in Rhodes by “all who departed for the provinces across the sea, whether proconsuls or legates” (\textit{ut omnes, qui pro consulibus legatique in transmarinas sunt profecti prouinias, visendi eius gratio Rhodum deuerterint}) and 2.112.5 and 113.3, where he distinguishes between Tiberius, termed \textit{imperator}, and his legates, termed \textit{duces} or \textit{legati}, in his narrative of the great Pannonia revolt of 6–9 CE.
in the East in 20,\textsuperscript{130} a distinction ranking well above the supplications recorded in Dio (\textit{supra}, p. 130; 133), and that his conquest of the Vindelici and the Raeti should have earned him a full public triumph, further confirms that he achieved these feats as a proconsul, \textit{propriis cum auspiciis}.\textsuperscript{131}

A few other passages scattered across his second book further confirm that Tiberius had held independent \textit{imperium auspiciumque} from his Armenian campaign in 20 BCE down to his first command in Germania in 8 BCE. In 2.96.3, Velleius attests that, following Agrippa’s death, Tiberius took over the war effort in Pannonia as \textit{imperator}, i.e., as holder of independent \textit{imperium auspiciumque}, and that his victory in this formidable war earned him an ovation.\textsuperscript{132} That he had already held that status during his first stint as commander in Gaul in 15 can also be inferred from 2.104.3. Velleius here claims that in 4 CE, when Tiberius was travelling north to resume aggressive operations in Germania, the inhabitants of the Gallic provinces were overjoyed at the sight of their old commander: \textit{omnem Galliae provinciarum ueterem imperatorem et ante meritis ac uirtutibus quam nomine Caesarem reuisentes sibi quisquam quam illi gratularentur plenius}. Velleius’ ensuing description (in 2.104.4) of the soldiers’ reaction to Tiberius’ glorious return to the front following his adoption by Augustus on 26 June 4 CE likewise confirms what is implied in 2.122 (\textit{supra}, p. 160 f.):

\begin{quote}
\textit{At uero militum conspectu eius elicitae gaudio lacrimae alacritasque et salutationis noua quaedam exultatio et contingendi manum cupiditas non continentium protinus quin adierent, \textit{uidemus te, imperator? Saluum recepimus?} Ac deinde \textit{ego tecum, imperator, in Armenia, ego in Raetia fui, ego a te in Vindelicis, ego in Pannonia, ego in Germania donatus sum} neque uerbis exprimi et fortasse uix mereri fidem potest.}
\end{quote}

\textquotedblleft Indeed, words cannot express the feelings of the soldiers at their meeting, and perhaps my account will scarcely be believed – the tears which sprang to their eyes in their joy at the

\textsuperscript{130} The ovation (or lesser triumph) being the customary reward for ‘dustless’ (i.e., bloodless) victories: Gell. 5.6.21–22.

\textsuperscript{131} That Velleius is prone to exaggerate Tiberius’ military feats (e.g. in 2.106.2–3, where he claims that Tiberius was the first to lead a Roman army all the way to the Elbe) does not detract from the implications of his eulogy in 2.122 for our knowledge about his official position as from 20 BCE.

\textsuperscript{132} 

Subinde bellum Pannonicum, quod inchoatum ab Agrippa, Marco Vinicio, suo tuo consule, magnum atroxeque et perquam uicinum imminebat Italiae, per Neronem gestum est. Gentes Pannoniorum Delmatarumque nationes situmque regionum ac fluminum numerumque et modum uirium excelssimamque et multiplices eo bello victorias tanti imperatoris alio loco explications: \textit{hoc opus seruet formam suam. Huius victoriae comos Nero ouans triumphauit}. Velleius likewise styles Tiberius \textit{imperator} during his command in the so-called Great Illyrian Revolt of 6–9 CE: see, e.g., 2.110.6, 111.4, 112.5, 113.2, 114.4, 115.2 and 5. It is generally accepted that he led these operations as proconsul.
sight of him, their eagerness, their strange transports in saluting him, their longing to touch
his hand, and their inability to restrain such cries as ‘Is it really you that we see, imperator?’
‘Have we received you safely back among us?’ ‘I served with you, imperator, in Armenia!’
‘And I in Raetia!’ ‘I received my decoration from you in Vindelicia!’ ‘And I mine in Pannonia!’
‘And I in Germany!’ “

Whilst the vocative imperator strictly refers to the present situation, Velleius’
representation unmistakably suggests that all these men had previously served
under Tiberius as their imperator and proudly acknowledged him as such. That
Velleius’ in a single instance (2.120.5) uses the term imperator in a non-technical
sense with respect to P. Quinctilius Varus might cause some to doubt this
interpretation.¹³³ The detail that Tiberius had granted dona militaria to some of
his men during his commands against the Vindelici and the Pannonians in the
years 15 to 9 BCE, however, provides further evidence: traditionally, such was the
exclusive preserve of imperatores in the technical sense of the word as command-
ers invested with independent imperium and the corresponding auspices. In the
period here considered, that would have been either Augustus himself or anyone
else with proconsular imperium.¹³⁴

¹³³ One should, however, note that Velleius otherwise consistently terms Varus dux in 2.117–120
(see 118.2, 119.2 and 3), and that in his narratives of the campaigns he conducted as procon-
sul after his adoption by Augustus in 4 CE and before his assumption of the imperial purple
(2.104–121) he often terms Tiberius dux (2.106.1 and 3, 111.2 and 4, 112.3 and 5, 113.1, 115.5) as well
as imperator (2.104.3–4, 106.1, 111.4, 112.5, 113.2, 114.4, 115.2 and 5, 117.1, 125.3).
¹³⁴ See Maxfield 1981, 115–118 (esp. 117): “The epigraphic evidence for the entire imperial
period is unanimous on the point that it was the emperor or a member of the imperial family who
granted dona, whatever discretionary powers their agents may in theory have had. No inscrip-
tion records a provincial governor granting dona: the vast majority of cases record the emperor
as the awarding authority, while just a few name a member of the imperial family, for example
Tiberius Caesar, stepson and heir to Augustus, and Germanicus Caesar, nephew of Tiberius. The
situation in the senatorial provinces was rather different. Here it was the senate who appointed
governors, proconsuls, to act on their behalf: the proconsular imperium gave these men the same
rights in the matter of awarding dona as had been granted to their republican predecessors.
There is just one example of this theory being put into practice and that was in the province of
Africa Proconsularis when the soldier Helvius Rufus distinguished himself during an encounter
with the rebel leader Tacfarinas and was awarded a torques and hasta not by the emperor Tibe-
rianus but by the governor Apronius [Ann. 3.21]. That no further examples of decorations awarded
by proconsular governors are recorded could be due to the fact that their powers in this respect
were eroded away in favour of the emperor. It is, however, much more likely to be a simple case
of desuetude” (quoted from p. 117). In Aug. 25.3 Suetonius expressly records that Augustus did
not deem “those who had celebrated triumphs” eligible for dona as they themselves had “the
privilege of bestowing such honours wherever they wished”, which indicated his respect for the
republican tradition that any holder of independent imperium could award military decorations
(for examples of which, see, e.g. Liv. 42.34.11 and Plin. Nat. 22.7). In Tib. 32.1, we are told that
In this respect, it is also well worth noting that Florus, too, in 2.30.31 records that all of Germany between the Rhine and the Elbe (in 2.30.23–26, he successively mentions the Usipetes, Tencturi, Catthi, Marcomanni, Cherusci, Suebi and Sicambri) had been conquered *sub imperatore Druso*, at the behest of Caesar Augustus (2.30.21–22). That Florus, too, was well aware of the key distinctions between *imperatores* and *legati* can be gleaned from 2.33.51, where we are told that the final stages of the war against the Cantabrians were carried out by Augustus’ “legates Antistius and Furnius as well as Agrippa while he was wintering on the coast at Tarrago”: *Haec per Antistium Furniumque legatos et Agrippam hibernans in Tarraconis maritimis Caesar accepit.* Although all three men commanded separate army groups under Augustus’ auspices\(^{135}\), Florus clearly distinguishes between the two *legati* and Agrippa, who like his commander-in-chief held the rank of proconsul.

Last but not least, there is Ann. 1.3, where Tacitus provides the following, most informative, précis:

*Ceterum Augustus subsidia dominationi Claudium Marcellum, sororis filium, admodum adulescentem pontificatu et curuli aedilitate, M. Agrippam, ignobilem loco, bonum militia et victoriae socium, geminatis consulatibus extulit, max defuncto Marcello generum sumpsit; Tiberium Neronem et Claudium Drusum priuignos imperatoris nominibus auxit, integra tum domo sua. Nam genitos Agrippa Gaium et Lucium in familiam Caesarum induxerat, necdum posita puerili praetexta principes iuventutis appellari, destinari consules specie recusantis flagrantissime cuperat. Vt Agrippa uita concessit, Lucium Caesarem euntem ad Hispaniens exercitus, Gaium remeantem Armenia et uulnere inualidum mors fato propera uel nouercai Liuiae dolus abstulit, Drusoque pridem extincto, Nero solus e priuignis erat, illuc cuncta uergere: filius, collega imperii, consors tribuniciae potestatis adsumit omnisque per exercitus ostentatur, non obscuris, ut antea, matris artibus, sed palam hortatu.*

“Meanwhile, to consolidate his power, Augustus raised Claudius Marcellus, his sister’s son and a mere stripling, to the pontificate and curule aedileship; Marcus Agrippa, no aristocrat, but a good soldier and his partner in victory, he honoured with two successive consulates, and a little later, on the death of Marcellus, selected him as a son-in-law. Each of his step-children, Tiberius Nero and Claudius Drusus, was given the name of *imperator,*

---

\(^{135}\) In 2.33.48, we are told that after arriving in Segisama and pitching his camp there, Augustus had divided his army into three parts in order to seal off the whole of Cantabria and mount a three-pronged offensive against their mountainous strongholds.
though his family proper was still intact: for he had admitted Agrippa’s children, Gaius and Lucius, to the Caesarian hearth, and even during their minority had shown, under a veil of reluctance, a consuming desire to see them consuls designate with the title Princes of the Youth. When Agrippa gave up the ghost, untimely fate, or the treachery of their stepmother Livia, cut off both Lucius and Gaius Caesar, Lucius on his road to the Spanish armies, Gaius – wounded and sick – on his return from Armenia. Drusus had long been dead, and of the stepsons Nero survived alone. On him all centred. Adopted as son, as colleague in the supreme command, as consort of the tribunician power, he was paraded through all the armies, not as before by the secret diplomacy of his mother, but openly at her injunction.”

Tacitus here produces an undoubtedly chronological summary of events. Since Dio expressly attests that Tiberius and Drusus were not allowed their salutationes imperatoriae of 12 and 11 BCE respectively, imperatoria nomina are here meant in a technical sense: Augustus had already made them imperatores, i.e., holders of independent imperium auspiciumque, when his family was still intact, well before the death of Agrippa (in March 12), and, in the case of Tiberius, even before he had decided to adopt Agrippa’s young sons Gaius and Lucius (in June 17). In this particular instance, it should be noted that Ann. 1.2 offers a striking parallel.

136 Contra Gelzer 1918, col. 484; Stylov 1977, 489, and Radice – Mayer 2016, 57 (“Tacitus offers in this chapter a sweeping and fast-paced summary of Augustus’ attempts to ensure a likely successor. It is worth noting that strict chronology is often ignored”; comp. also p. 59, where it is incorrectly asserted that “the title ‘imperator’ brought with it no official imperium [...] but did increase the recipients’ auctoritas”). Barnes’ assertion in 1974, 22 that Tacitus “may be guilty of a misconception: the best evidence seems to reveal that Drusus was not allowed the title during his lifetime” is correct only in the sense that Drusus was probably never made IMP I during his lifetime (cf. infra pp. 179–182). Syme 1979, 314 on the one hand rightly argues that “there are no grounds for perplexity. It is a question of style. The historian is deliberately avoiding the term imperium proconsulare. That power and that alone confers the right to accept and bear the title imp. The theme concerns high politics as well as warfare and ceremonial. The princeps was eager to promote his stepsons. They accede to the consulship at twenty-eight, four years earlier than normal for a nobilis in this epoch; and both are invested with proconsular imperium”. On the other, however, he sees this decision as a direct consequence of the death of Agrippa (comp. p. 309: “Hence a problem, to reward their ambition but not to incite it detrimentally; and it was a question how soon they might accede to an imperium proconsulare”) and firmly dates it to 10 BCE (p. 310–314). In their respective commentaries, Koestermann (1963, 67: Tiberius and Drusus bore the title “wegen ihrer Verdienste um die Ausdehnung und Befestigung der römischen Macht in den Alpen und in Germanien seit dem J. 16 v. Chr.”) and Goodyear (1972, 109: “the exact date of the first conferment [...] is not known, but 9 B.C. or not much earlier seems probable”) remain tantalizingly vague on the issue. Barnes, Koestermann and Goodyear moreover fail to distinguish between the term imperator in its technical sense of commander with independent imperium and the nomen Imperatoris accorded by the troops in the field through imperatorial salutation.
In the context of chonological précis of Augustus’ own political career, Tacitus here similarly uses the term *triumuiri nomen* in a technical sense, to designate the office of *triumuir rei publicae constituendae*, indicating that Caesar Octavianus continued to hold this plenipotentiary magistracy beyond the death of Marcus Antonius on 1 August 30 BCE:

*Postquam Bruto et Cassio caesis, nulla iam publica arma, Pompeius apud Sicilian oppressus, exutoque Lepido, interfecto Antonio, ne Julianis quidem partibus nisi Caesar dux reliquus, posito triumuir nomine, consulem se ferens et ad tuendam plebem tribunicio iure conten-tum.*

“When the killing of Brutus and Cassius had disarmed the Republic; when [Sextus] Pompeius had been crushed in Sicily and, with Lepidus thrown aside and Antonius slain, even the Julian party was leaderless but for Caesar; after laying down his triumviral title, he conducted his business as a simple consul content with tribunician authority to safeguard the *plebs*.“¹³⁷

That Augustus designates Tiberius as *legatus* in regard to his operations in Pannonia and Illyricum from 12 to 9 BCE in his *Res Gestae* does not present an insurmountable obstacle.¹³⁸ First, the term *legatus* here features in a non-technical sense of envoy, indicating that Augustus had personally dispatched Tiberius to conduct these operations, doubtlessly by virtue of a motion carried in the Senate at his behest. In this matter, it is, moreover, important to note that many attested proconsuls of the triumviral and Augustan period are likewise termed *legati* in the literary sources and the *Res Gestae*.¹³⁹ Second, Dio unequivocally attests that Tiberius had completed his summer campaign against Dalmatians and Pannonians of 9 BCE before Drusus’ misfortune compelled him to race north to Germany.¹⁴⁰ That Tiberius held the office of proconsul at the start of 10 BCE is unequivocally attested in Dio 53.33.5 (*supra*, p. 151).

¹³⁷ For further discussion, see Vervaet 2010b, 139. Tac. Ann. 1.10 offers another striking example of such a sweeping chronological précis, in this instance covering Augustus’ entire career.

¹³⁸ R. Gest. div. Aug. 30.1: *Pannoniorum gentes, qu[a][s a]nte me principem populi Romani exer-citus nunquam adit, deuictas per Ti[berium] [Ne]ronem, qui tum erat privignus et legatus meus, imperio populi Romani [subie]ci, protulique fines Illyrici ad ripam fluminis Dan[u<u>]]i. As Cooley 2009, 247 notes, the addition of the clause concerning Tiberius’ status “directs the reader away from assuming that Augustus is referring to Tiberius’ suppression of the Pannonian revolt in AD 6–9, towards his initial conquest of the region in 12–9 BCE, since Tiberius was adopted by Augustus in AD 4” – comp. also Ridley 2003, 85–88.

¹³⁹ See Vervaet 2014, 239–252, esp. 247 f. Comp. also Pliny’s usage of the term *ablegatio* with regard to Agrippa’s mission of 23 BCE in Nat. 7.149.

¹⁴⁰ Dio 55.2.4.
The above reappraisal of the extant sources invalidates the consensus that Tiberius and Drusus were denied curule triumphs and imperatorial salutations in 12 and 11 and instead received *ornamenta triumphalia* because they had conquered as mere *legati Augusti pro praetore*, a supposition that furthermore fails to account for their respective ovations.\footnote{141 To quote just a few examples of scholars arguing or suggesting that Tiberius and/or Drusus were denied triumphs and salutations in 12 and/or 11 respectively because they were mere *legati Augusti pro praetore*, many of whom also invoke R. Gest. div. Aug. 30.1 and Dio 54.33.5 (cf. *supra*, p. 151) as proof positive that they were not invested with consular *imperium* before January 10 BCE: Mommsen 1878, 1, 126 n. 1 (where Mommsen even invokes R. Gest. div. Aug. loc. cit. as evidence that Tiberius continued to command as a mere imperial legate in Pannonia in 9 BCE) and 131 n. 2, comp. 2, 852 n. 3 and 1152 n. 2; Stein 1899, col. 2709 and 2712 and PIR\textsuperscript{2} C 857 (p. 197; comp. C 941, p. 221); Gelzer 1918, c. 483 (Gelzer merely notes that Tiberius was sent to Pannonia in 12 as *legatus pro praetore* and that Augustus would only allow him the *ornamenta triumphalia* whilst vetoing his imperatorial salutation and the Senate’s vote of a triumph); Jones 1934, 153 (in n. 3, Jones asserts that Dio in 54.35.5 (sic) “tells us [...] that the Senate decreed that Drusus, at the close of his term of office as praetor, should rank *pro console*”); Alföldy 1974, 55; Barnes 1974, 22 n. 13; Levick 1976, 35 (comp. 1999, 21); Syme 1978, 60 n. 2 (“The stepsons of the Princeps first received proconsular *imperium* after the campaigns of 11, to be valid for Drusus from January of the next year”, with reference to Dio 54.33.5 and 34.3); Syme 1979, 310–314 (comp. 309, where Syme asserts that “no instance” of Augustus taking imperatorial salutations for victories won by proconsuls “is discoverable after the return of normal government in 28 and 27”; in 1939, 394 n. 2 Syme had already suggested that, “though it cannot be proved”, “M. Vinicius was the last proconsul, Tiberius the first imperial legate of Illyricum” – in 1986, 332, however, Syme is inclined to consider Vinicius the first of the imperial legates to govern Illyricum, from 15 or 14 to 12 BCE, a suggestion rightly contested by Hurlet 2006, 86 and 145–147, who cogently argues that Dio’s testimony in 54.34.4 that Illyricum ceased to be a public province only in 11 BCE should not be called to question); Castritius 1982, 46; Syme 1986, 334; Zanker 1987, 226; Rich 1990, 213 (arguing also that only Drusus as praetor in 11 satisfied the requirement that only holders of independent *imperium* could receive imperatorial salutations and celebrate ovations, a requirement waived by the Senate when granting Tiberius an ovation as well (Dio 54.34.3), and that only Drusus consequently received an imperatorial salutation in 11, whereas Tiberius had to wait until 9 (comp. also n. 176 *infra*); Kienast 1990, 69; Thomasson 1991, 34; Hickson 1991, 129; Hurlet 1997, esp. 87–89, comp. also 90 f. and 95 f. and the useful tables on pp. 556 and 562 (on pp. 86 and 88 f., Hurlet suggests that the promotion of Tiberius and Drusus to proconsul following Agrippa’s death suffered a slight delay as Augustus “respect pour des institutions républicaines toujours bien vivantes” had him insist on Drusus first holding the praetorship in 11 BCE: consequently, Drusus had to wait until 1 January 10 BCE, whereas Tiberius, as Hurlet argues on the basis of Dio 55.2.4 and 54.34.3, was invested with his first “*imperium proconsulaire*” at the end of 11 BCE – “de la fin de l’année” [comp. also 2006, 145: “dans le courant de l’année 11”]; on p. 97 and esp. 101, Hurlet suggests that Tiberius was voted his first and only ovation at some point in 9 BCE); (implicitly) Eck 1998, 58 f.; Bleicken 1998, 579 f.; Dettenhofer 2000, 162–167 (she even believes that Tiberius was decreed two ovations on account of his first victories in Pannonia following Agrippa’s death but was only allowed to celebrate the second and furthermore.
that, from 20 and 15 successively, both of Livia’s sons had invariably commanded as proconsuls, and thus as imperatores in their own right. As further discussed below, Augustus had a very different rationale for moderating the honours heaped on his stepsons.

argues that Augustus consistently favoured Drusus over Tiberius, investing the former with ‘proconsular’ imperium in 11, one year before the latter); Kehne 2002, 310 n. 102 (where Kehne nonetheless also deems it possible that Drusus administered his extra-urban province “mit eigenem prätorischen Imperium” during his praetura urbana in 11 BCE) and 312; Seager 2005, 20 f. and 214; Itgenschorst 2008, 40 n. 61 f. (with a hint of doubt in the case of Tiberius); Levick 2010, 93; Powell 2011, 48 f.; Dalla Rosa 2014, 234 n. 11 and 238 and 2015, 482 (with n. 72); Lange 2016, 168; Havener 2016, 336 f. For the erroneous view that the ornamenta triumphalia were only ever awarded to imperial legati, see also Rich 1990, 210 f. and 1998, 120 n. 157. A significant number of scholars even believe that Tiberius was only invested with an extraordinary consular imperium in 9 (following the death of Drusus) or, on the basis of an incorrect interpretation of Dio 55.6.5, a suggestion rightly exploded by Hurlet 1997, 88), even as late as 8 BCE, as opposed to his younger brother Drusus, who allegedly became proconsul in January 10 BCE: Dupraz 1963, 181 (9 BCE); Paladini 1969, 579 (9 BCE); Vrind 1923, 42 f. (8 BCE); Bringmann 1977, 235 and n. 85 (8 BCE – Bringmann omits Tiberius’ ovation altogether); Castritius 1982, 46 f. (8 BCE); Hellengouarc’h 1982, 241 (8 BCE); Gallotta 1987, 122 (8 BCE); Jacques – Scheid 1990, 21 (8 BCE); Kienast 1990, 76 (8 BCE); comp. also Fitz 1993, 50–56, who argues that Tiberius was the first legatus Augusti pro praetore of Illyricum from 12 through 9 BCE, regardless of the fact that his brother Drusus had been invested with imperium proconsulare “seit 11 v. Chr.”, suppositions that fly in the face of the extant evidence. According to Fitz, who consequently believes that Drusus in 11 received a number of honours refused to Tiberius because of the former’s “höheren Rang”, we should not be guided by the 20th century’s ‘sense of justice’ in supposing that the latter had been promoted at the same time as his younger brother, and that it was not customary in the early Principate to award more than one ‘secondary proconsulship’ at the same time. According to Fitz, is was only as Tiberius took over from Drusus in Germania in “10/9 v. Chr.” (sic, p. 54) that he acquired “prokonsularische Machtsbefugnisse” – comp. also p. 56: “Nach dem Tod von Drusus schickte ihn Augustus nach Germanien mit den Machtsbefugnissen eines Prokonsul.” On p. 55, however, Fitz is adamant that it is impossible to establish “ob Tiberius noch in Illyricum, zu Lebzeiten von Drusus, die prokonsularische Machtsbefugnisse erhielt oder erst nach dem Tod seines Bruders, als ihm diese mit dem germanischen Auftrag zukamen.” For a more or less similar position, see also Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017, 61 and 70, who likewise suggest that Drusus received and celebrated an ovation in 11 BCE (while still legatus Augusti pro praetore) and subsequently became a proconsul as from 1 January 9 BCE, whereas Tiberius campaigned in Pannonia and Dalmatia as a legatus Augusti pro praetore from 13 up to and including 9 BCE and only became proconsul in Germania in 8 BCE. The misconception that Augustus strongly favoured Drusus over Tiberius, considering the former as his preferred successor, can also be found in Wolters 2017, 45–52, esp. 50 f.

142 In Aug. 25.1, Suetonius seems to produce some further evidence for this, as he recounts here how Augustus after the civil wars invariably addressed his troops as soldiers and expected as much from “his sons or stepsons who held military commands” (ac ne a filiis quidem aut priuignis suis imperio praeditis alter appellari passus est). The context suggests that Suetonius here means independent imperium rather than delegated authority.
5. Hammering Home the Message: the Numismatic Evidence

Quite intriguingly, the disjointed – if unequivocal – literary evidence that Tiberius and Drusus held extraordinary, quinquennial proconsulships from respectively 20 and 15 BCE is hardly reflected in the extant epigraphic record. Fortunately, however, we do have a remarkable series of denarii and aurei commemorating Augustus' tenth imperatorial salutation (15–13 BCE) on account of Tiberius and Drusus’ decisive victories over the Raeti and the Vindelici in 15 and 14 BCE. Minted in Lugdunum, the administrative seat of Gaul, and mainly intended to pay the armed forces who were fighting these wars, the reverse of one series of these coins (viz. RIC I² Aug. nos. 162a–165b = BMC 1 Aug. nos. 443 and 446–449) strikingly displays either one or both brothers, bareheaded, wearing the general’s paludamentum and holding a parazonium, handing over the olive-branches (with the right hand) to Caesar Augustus, seated on a sella curulis on a dais at right in his capacity of universal supreme commander, bareheaded, wearing the toga praetexta, and holding out his right hand. (Images 1–5)

143 Hurlet 1997, 87 perceptively observes that Drusus’ title of proconsul is only epigraphically recorded in a posthumous honorific inscription on a dynastic monument built on the Campus Martius and dedicated to Drusus and (his son) Claudius under the latter’s principate, published in De Caprariis 1993, 98 Nº5: [Nero Clau]dius Ti(berii) f(ilius) / [Drusus] Germanic(us) / [co(n)s(ul), p(raetor), q(uaestor), proco(n)s(ul)]. All the other extant honorary inscriptions only ever mention his annual magistracies and his imperatorial salutation(s): cf. nn. 97 and 113 supra and Hurlet op. cit., 91f. Hurlet (comp. also n. 111 of p. 190) observes that this is also the case with Germanicus, who is termed proconsul in all known contemporary official sources but never in dedications established by individuals or local communities at their own initiative.

144 As Barnes 1974, 22 n. 12 observes, ILS 5816 (13/12 BCE) seems to be the earliest epigraphical attestation of Augustus as IMP X. That Augustus took his tenth salutation in 15 BCE on account of the victories of Tiberius and Drusus in their Alpine campaign is generally accepted; comp., e.g., Syme 1979, 310 and Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017, 58.

145 Kuttner 1995, 188 speculates that the first “must refer to Drusus, who initiated the Alpine campaigns, the second to Tiberius and Drusus in their joint fighting in the latter part of the Alpine campaign”. I do not, however, accept Kuttner’s suggestion (187 f.) that Augustus is being presented with palm-branches rather than olive-branches. Whilst Mattingly in BMC locc. cit. has olive branches, RIC remains silent on the issue. The possibility that it concerns laurel branches cannot be ruled out positively. Predominantly on the strength of Oros. 6.21.22 (Quibus etiam diebus multa per se multaque per duces et legatos bella gessit. Nam inter ceteros et Piso aduersum Vindelicos missus est; quibus subactis victor ad Caesarem Lugdunum uruit). Schön 1986, 57–61 mounts a far-fetched and highly speculative argument that Augustus had invested the consul L. Calpurnius Piso with the overall command of the Raetian war in 15, since he outclassed the Claudians in both senatorial rank and military experience. Consequently, he also believes the coinage displaying a single commander features Piso rather than one of the Claudians. Eck 2003,
Image 1: Denarius, Lugdunum mint, 15–13 BCE (RIC I² Aug. no. 162a)

Image 2: Denarius, Lugdunum mint, 15–13 BCE (RIC I² Aug. no. 162b)

Image 3: Denarius, Lugdunum mint, 15–13 BCE (RIC I² Aug. no. 165a)

Image 4: Denarius, Lugdunum mint, 15–13 BCE (RIC I² Aug. no. 165b)

Image 5: Aureus, Lugdunum mint, 15–13 BCE (RIC I² Aug. no. 164a)
The reverse of another series of denarii and aurei commemorating Augustus’ tenth imperatorial salutation (RIC I¹ ‘Aug. nos. 166a–169 = BMC 1 ‘Aug. nos. 450–451, 454–455 und 457–458) features a bull, the customary sacrificial animal of the curule triumph.

In the Republic, the imperator holding the summum imperium and the prevailing auspices would take credit for victories won even in his absence by subordinate commanders, regardless of the question whether these, too, held independent (i.e., non-derivative) imperium and auspices of their own. If, however, the subordinate commanders who had conducted the actual ductus, the personal leadership, also held independent imperium and auspices, they too perfectly qualified for salutationes imperatoriae, ovations and curule triumphs, as opposed to commanders who merely held derivative praetorium imperium and no auspices whatsoever, such as legati or (pro)quaestores pro praetore.⁴⁶ Therefore, the true significance of this remarkable coinage is twofold. First, it further suggests that Augustus’ stepsons gained their victories in Raetia and Vindelicia as proconsuls in their own right. There would have been no point in their conspicuously ceding the symbolical trappings of victory and triumph to Augustus had they merely acted as his legati pro praetore: such would have amounted to a pompous exercise in stating the bleeding obvious. Consequently, this coinage corroborates, and perfectly fits, Cassius Dio’s note (cf. supra p. 145) that Tiberius and Drusus commanded a number of legati pro praetore in Raetia as well as his evidence on the triumphal honours refused in 12 and 11 BCE. Second, these coins also strikingly confirm how Tiberius and Drusus made a signal contribution to Augustus’ policy of converting the triumph into an imperial monopoly. The message was unequivocal: even though both noble proconsuls had gained substantial successes worthy of all triumphal honours they notably ceded all credit to Imperator Caesar Augustus, who alone received an imperatorial salutation as he no doubt turned down the corresponding triumph decreed by the Senate.

This picture is substantiated by some further literary and epigraphical evidence. In Odes 4.4 and esp. 14, Horace, too, gives Augustus all the credit for what he terms the recent victories in Raetia and Vindelicia as he proclaims that Drusus destroyed the Vindelician Genauni and Breuni “with your soldiers” (milite nam tuo), and that Tiberius shortly after defeated the savage Raeti in a bloody battle “under your happy auspices”: mox graue proelium / commisit immanisque

⁴⁶ See Vervaet 2014, esp. chapters 1 and 4.
The famous inscription on the *Tropaea Augusti* at La Turbie, set up in the Alpes Maritimae between 1 July 7 and 30 June 6 BCE, unambiguously records how Augustus unhesitatingly took all the credit for the military successes of P. Silius Nerva, Tiberius and Drusus as won “under his personal leadership and his auspices”, *eius dux tu auspiscisque*. Though not quite false, the claim that the extensive series of conquests enumerated in the inscription were made under his personal leadership (*ductus*) stretches the truth, as he was in every instance physically absent from the actual fighting.

Augustus indeed spent the years 16, 15 and 14 BCE in Gaul. He set out for Gaul during the consulship of L. Domitius and P. Scipio, “making the wars in that region his excuse” (Dio 54.19.1). He returned to Rome in the consulship of Tiberius and Quinctilius Varus, having “finished all the business which occupied him in Gaul, Germany and Hispania” (Dio 54.25.1), leaving Drusus in Germany. From a purely technical point of view, the successive military operations in different parts of these lands thus took place under his *ductus*, even though in reality, he was far removed from the actual fighting in Noricum, Raetia and Vindelicia: see, e.g., Dio 54.21–22.1, 23.7. Compare also Dio 54.36.2–4 and 55.6.1–2 for Augustus remaining far from the fighting in campaigns he officially led in person in 10 and 8 BCE. As an autocrat in command of all Rome’s armed forces, Augustus could, of course, get away with this generous and expansive interpretation of the concept of *ductus*, in stark contrast to republican practice, when any *imperator* claiming some significant military success to have been achieved *suo dux to* had to have been personally involved with commanding the victorious Roman forces concerned on the field of battle: see Vervaet 2014, chapters 1 and 4.

---

147 Hor. Carm. 4.14.9–16.
148 CIL 5, 7817 = CAG-06, p. 663 = ILAM 00358 = AE 1973, 323 = AE 2002, 899 = AE 2004, 70 = AE 2005, 958 (Tropaeum Augusti): *Imperatori Caesari diui filio Augusto | Pont(ifci) Max(imo) imper(atori) XIX trib(unicia) pot(estate) XVII | Senatus Populusque Romanus | quod eius dux tu auspiscisque gentes Alpinae omnes quae a mari supero ad infernum pertinebant sub imperium p(opuli) R(omani) sunt redactae | gentes Alpinae devictae Trumpilini Camunni Vennonetes Venostes Isarci Breuni Genaunes Focunates | Vindeliciorum gentes quattuor Cosuanetes Rucinates Licates Catenates Ambisontes Rugsuci Suanetes Calucones | Brixentes Leponti Viberi Nantuates Seduni Vergani Salassi Acitaunones Medulli Ucenni Caturiges Brigiani | Sogiontii Brodionti Nemaloni Edenates (V)esubiani Veamini Gallitae Triulatti Ectini | Verguni Eguituri Nemeturi Oratelli Nerusi Velauni Suetri.* In Nat. 3.136–137, Pliny the Elder takes the trouble to append this inscription: *Imp. Caesari Diui filio Aug. Pont. Max., imp. xiv, tr. pot. xvii, S.P.Q.R., quod eius dux tu auspiscisque gentes Alpinae omnes quae a mari supero ad infernum pertinebant sub imperium p. R. sunt redactae. Gentes Alpinae devictae Trumpilini, Camunni, Venostes, Venostes, Vennonetes, Isarchi, Breuni, Genaunes, Focunates, four tribes of the Vindelici, the Cosuanetes, Rucinates, Licates, Catenates, Ambisontes, Rugsuci, Suanetes, Calucones, Brixentes, Leponti, Uberi, Nantuates, Seduni, Varargi, Salassi, Acitaunones, Medulli, Ucenni, Caturiges, Brigiani, Sogiontii, Brodionti, Nemaloni, Edenates, Vesubiani, Veamini, Gallitae, Triulatti, Ectini, Verguni, Eguituri, Nemeturi, Oratelli, Nerusi, Velauni, Suetri.* Augustus repeats the claim that he had conquered all of the Alpine lands in R. Gest. div. Aug. 26.3: *Alpes a re[gione] ea, quae proxima est Hadriano mari, [ad Tuscum pacari fec] nulli genti bello per iniuriam inlato.*

149 Augustine indeed spent the years 16, 15 and 14 BCE in Gaul. He set out for Gaul during the consulship of L. Domitius and P. Scipio, “making the wars in that region his excuse” (Dio 54.19.1). He returned to Rome in the consulship of Tiberius and Quinctilius Varus, having “finished all the business which occupied him in Gaul, Germany and Hispania” (Dio 54.25.1), leaving Drusus in Germany. From a purely technical point of view, the successive military operations in different parts of these lands thus took place under his *ductus*, even though in reality, he was far removed from the actual fighting in Noricum, Raetia and Vindelicia: see, e.g., Dio 54.21–22.1, 23.7. Compare also Dio 54.36.2–4 and 55.6.1–2 for Augustus remaining far from the fighting in campaigns he officially led in person in 10 and 8 BCE. As an autocrat in command of all Rome’s armed forces, Augustus could, of course, get away with this generous and expansive interpretation of the concept of *ductus*, in stark contrast to republican practice, when any *imperator* claiming some significant military success to have been achieved *suo dux to* had to have been personally involved with commanding the victorious Roman forces concerned on the field of battle: see Vervaet 2014, chapters 1 and 4.
The other senatorial proconsuls and the ranking equestrian officers would have certainly got the message, especially as Agrippa’s third and final *recusatio triumphi* of 14 BCE (cf. *infra* pp. 186–188) and the ensuing developments of 12 and 11 concerning Tiberius and Drusus rapidly followed suit. If even special and privileged proconsuls closely associated with Augustus declined or were denied triumphs and even imperial salutations, invariably matched by his own refusals to accept the corresponding triumphs decreed him in his capacity as *summus imperator*, there would be little point for any of the ‘ordinary’ proconsuls to petition for, or expect, any of the traditional triumphal honours. The fact that the Claudians “were not identified by legend, and there was no precedent in Roman coinage for historical scenes featuring several members of the Imperial family”, as Rose observes, this series being minted “in a period where the iconography of the Imperial family on Roman coins was suggestive rather than explicit”¹⁵¹, reinforces the universal applicability of its symbolism and Augustus’ novel triumphal monopolism.

Although the literary sources remain silent on the issue, this coinage furthermore suggests that Tiberius and Drusus may well have been denied senatorial ratification of the imperatorial salutations they doubtlessly received from the army in the field ensuing their victories in Raetia and Vindelicia. Likewise, Tiberius had possibly already been saluted *Imperator* by his legions in Armenia in 20 BCE. On that occasion, too, the Senate would have ratified only Augustus’ salutation. The panegyric nature of Velleius’ work easily explains his silence on probable denied salutations for Tiberius in 20 and 15 as well as the attested instances of 12 and 11 BCE.¹⁵² Dio’s failure to mention Augustus’ 9th and 10th salutations of 20 and 15 BCE respectively as well as any corresponding salutations for Tiberius and Drusus by their armies in the field should probably be explained differently. As

¹⁵⁰ Comp. Eck’s observations concerning the political ramifications of Agrippa’s refusals of 19 and 14 BCE in n. 188 *infra*.

¹⁵¹ Rose 1997, 15. Rose further argues that if “the coins were used as donatives for the troops who fought with Tiberius and Drusus, which seems likely, then the meaning could have been clarified orally at the time of distribution”, suggesting that it is, however, “unreasonable to think that the scene would have been clear to everyone who handled the coin”, and observes in n. 69 (on p. 219) that the “closest numismatic parallel is the type of Sulla being offered a laurel branch by the Mauretanian king Bocchus: RRC no. 426.1”. In my view, the symbolism of the scenes and the identity of the commanders involved would have been quite clear to the armies in Gaul and Germany as well as the contemporary senatorial elite and those equestrians involved with the armies in this sphere of operations.

¹⁵² In the last sentence of 2.122.2 (quoted *supra*, p. 160 f.), however, Velleius may be hinting at the fact that Tiberius himself may have turned down possible imperatorial salutations in 20 and 15 BCE.
recorded in 54.24.7–8 (quoted and discussed infra, p. 186 f.), the Severan historian considers Agrippa’s third and final recusatio triumphi of 14 BCE as the decisive moment in the establishment of an imperial monopoly over the public triumph. This arguably simplified representation explains why Dio only pays close attention to what happened in this sphere in regard to Tiberius and Drusus in the ensuing years. In the eyes of Dio, it was only in the context of a seemingly abruptly established new triumphal policy that the relevant actions and votes concerning Livia’s stepsons came into sharp relief.

The above analysis also explains why the major victories of P. Silius Nerva in 16 and 15 BCE over a number of Alpine tribes and subsequently the Pannonians, the Noricans and possibly also the Dalmatians did not spawn any imperatorial salutations or triumphal honours. As Dalla Rosa correctly observes, “l’année 16 av. J.-C. peut [...] être considérée à juste titre comme la date à laquelle les campagnes romaines commencèrent dans les Alpes”153, and the lands of the Noricans were now for the first time incorporated into the Roman Empire.154 Rather than just another instance of Augustan triumphal abstinence, the Senate’s inaction on behalf of Silius Nerva, too, suggests that Augustus had already made the decision to exclude ‘regular’ proconsuls from the public triumph and its associated rituals whilst drastically reducing their frequency too. Following the conviction of M. Primus, who was tried de maiestate in 22 BCE for having waged an unauthorized war of aggression as proconsul of Macedonia (cf. supra, p. 140), none of his peers would have risked to take significant military action without prior authorization on the part of Augustus and his Senate. Silius therefore doubtlessly acted on Augustus’ orders throughout his tenure in Illyricum, especially as regards his offensive operations against some Alpine tribes and subsequently also the Noricans following his defeat of their allies, the Pannonians. Dalla Rosa is therefore right to note that “le cas de Silius Nerva dut jouer un rôle décisif, car il fut l’un des premiers proconsuls à subir les conséquences du durcissement de la politique augustéenne en matière de concession du triomphe”155. Since we also

153 Dalla Rosa 2015, 469; on the importance of Silius’ Alpine campaign, see also van Berchem 1968 and Wells 1972, 66.
154 Comp. Eck 2018a, 10: “Das Königreich Noricum [...] fand damals ein Ende und wurde wahrscheinlich dem Statthalter von Illyricum unterstellt; vielleicht amtierte in Noricum ein praefectus als unmittelbarer Vertreter Roms.” For a similar appraisal, see Dalla Rosa 2015, 467, with further scholarship on the issue as well as the authority and prerogatives of such praefecti in n. 16.
155 Dalla Rosa 2015, 482. Given the argument of this study, I cannot, however, accept Dalla Rosa’s (loc. cit.) argument that the Senate could not possibly have awarded Silius with a triumph because such would have elevated the proconsul above Augustus’ stepsons, allegedly unable to receive curule triumphs in 15 as mere legati Augusti pro praetore – comp. also Rich 1990, 202 for a similar argument: a number of proconsuls could have claimed triumphs during the years
know from Suetonius (Aug. 71.2) that he was one of Augustus’ intimate friends, being consul throughout 20 BCE, he may very well even have been aware of Augustus’ decision to transform the triumphal ritual into the exclusive monopoly of his dynasty. At all events, the remarkable good fortunes of his three sons attest to the fact that his unassuming loyalty did not go unnoticed: whilst P. Silius held a suffect consulship in 3 CE, his siblings A. Licinius Nerva Silianus and C. Silius were honoured with ordinary consulships in 7 and 13 CE respectively, the former with Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus Silanus as his (prior) colleague and the latter as consul prior with L. Munatius Plancus as his colleague. Since M. Lollius (consul prior throughout 21 BCE, holding the office alone at the start of the year: Dio 54.6.2) and M. Vinicius (suff. 19 BCE), too, had gained their significant successes as proconsuls in Macedonia (c. 19/18 BCE) and Illyricum (c. 14/13 BCE) respectively, much the same can be said of these trusted new men, especially since they, too, had received their important provincial commands extra sortem, i.e., by decree of the Senate on the motion of Augustus. It would, however, be up

156 P. Silius Nerva had also been legatus Augusti pro praetore in Hispania Citerior and may even have served under Agrippa there in 19 BCE: see Syme 1939, 333 n. 1. For a summary of Silius’ career, see PIR² S 729.

157 Dalla Rosa 2015, 466 (with n. 10) likewise counts Silius “au cercle des hommes de confiance d’Auguste” and terms his descendants “parmi les sénateurs les plus importants de l’époque julio-claudienne (stemma dans PIR² S, p. 271)”; comp. also 474: “L’envoi de ce consulaire en Illyrie, une province normalement administrée par d’anciens préteurs, indique qu’Auguste avait besoin d’un homme de confiance, parce que la garnison de la province était sûrement en cours d’accroissement numérique.”

158 In 54.20.3, in his is narrative of 16 BCE, Dio records that M. Lollius defeated the formidable Thracian Bessi. On the grounds of Vell. 2.96.2, Flor. 2.24 and Dio 54.24.3, most scholars plausibly suggest that Vinicius scored a significant victory over the rebellious Pannonians in 14/13 BCE. Syme 1939, 329 terms P. Silius, M. Lollius and M. Vinicius “three of the principal marshals of Augustus, all noui homines”. Comp. also p. 372: “During the absence of the ruler (22–19 B.C.) each year one of the two consuls had been a partisan of Augustus and a military man, the first to ennoble his family, namely L. Arruntius, M. Lollius, P. Silius Nerva and C. Sentius Saturninus.”
to the privileged extraordinary proconsuls Tiberius, Drusus (*supra*) and Agrippa (*infra*) to set a number of explicit examples in the ensuing years 15–11 BCE.

6. The Years 10 to 7 BCE

Although 11 BCE had been very busy for both of Livia’s sons, the following years would bring no reprieve. Sometime in the winter of 11/10 BCE, the Senate voted that the temple of Janus Geminus be closed again on the ground that the wars had ended. Incursions of the Dacians into Pannonia and a fiscal rebellion of the Dalmatians, however, prevented the execution of the decree. Augustus promptly sent Tiberius, who had accompanied him to Gaul, to quell these disturbances whilst Drusus subjugated the Germanic Chatti, who had allied with the Sugambri. Afterwards (i.e., in the winter of 10/9 BCE), so Dio goes on to relate, both brothers returned to Rome with Augustus, who had remained in Lugdunum to monitor the situation in Germania from nearby, and “carried out whatever decrees had been passed in honour of their victories or did whatever else devolved upon them”: καὶ ὅσα ἐπὶ ταῖς νίκαις ἐψήφιστο ἢ καὶ άλλως καθήκοντα ἣν γενέστθαι, ἐπετέλεσαν. As he held the eponymous consulship with T. Quinctius Crispinus Sulpicianus (i.e., in 9 BCE), Drusus again invaded the lands of the Chatti, conquered the territory of the Suebi, their allies, with great difficulty and bloodshed, and ransacked the country of the Cherusci, crossing the Weser and advancing as far as the Elbe. Dio recounts that he failed to cross this river and decided to

Thanks to Tib. 12.1 we know that Augustus assigned M. Lollius to the staff of C. Caesar in 1 BCE as *comes et rector eius*, whilst he also mentions M. Vinicius as one of Augustus’ closest friends in Aug. 71.2. On the commands of M. Lollius in Macedonia and P. Silius and M. Vinicius in Illyricum, see Hurlet 2006, 86–89, who cogently argues that all three of these reliable *uiri militares* had received their proconsulships and important military commissions *sine sorte*. On the issue of M. Vinicius’ official position, see also n. 141 *supra*.

159 On the strength of Suet. Claud. 2.1, Kehne 2002, 312 argues that Augustus amongst other things presided over the dedication of the temple of Augustus et Roma on 1 August 10 BCE.
160 Dio 54.36.2–4, with the quote cited from § 4. See also 55.1.1 for these events occuring in the consulship of Iullus Antonius and Africanus Fabius Maximus = 10 BCE.
161 Eck 2018a, 12 (comp. 2018b, 133) suggests that Drusus’ brief in 12/9 BCE was to conquer transrhenian Germany at the very least all the way up to the Elbe. Wolters 2017, 45–52 argues that the second phase of Drusus’ conquests, commencing in 10 BCE and targeting the southern lands of transrhenian Germany (and to be concluded by Tiberius in 8 BCE, *infra* pp. 182–185), amounted to an outright war of aggression facilitated by improved geographical knowledge of Germany and prompted by Augustus’ wish to ensure Tiberius’ renewed campaigning in Pannonia and Dalmatia was duly matched in Germania. Since both brothers had received a quinquen-
make his way back to the Rhine after setting up trophies, and, reportedly, receiving a prophetic warning from a native woman.\textsuperscript{162} He would never make it back there, however, as he prematurely died in his summer camp from complications arising from an accident with his horse.\textsuperscript{163} After recounting events regarding the repatriation of Drusus’ body and his posthumous honours,\textsuperscript{164} Dio calls to mind that, “while Drusus was yet alive” (i.e., in the summer of 9 BCE), Tiberius had quashed another revolt on the part of the Dalmatians and the Pannonians, “celebrated the equestrian triumph, and feasted the people, some on the Capitol and the rest in many other places” whilst Livia and Julia dined the women. Dio goes on to recount that “the same festivities were being prepared for Drusus: even the \textit{Feriae} were to be held a second time on his account, so that he might celebrate his triumph on that occasion”, all thwarted by his untimely death.\textsuperscript{165} That Tiberius

\textsuperscript{162} Comp. also Suet. Claud. 1.2–3: \textit{quam species barbarae mulieris humana amplior uictorem tendere ultra sermone Latino prohibuisset.}

\textsuperscript{163} Dio 55.1. Thanks to Suet. Claud. 1.3 we know that Drusus died in his summer camp (\textit{in aesttiis castris}), whereas we are told in Liv. Per. 142 that Drusus died from complications arising from a broken leg, sustained when his horse fell on it, on the thirtieth day after the accident. Dio 55.1.2–4 merely recounts that Drusus died “of some disease” on his way back from the Elbe before he reached the Rhine. Levick 1972b, 783 n. 5 suggests that Drusus died around the onset of autumn. Tacitus’ observation in Ann. 3.5.1 that \textit{ipsum [i.e, Augustus]} \textit{quippe asperrimo hiemis Ticinum usque progressum neque abscedentem a corpore simul urbem intrauisse} (“In the bitterest of the winter, he had gone in person as far as Ticinum, and, never stirring from the corpse, had entered the City along with it”) should certainly be taken with a grain of salt as he is prone to exaggeration in a context where he attacks the alleged comparative lack of respect for Germanicus’ returning remains by Tiberius and his son Drusus – comp. also Syne 1979, 321 n. 21: “it is not safe to press an allegation reported by Tacitus.” We also know from Val. Max. 5.5.3 (\textit{infra}, p. 180) that Augustus and Livia were already in Ticinum when Tiberius arrived there following his victories in Illyricum only to learn of his brother’s critical condition. This suggests that Augustus and Livia had decided to remain in Ticinum after Tiberius’ hasty departure until the arrival of Drusus’ bodily remains. Thanks to Plin. Nat. 7.84, finally, we know that Tiberius “completed by carriage the longest twenty-four hours’ journey on record when hastening to Germany to his brother Drusus who was ill: this measured 182 miles”. As Tiberius covered the entire distance in a full day and factoring in a somewhat slower pace on the way back to Ticinum (on an estimate of c. 20 days), the combined evidence suggests that Drusus had died sometime around the start of November: comp. also Hurlet 1997, 93 f.: “les derniers jours du mois d'octobre ou les premiers jours du mois de novembre”, with the funeral taking place some time in December.

\textsuperscript{164} 55.2.1–3.

\textsuperscript{165} Dio 55.2.4–5: Ο δὲ δὴ Ἠβέριος τῶν τε Δελματῶν καὶ τῶν Παννονίων ὑποκινησάντων τι αὖθις ζώντος ἔτι αὐτοῦ κρατήσας, τὰ τε ἐπὶ τοῦ κέλητος ἐπινίκη ἐπεμψε, καὶ τοῦ δήμου τούς μὲν ἐν τῷ Καπιτώλῳ τοὺς δ’ ἄλλοθι πολλαχόθι ἐδείπνιε. κἂν τούτῳ καὶ Ἡ Λιουία μετὰ τῆς Ἰουλίας
celebrated his ovation *ex Pannonia* first, in all likelihood on 16 January 9 BCE\(^{166}\), is consistent with what we know about the honours decreed to both brothers in 12 and 11 BCE, when Tiberius as the older sibling invariably enjoyed due priority. Although Dio in 55.2.4 mentions Tiberius’ victories of 9 BCE over the rebellious Dalmatians and Pannonians before his ovation, the date of 16 January 9 also sits well with his ensuing note (§ 5) that the *Feriae Latinae*, normally (though not invariably) held around March,\(^{167}\) were to be held a second time for the sake of the ovation planned for Drusus.\(^{168}\) Dio’s slightly confusing narrative thus suggests that the *Feriae* had been celebrated as early as on 16 January in 9 BCE, so as to coincide with Tiberius’ ovation,\(^{169}\) and that they were to be repeated later in that year on the occasion of Drusus’ ovation, in both instances a striking indication of imperial favour.

At all events, there is compelling evidence that Tiberius’ victories in Illyricum in the summer of 9 must have earned him his first officially sanctioned

\[\text{τάς γυναίκας εἰσίτασε. τά δ᾿ αὐτὰ ταῦτα καὶ τῷ Δρούσῳ ἥτοιμάζετο· καὶ γε αἰ ἄνοχαι δεύτερον τὴν χάριν αὐτοῦ, πρὸς τὸ τὰ νυκτήρια ἐν ἔκειναι αὐτὸν ἐστόρασα, γενήσεσθαι ἐμελλὼν. ἀλλ᾿ ο} \)\(\text{μὲν προσπώλετo. Syme 1979, 311, followed by Kehne 2002, 311 n. 107, rightly discards the erroneous assumption in Stein 1899, col. 2712 and PIR\(^{2}\) C 857 (p. 197) and Rohde 1942, col. 1902 that Drusus actually held his ovation in 11, a mistake repeated by Seager 1972, 26f.; Bleicken 1998, 579; Seager 2005, 21; Itgenshorst 2008, 30 and 52 (cf. also n. 168 infra), and 2017, 66 n. 27, 66 nn. 34, 71 and 80; and Havener 2016, 335.}

\(^{166}\) For the date of 16 January 9 BCE, see Syme’s convincing argument in 1979, 312f. and esp. 326–329, building on the case made by Taylor 1937 (esp. 185). Though Bersanetti 1947 (esp. 11–15) had argued for 16 January 8 BCE, Syme is right to accept his reconstruction of the relevant entry in the *Fasti Praenestini*: *Ti. Caesar ex Pannonia ouans urbem intrāuit* (comp. Degrassi’s older reconstruction in Inscr. Ital. 13.2, 115: *Ti. Caesar ex Pannonia reuersus dedicāuit*). Gelzer 1918, col. 484 and Stein, PIR\(^{2}\) C 481 (p. 221) too had already put Tiberius’ ovation in 9, before the death of Drusus. As Syme discerningly observes in 1979, 313, “the day was auspicious, made memorable forever by assumption of the ruler’s august cognomen”. Syme’s argument found acceptance in, amongst others, Hurlet 1997, 97–100 (with due reference to Dio 54.36.4) and Seager 2005, 214, where the latter abandons his older position (21f.) that Tiberius celebrated two ovations over the Pannonians, one in 11 and then another one following the funeral of his brother in 9. Although Fitz 1993, 55, too dates Tiberius’ ovation to 9 BCE, he believes it is impossible to discern whether the celebration took place before or after Drusus’ death. Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017, 70 tentatively accept 16 January 9 BCE as the date of Tiberius’ ovation.

\(^{167}\) Pina Polo 2011, 256f.

\(^{168}\) There are, at any rate, no grounds for Levick’s view (in 1976, 35) that “in 12 BC Tiberius and in 11 Nero Drusus were allowed the insignia of a triumph” followed by the award of an ovation to Tiberius in 10 BCE and one to Drusus in the following year. Comp. also p. 236, n. 6. On the basis of Dio 54.33.5, Itgenshorst 2008, 30 f. likewise accepts that Drusus celebrated an ovation in 11 BCE, two years before Tiberius.

\(^{169}\) See Pina Polo 2011, 257 for the fact that the *Feriae* could be held as early as in January.
imperatorial salutation. First, there is unequivocal epigraphic testimony that Tiberius' was already IMP II by the time he as consul II presided over the festival celebrating Augustus' return in 7 BCE: Ti. Claudius Ti. f. Nero / Pontifex, Cos. iterum, / Imp. iterum, ludos uotiuos pro reitu / Imp. Caesaris Diui f. Augusti / Pontificis Maximi / Ioii Optimo Maximo fecit / ex S.C. (erased: cum Cn. Calpurnio Pisone conlega). Second, there is the insightful anecdote in Valerius Maximus' examples of brotherly goodwill. In 5.5.3, Valerius tells of the affection felt by Tiberius for his younger brother Drusus. When Tiberius arrived at Ticinus “as victor over enemies” (victor hostium) to embrace his parents and learned that Drusus' life hung in the balance in Germany, he reportedly made the two-hundred mile journey north in the company of a sole guide. When he arrived there, his dying brother had arranged for a most conspicuous display of respect and deference:

Drusus quoque, quamquam fato iam suo quam ullius officio propior erat, uigore spiritus et corporis uiribus collapsus, eo ipso tamen quo uita ac mors distinguitur momento legiones cum insignibus suis fratri obuiam procedere iussit, ut Imperator salutaretur. Praecepit etiam dextera in parte praetorium ei statui et consulare et imperatorium nomen obtinere uoluit, eodemque tempore et fraternae maiestati cessit et uita excessit.

“Drusus too, though closer to his own fate than to duty towards anyone, in the collapse of spiritual vigour and bodily strength, yet at the very moment that separates life from death ordered his legions with their ensigns to go to meet his brother, so that he be saluted as Imperator. He further gave orders that a headquarters be set up for him to the right of his own and wished him to use the title of consul and Imperator. He bowed to his brother’s majesty and out of his own life at the same time.”

170 Hurlet 1997, 97 dates Tiberius' first imperatorial salutation to either 10 or 9 BCE: “au terme de l'une des campagnes victorieuses des années 10–9”. Although Hurlet correctly associates Tiberius' first imperatorial salutation with Augustus' 13th, I cannot accept his suggestion that “avec la première salutation impériale de Tibère est née la pratique d’associer le prince à une victoire qu’il n’avait pas remportée sous ses propres auspices” since Tiberius, like all other pro-consuls of the Augustan era, invariably conducted all his military campaigns under Augustus' auspices: see Vervaet 2014, 253–292. This alleged breach of custom also sits uneasy with Hurlet's assertion (p. 96 with n. 85) that as late as 12 BCE, Augustus had acted as “le garant des traditions ancestrales” as he vetoed the Senate’s decision to award Tiberius with a triumph. Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017, 72 more precisely date Tiberius' first (officially sanctioned) salutation to September of 9 BCE but are to my thinking wrong to suggest (on p. 62) that his younger brother Drusus had already received his first and second (officially sanctioned) salutations in 11 (the first) and “10 oder 9 v. Chr.” (the second).

171 ILS 95, inscribed on a marble base found in the Campus Martius.

172 Valerius' account is slightly exaggerated here as we know from Plin. Nat. 7.84 and SC ad Pol. 34 that Tiberius made the journey of precisely 182 miles tribus uehiculis. That Tiberius was devastated by the loss of his younger brother is also on record in Consolatio ad Luiiam 85–86.
In other words, Drusus insisted on Tiberius using the *nomen consulis* as well as that of *imperator* while in his camp, after he had already ordered his legions to salute his brother as such. Since Tiberius had held the consulship in 13 BCE, it follows that he had already been awarded the *nomen Imperatoris*, too, before he made it to his brother’s summer camp. Although Dio remains silent in his briefest of mentions of Tiberius’ victory over the Dalmatians and Pannonians in 9 BCE\(^{173}\) and his narrative of the greater honours he gained in 8 BCE (*infra* p. 183) seemingly creates the impression that he only then won his first officially sanctioned imperatorial salutation, there should be no doubt that this had already happened sometime before he met with Augustus and Livia at Ticianum.\(^ {174}\) As had been the case in 12 and 11, Tiberius’ seniority again earned him due precedence in formally receiving the *nomen Imperatoris* from Augustus and the Senate.\(^ {175}\) This course of events also further explains the posthumous ratification of Drusus’ Germanic imperatorial salutations of 12 and 11. By a cruel stroke of fate, he had died before he could celebrate his ovation and officially accept his first *nomen Imperatoris*, and the actions of Augustus and the Senate on the occasion of his funeral sought

---

173 55.2.4, cf. *supra*, p. 178. In 54.36.2, Dio likewise gives the scantest of attention to Tiberius’ successes there the year before, as his narrative of these years systematically favours Drusus.  
174 *Contra* Barnes 1974, 22, who misinterprets Drusus’ personal and self-deprecating homage to his brother to suggest that “in the sequel, both Augustus and Tiberius took the imperatorial title, respectively for the thirteenth and the first time (ILS 93f.), and it was posthumously conferred on, or posthumously acknowledged for, Drusus (AE 1934, 151 = Inscr. Ital. xiii, 3, p. 15, no. 9)”. As argued in the above, Augustus and the Senate would posthumously ratify both imperatorial salutations Drusus had received from his army in the field in 12 and 11 BCE. Although Syme 1979, 313f. rightly doubts Barnes’ “hazardous conjecture”, he, for his part, wrongly believes (311, 314) that Tiberius earned his first, and Augustus his thirteenth, salutation on account of victories won by the former during his campaign of 10 BCE: cf. also n. 109 *supra*.  
175 As demonstrated in the above, Tiberius had been decreed triumphal and other honours before Drusus in both 12 and 11, and his ovation likewise was scheduled to precede that of his younger brother. Syme 1979, 313, is, however, wrong to conceive of Tiberius’ early ovation as “a modest reparation” for the alleged fact that “Augustus in his marked predilection for Drusus put him level with his consular brother (although four years junior) through the proconsular *imperium* decreed at the end of 11 B.C.”. In this respect, it is also well worth calling to mind that Augustus had made Tiberius *pontifex* at some point before 31 December 16 BCE, Drusus’ appointment to an augurate following some time before 31 December 11 BCE: Hurlet 1997, 562 and 556. Stein 1899, col. 2713 believes Drusus obtained the augurate around the same time as the consulship. Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017, 61, however, tentatively date Drusus’ appointment to the augurate to 19 BCE, when he received the *priulegium annorum*, whereas they suggest that Tiberius received his pontificate “at the latest” in 15 BCE, i.e., almost a decade after he received the *priulegium annorum* in 24 BCE. In my view, it strains belief that Drusus would have been appointed to a major priesthood before his older brother.
to offer posthumous compensation, no doubt with the unqualified support of a
deeply mournful Tiberius, then already officially IMP I.\textsuperscript{176}

After refusing to celebrate any festival on account of Drusus’ victories (and,
for that matter, Tiberius’), instead honouring his late stepson with a rare visit to
the temple of Jupiter Feretrius and leaving all other customary formalities to the
consuls of 8 BCE, Augustus again took the field to campaign against the Germans,
his very last military campaign.\textsuperscript{177} As was his wont, he remained behind in Roman
territory whilst Tiberius, whom he had appointed to succeed Drusus, crossed the
Rhine. As the Germanic tribes all fell in line or suffered further misfortune, awed
by Augustus’ calculated show of force, Tiberius was awarded with the nomen
Imperatoris as well as his first curule triumph and designated to a second con-
sulship. All the fine detail is yet again produced by Cassius Dio, who also records
some further measures and honours flowing from Augustus’ Germanic campaign
(55.6.4–7):

\textsuperscript{176} Comp. also Kuttner 1995, 185: Augustus, to console himself and preserve Drusus’ memory,
“decreed him all the paraphernalia of a real triumphator”, and “himself must have been the one
to direct that Drusus’ statue be placed in the Forum Augustum with the inscribed record that
he had been proclaimed imperator, an acclamation that in fact Augustus had not allowed him
to recognize officially”. Contra Siber 1940, 91 and 94 and Combès 1966, 176, who believe that
Drusus officially became IMP I on account of military success won in 9 BCE. Comp. also Crook
1996, 98, who suggests that, in addition to Augustus, both Tiberius and Drusus took imperatorial
salutations on account of their respective successes of 9 BCE in Illyricum and Germania – on
p. 97, Crook correctly dates the vote of ovations and ornamenta triumphalia to both Drusus and
Tiberius (whom he lists in that order) to 11 BCE, without making any comment with regard to
their official positions: legati Augusti (comp. his observations on p. 96, quoted supra in n. 84)
or proconsuls? Much earlier, Stein 1899, col. 2712 had already suggested that both Tiberius and
Drusus became IMP I in 9 BCE (see, however, n. 105 supra for the fact that in PIR\textsuperscript{2} C 857 and 941,
he suggests that Drusus received his first in 11 BCE, roughly two years before his older sibling).
Since Augustus is on record as IMP XII in 10/9 (ILS 91, trib. pot. XIV, July 10 to June 9) and IMP XIII
(ILS 93 f., trib. pot. XV, July 9 to June 8) as well as IMP XIV (IRT 319) in 9/8, it follows that Tiberius’
first salutation in 9 also occasioned Augustus’ thirteenth, as already argued by Mommsen 1883,
14, and that, as seen correctly by Syme 1979, 313, the latter’s fourteenth followed swiftly in result
of Tiberius’ successes in Germany in the early summer of 8 BCE, which also earned the latter
his second imperatorial salutation – comp. also Hurlet 1997, 100, with n. 112, where it is cleverly
argued that IRT 319 indicates that these imperatorial salutations must have taken place between
the spring and the early summer of 8 BCE. At any rate, ILS 147 unequivocally attests that Tiberius
was still IMP II in or soon after 2/1 BCE. That Tiberius gained his first officially recognized imper-
atorial salutation in 9 BCE is also accepted by Gelzer 1918, col. 484. Kienast – Eck – Heil 2017,
58 date Augustus’ 13th and 14th salutations to “10 oder 9 v. Chr.” and “Frühsommer 8 v. Chr.”
respectively.

\textsuperscript{177} As observed by Hurlet 1997, 100 and Halfmann 1986, 628.
Besides doing this, Augustus granted money to the soldiers, not as to victors, though he himself had taken the title of *Imperator* and had also conferred it upon Tiberius, but because then for the first time they had Gaius taking part with them in their exercises. So he advanced Tiberius to the position of commander in place of Drusus, and besides distinguishing him with the title of *Imperator*, appointed him consul once more, and in accordance with the ancient practice caused him to post up a proclamation before entering upon the office. He also accorded him the distinction of a triumph; for he did not wish to celebrate one himself, though he accepted the privilege of having his birthday permanently commemorated by Circensian games. He enlarged the *pomerium* and changed the name of the month called Sextilis to August. The people generally wanted September to be so named, because he had been born in that month; but he preferred the other month in which he had first been elected consul and had won many great battles.

After recounting the passing of Maecenas and digressing on his character and the nature of his association with Augustus, Dio does not fail to follow up on the actual celebration, which took place on January 1 of the next year, the very day Tiberius assumed his second consulship, his colleague being the noble Cn. Calpurnius Piso.
on the Capitol, and she gave one on her own account to the women somewhere or other. A little later, when there was some disturbance in the province of Germany, he took the field. The festival held in honour of the return of Augustus was directed by Gaius, in place of Tiberius, with the assistance of Piso.178

A little less than twelve years following Cornelius Balbus’ triumph of 27 March 19 BCE,179 Tiberius’ award at long last broke the longest curule triumphal dearth since the Second Punic War.180 None of our sources, however, record a major battle in Germany for 8 BCE and Tiberius even had to return there “not long after his triumph” because of renewed unrest.181 Therefore, the timing and circumstances show Augustus’ decision to honour Livia’s eldest son with the nomen Imperatoris and a curule triumph over Germany, officially signaling its conquest was now considered complete,182 was clearly predominantly politically motivated, especially as he had personally vetoed (and refused) Germanic triumphs in 12 and 11 BCE. Though arguably also intended to give due lustre to his last military campaign and belated recognition of Tiberius’ entire military track record since 20 BCE, the untimely successive deaths of Agrippa and Drusus doubtlessly

178 Dio 55.8.1–3. On (the passing of) Maecenas: see 55.7. As attested in ILS 95 (quoted on p. 180 supra), Tiberius nonetheless took the credit for presiding over the festival celebrating Augustus’ return, indicating that Gaius Caesar had merely acted as his proxy. In line with traditional practice, Tiberius remained outside of the pomerium for the sake of preserving his auspicia militaria: see Hurlet 1997, 315 and, esp., Vervaet 2014, 82–90.

179 Degrassi Inscr. Ital. 13.1, 86–87 and 571.

180 The period from 300 BCE saw its longest intervals between curule triumphs during the First and Second Punic Wars, viz. from 250 to 241 BCE and 219 to 209 BCE: see the list in Itgenshorst 2005, 266 f. The late Republic witnessed relatively long intervals from 88 to 81 BCE and 61 to 54 BCE: Itgenshorst 2005, 269 f.

181 Dio 55.8.3. Flor. 2.30.27 and 29–39, represents the entire interlude between the death of Drusus and the alleged maladministration by P. Quinctilius Varus (cos. 13 BCE) and the ensuing clades Variana as a period of relative armed peace in Germania Magna. Comp. also Seager 2005, 22: “So Augustus had accomplished nothing except to teach the Sugambri to hate Rome […]. The rewards for this season’s work were out of all proportion to the practical results: salutations for both Augustus and Tiberius, and for Tiberius at last a triumph and a second consulship at thirty-four.”

182 Though Eck 2018a, 13, seems to believe Tiberius’ armies gained some decisive successes in Germany in 8 BCE (comp. 2018b, 133 f.), he conclusively argues (esp. 14–27; comp. also 2018b, 133–137) that Augustus from now on considered transrhenian Germania a proper Roman province, with the oppidum Ubiorum as its administrative and religious capital. Compare also Wolters 2017, 36 and 71–74, who likewise argues that Tiberius’ triumph of 1 January 7 marked the completion of the Roman conquest of transrhenian Germany, and that the corresponding extension of the pomerium and the emergence of the Ara Germaniae further suggest that the newly conquered territories were now considered provincia Germania.
prompted Augustus to shore up the position and *auctoritas* of his only surviving stepson. As Gaius Caesar would not receive his first major military command before January 1 BCE, Tiberius was now by default the most formidable mainstay of the *domus Augusta*. Remarkably, he would not celebrate another curule triumph before 23 October 12 CE, roughly twenty years later, when he was readying to take over the reins from the elderly Augustus, since 26 June 4 CE his adoptive father. That Tiberius only ever celebrated two curule triumphs, the only such triumphs staged in Augustus’ reign after March 19 BCE, and that these twice took place at politically expedient moments, powerfully underscores how Augustus had converted the curule triumph into an imperial monopoly, used sparingly to serve the political interests of his house rather than reflecting the military situation in the field.

7. Closing Observations: Tiberius, Drusus and Augustan Dynastic and Triumphant Policy

First and foremost, the conclusion that Tiberius and Drusus had already been invested with extraordinary proconsular commands well before Agrippa’s premature passing in March 12 BCE significantly alters our understanding of the balance of power within the imperial family in this period. Though Agrippa arguably ever remained the first of the specially empowered strongmen, *a fortiori* after Augustus’ adoption of his sons by Iulia in June 17 BCE, he was closely flanked by Livia’s ambitious and capable sons from 20 and 15 BCE successively, who likewise held special proconsulships as from those dates. Augustus clearly hedged his bets

---

183 Cf. supra p. 158.
184 In 55.9.1–6, Dio in his summary of 6 BCE recounts how Augustus was vexed at their insolent and luxurious lifestyles and lack of appetite to emulate his own conduct. Dio suggests that Augustus invested Tiberius with quinquennial *tribunicia potestas* as well as another important mission in Armenia precisely to bring his adopted sons to their senses, which reportedly slighted Gaius and Lucius and caused Tiberius to fear their resentment and retreat to Rhodes. The grant of *tribunicia potestas* especially put Tiberius on a par with Agrippa, the princes’ biological father, and so created the prospect of an alternative successor, rendering Dio’s “truest explanation” of Tiberius’ self-imposed exile to Rhodes (ἡ μὲν οὖν ἀληθεστάτη αἰτία τῆς ἐκδημίας αὐτοῦ τοιαύτη ἔστι) perfectly credible. In § 7, Dio produces some further possible grounds for Tiberius’ retirement to Rhodes. All speculation aside, the impression remains that Augustus ever hedged his bets and did not flinch from playing out his favourites against each other if need be.
185 On (the date of) Tiberius’ second triumph, see Hurlet 1997, 155 f. Velleius 2.103.3 records the date of Tiberius’ adoption by Augustus.
and Agrippa is consequently no longer to be considered as the sole proconsular guardian of the regime during his lifetime.\textsuperscript{186}

On the one hand, the combined evidence on the early careers of Tiberius and Drusus confirms that Dio’s testimony on Agrippa’s third and final refusal of a decreed public triumph should not be rejected out of hand.\textsuperscript{187} In 54.24.7–8, Dio records the following response to Agrippa’s successful repression of a tribal revolt in the Cimmerian Bosporus in the summer of 14 BCE:

\begin{quote}
καὶ ἐπάνω ἔνας ἀνὴρ ἀναστάς ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀγρίππου ὄνομα ἐγένοντο, οὐ μέντοι καὶ τὰ ἐπίνικα καίτοι ψηφιοθέντα αὐτῷ ἐπέμφθη· οὔτε γὰρ ἔγγει έγραφεν ἄρχην ἐς τὸ συνέδριον ὑπὲρ τῶν πρα-
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{186} Contra, e.g., Dettenhofer 2000, 162–167, who suggests that Augustus held back the consular Tiberius even after the death of Agrippa, refusing to invest him with the sort of military authority granted to the latter until 10 BCE, when he at long last received ‘imperium proconsulare’; and Seager 2005, 17 f. (comp. also p. 20): “Out of this expedient [i.e., his marriage to Iulia in 21 BCE] devised to neutralize Agrippa there developed the concept of the guardian or regent, whose task was to rule until the time was ripe for the power to be passed on to a direct descendant of Augustus. This was the position for which, after the death of Agrippa, Tiberius was chosen by Augustus, and it is only if the repeated pattern is studied from its inception that the role of Tiberius in the overall design can be fully understood.” The view that Livia’s sons only rose to real prominence and extraordinary proconsulships following the death of Agrippa perhaps finds its clearest expression in Hurlet 1997, 79 f. and 85 f. I do, however, unreservedly accept Hurlet’s argument (op. cit., 81 f.) that Drusus was no second-tier figure vis-à-vis his older brother in terms of prestige and popularity with the people and the court, and that “au contraire […] ils suivaient une carrière parallèle, aussi bien avant la mort d’Agrippa qu’après.” Comp. also 84: “L’intervalle [i.e., between Tiberius and Drusus’ successive urban praetorships] étant naturellement justifié par leur différence d’âge, il n’était pas douteux aux yeux des Romains qu’Auguste faisait suivre à ses beaux-fils une carrière politique en parallèle. Le même s’observe pour leur carrière militaire.” The results of the analysis here firmly substantiate Hurlet’s sharp observations as well as those of Kuttner’s 8th chapter (1995). On pp. 182–184, Kuttner produces a compelling explanation of why Augustus never adopted Marcellus, Agrippa, the preexile Tiberius and Drusus, amongst other things observing (p. 184) “that Tiberius and Drusus remained Augustus’ stepsons in this period says nothing about their position in his dynastic plans. Not adopting them made them, in fact, more useful agents; acting for their stepfather while remaining Claudii, they added the prestige of the patrician Claudii to the supremacy of the Julian house […]. Plutarch (Ant. 87) was quoted above on Augustus’ reliance on Tiberius and Drusus next after Agrippa: in 13–9 B.C. the Ara Pacis is structured in such a way as to delineate this hierarchy visually, for on the south frieze Augustus capite velato is echoed by Agrippa similarly posed, after whom the next male portraits are the consul Tiberius and the imperator Drusus; Gaius (and probably his little brother) is on the other side of the altar (fig. 71).” The very fact that Tiberius features as consul on the altar whilst Drusus wore the paludamentum further suggests he was present at the ceremony as proconsul in 13 BCE.

\textsuperscript{187} On his first and second refusals of 37 and 19 BCE, see Dio 48.49.3–4 (37 BCE; comp. App. B.C. 5,92) and 54.11.6 (19 BCE; comp. 12.1–2). I intend to discuss the altogether different circumstances of these earlier refusals as well as Agrippa’s motivation in a wider study on Augustus and the public triumph.
For these successes, supplications were offered in the name of Agrippa, but the triumph which was voted him was not celebrated. Indeed, he did not so much as notify the Senate of what had been accomplished, and in consequence subsequent conquerors, treating his course as a precedent, also gave up the practice of sending reports to the public; and he would not accept the celebration of the triumph. For this reason, – at least, such is my opinion, – no one else of his peers was permitted to do so any longer, either, but they enjoyed merely the distinction of triumphal honours."

The above reappraisal of the early careers of the Claudians suggests that Agrippa’s conduct in 14 BCE indeed made for a significant episode in Augustus’ new triumphal policy and the wider history of the Roman triumph. That Agrippa’s final *recusatio triumphi* indeed was a carefully orchestrated affair with a distinct

---

188 Some scholars believe Agrippa’s second refusal of 19 BCE set the decisive precedent for all other proconsuls to follow: e.g. Kuttner 1995, 190 (“Agrippa opened this new phase when in 19 B.C. he ostentatiously refused the triumph voted him by the Senate in favor of Augustus, whom he acknowledged as supreme commander”; comp. 191, where she emphasizes “the importance of Agrippa’s ceremony of refusal”) and Hurlet 2001, 174 f. as well as 2006, 171 f. Others, however, give equal weight to both his second and third refusals: e.g., Eck 1984, 139, who observes that “Agrippa’s conduct set the tone. He declined a triumph in 19 BC and 14 BC, although possessed of independent *imperium*” (comp. also Eck 1998, 58 f.: “Wenn ein Mann wie Agrippa, der an Machtfülle und Prestige dem Princeps so nahe kam wie niemand sonst, vor diesem zurücktrat und ihn dadurch als alleinige Quelle aller römischen Sieghaftigkeit erscheinen ließ, wer konnte dann noch Anspruch auf einen Triumph erheben?” Eck here also points to Tiberius and Drusus being denied triumphs voted by the Senate but implicitly suggests that, unlike Agrippa, they lacked independent *imperium*); Itgenhorst 2008, 39 f., who, whilst likewise ignoring Agrippa’s first *recusatio* of 37, considers the refusals of 19 and 14 as equally important in terms of precedent value: “Die beiden Zurückweisungen des Triumphes durch den Angesehenen Feldherrn und engen Vertrauten des Princeps hatten offensichtlich Vorbildcharakter; entscheidend war hierbei, daß Agrippa (im Gegensatz zu den Legaten des Augustus) in beiden Fällen ein eigenständiges *Imperium* besessen hatte, was – zumindestens nach republikanischen Maßstäben – eine zentrale Voraussetzung für die Gewährung eines Triumphes darstellte.” (comp. also id. 2017, 67, where she casts doubt on Agrippa’s first *recusatio* of 37, attested in Dio 48.49.4); and Levick 2010, 93. Boyce 1942, 139 f., by contrast, suggests it was Augustus’ own refusal of a Parthian triumph in 19 that set the decisive precedent. Dalla Rosa 2015, 464 and 481, however, considers the *recusationes triumphi* of both Augustus (Dio 54.10.4) and Agrippa of 19 BCE (Dio 54.11.6) as the combined decisive precedent: “Le refus, précisément en 19 av. J.-C., des deux plus importants hommes politiques et chefs militaires de célèbrer le triomphe pour leurs succès en Orient et en Occident allait peser lourdement sur les futures chances des proconsuls de se voir attribuer ce même honneur.”
political purpose also follows from the remarkable oddity that neither he nor any of the Roman citizen forces at his disposal had been involved in the actual suppression of the revolt. According to Dio, news of an unwelcome (Roman) usurper to the Bosporan throne had prompted Agrippa to send king Polemo I of Pontus, who managed to defeat the rebels in battle but nonetheless failed to force them into surrender. The rebellious Bosporans only dropped their opposition to Polemo upon learning that Agrippa himself had arrived at Sinope to prepare for a further expedition against them. That Augustus was directly managing the Bosporan succession crisis and its immediate aftermath can be inferred from Dio’s note that Polemo subsequently took possession of the Bosporan throne by marrying queen Dynamis, who had married the slain usurper Scribonius following the decease of her husband Asander, as per Augustus’ wishes: τοῦ Αυγούστου δῆλον ὅτι ταῦτα δικαιώσαντος. At all events, Agrippa’s example of 14 BCE was not lost on the ‘regular’ proconsuls: in Tib. 32.1, we are told by Suetonius that Tiberius rebuked some proconsuls still commanding military forces (i.e. predominantly the proconsul of Africa) for not writing their reports to the Senate and even referring to him the award of the more prestigious dona militaria.

On the other hand, however, this reappraisal also significantly qualifies Dio’s picture in that this watershed in the history of the triumph and Rome’s senatorial aristocracy was not achieved by virtue of a single recusatio triumphi on the part of the most powerful man in the Empire next to Augustus himself. The first demonstrable step on the road towards a new triumphal paradigm was Augustus’ notable decision not to share the imperatorial salutation occasioned by Tiberius’ successful military diplomacy in Armenia in 20 BCE. Regardless of his status as proconsul – a legally and socially privileged one, for that matter – he had to content himself with a share in the ensuing supplications only. As argued above,

189 Dio 54.24.4–7: “naturally not without the sanction of Augustus”. That Augustus always retained full control over his extraordinary proconsuls can also be gleaned from Dio 55.10a.8. Here we are told that the ailing Gaius Caesar late in 3 CE (comp. Hurlet 1997, 560) begged Augustus for permission to retire to private life and convalesce in Syria, following which Augustus communicated his wish to the Senate, effecting a decree that released him of his provincia and authorized him to return to Italy to do there as he saw fit.

190 Corripuit consulares exercitibus praepositos, quod non de rebus gestis senatui scriberent quadque de tribuendis quibusdam militaribus donis ad se referrent, quasi non omnium tribuenorum ipsi ius haberent. It follows that I do not accept Rich’s argument in 1990, 202 that “Agrippa followed his earlier practice in not seeking or accepting a triumph [...] – he could hardly have accepted one now for a success won without fighting. Dio’s claim that ‘others like him’ did not triumph is incorrect”.

191 For Dio’s tendency to compress historical events, see Rich – Williams 1999, 194–199 and 212f., with due qualification in Vervaet 2010b, 138f.
however, the short decade from 15 to 7 BCE represents the period *par excellence* for the methodical and conspicuous implementation of Augustus’ new triumphal policy. During these years especially, Augustus orchestrated a coherent set of measures to bring about the most decisive rupture in the history of the triumphal ritual.\footnote{It is one of the foremost merits of Itgenshorst 2005 to have demonstrated that Augustus’ establishment of an imperial triumphal monopoly amounts to a watershed of paramount importance in Roman political history.} The triumphal honours awarded to Tiberius and/or Drusus in 11 and 8 are, however, just as important as the preceding refusals or denials of curule triumphs and such triumphal honours as imperatorial salutations since they demonstrate that the exclusion of the vast majority of the senatorial aristocracy from one of their foremost privileges and Augustus’ consistent refusal to celebrate any further triumphs was not tantamount to the ritual’s complete termination. By allowing the Senate to decree ovations to both Tiberius and Drusus in 11 and subsequently, at long last, the *nomen Imperatoris* as well as a curule triumph to Tiberius in 9 and 8 respectively whilst consistently upholding his own policy of refusing triumphs, Augustus made it clear that the public triumph was henceforth to be the exclusive if scarce privilege of the *domus Augusta*. These insights further substantiate Kuttner’s wider suggestion that,

> “the new Augustan theology of triumph, then, is very closely tied to the firm establishment of his dynasty. The sons, stepsons, and sons-in-law of his house may be only his agents, but they form the group singled out to serve as such agents. As long as he rules, celebration of their capability is carefully subordinated to the proclamation of his own preeminence, but care is also taken to give them scope to build the talents and reputation that enable them to act convincingly for him in his lifetime and to perpetuate his system after his inevitable death. This is a succession policy, in other words, formulated by a shrewd ruler who planned as if he could live indefinitely and at the same time as if he could die tomorrow – the latter event being one that, with Augustus’ early propensity to serious illness, was always a real threat.”\footnote{Kuttner 1995, 192.}  

In light of these considerations, it should also come as no surprise that the period here considered also saw the emphatic and strategic introduction of the *ornamenta triumphalia*.\footnote{Boyce 1942 (esp. 139 f.) believes that the practice of conferring *ornamenta triumphalia* should be traced to Augustus’ honours of 19 BCE. Rich 1998, 120 n. 157 objects that “the recipients of *ornamenta triumphalia* enjoyed the same entitlement to triumphal dress as those who had celebrated triumphs, chiefly the right to wear the laurel crown at the games. Octavian had been granted this right in 40 BC (Dio 48.16.1). The origins of *ornamenta triumphalia* are to be found in the grants made to Tiberius, Drusus and L. Calpurnius Piso in 12–11 BCE”. Whilst accepting that...} Officially awarded by decree of the Senate, probably invar-
ibly on the motion of Augustus and/or another qualified member of the domus Augusta,\textsuperscript{195} this distinction was for all intents and purposes designed as a prestigious Ersatz for the triumph proper.\textsuperscript{196} In 12, and then again in 11, both Tiberius and Drusus twice received the award as Augustus interfered with the Senate’s decree ratifying their nomina Imperatoris and curule triumphs.\textsuperscript{197} Their status as special proconsuls as well as Augustus’ stepsons would have immediately enhanced the prestige of the ornamenta. Significantly, the year 11 also saw this distinction awarded to none less than the noble L. Calpurnius Piso ‘Pontifex’ (ord. 15 BCE), who as legatus Augusti pro praetore managed to defeat the Bessi and a number of other Thracian tribes across three years of brutal warfare.\textsuperscript{198} Piso’s award is on record in both Tacitus (Ann. 6.10.3: decus triumphale in Thraecia meruerat) and...
Dio 54.34.7, who adds the interesting detail that Piso was honoured with both supplicationes and the ornamenta triumphalia on account of his victories: καὶ αὐτῷ διὰ ταύτα καὶ ἱερομηνία καὶ τιμαὶ ἐπινίκιοι ἐδόθησαν – “for these successes he was granted supplications and triumphal honours”\(^\text{199}\). These supplicationes were doubtlessly decreed to Augustus in the first place in his capacity of supreme commander and holder of the imperium auspicii under which Piso had conquered, possibly along with (yet) another declined triumph. Dio’s representation, however, strongly suggests that they were also voted in honour of Piso, regardless of the fact that he as legatus Augusti pro praetore lacked independent imperium and the corresponding auspices. The very fact that the ornamenta were thus for the first time ever awarded to a commander who did not normally qualify for a public triumph (be it curule or minor) as well as this novel, more liberal, usage of supplicationes may well account for Dio’s express mention, in keeping with his amply documented interest in triumphal honours and constitutional innovation.\(^\text{200}\) In all likelihood, Augustus’ decision to have one of his noblest and most trusted legati share in the honour of his supplicationes accounts for another conspicuous sweetener for the senatorial aristocracy to accept his blatantly autocratic new triumphal policy.\(^\text{201}\) In the context of a discussion of how Augustus promoted later imperial province of Moesia. On Piso the Pontifex, see Syme 1986, 329–345 (with a discussion of his command in Thrace on 334–336).

\(^{199}\) Although Dio mostly uses the term θυσία for supplications (cf. supra, e.g. in 54.24.7) he (e.g. in 39.53) as well as Appian (e.g. in Civ. 5.130) also employ the term ἱερομήνια for the same ritual typically associated with military victories or satisfactory resolutions of grave threats to the security of the Republic.

\(^{200}\) For Dio’s keen interest in institutional novelties and precedents as well as the ius triumphi, see, e.g. Vervaet 2014, 216–239, 2014b; Vervaet – Dart 2018; comp. also Coudry 2016. Contra Dalla Rosa 2015, 482, who suggests that the novel award of ornamenta triumphalia “à Tibère en tant que légat aurait été un important précédent pour leur concession aux legati Augusti pro praetore dans l’avenir”. As such, Dio’s emphatic record of Piso’s triumphal honours further hints at the fact that Tiberius and Drusus first received the ornamenta triumphalia in 12 and 11 as proconsuls.

\(^{201}\) In Epist. 83.14 –15, Seneca records that “Augustus trusted him with secret orders when he placed him in command of Thrace” (huic et diius Augustus dedit secreta mandata, cum illum praeponeret Thracia), and that Piso enjoyed Augustus’ as well as Tiberius’ unqualified confidence. ILS 918, a fragmentary inscription found in the Tiber in Rome and believed to concern P. Sulpicius Quirinius, consul ordinarius in 12 BCE, may attest another such instance: [r]egem, qua redacta in pot[estate Imp. Caesaris] / Augusti Populique Romani Senatu[s dis immortalibus] / supplicationes binas ob res prosp[ere gestas et] / ipsi ornamenta triumph[alia decreuit]; pro consul. Asiam provin[cia op]tinuit; legatus pr. pr. / D[iu] Augusti iterum Syr[iam et Phoenicen optinuit]. In Ann. 3.48.1, Tacitus too attests to the fact that, shortly after his consulate (mox), Quirinius received the ornamenta triumphalia for having stormed some fortresses of the Homonadenses beyond the Cilician frontier. For a brief survey of Quirinius’ career, see also Syme 1939, 399. Gruen 1996, 153 dates Sulpicius Quirinus’ campaigns against the Homonadenses to ca. 5–3 BCE.
his stepsons in the immediate aftermath of Agrippa’s untimely decease, allegedly culminating in their promotions to proconsul in 10 BCE, Syme cleverly discerns two further Augustan ploys to avoid antagonizing “the high aristocracy, the de
cus ac robur of the renovated Republic”. First, he observes how

“a resplendent collection is on show, the coevals of the Claudii, consuls in the decade 16–7: a Scipio, two Fabii, two Pisones, and so on [...]. Furthermore, a new distinction emerges in these years, pleasing to some at least of the nobles. Cities in Asia and Africa now put on their coins the names and images of proconsuls.” The first to acquire the honour is Paullus Fabius Maximus (cos. 11), proconsul of Asia by special appointment in 10/9."

Since imperatorial salutations by the Late Republic often represented the necessary first step on the road to a curule triumph, it should neither surprise that Tiberius and Drusus in 12 and 11 BCE were twice denied their imperatorial salutations. That Augustus would indeed not hesitate to cast his veto against (or otherwise neutralize) motions awarding honours he deemed unwelcome or excessive is on record in Suet. Tib. 17.2, where we are told that he prevented the Senate from awarding Tiberius with a special honorific cognomen on account of his hard-won victory in Pannonia in 9 CE (Pannonicus, Invictus or Pius). Although Dio has

---

202 See Grant 1946, 139 f., 224, 228–233 and 387 f.
203 Syme 1979, 314 f. On p. 315, however, Syme needlessly downplays this development: “Too much should not be made of this phenomenon – and it was in fact sporadic. No coins commemorate the proconsuls L. Piso and Iullus Antonius.” On the procedure of extra sortem appointments (i.e., by decree of the Senate on the motion of Augustus) of proconsuls and the case of Paullus Fabius Maximus: see Hurlet 2006, 82 f. and 89 f. For a fine study of gubernatorial portraits on Roman provincial coinage, see Erkelenz 2002.

204 Supplicationes were so frequently the forerunner of a triumph (comp. Livy 26.21.3–4) that Cato thought it necessary to remind Cicero that it was not invariably so (Fam. 15.5.2, end of April 50).

205 Contra Kehne 2002, 311, who suggests that Augustus denied Drusus the nomen Imperatoris in 11 BCE as a rebuke of his alleged and costly recklessness as a field commander (with reference to Dio 54.33.3 and 55.1.2 and Vell. 2.97.4). Apart from the fact that such would have been incongruent with the other honours conferred upon Drusus on account of his military exploits of that year, Kehne’s speculative suggestion also fails to explain Tiberius’ identical treatment by the Senate and the princeps: cf. supra pp. 148–152. Velleius’ repeated claims that Tiberius’ army never suffered any significant losses during his campaigns in Germany (2.97.4; 107.3 and 120.2) should probably not be taken as veiled criticism of a man Tiberius always held in the highest regard – to quote just one example of Tiberius’ profound love of his younger sibling: in Tib. 7.3, we are told that he conveyed Drusus’ body from Germany to Rome “going before it on foot all the way”. It more likely concerns subtle criticism of Germanicus Caesar, whose campaigns had been deemed costly by Tiberius in 16 BCE: Tac. Ann. 2.26 and Suet. Tib. 52.2.

206 Contra Levick 2010, 93, who suggests that the triumphs offered in 12 to Tiberius and Drusus by the Senate were merely “refused on their behalf by Augustus”.
Augustus bluntly denying his stepsons the curule triumphs they were decreed in 12 and next also the imperatorial salutations by their armies in 11 (supra, p. 149 and 151). It should not be doubted that they readily accepted the sharply moderated honours and distinctions voted at the behest of Augustus. The unequivocal imagery on the coinage issued on account of Augustus’ tenth imperatorial salutation suggests as much, as the brothers are featured as willingly handing over the olives of victory to their commander-in-chief. This suggests that, much like Agrippa, who thrice refused to celebrate decreed triumphs, viz. in 37, 19 and, especially, 14 BCE, Tiberius and Drusus, too, were prepared to play their part in Augustus’ triumphal policy. Thanks to Suetonius (Tib. 17.2) we know that Augustus’ justified his veto against the motion to award Tiberius with a distinct cognomen in 9 CE by “reiterating the promise that he would be satisfied with the one he received at his father’s death”. This suggests that he would have advised the Senate that, just like he himself politely refused any triumphs or ovations decreed to him on account of their victories, Tiberius and Drusus would be content with moderated honours, and that they could in due course expect to gain greater honours. By virtue of their signal modesty, Augustus’ stepsons loyally subscribed to, and played key roles in, Augustus’ new triumphal framework. Crucially, their subservient and self-effacing conduct in the years 15 to 11 BCE, compounded by Agrippa’s third and final recusatio triumphi in 14 BCE, indicates the existence of a concerted and carefully crafted strategy to transform the triumphal ritual and some of its key trappings, masterminded and closely directed by Augustus himself. Augustus’ three extraordinary proconsuls were, as such, deeply implicated in the implementation of his new scheme for the triumph. Only in 8 BCE,

---

207 There should be no doubt that Augustus, too, was decreed an ovation or possibly yet another curule triumph in 11 as the Senate awarded Livia’s sons with an ovation, and that, in this instance in contrast to Tiberius and Drusus, he again turned down the honour as he consistently stuck to his policy of recusatio triumphi. That much can be inferred from Dio 55.5.1–2 (comp. also 55.2.2), where we are told that he did carry the laurels he gained through Drusus’ victories into the temple of Jupiter Feretrius but refused to celebrate any festival in honour of his achievements, which must, amongst other traditional formalities, also concern the triumph and ovation (or, possibly, second triumph) decreed in 12 and 11 successively on account of his stepsons’ victories.

208 That Augustus at the time was very close with both Tiberius and Drusus is also on record in Suet. Aug. 71.2–3, where he produces some telling anecdotal material concerning the period before Drusus’ untimely demise.

209 For Agrippa’s unwavering loyalty to Augustus, see, e.g. Dio 53.27 and 54.11–12 and 29. Tiberius’ zeal to please his stepfather was such that he incurred a rebuke from Augustus in 13 BCE for having seated Gaius Caesar at the emperor’s side at the festival he directed in fulfilment of a vow for the emperor’s return: Dio 54.27.1.
roughly one year after the untimely passing of Drusus, would Tiberius be granted the honour of a curule triumph *ex Germania*, for predominantly political reasons. Since Dio is adamant in 53.21.6 that “nothing was done [in the Senate] that did not please Caesar”\(^{210}\), it should, furthermore not be doubted that the consuls moving the vetoed motions on behalf of Augustus’ stepsons in 12 and 11 were really acting in accordance with his wishes.\(^{211}\)

The paramount importance of the Claudian princes as mouthpieces and instruments of Augustus’ will in key matters of state involving the senatorial order is directly attested in the – equally sensitive – issue of Augustan fiscal policy. In 13 CE, shortly after the fifth and final decennial renewal of his provincial command, the elderly emperor faced widespread and tenacious opposition against the (conditional) five percent tax on inheritances and bequests.\(^{212}\) On the one hand, he asked the Senate to suggest any other viable sources of revenue. According to Dio, he did this with the intention for them to ratify the existing tax for want of any better method, without bringing any censure upon him. On the other, he also ordered both Germanicus and Drusus Caesar not to make any statement in the matter, “for fear that if they expressed an opinion it should be suspected that this had been done at his command, and the Senate would therefore

\(^{210}\) οὐ μέντοι καὶ ἐπράττετό τι ὅ μὴ καὶ ἐκεῖνον ἤρεσκε.

\(^{211}\) Comp. also Dio 53.21.4–5, where we are told that Augustus established a new advisory body in 27, taking as “advisers for periods of six months the consuls (or the other consul when he himself also held the office), one of each of the other magistracies, and fifteen men chosen by lot from the remainder of the senatorial body, with the result that all legislation proposed by the emperors is usually communicated after a fashion through this body to all the other senators; for although he brought certain matters before the whole Senate, yet he generally followed this plan considering it better to take under preliminary advisement most matters and the most important ones in consultation with a few; and sometimes he even sat with these men in the trial of cases”; a measure distinct from the institution of the so-called Consilium Principis in 13 CE (on which Dio 56.28.1–3). It is, therefore, unlikely that the consuls of 12 and 11 had moved to ratify Tiberius and Drusus’ salutations and award them with curule triumphs without the connivance of Augustus, who could then use these *sententiae* as springboards for his own alternative proposals. *Contra* Havener 2016, 337, who suggests that the Senate moved “eigenständig”, either in a proactive attempt to please Augustus or to ‘test’ his triumphal policy. At least three of the consuls of 12 and 11 BCE were zealous supporters and close confidants of Augustus, viz. P. Sulpicius Quirinius, L. Volusius Saturninus (who both served in 12) and Paullus Fabius Maximus (who served as *consul ordinarius* throughout 11 BCE, alongside consul prior Q. Aelius Tubero). The fact that P. Sulpicius Quirinius declined a *cognomen ex provinicia* (viz. Marmaricus: Flor. 2.31), suggests he was well aware of the key tenets of Augustus’ new triumphal policy. In 1 BCE, Augustus would assign this seasoned military man to the entourage of C. Caesar as one of his *rectores* in the tricky task to restore Roman influence in Armenia: *Ann.* 3.48.1.

\(^{212}\) Reintroduced by Augustus in 6 BCE: Dio 55.25.5.
choose that plan without further investigation”\textsuperscript{213}. It follows that the senatorial aristocracy would hardly have interpreted the actions of Agrippa, Tiberius and Drusus in the matter of triumphal honours as anything else but an unequivocal expression of Augustan policy.

This close study of the early careers of Tiberius and Drusus also begs the question as to why Agrippa was allowed to decline a decreed triumph in 14, no doubt along with an officially sanctioned imperatorial salutation, whilst Augustus himself moved to deny Tiberius and Drusus similar honours in 12 and 11. The answer arguably lies in their relative ranks within the dynasty as well the senatorial aristocracy. Agrippa, \textit{consul tertio}, had been Augustus’ faithful \textit{compagnon de route} ever since the beginning of the latter’s bold bid for power in the immediate aftermath of Caesar’s assassination and ever remained the second most powerful man as well as the most seasoned military commander of the new regime until his untimely demise in 12. No doubt also in consideration of his track record of ‘triumphal modesty’\textsuperscript{214}, Augustus therefore respectfully allowed him the glory of voluntary refusal. Since his aspiring stepsons, the young Claudians, however, occupied very different positions, their youthfulness and comparative inexperience rendered them all the more useful as exemplars and executives of the new triumphal policy. Another key element to consider here is their vastly superior nobility vis-à-vis Agrippa: if two of the foremost paragons of the old republican \textit{nobilitas} were denied imperatorial salutations and triumphs and willingly accepted Augustus’ supreme authority and guidance in this important matter, the ensuing impression upon their aristocratic peers would be all the more power-

\textsuperscript{213} Dio 56.28.4–5. It was not, however, before Augustus had threatened to introduce a levy upon fields and houses possessed by both private individuals and cities that the Roman elite dropped its opposition against the \textit{uicesima hereditatium et legatorum}: Dio 56.28.6.

\textsuperscript{214} Comp. Cassius Dio’s reflections on Agrippa’s outward moderation in 54.11.6–12.2 as he recounts his second \textit{recusatio triumphi} of 19 BCE, noting that he preferred (and duly received) real power above public triumphs. In 53.23.4, on account of the fact that Agrippa in 26 embellished the Saepta and renamed it the Saepta Iulia in honour of Augustus, Dio explains that “the reason for this was that, although he collaborated with Augustus in the planning and execution of projects of outstanding philanthropy, renown and utility, he sought not the slightest share in the glory for them, and he used the honours he received from Augustus not for his own advancement or enjoyment, but for the benefit of Augustus and the public”. Comp. also 48.49.3–4, where Dio, describing the initial engagements of Octavianus and Agrippa’s campaign in Sicily against Sextus Pompeius in 36 BCE, also recounts that “Agrippa thought it sufficient merely to rout his adversaries, since he was fighting for Caesar and not for himself”, and that “he was wont to say to his intimate friends that most men in positions of power wish no one to be superior to themselves, but attend personally without the use of agents to most matters – to all, in fact, that afford them an easy victory – and assign the more difficult and extraordinary tasks to others” (comp. also App. Civ. 5.92).
ful. Furthermore, since the major victories gained by the Claudians in the years 15 through 11 were genuinely worthy of curule triumphs, as opposed to Agrippa’s bloodless success in absentia in the regnum Bospori, the precedent value of the honours denied/granted to Tiberius and Drusus was all the more formidable.
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