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Over a century ago, in a remarkably lucid and spirited attempt to rescue Tiberius from the innuendoes of Tacitus and the slanders of Suetonius, E.S. Beesly offered a novel interpretation of Tiberius' motivation for appointing Cn. Calpurnius Piso as imperial legatus of Syria in AD 17. To my knowledge, Beesly's hypothesis has not been accepted, denied, or even seriously evaluated in any subsequent account of the reign of Augustus' successor.

Beesly pointed out that Piso was 'just the sort of man that Tiberius always avoided sending into the provinces'. Nevertheless, he was appointed to govern Syria because of the pressure applied on Tiberius by Livia at the behest of her friend Plancina, Piso's wife. Fearing that Piso, backed by legions, might cause trouble in the East, Tiberius despatched Germanicus, armed with 'extraordinary' powers, to 'keep him in check'. Piso's mutiny following the death of Germanicus came as a striking confirmation of Tiberius' worst fears, and it was that crime that weighed most heavily against him in the eyes of his Princeps at his trial in the following year.

As it stands, Beesly's chronology of the commissions awarded to Piso and Germanicus is not only inherently improbable, but also reverses the sequence of events demanded by the wording of Tacitus Annals 2.43.2-3. It is extremely unlikely that Germanicus would be sent off to the East with maius imperium; simply in order to act as a watchdog over a suspect legate. The problems in the East that demanded the appointment of a senior member of the imperial family with wide powers to deal with them are well-attested. It is far more likely that, if Livia and Plancina had demanded a province for Piso, Tiberius would have selected one of the major Eastern provinces in the knowledge that Germanicus would be in the area on other business anyway. There is no doubt that only a major military province would have satisfied the ambitions of Tiberius' former consular colleague of 7 BC. The sequence of tenses at Annals 2.43.2-3, 'permissae Germanico provinciae; Tiberi us demoverat Suri a Creticum Silanum; praefeceratque Cn. Pisonem', does not demand any particular view of the order in which these events took place. What is important is the sequence in which Tacitus narrates them, and this demonstrates that as far as Tacitus was concerned, the granting of the Eastern commission to Germanicus preceded the removal of Creticus Silanus from Syria and the appointment of Cn. Calpurnius Piso.

Beesly's hypothesis is unrefined and startling. However, I believe that it makes more sense of the events of AD 17–19 than the majority of more recent interpretations, which assign the watchdog role to Piso. That of Shotter, for example, is largely vitiated by his constant and unwarranted assumption of friendship and a marked degree of empathy between Tiberius and Piso. In the argument which follows, I propose to resurrect Beesly's overall view of the missions of Germanicus and Piso and to strengthen his case by consideration of
the following issues:
1. The relationship between Tiberius and Piso.
2. The attitude of Tiberius towards Germanicus.
3. The nature of Roman diplomatic and military policy in respect of the Eastern frontier.

The year 7 BC brought Tiberius and Cn. Calpurnius Piso together as consular colleagues. The conjunction of a Julio-Claudian prince and a colleague in the consulship not from the imperial family tells us very little about the less celebrated of any such pair of consuls. Tiberius had held his first consulship in 13 BC with the unfortunate P. Quinctilius Varus. It is merely coincidental that Varus subsequently became governor of Syria before he was placed in charge of Germany in 9 BC.7

L. Aemilius Paullus,8 colleague of C. Caesar in AD 1 during Tiberius’ absence from public life, had even less luck than Varus. Married to his consular colleague’s sister, the younger Julia,9 he survived his wife’s disgrace in AD 6, only to enter into a conspiracy against Augustus.10 Germanicus’ colleague during his first consulship in AD 12, C. Fonteius Capito, passed his year in office as a mere cypher,11 only to be arraigned on a charge of maestas in AD 25, following his proconsulship of Asia, by the notorious informer Vibius Serenus.12 Nothing is known of Drusus’ colleague in his first consulship in AD 15, C. Norbanus Flaccus, beyond the fact that he held the office.13 It is quite apparent that sharing a consulship with a son (or stepson in the case of Tiberius and Piso) of the Princeps conferred no special distinction or promise of favour or advancement. Levick’s attempt to see L. Aemilius Paullus as fourth in line for the succession as the ‘running mate’ of Agrippa Postumus is without foundation and miscarries.14

During his consulship, Piso assisted C. Caesar in organizing a festival in honour of the return of Augustus from Gaul.15 The young prince, who had only the year before been introduced to military service,16 was appointed to direct the home-coming festivities in place of Tiberius who had returned to Germany. The literary tradition complements an inscription which records the names of Tiberius and Piso as the joint sponsors of the games in 7 BC.17

Shattock, using numismatic evidence, dates Piso’s first provincial command as proconsul of Africa, the one in which he displayed irrational cruelty, to some time between 5 BC and AD 2.18 Syme, on the basis of CIL II.2703, demonstrated that Piso held his controversial appointment as consular legatus of Hispania Citerior in AD 9/10.19

From the figures provided by Badian,20 one of the Spanish provinces would appear to be almost a natural post for a capable Calpurnius.21 The accusations that Piso administered his province ambitiose avaraque22 can scarcely be credited. Not only were they irrelevant, and perhaps even untrue, in the eyes of Tacitus,23 but also in the opinion of Augustus, whose friendship24 and approval25 Piso never forfeited. The questions of Piso’s place amongst the capaces imperii of Annals 1.13.2–3 and the authenticity of these supremi sermones of Augustus have produced much erudite comment.26 While the arguments for the inclusion of Piso
and the overall reliability of the passage are not strong, it nevertheless confirms the impression that the position Piso enjoyed under Augustus was one of eminence and trust, an impression which is quite inconsistent with late and probably unreliable allegations of provincial maladministration, coming as they did from a notorious delator.21

During the reign of Augustus, therefore, the role of Piso was that of a loyal and esteemed public servant. Like his father before him, the suffect consul of 23 BC whose acceptance of his shortlived position as Augustus' colleague 'sealed his acquiescence in the new dispensation',28 the consul of 7 BC and governor of Africa and Hither Spain seems to have come to terms with the Principate. Certainly not a man who was ingenio violentus et obsequii ignarus,29 still less any trace of the rigor and iracundia that characterizes his behaviour in Seneca's anecdote.30 Surprisingly, perhaps, his attitude towards his Princeps appears to have been very different under Tiberius, insofar as it can be reconstructed from Tacitus and Dio. On no less than three occasions during the first two years of the new reign did Piso openly and cantankerously clash with his former consular colleague. The first was the case of Granius Marcellus, propraetorian governor of Bithynia, tried before the Senate in AD 15 on a charge of maestias.31 Incensed by the manner in which the accused had demonstrated his disrespect for both himself and, particularly, Augustus, Tiberius declared that he would vote openly and under oath so that the rest of the Senate would be compelled to do likewise. It was then that Piso displayed one of those vestigia morientis libertatis by asking his Emperor whether he would vote first or last. In the Tacitean version, Tiberius was repentant of his outburst and permitted Granius Marcellus to be acquitted. If Suetonius32 is referring to the same trial, a conviction still resulted. A second species libertatis was inflicted on Tiberius by Piso, again before the Senate, in the following year.33 In the face of obsequious opposition from C. Asinius Gallus and with Tiberius observing the exchange in stony silence, Piso argued that the decorum rei publicae demanded that the Senate continue to meet and transact business during the absence of Tiberius from Rome. Strikingly, in view of the argument to follow, we find Asinius Gallus maintaining that any public business discussed without the presence of Tiberius would appear unimportant as a result. Seager,34 attempting to create a 'Republican' Tiberius,35 misinterprets the exchange as reflecting more credit on Piso than Gallus in the eyes of his Princeps. If Seager is correct, then either Tiberius was a poor manager of senatorial business or auctoritas principis counted for little since Gallus' view prevailed and the Senate was adjourned.36 The third clash also occurred in AD 16 over the question of the punishment of citizens found practising astrology.37 On this occasion the Senate voted for the motion of Piso recommending the acquittal of all citizens so accused, and against the wishes of Tiberius and Drusus. The timely use of his veto by an unnamed tribune ensured that the Princeps and his son were not overruled on this matter. I cannot agree with Marsh38 that the authenticity of the incident is suspect because Tacitus failed to mention it. Quite the opposite, in fact. An occasion on which the Senate decisively flouted the stated desire of Tiberius does
not sit comfortably with the Tacitean picture of resigned obsequiousness and moriens libertas.\textsuperscript{36}

So far, we have examined three separate and significant disagreements between Piso and the man whose ‘trust and esteem’ he enjoyed.\textsuperscript{40} In fact, nowhere in the sources is Piso found in agreement with Tiberius at any time or on any issue. Indeed, in his speech to the Senate prior to the trial of Piso in AD 20,\textsuperscript{41} ‘Tiberius does not claim Piso as one of his own friends, but merely described him as patris sui legatum atque amicum. By contrast, Asinius Gallus, whom the source tradition represents as the object of implacable hatred on the part of Tiberius ever since his marriage to the discarded Vipsania,\textsuperscript{42} more often than not sided with his Princeps on any matter of substance. Bosworth has convincingly demonstrated that the fates of Gallus’ sons under Claudius have wrongly resulted in his being cast as an ‘enemy and critic’ of Tiberius, and that the connection between the two through Vipsania produced a glittering array of honours for her sons by Gallus rather than rancour.\textsuperscript{43} A brief tally of senatorial debates as recorded by Tacitus in which Asinius Gallus participated is instructive.

On six occasions he either proposed motions or expressed sentiments that were designed to win the approval of his Princeps.\textsuperscript{44} His disagreements, if they be such, with Tiberius are confined to \textit{Annals} 1.76; 2.36; and 4.71. The first of these was in respect of a very trivial matter; the second may well represent an attempt to further extend the electoral prerogatives of the Princeps by Gallus which simply miscarried; while the third occurred during the feud between Tiberius and Agrippina in which Gallus was closely identified with the latter,\textsuperscript{45} and is a matter of interpretation, anyway. Perhaps even more significantly, Gallus refused to assist in the defence of Piso at his trial.\textsuperscript{46}

If it is thus possible to dispose of the fiction of Piso as the friend and ally of Tiberius, then perhaps Beesly might have been correct in attributing his appointment to Syria in AD 17 to the friendship between Munatia Plancina and Livia, and the influence of the latter over her son.\textsuperscript{47} The close relationship between Livia and Plancina is frequently mentioned by Tacitus.\textsuperscript{48} As far as the background of Plancina need concern us here, Tacitus could justifiably remark of Piso, \textit{uxoris quoque Plancinae nobilitate et opibus accendebatur}.\textsuperscript{49} Her grandfather, the consul of 42 BC, served Augustus well in 27 BC when he steered him away from his preferred \textit{cognomen}, Romulus,\textsuperscript{50} but the less well five years later in his censorship with Paulius Aemilius Lepidus, if Velleius Paterculus is to be believed.\textsuperscript{51} Despite the doubts of Furneaux,\textsuperscript{52} I am sure that Syme was correct in making Piso’s wife the grand-daughter and not the daughter of L. Munatius Plancus, cos. 42 BC.\textsuperscript{53} The Munatii Planci missed a generation in the consulship. Plancina’s brother, another L. Munatius Plancus, turns up in the \textit{fasti} as consul in AD 13, and in history as the envoy of the Senate to the mutinous legions in Lower Germany in the following year and the unwitting instigator of a fresh outbreak of violence among Legions I and XX at Ara Ubiorum.\textsuperscript{54}

There was, in fact, no need for Beesly to conjecture a secret request from Plancina to Livia for a province for Piso. Tacitus,\textsuperscript{55} in reporting rumours that flew
around Rome, once the illness of Germanicus in AD 19 became known, to the
effect *hoc egisse secretos Augustae cum Plancina sermones*, permits precisely such
a conclusion to be drawn. The ability of Livia to influence Tiberius to make the
requested appointment is another matter. While by no means would I assent to
the idea of Livia as some kind of co-regent under either Augustus or Tiberius as
suggested by Kornemann,68 the influence of Livia over Tiberius, particularly
during the early years of his principate, is too well documented in our sources to
be ignored.57 That Livia could and would exert herself to promote individual
careers is illustrated by the case of C. Fufius Geminus who rose all the way to the
ordinary consulship of AD 29 *gratia Augustae*.58 I, thus, have little doubt that
Livia was instrumental in securing Syrian legateship for Piso. Likewise, I am
fairly sure that once Tiberius had been convinced of the need to give Piso a major
military command as befitted his status, the choice of Syria was more or less
automatic. As we have already seen,59 the order in which Tacitus narrates the
events of AD 17 at *Annals* 2.43.2–3 makes it clear that Germanicus' appointment
as proconsul with *imperium maius* over all the Eastern provinces preceded
Tiberius' decision to send Piso to Syria. That Tiberius felt uncomfortable about
the situation he had been placed in by Livia and Plancina is demonstrated by his
admission at *Annals* 3.12.2 that the command in Syria was granted to *Piso a se
auctore senatu*.

Surprisingly, perhaps, this unique example of the Senate being consulted on
the question of an appointment to an imperial province has received little
scholarly attention. Furneaux60 rightly described it as 'a very remarkable instance
of (Tiberius') habit of making the senate share responsibilities even in his own
department', but then proceeded to cite two inappropriate and irrelevant
parallels.61 In fact there are no parallels, and Dio's lucid explanation of the
differences between imperial and senatorial governors and provinces, written as
it was from the vantage point of over two hundred years of imperial practice, fails
to suggest such a possibility.62 Nevertheless, it would be rash to contradict Tacitus
on this point. Piso probably enjoyed considerable support among the senators if
his ability to carry a motion in the teeth of opposition from Tiberius and Drusus in
the previous year, AD 16, is any indication.63 In all probability, Tiberius, when
faced with having to appoint Piso to a province against his better judgement,
decided to share the possible consequences of such action with the Senate. For
the same reason, Tiberius decided that Piso should be tried by the whole Senate64
rather than by the praetor in charge of the *quaestio perpetua de sicariis et
veneficis*65 or the *iudices in foro*.66 Even though Tiberius himself was requested by the
prosecution to hear the case,67 I cannot accept Jones' view that he 'clearly
considered judging the case himself'.68 Just as Tiberius had made the Senate
partially responsible for the decision to appoint Piso to Syria, likewise he insisted
that it accept responsibility for judging his conduct. Indeed, the desire on the part
of Piso's prosecutors that Tiberius should judge the case himself is a strong
indication against Tiberius having any partiality in favour of the accused.

The temptation to oversimplify Tiberius' thought processes when he chose
Syria as Piso's province should be resisted. Certainly the presence of Germanicus in the East with his vast proconsular authority must have helped. The attempts of the standard accounts of the period to denigrate the military and administrative ability of Germanicus founder both on the evidence of Tacitus and of Germanicus' own career. His adoption of Tiberius in AD 4 was not resented by the man who once again found himself as the successor designate. On the contrary, Tacitus' stated reason for the adoption, *quo pluribus munimentis insisteret*, can only mean that Augustus was anticipating and attempting to remove the objections of those who might have preferred a Julian rather than a Claudian successor. Following his accession ten years later, one of Tiberius' first acts was to confer the *imperium proconsulare* on Germanicus. In AD 17 came Germanicus' triumph for his victories on the Rhine frontier, a large donative to the plebs from Tiberius in the name of Germanicus and designation to a second consulship in the following year. Germanicus' mission to the East actually represents a reversal of Tiberius' intention that his consular colleague of AD 18 should remain in Rome and discharge the duties of his magistracy in person. The problems in the East had become too pressing. Only the wisdom, and no doubt the *auctoritas* and experience, of Germanicus would suffice to settle them, Tiberius told the Senate. Moreover, Tiberius felt more secure with both his sons in command of the legions, Drusus on the Pannonian frontier and Germanicus in the East.

In short, Tiberius probably calculated that if Germanicus was capable of handling the dynastic problems that had arisen in Parthia and Armenia, not to mention possible restructuring of Commagene and Cilicia and the financial difficulties of Syria and Judaea, then he could certainly deal with any difficulties that Piso might create.

Despite this, Tiberius must have been well aware of what Syme calls 'the danger of clash or complications' between a member of the imperial family invested with proconsular 'imperium maius' and a senatorial or imperial governor of one of the provinces in which he was 'perambulating'. Any trial of strength between these two forms of authority was potentially damaging to the Principate. Tiberius was himself involved in the aftermath to the clash between Augustus and M. Primus, proconsul of Macedonia,99 which resulted in the 'Second Settlement' and the extension of the proconsular *imperium* in 23 BC.100 More recently, Tiberius had been the victim of 'complications' arising from the appointment of M. Lollius as advisor to C. Caesar when the latter was sent to Armenia with proconsular *imperium* in 1 BC.101 The clashes that did occur between Germanicus and Piso in AD 18 and 19, culminating in Piso's dismissal from his province102 are too well known to require recitation or comment. One, however, stands out. At *Annals* 2.57.1 Tacitus relates that *Piso iussus portum legionum ipse aut per filium in Armeniam ducere utrumque neglexerat*. Although Piso's failure to send the legionaries into Armenia did not force Germanicus to postpone the installation of Zeno Artaxias as ruler of the client kingdom,103 it was nevertheless an act of rebellion and raises important questions about the tone of Roman diplomacy on the Eastern frontier. It may be that Germanicus simply planned that the troops
should be an ornamental accretion to the coronation of Rome’s newest client king. If so, Piso’s refusal to supply them may amount to nothing more than an insubordinate display of revulsion at the luxury and ostentation of the East, similar to that which he manifested when offered a crown at the Nabataean banquet. But, could it be that Germanicus’ request for legionaries was not simply motivated by his desire to provide a guard of honour? Is Levick correct when she states that Tiberius ‘discovered that diplomacy, backed up by a credible threat from the Roman army, was a sure means of keeping peace on terms that were satisfactory to Rome’? Certainly when Tiberius himself entered Armenia in 20 BC to replace Artaxes with the pro-Roman Tigranes, he was accompanied by at least two legions. Despite Ferrill’s ingenious postulation of ‘imperialist’ and ‘defensive policy’ parties at Rome led by Germanicus and Tiberius respectively, I am inclined to believe that Germanicus’ call for the Syrian legionaries was in line with Roman diplomatic practice on the Eastern frontier—call it ‘gunboat diplomacy’, if you will. In such circumstances Piso had defied a vitally important order from his superior in the region and had very possibly undermined the credibility of Rome’s authority in the area. When the news from Germanicus reached Rome in the following year, Tiberius attempted to put the best face possible on the situation. Germanicus was awarded an ovatio by the Senate and Tiberius sensibly chose not to broadcast the fact that he had achieved his aim in Armenia despite the lack of ‘a credible threat from the Roman army’.

In a sense, Tiberius’ worst fears in respect of the manner in which Piso would conduct himself in his provincial command had been realised. Piso’s disobedience towards his imperator in the face of an important and expected request for troops was an act of mutiny. The rest of what Tacitus has to relate of Piso’s attitude and actions in the East becomes clear, consistent, and convincing. The charge that he murdered Germanicus need not concern us here. The Senate rejected it. We must do the same. If any blame should attach itself to Germanicus, it must rest on the fact that he waited over a full year before ordering Piso to leave Syria, something Piso had already anticipated.

To sum up. Beesly’s reservations about the suitability of Piso for a major military command are strikingly confirmed by close examination of his attitude and conduct, both before and after he assumed his post in Syria. Having been Tiberius’ consular colleague in 7 BC offered no guarantees for the future except, perhaps, as Dio grimly observed, for a violent and miserable death. The relationship of Augustus’ friend with his successor was one characterized by constant opposition and friction; this comes out all the more clearly when contrasted with the attitude of Asinius Gallus, a man also noted for his ferocity. The potentially disastrous consequences of his appointment to a military province, foisted as it was upon a reluctant Tiberius by Livia and Plancina, were only averted by the presence of a reliable superior in the area and the tact and cool-headedness of Tiberius when the crisis produced by the disobedience of his legate became known to him. Perhaps it should thus come as no surprise to find that when the senatorial province of Africa fell to L. Calpurnius Piso, the son of
Gnaeus and Plancina, by lot in AD 39, the then Emperor, Gaius, entertained similar fears to those of Tiberius twenty-two years previously.  

Notes

2. Tac. Ann. 2.43.2.
3. E.g. Tac. Ann. 2.1–5, 42–3, 56–9, etc.
6. Vel. 2.117.2.
7. Dio 56.8.3; Vell. 2.117.3–118.4.
8. PIR A391.
12. Tac. Ann. 4.36.4; Dio 57.23.4.
13. Tac. Ann. 2.55.1; Dio 57.14.1; Suet. Vit. 3.2.
15. Dio 55.8.3.
17. ILS 95 = EJ 39, with the famous erasure cum Cn. Calpurnio Pisone contega.
18. Shotter, op. cit. 230. For Piso’s conduct, see Seneca De Ira 1.18.3–5.
21. Another Calpurnius Piso, this time Lucius, the son of the homonymous pontifex and consul of 15 BC (PIR C289), was assassinated in Hispania Citerior in 25 BC (Tac. Ann. 3.13.2). Syme,JRS 46 (1956) 17–21 = Ten Studies in Tacitus 50–57. sees him as ‘a subordinate legate, acting as deputy in the absence of the consular’.
23. inania, at least, at Ann. 3.13.2.
27. On the character of L. Fulciunius Trio, see Tac. Ann. 2.28.4.
29. Tac. Ann. 2.43.3.
30. De Ira 1.18.3–6.
32. Tib. 58. Shotter, op. cit. 233, disagrees and relies on the ‘friendship’ between Tiberius and Piso to support his interpretation.
33. Tac. Ann. 2.35.1–4.
36. Tac. Ann. 2.35.4. I fail to see how Shotter, op. cit. 233, can claim that ‘Piso no doubt again echoed Tiberius’ own feelings’ on this issue (the italics are mine).
37. Dio 57.15.7–9.
39. I am indebted to Professor M. T. W. Arnhem for suggesting this reason for Tacitus’ silence on this event.
41. Tac. Ann. 3.12.
42. Tac. Ann. 1.12.6; Dio 57.2.7.

68
44. Tac. Ann. 1.77; 2.32, 33, 35; 4.20, 30.
45. Tac. Ann. 6.25.2.
46. Tac. Ann. 3.11.2.
47. Beesly, op. cit. 126.
48. Tac. Ann. 2.43.5, 82.2; 3.15.1–3, 17.4, 17.8.
49. Tac. Ann. 2.43.4.
50. Suet. Aug. 7.2; Vell. 2.91.1.
51. Vell. 2.95.3; cf. Dio 54.2.1–3.
55. Tac. Ann. 2.82.2. Shotter, op. cit. 241–2 confines his discussion to advice that Livia may have given Plancina after Piso had been granted Syria, but does not speculate on the roles of Livia or Plancina in actually obtaining the province for Piso.
57. Suet. Tib. 50.2–51.1; Tac. Ann. esp. 1.13.7; 2.34.3–7, 77.6, 82.2; 3.15.1–3, 17.4, 17.8; 4.12.5, 21.1, 57.4; 5.2.3, 3.1; 6.26.4; Dio 57.12.1–6.
58. Tac. Ann. 5.2.3.
59. p. 61 supra.
60. Furneaux, op. cit. 405.
61. viz. Tac. Ann. 1.25.3; 4.15.3. Germanicus' commission in AD 17 was the result of a decretum patrum (Tac. Ann. 2.43.2), as was the renewal of his proconsular authority on the Rhine in AD 14 (Tac. Ann. 1.14.4). The involvement of the Senate in granting imperium maius to members of the imperial family seems to have been standard practice.
63. Dio 57.15.7–9.
64. Tac. Ann. 3.10.6.
65. Tac. Ann. 2.79.2.
69. Tac. Ann. 2.43.2.
70. e.g. M.P. Charlesworth in CAH Vol. 10, 618–622; A. Garzetti, From Tiberius to the Antonines, London 1960, 33–8; Shotter, op. cit. 234 ff.
71. Tac. Ann. 1.3.5.
73. Tac. Ann. 2.41.2.
74. Tac. Ann. 2.42.1.
76. Tac. Ann. 2.43.1.
77. Tac. Ann. 2.44.1.
78. Syme, Tacitus 442.
79. Dio 54.3.2–4.
80. Dio 53.32.5. For the involvement of Tiberius, see Suet. Tib. 8.
81. Dio 55.10.18–19; Suet. Tib. 12.2–13.2; Tac. Ann. 3.48.3; Vell. 2.102.1.
82. Tac. Ann. 2.70.3.
83. Tac. Ann. 2.56.2–3.
84. Tac. Ann. 2.57.5.
85. Levick, op. cit. 145.
86. Vell. 2.94.4; Dio 54.9.4–5.
88. Tac. Ann. 2.64.1–2.
89. Germanicus' position is described as such at Tac. Ann. 3.12.4.
91. Tac. Ann. 3.70.3.
92. Tac. Ann. 2.69.3.
93. Dio 57.20.1–2.
94. Dio 59.20.7.
Acta Classica is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.

For further information go to: