The Succession Planning of Augustus

ABSTRACT

Erich Gruen has questioned the notion of 'succession planning' under Augustus, arguing that the *princeps* was careful to avoid giving the impression that he wanted to create a heritable dynasty, for it was not in his interest to emphasise autocracy and there was no office of state to pass on. This view seems incomplete, since the prerogatives and resources of the Julian family were of such magnitude that Augustus' heir could hardly fail to occupy a position of dominance in the state, as everyone surely knew. Moreover, it seems likely that Gruen overestimates the level of opposition to autocracy, that the cause of state stability was aided overall by clear lines of succession, that relevant attitudes were dynamic rather than static, and that there was a higher public profile (and more practical, substantial importance) for the imperial family than Gruen describes.

It has long been taken for granted that Augustus wanted a member of his family to succeed him, and that he began planning for this to happen from as early as the lifetime of Marcellus in the 20s BC.[1] Erich Gruen, however, did much to problematise the topic of succession planning in a paper which argues that Augustus was careful to avoid giving the impression that he wanted to create a heritable dynasty, for it was not in his interest to emphasise autocracy and there was no office of state to pass on. Gruen believes that Augustus was faced throughout his rule by a fundamental dilemma: how could he maintain the continuity of his principate (personal leadership) in the interests of stability without giving the offensive impression that he was instituting a Principate (a heritable autocracy)? His solution was to operate as *princeps* rather than create a *Principatus*.[2] This is

[1] R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939) 342-3; R. Seager, *Tiberius*, 2nd edn (Oxford 2005, orig. 1972) 18-20; B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician*, 2nd edn (London 1999, orig. 1976) 21; K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture: An Introduction* (Princeton 1996) 247, 365.

[2] In other words, Augustus preferred to operate as *princeps* ('leader') within the framework of the traditional republican state rather than set up a new, autocratic state (a *Principatus* or 'Principate') based on the concept of *principatus* ('leadership'). See E.S. Gruen, 'Augustus and the Making of the Principate', in K. Galinsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* (New York 2005) 33-51, esp. 36, 50. Edwin Judge has also argued against the idea of a heritable autocracy, emphasizing instead the republican offices and powers held by Augustus and his stated aim of wanting to provide an *exemplar* for future *principes* to follow: e.g. E.A. Judge, 'The Eulogistic Inscriptions of the Augustan Forum: Augustus on Roman History', in J. Harrison (ed.) *The First Christians in the Roman World: Augustan and New Testament Essays by E.A. Judge* (Tübingen 2008) 165-81, and other papers in this collection; id. 'The Failure of Augustus', *Classicum* 38.1 (2012) 2-7. Judge believes that scholarship on Augustus' principate has been unduly governed by a hindsight conception of the Principate, a form of government which developed predominantly after his death and in light of his model. Augustus did not aim to create the form of state now commonly described

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

perhaps only half the story, because Augustus also wanted, like any noble under the Republic, to pass on to his heir a family enhanced in power and standing, and in this case that meant passing on family prerogatives and resources of such magnitude that the heir could hardly fail to occupy a position of dominance in the state. Moreover, there was considerable support for Julian pre-eminence, so that the cause of state stability was probably aided overall by clear lines of succession. Augustus went to great lengths to plan for inheritance within his family. This planning obviously had implications for the state, as everyone surely knew, even if the message was not made explicit. The great value of Gruen's paper, however, is that it forces the revision of several questions whose answers are often taken for granted. Who, for instance, were Augustus' direct successors? How much opposition to monarchy did he encounter, and how did he deal with it? How clear were the implications of family marriages? To what degree did he favour blood relatives? It emerges that there are points still to be made about the evolution and 'dynastic' nature of this planning, about support as well as opposition, the importance of descent by blood, changes in tactics employed over time, and the roles played by Agrippa and Tiberius. The aim in what follows is to discuss these matters in response to Gruen's thoughtful treatment. It seems likely that ideas of personal leadership and heritable autocracy existed in constant tension, but that the Principate was always a likely outcome.

The Republic saw magistrates progress through the *cursus honorum* according to votes of the Roman people. A 'dynasty', however, would see a man progress on the basis of his family relationship to the ruler. There can be little doubt in this light that dynastic progression took place at Rome during the lifetime of Augustus. In fact, it began with the rise of Octavian/Caesar himself in the wake of Julius Caesar's assassination. The new 'Caesar' was accepted as a major player from the start, not because he was a senior figure in terms of the *cursus honorum*, but because he successfully laid claim to the massive resources of the Julian family, including the men, property and bonds of loyalty accumulated by Julius Caesar.[3] He was able to claim these

as the Roman 'Empire' (ruled by a Roman emperor). Instead, he sought to function as *princeps* and provide a leadership model for other Romans to emulate, whether they were members of his family or not. For the edict in which he offers himself as an *exemplar* to be compared with the heroes represented in his Forum, see Suet. *Aug.* 31.5; cf. Aug. *RG* 8.5. For the edict in which he vows to maintain the state safe and sound and be called the author of the finest state of affairs, see Suet. *Aug.* 28.2; K. Girardet, 'Das Edikt des Imperator Caesar in Suetons Augustusvita 28,2. Politisches Programm und Publikationszeit', *ZPE* 131 (2000) 231-43. D. Wardle, 'Suetonius and Augustus' "Programmatic Edict"', *Rh. Mus.* 148 (2005) 181-201, argues that the edict is essentially irrelevant in constitutional terms. Augustus was not 'restoring the Republic' or creating a 'new order', but looking forward 'to the ultimate fulfilment of his former triumviral role to have put the state on a firm footing' (201).

[3] Aug. *RG* 1.1 (trans. Cooley): 'Aged nineteen years old [44 BC] I mustered an army at my personal decision and at my personal expense, and with it I liberated the state, which had been oppressed by a despotic faction.' Cf. Cic. *Att.* 16.15.3 (Octavian states publicly that he is aspiring to the honours of his father). For the legality of Augustus' behaviour as triumvir, including a period of 'discreetly clouded *continuatio*' from January 31 to January 27 BC, see

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

resources, and thereby dominate the state, because he was Caesar's heir, the new 'Caesar', the new head of Caesar's family.[4] Subsequently, Augustus ruled because of the overwhelming power and image of his family.[5] As Beth Severy has described in detail, the Julian family increasingly became identified with the Roman state in fundamental, practical ways.[6] There was no state bureaucracy as such, so the slaves of the *familia Caesaris* kept records, managed accounts and oversaw business in areas of responsibility which would be classed as 'state' or 'official' today. The distinction between the state treasury and the imperial purse often became blurred, when, for example, contractors were paid, soldiers received benefits, or festivals were staged. The loyalty of the legions to the house of Caesar was, of course, the main foundation stone of Augustus' pre-eminence, and many of the leading generals were either members of the Julian family or trusted *amici*.[7] Under such circumstances, family succession planning had clear dynastic implications for the state. It could hardly be otherwise after the experience of Julius Caesar's heir.

Certainly no definite assertion of (dynastic) Principate over (personal) principate was made. Augustus respectfully chose to emphasise the importance of law and tradition as bases for his rule. This approach protected the *dignitas* of those who assisted the new regime, underlining the importance of republican offices and powers. Yet his ongoing acceptance of fixed-term tasks – something he had been doing since the triumviral period – gradually became little more than his usual method for justifying monarchy;[8]

F. Vervaet, 'In What Capacity Did Caesar Octavianus Restitute the Republic?', in F. Hurlet and B. Mineo (eds), *Le principat d'Auguste: réalités et représentations du pouvoir autour de la res publica restituta* (Rennes 2009) 49-71, esp. 59-70.

4 Cf. Cic. *Phil.* 13.11.24-25 (Antony's sneer that Octavian is a boy who owes everything to a name, viz. '[Julius] Caesar'). Nicolaus of Damascus, who was closely familiar with conditions in Augustan Rome, writes unhesitatingly about the heritability of Caesar's power – specifically his offices and honours – by Octavian (*Caes.* 53; cf. 57, where Octavian decides to adopt a conventional, law-abiding route to his father's honours). For a penetrating narrative, see J. Osgood, *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge 2006) 12-61; cf. Levick, *Augustus: Image and Substance* (Harlow 2010) 23-62; J. Richardson, *Augustan Rome 44 BC to AD 14: The Restoration of the Republic and the Establishment of the Empire* (Edinburgh 2012) 10-47, esp. 16-34.

5 E.g. P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro (Ann Arbor 1988); B. Severy, *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire* (New York and London 2003).

6 Ibid., esp. 140-57.

7 In the famous words of Ov. *Trist.* 4.4.13: *res est publica Caesar* ('Caesar [Augustus] is the state').

8 C. Hjort Lange, *Res Publica Constituta: Actium, Apollo and the Accomplishment of the Triumviral Assignment* (Leiden and Boston 2009); J. Rich, 'Deception, Lies and Economy with the Truth: Augustus and the Establishment of the Principate', in A. Turner, J. Kim On Chong-Gossard and F. Vervaet (eds), *Private and Public Lies: The Discourse of Despotism and Deceit in the Graeco-Roman World* (Leiden and Boston 2010) 167-92.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the autocratic reality was served by much of the evolving ideology;[9] and in the *Res Gestae* Augustus memorably stressed his *auctoritas* ('moral influence') over his *potestas* ('legal power').[10] His professed respect for law and tradition might have stemmed from a genuine attitude, but it was nonetheless a distortion, a concession to those who opposed autocracy. Such opposition was significant, but it fluctuated in strength, and hardly outweighed Augustus' overwhelming support, especially after the decade or so of 'settlements'. It is worth contemplating this support for a moment, because it tends to affect our understanding of the dynamics of succession planning.

Developments in succession planning are normally assigned to Augustus' initiative. In general, this seems justifiable, though it is worth remembering the 'biographical fallacy' identified by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, whereby interpretations conventionally focus on the *princeps* as the prime agent for historical change.[11] It is also worth pointing out that interpretations of relevant developments often assume the 'encroachment model' of Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.2), who describes Augustus seducing the army with bonuses, the people with bread and circuses, the world with peace, and then proceeding to encroach inexorably on prerogatives of the senate and people, eventually

[9] M. Roller, *Constructing Autocracy: Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome* (Princeton and Oxford 2001) 6: '[In the Julio-Claudian period] the emperor was being invented on the fly, through various feats of imagination, as a social figure who related in particular ways to other members of society, and particularly to elites'; cf. 127-287, where it is argued that giving and receiving gifts, and applying authority paradigms (like father and master), were ways of negotiating social relationships with an emperor and even of applying pressure to him. E. Flaig, *Den Kaiser herausfordern. Die Usurpation im Römischen Reich* (Frankfurt and New York 1992), suggests that the Principate had legitimacy, while the individual emperors only had acceptance; id., 'How the Emperor Nero Lost Acceptance in Rome', in B. Ewald and C. Noreña (eds), *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual* (Cambridge and New York 2011) 275-88.

[10] Aug. *RG* 34.3 (trans. Cooley): 'After this time I excelled everyone in influence (*auctoritas*), but I had no more power (*potestas*) than the others who were my colleagues in each magistracy.' On *auctoritas*, see J. Crook, 'Augustus: Power, Authority, Achievement', in A. Bowman, E. Champlin and A. Lintott (eds) *CAH*^{2} 10.113-46, esp. 121-3 (*auctoritas*), 133-40 (ideology); W. Eck, *The Age of Augustus*, 2nd edn, trans. D. Lucas Schneider and R. Daniel (Oxford 2007, orig, 1998) 148; A. Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge 2009) 271-2. Cf. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture* (n. 1) esp. x, where Augustan culture is defined as 'the sum of creative activities during this period', and 10-41, where it is argued that the *auctoritas* of Augustus gave rise to Augustan culture and that the two phenomena shared a reciprocal and mutually reinforcing relationship. In respect of the events of January 27 BC, Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 71, writes that '[i]t was ultimately on the basis of his military power, *imperium*, . . . that Octavian's extra-legal influence, his *auctoritas*, was to rest. If the *imperium* were withdrawn he could still rely on that power, better called by the sinister word *potentia* in this context: soldiers would follow him whatever the Senate said, as they had already shown.'

[11] A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Review: D. Kienast, *Augustus: Prinzeps und Monarch*', *JRS* 75 (1985) 245-50, esp. 247.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wearing down opposition.[12] This is a model in which continuous pressure is applied *by* Augustus, and in which displays of popular support derive from greed, sycophancy or imperial orchestration. Certainly Augustus had unrivalled power to influence public opinion, and to organise public displays, but it has become common to emphasise that he was operating in the midst of a web of relationships, that negotiations of various kinds were taking place, and that the *princeps* was subject to genuine pressures from numerous directions.[13] It was in his interest to take heed of these pressures for the sake of his personal security and power. The shock produced by the civil wars was equation-changing, as were measures affecting the Julian family's relationship with the armies, the senate, the people, and the provinces. Thus there is reason to contemplate a supplementary model, according to which pressure was applied *to* Augustus by supporters who wanted the head of the Julian family to be the head of the state, or who favoured one prospective heir over another. Motives undoubtedly varied. Aside from charismatic elements and imperial patronage, it seems that many people looked upon Julian dominance as the best way to ensure external triumph and internal harmony, or at least relative stability, in place of the old republican system of noble competition and division. The emperor acted as guarantor against renewed civil war, and as time passed he and his family became symbols of state unity.[14] Under such developing circumstances, it would have become increasingly reasonable to contemplate a form of state leadership that could be inherited by a successor of the Julian house. Opposition to Augustus tends to garner a lot of attention, but his support was overwhelming, and it is probable that there was no neat split in attitudes between the elite and the common people, in spite of stereotypical ideas about the people's support for the emperor in response to 'bread and circuses'. 'Supporters' conceivably included senators, *equites* and members of the *populus Romanus* generally. Rome's ordinary citizens could be just as proud of Roman tradition as the elite, and each group showed a readiness to accommodate change under Augustus. Furthermore, individual attitudes undoubtedly evolved and fluctuated through changing circumstances.[15] Augustus would have to lead but also yield, respond but also resist, in his management of the contradictory ideas and pressures of the age.

[12] The influence of the 'encroachment model' may be detected in the work of writers as prominent as Syme, *Roman Revolution* (n. 1) and W.K. Lacey, *Augustus and the Principate: The Evolution of the System* (Leeds 1996), on which see E. Chaplin, *BMCR* (1997) 97.3.35.

[13] On imperial patronage, see R. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge 1982). For ongoing negotiation of power, see Roller, *Constructing Autocracy* (n. 9).

[14] For the emperor as a unifying symbol, see F. Millar, 'State and Subject: The Impact of Monarchy', in F. Millar and E. Segal (eds), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford 1984) 37-60; C. Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 2000) e.g. 206-73 (art); C. Noreña, *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power* (Cambridge 2011).

[15] For opposition to Augustus, see Dio 52.48.8, 54.3.3-4. K. Raaflaub and L. Samons II, 'Opposition to Augustus', in K. Raaflaub and M. Toher (eds), *Between Republic and Empire:*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The constitutional 'settlements' of 27, 23 and 19 BC are often interpreted in relation to concerns about autocracy, whereas the creation of a dynasty tends to be discussed in connection with later events. It seems probable, however, that autocracy and dynasty were linked ideas from the start, and that Augustus always realised, in the wake of Caesar's assassination and his own rise to power, that the senate and people would hold strong views on both ideas. In consequence, he adopted a pose of denial in respect of both.[16] In 27 BC, for instance, he was probably offered the title *Parens Patriae* ('Parent/Father of the Fatherland'), with inherent implications of acceptable autocracy in respect of the *patria*, a traditional formulation of the Roman state.[17] In Greek political thought, the good king behaved as a gentle father, whereas an evil ruler behaved like a violent tyrant. Augustus, however, refused this title, apparently because of its overtly autocratic nature, controversial recent history in connection with Cicero and Caesar, and association with civil conflict, civil war, and the deaths of citizens.[18] It is true that a number of honours later associated intimately with the title *Pater Patriae* were accepted in 27 BC, such as the oak wreath (*corona civica*), conferred for 'saving the lives of citizens'.[19] Yet Augustus resisted explicit characterisation as the father of the state and, in so far as fathers tend to imply families, he likewise set aside the concept of the state as a 'family'.

Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1990) 417-54, argue for limits to the idea of 'opposition'. Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 164-201, esp. 164-79, takes the point about Augustus' support but expands the horizons of 'opposition' in a nuanced discussion. Cf. S. Wilkinson, *Republicanism during the Early Roman Empire* (London 2012) 35-82. For charismatic imperial patronage of the *plebs*, see Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (Oxford 1969) esp. 103-29; P. Veyne, *Bread and Circuses*, intro. O. Murray, trans. B. Pearce (London 1990). For the *plebs* as essentially apolitical, see H. Mouritsen, *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic* (Cambridge 2001). Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic* (Ann Arbor 2002), and R. Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic* (Cambridge 2003), have more generous views of the political engagement and power of the *plebs*.

[16] On the practice of *recusatio*, see Dio 54.10.4, 54.30.1, 55.34.1, 56.43.1-3; Wallace-Hadrill, 'Civilis Princeps: Between Citizen and King', *JRS* 72 (1982) 32-48; T.W. Hillard, 'Augustus and the Evolution of Roman Concepts of Leadership', *Ancient History: Resources for Teachers* (Macquarie University) 38.2 (2008) 107-52, esp. 112-14, 135-43.

[17] T. Stevenson, 'Acceptance of the Title *Pater Patriae* in 2 BC', *Antichthon* 43 (2009) 97-108, esp. 97.

[18] For references and discussion, see Stevenson, 'The Ideal Benefactor and the Father Analogy in Greek and Roman Thought', *CQ* 42.2 (1992) 421-36, esp. 421.

[19] The honours of 27 BC – specifically the name 'Augustus', the oak wreath and the laurel branches flanking the door of his house on the Palatine – appeared subsequently in both public and private art. *Aes* coinage of 23-19 BC bore images of these honours in place of the usual portraits of gods. Cf. *EJ* p. 45 (date); Aug. *RG* 34.2; Ov. *Fast.* 1.614; *Trist.* 3.1.36-48; Vell. Pat. 2.91.1; Suet. *Aug.* 7.2; Dio 53.16.4, 6-8; Rich (ed. with trans. and comm.), *Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement (Roman History 53-55.9)* (Warminster 1990) ad loc.; Cooley, *Res Gestae* (n. 10) 262-71.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Instead, he opted to express his pre-eminence through the office of consul and the authority of *maius imperium*.[20]

Nevertheless, Augustus soon set about promoting his family and creating lines of succession, though he was at first circumspect about the political implications of his succession planning. Two points seem fundamental. First, Augustus was vitally concerned with descent by blood.[21] Second, in contrast to republican practice, which often cast a wide net for suitable marriage partners, Augustus constructed a string of endogamous marriages within the imperial family. These had the effect of elevating the family's profile and of making it a unified focus for attention and loyalty. The crucial constraint was that he had no son of his own blood and would not, for personal and political reasons, divorce Livia. From his marriage to Scribonia he had a daughter Julia (b. 39 BC). Tiberius (b. 42 BC) and Drusus (b. 38 BC), the sons of Livia, were not related to Augustus by blood. In consequence, Augustus turned first to Agrippa, his friend, and Marcellus, his nephew. Agrippa was a direct contemporary whose family background was clearly inferior (see, for example, Suet. *Calig.* 23). These traits were not ideal, but dynastic marriages, high-profile appointments, and an extravagant building programme in the city would keep Agrippa in the public eye throughout the rest of his life.[22] In 28 BC he married Marcella, daughter of Augustus' sister Octavia.[23] Marcellus (b. 42 BC), the brother of Marcella, married his cousin Julia in 25 BC.[24] Agrippa presided over the ceremony when Augustus was detained in Spain due to illness (Dio 53.27.5). It was obviously important to the *princeps* that the teenagers should be married without delay. Marcellus was soon awarded a ten-year advance in the *cursus honorum*, so that he would probably have become consul in 19 or 18 BC, at the age of 23 or 24 (Dio 53.28.3-4). This certainly looks like a dynastic honour because Marcellus, unlike Agrippa, had no spectacular achievements to his name. He was promoted simply because of his family connection as nephew and son-in-law of Augustus and brother-in-law of Agrippa. The 'Theatre of Marcellus', funded by Augustus, was apparently an attempt to raise his public profile in line with his dynastic importance.[25]

[20] Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 59-61 argues that the initial concentration was on Augustus himself, rather than on his family.

[21] Eck, *Age of Augustus* (n. 10) 157: 'When it came to the descent of his line of blood the behaviour of Augustus could almost be described as obsessive.'

[22] For the building programme, see Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 93.

[23] Suet. *Aug.* 63.1; Plut. *Ant.* 87.2; Dio 53.1-2.

[24] M. Clark, *Augustus, First Roman Emperor: Power, Propaganda and the Politics of Survival* (Exeter 2010) 131: 'Julia would have had no expectation of being able to choose her own husband.'

[25] Suet. *Aug.* 29.4; Dio 53.30.5; D. Favro, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge 1996) 115-17, 162-4. Vergil created his own monument to Marcellus by ending his parade of future Romans in the *Aeneid* (6.860-886) with Marcellus' untimely death.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In late 24 or early 23 BC an attempt was made to invoke Marcellus' authority in a way that clearly implied a dynastic interpretation of the succession planning. At the trial of M. Primus, a former proconsul of Macedonia, the defendant was accused of attacking the Odrysai beyond the borders of his province without having gained authorisation first. Primus countered with the claim that he had in fact received authorisation not only from Augustus, but from Marcellus as well.[26] The *princeps* subsequently denied the claim, but whether or not it was true, it must have had some credibility, which means that Primus was invoking the political consequences of succession arrangements within the Julian family in so far as he understood them. His emphasis on Marcellus might have tallied with general suspicion rather than intimate knowledge. When Augustus fell gravely ill in this year, he passed state papers to his fellow-consul Piso, and his signet ring to Agrippa, who was thereby empowered to take over the business of the Julian family.[27] Augustus was evidently keen to stress that he had made no overt 'dynastic' plans for Marcellus to succeed him. After his eventual recovery, he even offered to have his will read aloud in the senate.[28]

Several questions arise about the contents of this will. If Augustus had died suddenly, how had he planned to accommodate Agrippa and Marcellus in order to avoid a repeat of the conflict which had broken out between Antony and Octavian/Caesar following the assassination of Julius Caesar? The act of giving over his signet ring seems to imply that Augustus had named Agrippa as his heir in his will (cf. Val. Max. 7.8.5). This was a good move in the circumstances. Agrippa was formidable, ambitious and conspicuously loyal, though dwarfed by the family prestige of Augustus.[29] His resources would have been huge when his own estates were combined with those of Augustus. He would have had more than enough money, for instance, to pay the legions. Furthermore, the naming of Agrippa as heir would have undercut objections to the 'dynastic' elevation of Marcellus. Thus, it is doubtful that his role would have been that of a caretaker or regent, who might at some point step aside, even though a son of Marcellus and Julia would have been a direct descendant of Augustus. Ann Kuttner suggests that Augustus might have used testamentary adoption to consolidate Agrippa's position as the new 'Caesar'.[30] This seems reasonable, though it would have been a move tinged with controversy, given the fragile nature of testamentary adoption and the civil war associations of testamentary adoption of a new

[26] Dio 54.3.2-4 (who dates the trial to 22 BC); Eck, *Age of Augustus* (n. 10) 62-3; Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 81-2, 175-7. A defence of Dio's date is given by Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 103-4.

[27] Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.2; Suet. *Aug.* 28.1; Dio 53.30.1-3; Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 83.

[28] Dio 53.31.1-4; cf. Crook, 'Power, Authority, Achievement' (n. 10) 84-5; Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 69; Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 83.

[29] Vell. Pat. 2.79.1; Dio 53.27.1-4, 54.29.

[30] A. Kuttner, *Dynasty and Empire in the Age of Augustus: The Case of the Boscoreale Cups* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford 1995) 182-3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'Caesar'.[31] On the other hand, it would have been far more contentious to adopt Marcellus as the new 'Caesar', far more 'dynastic' in character and evocative of Augustus' own experience. The *princeps* apparently refrained from doing so, given his willingness to share the contents of his will.[32]

Augustus and Agrippa undoubtedly wanted to consolidate their power in the event of Augustus' premature death. Further consolidation would be served best by Julian succession. This would require Agrippa, as matters currently stood, to adopt Marcellus as heir of the next generation. Augustus and Agrippa might well have written their wills together. If Agrippa were to secure the succession of Marcellus as a Julian, this would negate any suggestion that Augustus had 'monarchically' created a dynasty over the heads of the senate and people.[33] There could obviously be no guarantees for Augustus' wishes, if he were to predecease Agrippa, but this was one of the most important reasons for using Agrippa in this way. It meant that Augustus was no monarch.[34]

In formal terms, of course, there was no office of state to pass on, but in the wake of these events Augustus stopped taking consecutive consulships and began to advertise his *tribunicia potestas*, even though his patrician status prevented him from taking the actual office as a tribune of the plebs.[35] Gruen rightly stresses the significance of this development: here was power without office, power for someone who had no need to stand for office, a distinctly non-republican concept.[36] In combination with *maius imperium*, *tribunicia potestas* denoted ongoing autocratic pre-eminence without identifying autocracy explicitly. Gruen argues that the distinction was a personal one for the *princeps*. Augustus, however, was simultaneously an individual and the head of a family whose dynastic potential had already been proven in the wake of Caesar's assassination. It is well to remember the dictum of Fergus Millar, who wrote that the events of 27 and 23 BC moved

[31] H. Lindsay, *Adoption in the Roman World* (Cambridge and New York 2009) 79-86, 182-9.

[32] Cf. Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 84: 'It would have been the omission of the requirement [for Marcellus] to take the name Julius Caesar that made it possible to offer to open the will.'

[33] On Marcellus and Agrippa, see Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 68-77. Eck, *Age of Augustus* (n. 10) 151, thinks that the reading of the will would have been aimed reassuringly at Augustus' supporters, above all Agrippa himself, rather than at opponents or potential opponents. Cf. Clark, *Augustus, First Roman Emperor* (n. 24) 132, who thinks that Agrippa was elevated because he 'had evidently been annoyed by Marcellus' prominence.'

[34] Friction between Agrippa and Marcellus would not surprise under such circumstances, though evidence for it probably derives largely from uninformed attempts to interpret Agrippa's speedy departure for the East after Augustus' recovery in 23 BC: Vell. Pat. 2.93.2; Plin. *NH* 7.149; Tac. *Ann.* 14.53, 14.55; Suet. *Aug.* 66.3; *Tib.* 10.1 (comparing Agrippa's withdrawal to that of Tiberius in 6 BC over friction with Gaius Caesar); Dio 53.32.1; Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 86 ('absurd').

[35] *EJ* p. 36 (*Fasti Cap.*); Aug. *RG* 10.1; Tac. *Ann.* 3.56; Dio 53.32.5; Rich, *Cassius Dio* (n. 19) ad loc.; Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 84-6.

[36] Gruen, 'Augustus' (n. 2) 40.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Roman state in the direction of monarchy, not away from it, and he added that no one at the time really thought otherwise.[37]

Marcellus' death, late in 23 BC, curtailed this first round of planning. After an appropriate period of mourning, Agrippa married Julia, the daughter of Augustus and widow of Marcellus, in 21 BC.[38] Tiberius married Vipsania, Agrippa's daughter by his first marriage to Caecilia Attica, the daughter of Atticus, Cicero's great friend (Nep. *Att.* 19.4). These marriages appear to confirm Agrippa's primacy. Soon, however, the limits of Augustus' autocracy were tested (and ultimately confirmed) again. In 19 BC, following his return to the city from campaigns abroad, the people of Rome evidently became concerned because their champion no longer seemed to possess consular *imperium* inside the city. This permitted the superficial conclusion that the *princeps* was less powerful than the consuls in Rome. Consequently, the people agitated to ensure that Augustus was given certain prerogatives of a consul for life without the office. In particular, he was permitted to sit between the two consuls on public occasions, thereby making it plain that he was not overshadowed by them (Dio 54.10.4-7). Lacey saw this as the beginning of the Principate, while Gruen describes it as essentially another honour related to Augustus' personal pre-eminence, so that only the *princeps* was meant to benefit.[39] The point about these developments, however, is that challenges were met in ways which resulted in strengthened autocracy, and Augustus' autocracy was based on the resources of a family far more powerful than those of the republican era. In the next few years, a less circumspect attitude to both his own power and that of his family can be described. Discontent became less about the old Republic and more about rival groups supporting prospective successors.[40]

Agrippa had acquired proconsular *imperium* in 23 BC. In 18 BC he received *tribunicia potestas*, and probably also *maius imperium*, for five years.[41] In later imperial times, the receipt of *tribunicia potestas* was one means by which a successor to the emperor was marked out. Gruen doubts that this meaning applies here. Augustus shared his powers but remained

[37] Millar, 'Triumvirate and Principate', *JRS* 63 (1973) 50-67, esp. 50.

[38] Plut. *Ant.* 87.4; Dio 54.6.5.

[39] Lacey, '19 BC', *Classicum* 23 (1983) 30-5, esp. 35; Lacey, *Augustus and the Principate* (n. 12) 153; Gruen, 'Augustus' (n. 2) 43. Crook, 'Power, Authority, Achievement' (n. 10) 92, distinguishes between 'honour' and 'power' in respect of the measures of 19 BC. Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 90, writes that '[t]his was the turning point in the Augustan Principate, a victory for the Princeps that changed his relationship with the Commonwealth and its leading members . . . it means that he was no longer on the attack, using every means to entrench himself; his future efforts went towards consolidation'; cf. 168 ('19 is a good place for the definitive "start" of the Principate, when relations settled into a stable pattern.').

[40] Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 180. For the development of the idea of the *domus Augusta*, see Wardle, 'Valerius Maximus on the *Domus Augusta*, Augustus and Tiberius', *CQ* 50 (2000) 479-93, esp. 479-80; Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 214-18.

[41] Aug. *RG* 6.2; Tac. *Ann.* 3.56; Dio 54.12.4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unchallenged in a unique position.[42] Yet Agrippa now wielded *maius imperium* and *tribunicia potestas* and would continue to hold them in the event of Augustus' death. He was both an outstanding individual and a close relative of Augustus. The scale of his achievements effectively meant that he never received honours simply because he was related to Augustus, but this hardly implies that he did not also represent the dynasty. He was the principal heir, married to Julia, and by this stage the father of a son, Gaius Caesar, born in 20 BC.[43] In 17 BC Julia gave birth to a second son, Lucius Caesar, and Augustus promptly adopted the two boys.[44] This development is crucial. Now, unequivocally, Augustus had sons of his blood, heirs who, unlike Marcellus, could be given the name Julius Caesar. Such adoption of grandsons as infants was quite extraordinary, and seems to underline the dynastic implications.[45] If the method was innovative, however, the basic principles remained the same. The new arrangement emphasised the importance of blood descent, but it also increased the unity and solidarity of the imperial family. Agrippa could no longer be principal heir, but rather than being superseded, Augustus was drawing him closer, along with his two sons.[46] The *princeps* was redefining the Roman family with these endogamous marriages and adoptions. He was covering the current generation and the next.[47] Agrippa would not have been a 'regent' as such, given the close family ties, but the adoptions obviously had inheritance implications.[48] This need not involve a sense of loss or usurpation. Agrippa was co-operating and being honoured by the adoptions. He was placing himself in the position of having supplied the *princeps* of the future. It was now not so important to thwart potential charges that Augustus was creating a monarchy. It was, however, important to shepherd his sons to the point where they could manage the monarchic power of their adoptive father. Agrippa would stand ready to support the boys, particularly Gaius Caesar, until they reached suitable levels of maturity and experience. From that point, Gaius could take over. Agrippa would bow to the claims that blood succession and adoption gave to his sons. Yet he was their natural father, part of the *domus Augusta*, and the perception would probably have been that he had been elevated rather than demoted through the process. The adoptions are innovative, eye-catching, promotional, and reinforcing of the dynasty. They would not have created a potential problem or risked giving offence to Agrippa. They are reassuring, a firm statement to all. Given that Agrippa would not feel

[42] Gruen, 'Augustus' (n. 2) 43.

[43] Dio 54.12.4; Crook, 'Power, Authority, Achievement' (n. 10) 92; Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 70.

[44] Vell. Pat. 2.96.1; Tac. *Ann.* 1.3; Suet. *Aug.* 96.1; Dio 54.18.2.

[45] Galinsky, *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor* (Cambridge 2012) 129.

[46] Clark, *Augustus, First Roman Emperor* (n. 24) 132: '[The adoptions] strengthened his bond with Agrippa.'

[47] Eck, *Age of Augustus* (n. 10) 152, writes of an 'elegant, two-generation solution'.

[48] Gruen, 'Augustus' (n. 2) 44 (wrong to label Agrippa as 'regent').

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

threatened by his natural sons, it was probably intended from the start that Gaius and Lucius Caesar would receive accelerated promotion. Meanwhile, the sons of Livia, Tiberius and Drusus, also received dynastic advancement. They too were intermarried with the families of Augustus and Agrippa.[49] The Julian family's hold on power was dynastically assured into the next generation. Severy thinks that the moral legislation of 19-17 BC saw Augustus take on a fatherly role in respect of his fellow-citizens. In ensuing years, the paternal character of his rule and the public profile of his family would receive enhanced emphasis.[50]

In 13 BC Augustus returned to Rome from campaigns in the West. Tiberius served as consul and, as can be seen from the coinage, promoted public adulation of Gaius and Lucius Caesar.[51] The reliefs of the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, decreed by the senate in 13 BC and dedicated in 9 BC, stress symbiosis between the Julian family and the state.[52] The north and south sides represent the procession of the senate (on the north) and the Julian family (on the south) in a parallel, balanced way. Yet there is a significant intersection. Aeneas is shown sacrificing on the south-west side. Heroic progenitor of the Julian family, Aeneas operates in the presence of the *penates* brought to Italy from Troy and subsequently bequeathed to the Roman state through Aeneas' son Iulus.[53] The figure of Augustus on the south, unfortunately badly damaged, is shown in precisely the same pose as Aeneas and in precisely the same activity, namely sacrifice.[54] The senate operates in the context of Julian prominence on a monument commissioned by the senate. Augustus is the heir to Aeneas' legacy; his sacral headship covers both family and state. Like Aeneas, Augustus stands in a paternal relationship to both his family and the state – at the formal suggestion of the senate (cf. *RG* 12.2), it would appear.

Further evidence for such symbiosis is available. Marcus Lepidus, the former triumvir, had died in 13 BC. Among other things, this meant that the

[49] Tiberius married Agrippa's daughter Vipsania c. 19 BC, and Drusus married Augustus' niece Antonia c. 16 BC: Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford 1987) 314; Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 64.

[50] Ibid. 59-61. For prayers at the Secular Games for 'myself, my house, [and] my family', see Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 126.

[51] For *denarii* of 13 BC bearing portraits of Julia with Gaius and Lucius Caesar, see Galinsky, *Augustan Culture* (n. 45) 124, fig. 18.

[52] Aug. *RG* 12.2 (trans. Cooley): 'When I returned to Rome from Spain and Gaul, having settled affairs successfully in these provinces, in the consulship of Tiberius Nero and Publius Quintilius [13 BC], the senate decreed that an Altar of Augustan Peace should be consecrated in thanks for my return on the field of Mars, and ordered magistrates and priests and Vestal Virgins to perform an annual sacrifice there.' Zanker, *Power of Images* (n. 5) 215-30 sees the Ara Pacis as a pictorial representation of Augustus' succession plans following Agrippa's death in 12 BC.

[53] Galinsky (ed.), *Companion to the Age of Augustus* (n. 2) 109, fig. 43.

[54] Ibid. 143, fig. 58. For the same pose, see J. Pollini, *The Portraiture of Gaius and Lucius Caesar* (New York 1987) 298; Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 107.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

office of *pontifex maximus* was now vacant, for Lepidus had done a deal with Antony to secure the post for himself in the wake of Caesar's assassination. In 12 BC Augustus was made *pontifex maximus* in dramatic fashion. He tells us in the tenth chapter of his *Res Gestae* that a huge multitude turned out from all over Italy to ensure his election to the chief pontificate.[55] This multitude evidently thought that the office of *pontifex maximus* was especially appropriate to the head of the Julian family because the most holy *sacra* ('sacred objects') possessed by the Roman state were also Julian objects, associated above all with the Trojan prince Aeneas, who had brought them to Italy from the sack of Troy. Aeneas, of course, was the father of Ascanius, also known as Iulus, and by this means the ancestor of the Julian family. These objects included the Palladium, a wooden statuette of Pallas Athena, the *penates* ('store-cupboard gods') of the house of Troy, whose images were kept in a small box shaped like a temple, and the *fascinus*, an erect phallus which featured in several rituals of the Vestal Virgins. In fact, the *sacra* were cared for by the Vestals, who were in turn supervised by the *pontifex maximus*, rather like the father of a Roman family supervising his daughters in family worship. A *pontifex maximus* from the Julian family, therefore, was able in a unique way to unite state worship with Julian family worship. The sacral headship of Augustus was such that he occupied a paternal role in respect of both the Julian family and the state. The state *sacra* were Julian *sacra*, and vice versa. For their part, the citizens of Rome stood in some sense as dependants of the head of the Julian family. Even during Lepidus' lifetime, Augustus had broadcast his close connection with the cult of the Vestals, designating part of his house on the Palatine as public property and causing a shrine of Vesta to be constructed there. The ritual symbolism was all about concordance between the Julian family and the state under Augustus' headship. The great display of consensus (cf. *RG* 10.2) amounted to an insistence that the state should be aligned with the Julian family in a way which surely promoted ideas of a dynasty, given that the next father of the family would be the next priest of the state *sacra*.[56]

[55] Aug. *RG* 10.2 (trans. Cooley): 'I rejected the idea that I should become chief priest [*pontifex maximus*] as a replacement for my colleague [Lepidus] during his lifetime, even though the people were offering me this priesthood, which my father had held. After several years, on the eventual death of the man who had taken the opportunity of civil unrest to appropriate it, I did accept this priesthood; from the whole of Italy a crowd, such as it is said had never before been at Rome, flooded together for my election, in the consulship of Publius Sulpicius and Gaius Valgius [12 BC].' It is hard to resist the impression of orchestration, but this would mean that a great display of consensus (achieved via an election) was deemed important, since family and state headships were being extraordinarily linked on essentially dynastic grounds ('priesthood, which my father had held'). *Fast. Maff.*, *Praen.* and *Fer. Cum.* (*EJ* p. 47 = *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.74, 121, 279, 420); Ov. *Fast.* 3.415-28; Dio 54.27.2 (dating to 13 BC).

[56] Lacey, *Augustus and the Principate* (n. 12) 169-89, describes penetration by Augustus into Roman family worship rather than pressure for him to assume the office of *pontifex maximus* and thereby exercise pivotal authority over both state and family worship. For Augustus as *pontifex maximus*, see G. Bowersock, 'The Pontificate of Augustus', in Raaflaub and Toher

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Additional developments in the city between 12 and 2 BC re-inforce this transformation. The first was the re-organisation of the city into 265 *vici* ('neighbourhoods'), a reform which was complete by 7 BC and which showed Augustus' ongoing concern for order and stability in the city. Next followed a dramatic set of changes to worship at the *compita* ('crossroads altars'), which served as the central foci of these neighbourhoods.[57] Instead of honouring the *Lares Compitales* as before, the magistrates in charge of the various altars began to worship the *Lares Augusti* ('guardian spirits/ancestors of Augustus') and the *Genius Augusti* ('procreative spirit of Augustus'), as though Augustus was clearly the state's father in sacral terms.[58] This seems to be the very type of worship that a Roman father could expect from dependants within his home. It appears that those engaged in compital worship, including large numbers of Rome's freedmen and poor, were assimilating their activities as closely as they could to worship within the Julian family. These groups, who had previously lacked prominence, could well have generated the change in worship voluntarily. Worship of the *Lares Augusti* and the *Genius Augusti* would have been natural for people who already saw Augustus as their father. The *princeps* apparently accommodated their desires, incorporating them into his regime in a striking new way.

Agrippa's death in 12 BC changed the dynamics of the regime fundamentally.[59] Augustus faced two immediate problems: (1) Gaius and Lucius were not ready to become his heirs, for they were as yet too young, and (2) Agrippa's role as the ostensible arbiter of succession was lost. The solution was, in effect, to find a substitute for Agrippa. Accordingly, in 11 BC, after an appropriate interval of mourning, Julia was compelled to marry Tiberius, whose wife Vipsania was suddenly without political significance in the wake of her father's death. Suetonius (*Tib.* 7) claims that the new marriage turned sour after the death of a child in infancy. Gruen points out that Tiberius did not receive Agrippa's *maius imperium* or *tribunicia potestas*. His conclusion is that Tiberius was no more a successor on the state level than Agrippa had been.[60] Yet Agrippa did not receive *tribunicia potestas* until some years after he had married Julia (21 to 18 BC). This helped to maintain a respectful distinction between family and state, while not affecting or denying the practical reality. Tiberius' position was modelled on that of Agrippa, but he would not have been named as principal heir in the

(eds), *Between Republic and Empire* (n. 15) 380-94; Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 99-104.

[57] Dio 55.8.6-7; P. Swan, *The Augustan Succession: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 55-56 (9 BC–AD 14)* (Oxford 2004) 78-82.

[58] On compital worship and the *Lares Augusti*, see Lacey, *Augustus and the Principate* (n. 12) 169-89; Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 118-31; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 144-5.

[59] Dio 54.28.2-5, 54.29.6; *EJ* p. 366.

[60] Gruen, 'Augustus' (n. 2) 45.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

princeps' will.[61] His job in the event of Augustus' sudden death would have been to shepherd Gaius and Lucius Caesar to power. The armies commanded by Tiberius and his brother Drusus at the time were key. Tiberius' marriage to Julia meant political advancement for him and consolidation of the primacy of the extended family which held sway over the state. Moreover, Drusus was promoted to help. Suetonius (*Claud.* 1.5) says that Drusus was cast as Augustus' heir equally with Gaius and Lucius. There was perhaps no formal basis for this statement, but it is undoubtedly based, as always, on blood relations. Drusus was married to Antonia, daughter of Mark Antony and Octavia, Augustus' sister. His sons, Germanicus and Claudius, therefore, had an indirect blood link to the *princeps*.[62] Tiberius would have understood these blood lines and their implications perfectly. When Drusus died on campaign in 9 BC, his role in the dynasty was lost, and pressure on Tiberius gradually began to mount from supporters of the two princes.

His behaviour at first, however, was impeccable. In 8 BC Gaius Caesar was given early exposure to the army. The Rhine legions, which were under the command of Tiberius, received a bonus in Gaius' name. Then, in 6 BC, Tiberius received the *maius imperium* and *tribunicia potestas* which had previously been given to Agrippa. He was clearly the second man in the empire. Soon, however, he withdrew dramatically – and still mysteriously – to Rhodes.[63] Scholars have often interpreted this move as a jealous reaction to accelerated honours for Gaius and Lucius, who had recently (on initiative from the senate and people) been designated to the consulship once they attained adulthood.[64] Their consulships at about age 19 would directly parallel the experience of Augustus himself.[65] The dynastic implications of

[61] For Tiberius as 'ersatz Agrippa', see Bleicken, *Augustus: eine Biographie* (Berlin 1998) 365; cf. Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 98 ('Augustus was mimicking his own progress in 23 BC ... Tiberius was the new Agrippa.').

[62] Suet. *Claud.* 1.6; Dio 54.35.6.

[63] Vell. Pat. 2.99.1-2; Tac. *Ann.* 1.53.1, 6.51.1-2; Suet. *Tib.* 10.1-11.1, 5; Dio 55.9.5-8; Swan, *The Augustan Succession* (n. 57) 86-8. Eck, *Age of Augustus* (n. 10) 153, believes 'we will never know for certain just what happened', while Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 163, writes that '[w]e simply cannot know what motivated this action of Tiberius in 6 B.C.E.'

[64] Dio 55.9. Eck, *Age of Augustus* (n. 10) 153, thinks that the honours for Tiberius represent a failed attempt to combat Tiberius' jealousy: 'It was already too late.' Clark, *Augustus, First Roman Emperor* (n. 24) 143 believes 'it was clear he would be moved aside in favour of Gaius and Lucius Caesar . . . [and that he despaired of his own] fundamentally subordinate position.' Galinsky, *Augustus* (n. 45) 129, writes that '[i]t didn't take much for Tiberius to conclude that he was merely warming the seat for Gaius.' Cf. Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 146.

[65] Aug. *RG* 14.1-2 (trans. Cooley): '[1] My sons, whom fortune took from me when young men, Gaius and Lucius Caesars, the senate and people of Rome appointed as consuls when they were fourteen years old, as a way of honouring me, on the understanding that they should enter upon the magistracy five years later; and the senate decreed that from the day on which they were brought into the forum they should take part in the councils of state. [2] Moreover the Roman equestrians (*equites*) all together presented each of them with silver shields and spears and hailed each of them as leader of the youth (*princeps iuventutis*).'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

such designation, based solely on family connection, are obvious and dramatically at variance with the operation of the traditional *res publica*. The two boys were to hold the highest executive office in the state, despite the fact that they were quite plainly not proven performers like Agrippa or Tiberius. Although Augustus says that this was done 'as a way of honouring me' (*RG* 14.1), the foregrounding of Gaius and Lucius Caesar amounts to something beyond a personal honour for Augustus and surely has implications for the maintenance of Julian family power after his death. Gaius received envoys from the provinces, assuring him of their loyalty. Inscriptions from southern Spain and Asia Minor reveal that the annual oath sworn to Augustus was expanded to include Gaius and Lucius.[66] Here were moves with clear succession implications. Gruen, by contrast, sees these events occurring the other way around, so that Tiberius' departure for Rhodes forced Augustus to conceive the extraordinary measures for Gaius and Lucius Caesar.[67] Yet Tiberius' withdrawal can hardly have been a simple reaction to the promotion of Gaius and Lucius, if the aim had long been to accelerate their progression through the *cursus*. Surely, too, he could not have suddenly perceived his inferior claims to ultimate power. Ideas of familial dynasty and succession to Augustus' authority were plainly on the table, but the problem was probably not the elevation of Gaius and Lucius as such. He was more likely spurred by a protest against the role that he was to play in Augustus' succession planning in the wake of his receipt of *imperium maius* and *tribunicia potestas*. Some elements among the people responded by casting votes at the consular elections for Gaius Caesar, though he was only fourteen. After heavy negotiation, Gaius' designation to the consulship was put off for five years, as mentioned above. Tiberius was humiliated by supporters of Gaius, who expressed their distrust and dislike of him. Alternatively, or in addition, though he had for some years played a dutiful family role in promoting Gaius and Lucius, the receipt of these new powers meant that he was, until their expiry, more openly the arbiter of dynastic succession, more openly complicit in a monarchic reality. The implications evidently did not sit as comfortably with him as they had done with Agrippa.[68]

Over the next few years, Augustus was quite open about the question of succession. In 5 BC Gaius Caesar received the *toga virilis* ('toga of manhood') at 15 years of age from the hand of his father Augustus, who had assumed the consulship for the occasion.[69] In 2 BC Lucius Caesar received his

[66] For references and discussion, see Eck, *Age of Augustus* (n. 10) 156; Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 183-4.

[67] Gruen, 'Augustus' (n. 2) 46.

[68] For an excellent discussion, see Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 181-3. Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 148, emphasises in this connection that Agrippa and Tiberius 'belonged to different generations', so that the slight for Tiberius over the succession would have been more obvious and hurtful.

[69] Aug. *RG* 14.1-2; 15.2; Ov. *Fast.* 3.771-90; Dio 55.9.9-10; Swan, *The Augustan Succession* (n. 57) 88-91; Cooley, *Res Gestae* (n. 10) 172; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 150.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

toga virilis, once again from the hand of Augustus as consul.[70] The setting for the latter ceremony was the new Forum of Augustus, which – in view of the representations of Julius Caesar, Aeneas, Romulus, Julian ancestors, and Augustus himself (as *Pater Patriae*) in the centre of the complex – ranks solidly as a dynastic monument. It implies not just the primacy of Augustus or Julian leadership of the Roman state, but incorporation of the state's achievement into that of the Julian family. Opened at the beginning of 2 BC, it promotes the ongoing, fundamental influence of the Julian family, not just of Augustus himself, in Roman history. Such a close association blurs the distinction between family and state, or perhaps even amplifies the intensity of the message about the state's reliance on the Julian family.[71] On receipt of their togas of manhood, both boys were given the title *princeps iuventutis* ('leader of the youth'), which was plainly a generational mirror of Augustus' title *princeps senatus* ('leader of the senate/body of old men').[72] The generations were covered (cf. Ov. *Ars am.* 1.194).

In the same year, Augustus accepted the title *Pater Patriae* ('Father of the Fatherland'), the honour with which he concludes his *Res Gestae* (35.1). Augustus implies that the offer of the title took him by surprise and that his resistance to it was finally broken down by elaborate approaches and rituals in which the senate, the *equites* and the people all took prominent roles (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 58.1-2). When confronted by a great, and obviously orchestrated, display of consensus in the senate, the *princeps* apparently dissolved into tears and accepted the inevitable: he had at last brought civil concord to the formerly ruptured *res publica*.[73] The words of Messalla Corvinus, who spoke

[70] Aug. *RG* 14.1-2; Suet. *Aug.* 26.2; Dio 55.9.10; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 153. Cf. Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 165: 'In 2 B.C.E., Augustus became the father of two adult sons.'

[71] Interpretations of the Forum Augustum vary widely and not everyone sees emphasis on the Julian family. T.J. Luce, 'Livy, Augustus, and the Forum Augustum', in Raaflaub and Toher (eds), *Between Republic and Empire* (n. 15) 123-38 at 125, concludes that 'the Forum Augustum was an amalgam of personal and public elements, with pronounced emphasis on the personal.' Crook, 'Power, Authority, Achievement' (n. 10) 102, however, believes that '[the] emphasis [of the Augustan Forum] is, actually, not so much on the 'divine family' (and we may be inclined to guess why not) as on victory and the long, successful tale of Roman imperialism.' Galinsky, *Augustan Culture* (n. 1) 197-213, emphasises polysemy and (on 208) 'a network of associations that relate in various ways to Augustus himself.' Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 167, sees a 'combination of public and private historical references, rituals, and imagery within this new civic space [which] presented Augustus as the ultimate *pater*.' Cf. Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 217-18; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 154-6.

[72] Aug. *RG* 14.2; Dio 54.9.9.

[73] Aug. *RG* 35.1 (trans. Cooley): 'When I was holding my thirteenth consulship [2 BC], the senate and equestrian order and people of Rome all together hailed me as father of the fatherland, and decreed that this title should be inscribed in the forecourt of my house and in the Julian senate house and in the Augustan forum under the chariot, which was set up in my honour by senatorial decree.'Cf. *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.119, 407 (*Fast. Praen.*); Ov. *Fast.* 2.119-44; Suet. *Aug.* 58.1-2; Dio 55.10.10. Augustus' tears: Suet. *Aug.* 58.2. On the events of 2 BC, see Dio 55.10.1-16; Crook, 'Power, Authority, Achievement' (n. 10) 101-4; Lacey, *Augustus and the Principate* (n. 12) 190-209; Swan, *The Augustan Succession* (n. 57) 91-110; Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 91-2, 185-7; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 153-61.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for the senate, tend to re-inforce the dynastic associations: 'May good fortune and prosperity attend you and your house (*domus*), Caesar Augustus.'[74] Although he lived for another sixteen years, Augustus, who was approaching his climacteric sixty-third year (Gell. *NA* 15.7.3), presents this honour as the high point of his life. It did not, however, come out of the blue. David Wardle (in a forthcoming commentary on Suetonius' *Life of Augustus*) has found a few inscriptions from adjacent years which name Augustus *Pater* (or *Parens*) *Patriae*, as though momentum for the eventual honour of 2 BC had been building for some time beforehand.[75] Augustus wanted to signal the demise of concerns about his autocracy and to advertise his family. There was no new readiness at Rome to accept a Julian dynasty. It was the pre-existing readiness, adapted to the changing circumstances provided by Augustus' climacteric year, the coming of age of Lucius Caesar, and perhaps the proconsular *imperium* which would soon be given to Gaius Caesar for an important campaign in the East (Dio 55.18).

The autocratic and dynastic implications of these developments are obvious, since Roman fathers held supreme power and were succeeded by male heirs. Augustus was proceeding at will. These were years in which the Roman state and the Julian family were becoming conceptually and practically closer under the paternal headship of Augustus, who, as *pater* of the Julian family, would be succeeded in the usual way by his male heir upon his death. It is not always accepted that the title *Pater Patriae* carried significance beyond the symbolic, but it seems better to adopt a more holistic approach to Augustus' authority and to contemplate the new honour acting in conjunction with, for example, grants of *imperium* in the ongoing negotiation of Augustus' principate.[76] Given the substantial overlaps in personnel, resources, and sacred ritual between the Julian family and the Roman state, paternal and familial symbolism was not merely 'honorific' or frivolous.[77]

[74] Wardle, *A Commentary on Suetonius' Life of Augustus* (forthcoming) on Suet. *Aug.* 58.2, thinks that although the form *domus Augusta* is not attested before AD 19, it might arguably be traced back to these words of Messalla; cf. Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 213-31.

[75] Wardle's commentary (n. 74) reads (on Suet. *Aug.* 58.1) in part: 'Dio states generally (55.10.10) that "previously he was called [*Pater Patriae*] without a vote"; in 8/7 the Sedunni in the Alps commemorated him as *Pater Patriae* (*CIL* 12.136); a milestone from Urgavo in Baetica calls him *Pater Patriae* in 6/5 (*CIL* 2.2107); at Pompeii on the temple of *Fortuna Augusta* (*CIL* 10.823) and in Pisidian Antioch (*CIL* 3.6803) he is *Parens Patriae*.' I thank David Wardle sincerely for allowing me to read part of his manuscript in draft form.

[76] Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4), expresses the significance of the *Pater Patriae* title admirably, e.g. 92 ('[*Pater Patriae*] came close to implying a supreme *auctoritas*, virtually emancipating Augustus from the restrictions of the defined powers that had been conferred on him'); 204 ('Psychologically, without conferring the formal *potestas* of a father, [*Pater Patriae*] put Augustus into a parental relationship with all his fellow-citizens no matter how eminent'). Also on the significance of *Pater Patriae*, see M. Strothmann, *Augustus: Vater der Res Publica* (Stuttgart 2000), whose treatment is wonderfully comprehensive but somewhat too formulaic and neat in describing evolution through phases governed successively by the ideas of *restitutio*, *saeculum*, and *pater patriae*.

[77] For the importance of Julian resources to Augustus, see Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) esp. 140-57.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pater Patriae did not simply derive from honorific epithets for founders and saviours in earlier Roman history.[78] It evidently implied a congenial (non-tyrannical) type of state authority to which a member of the Julian family might naturally succeed.

Surely dynasty and succession for Gaius and Lucius were the central ideas of this phase of Augustus' planning. His harsh responses to the behaviour of Tiberius and Julia probably stem from this fixation. Tiberius' failure to co-operate and Julia's adultery both had potential to undermine Augustus' plans for his sons.[79] When Julia was exiled, Tiberius was sent notice of his divorce – a further indication that he was being removed from succession calculations.[80] Augustus now had no daughter and no son-in-law, only his sons. In 1 BC Tiberius' *tribunicia potestas* expired, and he was not at first allowed to return to Rome.[81] He was both weak in terms of formal powers and yet potentially threatening to Gaius in view of his former role and achievements (cf. Suet. *Tib.* 13, where a member of Gaius' entourage threatens to kill Tiberius). More than two decades had passed since 23 BC. Concerns over dynastic succession had evidently eased or been steadily overborne, especially after the show of consensus in 2 BC. The only question was who the successor would be, and it seems that the cards were stacked in Gaius' favour. Tiberius was permitted to return to Rome in AD 2, when Gaius made it known that he feared no rival (Suet. *Tib.* 13).

Subsequently, disaster struck, unravelling all Augustus' plans. In AD 2 Lucius Caesar died of illness in Massilia. The death of his brother, Gaius, followed in February AD 4.[82] These untimely deaths resulted in the collapse of the putative dynasty. Augustus would not be succeeded by an heir of his own blood. Accordingly, Tiberius was adopted in June AD 4 in a move which re-established the unity and continuity of the Julian family.[83] Although he already had a son Drusus (b. 14 BC) by Vipsania, Tiberius was compelled simultaneously to adopt and prefer his brother's son Germanicus (b. 15 BC), who was in turn married to Agrippina, daughter of Agrippa and Julia, so that

[78] See the references collected by Cooley, *Res Gestae* (n. 10) 273-5; cf. Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 153-4.

[79] For Julia's rebelliousness, see e.g. Macr. *Sat.* 2.5.4, 2.5.8.

[80] Suet. *Tib.* 11.4-5. For Julia's downfall, see Sen. *Brev. Vit.* 4.5; *Ben.* 6.32.1; Plin. *NH* 21.9; Tac. *Ann.* 3.24.2; 4.44.3; Suet. *Aug.* 65.1-2; Dio 55.10.12-16; Swan, *The Augustan Succession* (n. 57) 106-10; Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 185-9; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 157-9.

[81] Vell. Pat. 2.101.1; Dio 55.10.17-21.

[82] Aug. *RG* 27.2; Vell. Pat. 2.102.2-3; Sen. *ad Polyb.* 15.4; Dio 55.10a.8-10; Crook, 'Power, Authority, Achievement' (n. 10) 104-5; Swan, *The Augustan Succession* (n. 57) 133-7; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 163-4. For the unacceptability of Agrippa Postumus, see Tac. *Ann.* 1.4; Dio 55.32; Levick, *Augustus* (n. 4) 187-9; Galinsky, *Augustus* (n. 45) 135-6.

[83] Vell. Pat. 2.103.3-104.1; Suet. *Aug.* 65.1; *Tib.* 15.2; 20.3; 68.3; Dio 55.13.1a-2; Swan, *The Augustan Succession* (n. 57) 140-3. On designating Tiberius as heir, see Severy, *Augustus and the Family* (n. 5) 187-93.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their children were Augustus' great-grandchildren.[84] The receipt of pro-consular *imperium* and *tribunicia potestas* followed soon after.[85] These were the only moves available to Augustus. In spite of Tiberius' attitude to questions of dynasty and succession in the past, he was now plainly the heir and stood as a force for stability. Through this adoption, the *princeps* demonstrated his ongoing commitment to concord at Rome, found a solution that Tiberius was willing to take up, and gave no irreparable offence to anyone whose sensitivities about autocracy were traditional and potent.[86]

In AD 10 the Temple of Concordia Augusta was completed and dedicated by Tiberius, emphasising the harmonious condition of both the state and the Julian family under Augustus' leadership.[87] Its reconstruction had been proposed in 7 BC, when Tiberius told the senators that he would make the dedication in both his own name and that of his dead brother Drusus, thereby honouring their victories in Germany and the unity of the imperial house, which had brought stability to the state.[88] In AD 13 Tiberius' *tribunicia potestas* reached its tenth year and was renewed. He also received a grant of *imperium maius*, which meant that his formal powers equalled those of Augustus.[89] Augustus constantly emphasised his indispensability (Suet. *Tib.* 21) and, of course, named him as primary heir in his will, dated 3 April AD 13. The first line of this will, however, indicates that Gaius and Lucius would have been preferred: 'Since cruel fortune has deprived me of my grandsons Gaius and Lucius, Tiberius shall be my heir.'[90] There is a strong sense of Principate in these moves to patch up the dynasty for the sake of the *res publica*, even though there was no explicit statement of a monarchic role, to which Tiberius would succeed.

In AD 14 Augustus died. He bequeathed no constitutional powers to Tiberius, but did not need to, since he had previously organised matters so that Tiberius already had them. The transition to Tiberius' rule was relatively smooth, showing that attitudes to monarchy were more accepting than they had been in (say) 44, 27 or 23 BC.[91] The Principate becomes particularly

[84] Suet. *Tib.* 15.2; Dio 55.13.2; *Inst. Iust.* 1.11.11; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 165.

[85] Aug. *RG* 6.2; Suet. *Tib.* 16.1; Dio 55.13.2; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 165-6.

[86] Augustus declared at the formal ceremony that he was adopting Tiberius for the good of the *res publica*: Vell. Pat. 2.104.1; Suet. *Tib.* 21.3; cf. Gruen, 'Augustus' (n. 2) 48 (an appeal to supporters of Gaius and Lucius to rally round Tiberius).

[87] Dio 55.8.2, 55.9.6, 56.25.1; Swan, *The Augustan Succession* (n. 57) 73 ('key motifs were fraternal concord and reconciliation of strife over the succession'), 276-7; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 145.

[88] Ov. *Fast.* 1.637-50; Suet. *Tib.* 20.1; *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.114-15 (*Fast. Praen.*).

[89] Vell. Pat. 2.121.1; Tac. *Ann.* 1.54-71; Suet. *Ti.* 21.1; Dio 56.28.1; Crook, 'Power, Authority, Achievement' (n. 10) 111; Swan, *The Augustan Succession* (n. 57) 293-4; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 188.

[90] Suet. *Tib.* 23; cf. 21.3; Aug. *RG* 14.1; Vell. Pat. 2.104.1.

[91] Vell. Pat. 2.123.1-2; Suet. *Aug.* 98-9; Tac. *Ann.* 1.5.3-4; Dio 56.29.2-31.1; Crook, 'Power, Authority, Achievement' (n. 10) 112; Swan, *The Augustan Succession* (n. 57) 299-305;

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

obvious in the attitudes of those who would not let Tiberius – as head of the Julian family – avoid responsibility for civil matters, though in reality they were only behaving as they had done previously under Augustus.[92]

CONCLUSION

The succession planning of Augustus is often described in terms of dynastic complexity and disappointment.[93] Erich Gruen has stressed the opposition Augustus faced on this issue and questioned a number of common assumptions, drawing attention to various uncertainties of interpretation regarding the chain of developments. Yet Augustus was creative, determined and ultimately successful in creating a dynasty. In this paper, an attempt has been made to argue that there was greater clarity about the dynastic nature of the planning than Gruen believes, notwithstanding the care and respect for tradition which are also evident. There was an important evolution in attitudes after the period of the 'settlements', so that 'opposition' was not of the same order. The circumstances of 27 and 23 BC were very different from those of (say) 2 BC. There was also a higher public profile (and more practical, substantial importance) for the imperial family than Gruen describes, especially in the years following Agrippa's death. In tactical terms, Agrippa and Tiberius were employed in pivotal roles as arbiters of the succession, in order to counter hostile attitudes and to support Augustus' heirs by blood. Gaius Caesar was preferred over both Agrippa and Tiberius, but the move backfired with Gaius' death in AD 4. Tiberius was re-instated, as he simply had to be. The dynastic implications of each of the relevant individual honours can be questioned in isolation, as Gruen does well, especially in the absence of a throne, but taken as a whole the direction and messages are clear, and the result (the Principate) is not particularly surprising. There was a family involved, not just an individual. Nevertheless, Gruen's emphasis on the complexities and uncertainties of the process is absolutely welcome because it reflects the complexities and uncertainties faced by Augustus himself. Contradictory pressures meant that Augustus took great care about advertising his dynastic aims, though in truth the rise of

Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 190-6. Agrippa Postumus was murdered on Augustus' orders: Vell. Pat. 2.112.7; Tac. *Ann.* 1.5-6; Suet. *Aug.* 65.1, 4; Suet. *Tib.* 22; Dio 55.32.1-2; 56.30.2; Richardson, *Augustan Rome* (n. 4) 190-1.

[92] For the idea of the Principate in AD 14, cf. D. Kienast, Review of E. Ramage, *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' Res Gestae*, *AJP* 110.1 (1989) 177-80 at 179: 'this new constitution found its definitive form only after Tiberius' accession to the throne; after that it only needed to be developed further.' Cf. Levick *Tiberius* (n. 1) 223: 'one of the most important events of Tiberius' principate was precisely the death of Augustus and his own accession to sole power; it made the principate a permanency.' E. Cowan, 'Tacitus, Tiberius and Augustus', *ClassAnt* 28.2 (2009) 179-210 at 207, is more circumspect: 'proclaiming adherence to Augustus was part of a political strategy aimed at maintaining stability at Rome and throughout the empire by stressing continuity with the past and his own suitability as Augustus' successor-continuator.'

[93] Aug. *RG* 14.1; Suet. *Tib.* 23; Tac. *Ann.* 3.24.3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Octavian/Caesar probably supports the idea of a dynastic reality all along. Augustus demonstrated political brilliance in making available the contradictory impressions required by supporters and opponents.[94]

The University of Queensland

TOM STEVENSON
t.stevenson@uq.edu.au

[94] I want to express my sincere thanks to Paul Burton and the journal's two anonymous referees for the enormous help they provided in the writing of this paper. Remaining errors or misconceptions are certainly not due to them.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press