

CAESAR
AUGUSTUS
SEVEN ASPECTS

EDITED BY
FERGUS MILLAR
AND
ERICH SEGAL

HISTORICAL STUDIES - SOCIAL SCIENCE LIBRARY
THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD

1984

VI. AUGUSTUS AND THE EAST: THE PROBLEM OF THE SUCCESSION

GLEN BOWERSOCK

The eastern part of the Augustan Empire had been, for a short but dangerous season, the preserve of Antonius. Through judicious compromise and the diplomatic arts of well placed partisans, Augustus swiftly managed to ensure the smooth incorporation of Antonius' realm into the larger Roman world, but vestiges of hostility remained. It was not only that many had to bear the burden of public adherence to a vanquished cause: the Greeks had been obliged to endure the depredations of Roman soldiers, who used Greece as their base for the three greatest battles in the civil wars of the late Republic. At the battle of Actium in 31 BC, only Mantinea and Sparta had had the foresight – or perhaps, it must have seemed at the time, the folly – to come to the aid of the future Augustus.¹ In Asia Minor Octavian had his Zoilus at Aphrodisias, but Antonius commanded the loyalty of the rich family of Pythodori from Tralles, the progenitors of kings in Pontus.²

It is well recognized that Augustus' success in administering the Antonian portion of his Empire was due in large measure to the winning of allegiance from the affluent and well placed citizens of those regions. In two major missions to the East, Augustus' general, Marcus Agrippa, brought the message of the Augustan peace, and between the years 21 and 19 BC, Augustus himself journeyed from Greece to Syria. But even then, ten years after Actium, the Athenians were not ready to welcome the new ruler; and he, for his part, passed a winter on the island of Aegina instead of in the great city of Athens, in order to show his indignation.³ The Hellenized East had entered the Empire of Augustus as defeated nations. This created a problem that required constant watching, as Augustus recognized. It offered a potential for any rival with

sufficient personal eminence and audacity to exploit it. Before Antonius' failure Sulla had confronted the masters of Italy with the support of the Greek East behind him. But Sulla, unlike Antonius, had prevailed.

After the visits of Augustus and Agrippa to the East, the next member of the royal house to be present in those parts was Augustus' own stepson, Tiberius Claudius Nero. Setting forth from Rome in 6 BC and endowed with the tribunician power,⁴ which represented to the whole world his position as the heir of Augustus, Tiberius began a diplomatic trip to negotiate with the Parthians over the throne of Armenia in repetition of his success in dealing with comparable issues in 20 BC. But instead of proceeding to the banks of the Euphrates, Tiberius settled down on the island of Rhodes and devoted himself to the academic pleasure of attending lectures on Greek culture by noted professors.⁵ The mystery of Tiberius' alleged retirement to the island of Rhodes has beguiled scholars across the centuries and will serve as the central point of the investigation that follows.

Tiberius, stepson of the Emperor and philhellene, in residence on a Greek island from 6 BC to AD 2, cannot fail to have some bearing on our understanding of Augustus and the East. The issues become most sharply defined after 2 BC, that is, after the expiry of the five-year grant of Tiberius' tribunician power. For in the ensuing years, 1 BC, AD 1 and AD 2, Tiberius continued to reside on Rhodes with only the vague title of *legatus*.⁶ He had no meaningful position in respect to Rome apart from his familial relationship to the Emperor. His sojourn on the island is often described as self-imposed or voluntary exile,⁷ and yet Suetonius is explicit in telling us that Tiberius remained on Rhodes 'contra voluntatem' and that he often asked to return to Rome during these last years but was expressly forbidden to do so.⁸ He was not to go home unless and until Augustus' grandson and now his adopted son, Gaius Caesar, so permitted.⁹

It was just as Tiberius' tribunician power was coming to an end that the Emperor dispatched Gaius to the East to undertake negotiations with the Parthians, in a project not all that unlike what had been proposed for Tiberius five years earlier. The presence of Gaius together with Tiberius in the East

between late 2 BC and AD 2 generated a tension that has left clear traces in our sources. The role of Tiberius, while Gaius set forth on his tour of the region as the new heir of Augustus, is a central part of the drama Sir Ronald Syme has taught us to call the crisis of 2 BC. In his important paper devoted to this subject, in the *Proceedings of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences*, Syme emphasized the importance of the testimony of Ovid in the first book of the *Ars Amatoria* for the interpretation of events in this crucial year.¹⁰ The treatment of Ovid's evidence was to be enlarged in Syme's later work, *History in Ovid*, and it will be appropriate on this occasion to begin our examination of Augustan policy for the East in 2 BC with Ovid's famous account of the dedication of the temple of Mars the Avenger, Mars Ultor, in May of that year.

With his customary fluency and enthusiasm, Ovid drew a close connection between the dedication of the Mars temple and the imminent departure of Gaius Caesar. He saw the Parthians as about to pay at last the penalty for their destruction of the army of Crassus, and he declared that Gaius would enlarge the realm of Rome to the limits of the eastern world: 'nunc, oriens ultime, noster eris', 'now, farthest east, you will be ours.' 'Parthe, dabis poenas', 'Parthian, you will pay the penalty.'¹¹ Young Gaius is described as himself an avenger, *ultor*, and is hailed as the favoured child of Mars and Augustus.¹² It was not without good reason that Ovid forged this link between Gaius' mission and the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor. An important part of the ceremonies had been the solemn installation in the new temple of those legionary standards which had been recovered from the Parthians in 20 BC as a step toward the rehabilitation of the Roman name after the defeat of Crassus.¹³ Augustus was proud to have recovered the standards by diplomacy, and he boasted of his success in the *Res Gestae*, of which the first draft appears to have been written in the very year of the dedication of the new Mars temple.¹⁴ By all of this publicity, Augustus and Ovid were proclaiming the strength of Rome against the barbarian and the identification of the young Gaius Caesar as a new avenger in the struggle with Parthia.

But the celebration of Gaius and his mission was no merely local affair for the delectation of Romans and the readers of

Ovid's elegiacs. All this publicity was designed to endow Gaius Caesar with an incontestable authority in the East itself. The poet Antipater of Thessalonica composed two epigrams within a year of Ovid's verses, to make much the same point: 'Be on your way to the Euphrates, son of Zeus', wrote Antipater. 'To you already the Parthians' in the East are deserting apace. Be on your way, my prince; you shall find their bows unstrung through terror, Caesar. Rule in accord with your father's precepts. Be yourself the first to certify to the rising sun that Rome is bounded by the ocean on all sides.'¹⁵

*Ῥώμην δ' Ὠκεανῶ περιτέρομονα πάντοθεν αὐτός
πρῶτος ἀνερχομένῳ σφράγισαι ἡλίῳ.*

Here in the elegant contortions of the *Greek Anthology* we have the equivalent of Ovid's 'nunc, oriens ultime, noster eris'.

In another poem, obviously of about the same date, Antipater of Thessalonica hailed Gaius as favoured by no less than four divinities – Athena, Aphrodite, Alcides, and Ares.¹⁶ It is the last which again calls to mind the tribute of Ovid. The association of Gaius with Mars in connection with the opening of the new temple at Rome is eloquently attested at Athens in an inscription from the theatre of Dionysus in which Gaius is proclaimed *νέος Ἄρης*, the new Ares.¹⁷ This Hellenized version of Roman propaganda fits into a substantial tradition of Athenian honours, whereby a benefactor, past or prospective, is declared to be a new incarnation of a famous figure, divine or otherwise, from the past. Automedon, another contemporary poet included in the *Greek Anthology*, provides clear evidence of the frequency with which the Athenians were given to offering these honorific epithets.¹⁸ If you can offer a pig to the Athenians, you will be declared, according to Automedon, no less than another Triptolemus. If you supply cabbage stalks, lentils, or snails, you may take on the names of Erechtheus, Cecrops, Codrus, or anybody you like. Nobody cares at all: *οὐδεις οὐδέν ἐπιστρέφεται*. Obviously Automedon's satire makes its point because people did care, and the designation of Gaius as new Ares can have been no accident.

'Marsque pater Caesarque pater, date numen eunti': the adopted son of Augustus left Rome in the guise of a new

Mars.¹⁹ When he arrived in Athens as the new Ares, he confronted an extraordinary spectacle, undoubtedly in his honour. A fifth-century-BC temple of Ares in Acharnae had been systematically dismantled and moved (or was conceivably then in the process of being moved) stone by stone into the agora at Athens, where it was reconstructed.²⁰ The excavators in the agora have tended to associate this bizarre operation with the progress of Gaius' military expedition in the East and therefore to date the reconstruction to the first years of the first century AD. But in doing this they consistently failed to recognize the importance of Mars Ultor at Rome in 2 BC and the dispatch of Gaius from Rome as a new Mars. In reviewing the evidence for the rebuilding of the Ares temple at Athens, a recent scholar has acutely observed 'it should be (but has not been) irresistible for the excavators to date this reconstruction in close proximity to the building of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Rome.'²¹ To be sure, Parthia and the eastern campaign were important, but as a future prospect rather than a current event. An issue of Roman imperial gold and silver, persuasively dated to 2 BC, depicts Gaius Caesar on a galloping horse with a sword in his right hand and a shield in his left, and behind him an eagle between two legionary standards. These standards undoubtedly represent those that were transferred to the temple of Mars Ultor, reminders of Augustus' past success in dealing with the Parthians and portents of the mission to come.²²

The Athenians carried out with distinction the dissemination in their own city of the publicity for Gaius that had been started in Rome. Not only Gaius himself but his companions, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus and M. Lollius, were honoured in inscriptions as they reached the city by way of the lower Danube in the late summer or autumn of 2 BC²³. Caesar Augustus had clearly found friends in Athens whom he had lacked during his own visit two decades earlier. The good offices of M. Agrippa in the interim may be invoked in explanation of this changed attitude in the Greek capital, and before we are done it will even be possible to identify the principal mover in organizing the honours for Gaius.

But first it is worth observing that Athens appears not to have been the only Greek city to have recognized the new heir

of Augustus. Messene in the Peloponnese had been among the conspicuous supporters of Antonius during the final phase of the civil war and, like so many other Greek cities in the region, had been strengthened in its allegiance to Antonius because Sparta, hated as a tyrannical city, had conspicuously espoused the cause of Augustus.²⁴ But it is clear from two new inscriptions that by the time of the mission of Gaius Caesar Messene was solidly behind the regime in Rome. In one text dated to AD 2 the Messenians can be seen publicly expressing their loyalty to Gaius and their gratitude for the good news that he is in sound health, despite perilous campaigns in the distant East.²⁵ Another inscription, which, because of its proximity to the first in the excavation, ought to be close in date, records donations for the repair and reconstruction of many of the city's older buildings, and this is being done explicitly as a tribute to the Romans and the emperor Augustus.²⁶ The donors are praised for their *εὐνοία* toward the people of Rome and Caesar Augustus *ὑπὲρ τᾶς πόλιος φροντίδος*.²⁷ As at Athens there seems to be some kind of self-conscious, deliberate association of the monuments of the classical Greek past with the new dynasty in Rome.

The large number of buildings involved in the restoration project at Messene can be compared not only with the removal of the Ares temple to Athens but with two other unusual operations at about the same time: the removal of parts of temples at Thorikos and Sunium and their redeployment in buildings of the agora at Athens.²⁸ Augustus and Gaius emerge as the patrons, even the defenders of the great classical traditions of Greece.

And there is more to be said about Rome's cultivation of the Greek past at this time. Athens' finest hour had undoubtedly been the dramatic repulse of the Persian forces at Salamis in 480 BC. In the Augustan age the home of the Persians was now under the sway of a Parthian monarchy, which represented no less a threat to the Hellenized world in those days as the Persians in the past. If the government at Rome were interested in presenting itself as the defender of Hellenic traditions, nothing would be more compelling than the celebration of Rome as protector of the Greeks against the present menace in the Iranian heartland. From what we have already seen of

operations in Greece for the visit of Gaius Caesar and the close linkage of observances in Rome and in Athens, it should come as no surprise to discover that the parallel with the victory at Salamis was made explicit in 2 BC.

Introducing his panegyric of Gaius on the eve of the expedition to the East, Ovid describes a great sea battle that was artificially contrived at Rome in connection with the celebrations of the consecration of the new Mars temple:²⁹

Quid, modo cum belli navalis imagine Caesar
Persidas induxit Cecropiasque rates?

What of the mock naval war in which the Emperor
recently displayed Persian and Greek ships?

This alludes to the sensational *naumachia* of which Augustus himself speaks with such pride in the *Res Gestae*.³⁰ He devotes an entire section to a grand naval battle which was enacted in an excavated site across the Tiber. He mentions a fleet of warships, including thirty triremes or biremes, and says that 3,000 men participated in the exercise. Several centuries later Cassius Dio noted that there were still remains of this great *naumachia* to be seen in his own time, and he states that the conflict between the navies of Athens and Persia ended as history prescribed – with a great victory for the ships of Athens.³¹ In his paper on the crisis of 2 BC, Syme observed: 'This piece of pageantry advertised Rome as the champion of Hellas against the Orient.'³² It did indeed. The event was staged not merely as an entertainment for the Romans but as a great statement of purpose and propaganda for the Greeks.

We can scarcely wonder, therefore, that the inscriptions of Athens have revealed a great benefactor of the city in the Augustan age, who was honoured, according to the style so ridiculed by the poet Automedon, as a new Themistocles.³³ This person was a Syrian by origin who possessed both the Roman and the Athenian citizenships. His name was C. Iulius Nicanor, and we know from a remark in Dio Chrysostom a hundred years later that one of his most magnificent benefactions to the city was nothing less than the purchase of the island of Salamis on behalf of the Athenians.³⁴ Nicanor's magnificent gesture, putting an end to the dispensation of Sulla, who had deprived the city of its island, must certainly be seen in the

context of the great *naumachia* at Rome. We have once more in the repossession of Salamis a Greek echo of the events at Rome in 2 BC. The benefaction of Nicanor appears to have suffered some kind of tarnish in later years, for his title of new Themistocles, and, in addition, another title which he received from the Athenians – that of new Homer, doubtless for poetical achievements of some kind – were systematically erased on Athenian inscriptions.³⁵ Before long we shall be able to suggest why the Athenians chose to dishonour their great benefactor, but at this point it will suffice to identify C. Iulius Nicanor as the man who played the most conspicuous part at Athens in representing Gaius Caesar as the Greeks' protector against the barbarian.

Writing of the mission of Gaius Caesar, Syme observed: 'It was advisable to display the heir apparent to provinces and armies which had seen no member of the syndicate of government since Agrippa, the vicegerent, departed from the East twelve years before.'³⁶ When Tiberius had left Rome in 6 BC, he might well have appeared to be a member of the syndicate of government. After all, he had the tribunician power and was destined for some kind of negotiations concerning Armenia. But the fact of the matter was that he never carried out his mission, did not visit provinces and armies, and, although his tribunician power continued to the end of its five-year term, was clearly perceived as isolated from the central government. Yet, for all that, he remained the stepson of the Emperor Augustus, and he was not altogether unnoticed in the Greek world. He had friends and clients in the area. Among them was the cultivated family at Mytilene which had provided Pompey with his great confidant, Theophanes, and Tiberius himself with a man identified as one of his most intimate friends in the early years of his imperial rule. This was Cn. Pompeius Macer, whose son, Q. Pompeius Macer, was the first eastern senator under the principate.³⁷

In Sparta the family of Tiberius' father had a *clientela* of long standing, which made it possible for his mother, Livia, to take him there for refuge when the two of them fled from Italy after the defeat of L. Antonius in the Perusine War.³⁸ Historians have perhaps not adequately appreciated the extent to which Augustus owed the allegiance of the Spartans to their devotion

to Livia and her husband. As we have seen, Sparta was almost the only city in the entire Peloponnese not to support Antony: how could it when it had sheltered a refugee who had become the wife of Octavian? The dynast of Sparta, C. Iulius Eurycles, must therefore have been numbered among the old friends of Tiberius and his mother as he settled into his Hellenic life on Rhodes.³⁹ If Tiberius' isolation soon became apparent to the friends of Augustus, the potential for this philhellene as a leader of the Greeks will have been equally apparent to the friends of Tiberius. In 1 BC, after the actual termination of Tiberius' tribunician power, we find a priest in the city of Nysa, near Tralles in Asia Minor, with the title of priest of Tiberius Claudius Nero for life.⁴⁰ Nearly twenty years ago I surmised that this document showed just how ignorant a city in Asia Minor could be of the facts of Roman politics.⁴¹ But the truth of the matter seems to me now to have been quite different. The people of Nysa could not fail to have been aware of what was going on in the East, of the conflict between Tiberius, not far away off the coast, and a new claimant to the role of defender of the Hellenes, namely Gaius Caesar, who had supplanted Tiberius as heir of Augustus.

The Greeks were constantly reminded of Tiberius' presence in their area and of his sympathy for their way of life. It was not merely his attendance at the lectures of their professors or his donning of their forms of dress that made this plain. It was, in addition, his dispatch of chariots to compete in the great Greek games at Olympia, as well as the games at Thespiac.⁴² He cannot fail to have been in touch with his friends on Mytilene, and the ancestral connection with Sparta must also have been important. In fact, we know from the testimony of Josephus that Augustus' man in Sparta, C. Iulius Eurycles, behaved very oddly in the last years of the first century BC⁴³. He caused trouble throughout the cities of Greece, provoking civil strife, and, in Josephus' words, 'stripping' (*περιιδθειν*) the cities. The situation became so bad that Augustus felt obliged to banish Eurycles.

It has always seemed peculiar, to say the least, that Augustus' own nominee should have given him such trouble. It seemed even more peculiar that, after the banishment of Eurycles, he and his family were somehow rehabilitated to such an extent

that a cult in his honour was conjoined with the celebration of the imperial cult at Gytheum in the early years of the reign of Tiberius.⁴⁴ Over twenty years ago it was possible to demonstrate by an analysis of the texts of Strabo and Josephus that the stasis which Eurycles stirred up in Greece and the banishment which resulted from it occurred between the years 7 and 2 BC, in other words, in exactly the period of Tiberius' residence on the island of Rhodes.⁴⁵ Furthermore, we have already seen that a city such as Messene, which had once been hostile to the victor at Actium, principally because Sparta had supported him, turns out to be a bastion of Augustan sympathizers by the end of the first century BC. By then Augustus had taken firm action against the tyrant at Sparta, and, no doubt in the process, won the goodwill and support of all those cities that had formerly viewed the *princeps* with suspicion. The obvious implication of all this is that Tiberius' old friend in Sparta had supported Augustus when the fortunes of the two Romans had been linked. But when the two men went their separate ways Eurycles opted for Tiberius, and Augustus had to wipe him out. At the time no one could have told that Tiberius himself would be rehabilitated under the force of sheer necessity and reinstated again in AD 4, with Gaius and Lucius Caesar both dead, as Augustus' successor. The fact that Tiberius did return to favour and ultimately succeeded his stepfather on the throne of the Caesars is undoubtedly the explanation of the rehabilitation of Eurycles' family in Sparta. Eurycles' son, Laco, took over the dynastic position from which his father, now deceased, had been expelled.⁴⁶

In the subsequent generation, the eastern friends of Tiberius are drawn even closer together. The grandson of Eurycles married into the Mytilenean family of Pompeius Macer, taking as his wife the daughter of Tiberius' intimate, the man whom Strabo describes as among the foremost friends of the Emperor Tiberius in the early years of his reign.⁴⁷ This visible nexus of the Mytilenean and Spartan friends of Tiberius and the elevation of both families during the reign of Tiberius must have taken its origins in the political atmosphere of the long sojourn on Rhodes. In short, some Greeks expected at that time that their future lay with Tiberius and not with Augustus or the new heir Gaius Caesar. Others calculated differently and, in

the event, unwisely. C. Iulius Nicanor, who cast his lot conspicuously with Gaius by orchestrating the commemorations of 2-1 BC at Athens, learned later that this display had cost him dear when Gaius was in his grave and Tiberius returned to favour. The subsequent ascendancy of Tiberius and his ultimate rule as Emperor constitute the best explanation of the public *damnatio* which C. Iulius Nicanor suffered as new Themistocles. Nicanor as Themistocles was a visible evocation of Nicanor, the partisan of Gaius.

One might well go on to ask why the Athenians, out of deference to Tiberius either as heir or as Emperor, saw fit to delete, in addition, the title of new Homer, which they had also bestowed upon Nicanor.⁴⁸ The answer is less clear, but it probably had something to do with another of Tiberius' eastern clients. His friend, Pompeius Macer, was, among other things, a notable poet, who is mentioned by Ovid as a writer in the Homeric tradition. Among his themes was the anger of Achilles.⁴⁹ Ovid calls him, in one of the poems from his Pontic exile, Iliacus Macer, 'Macer of the *Iliad*'.⁵⁰ It seems that we have at least two notable Homeric poets flourishing at the end of the first century BC, one a partisan of Tiberius and the other a partisan of Gaius Caesar. With the admission of Pompeius Macer's son into the Senate at Rome and the disgrace of Nicanor at Athens, the adulators of Tiberius would have had good reason to remove their praise of Nicanor as a poet no less than their gratitude to him as a Themistocles. The Athenians would have known that Tiberius had a long memory and did not forget those who slighted him during the difficult time of Gaius' ascendancy. It is recorded that a man he once defended, King Archelaus of Cappadocia, in an action before Augustus himself, had so miscalculated the future as to slight him in favour of Gaius during the years of residence on Rhodes. This was something which, as Cassius Dio says, Tiberius did not forget.⁵¹ A smouldering resentment drove Tiberius as Emperor to summon Archelaus to Rome for trial on a charge of revolution, and the outcome would have been death, had not the king's old age proved a more efficient executioner.

The tension between Tiberius and Gaius as rival heirs of Augustus is well documented in the pages of Suetonius' biography of Tiberius. Someone even offered to execute the older

man in order to please Gaius.⁵² The two rivals had an uneasy meeting at Samos or Chios, but for reasons of protocol conspicuously not at Rhodes.⁵³ Augustus' concern is evident in his determination that Tiberius not be allowed to return to Rome without the explicit permission of Gaius Caesar. It was stipulated further that when the return took place, Tiberius was to have no part whatever in the government.⁵⁴ It was even suggested to Augustus that Tiberius was plotting a revolution, but Tiberius strenuously and perhaps truthfully denied this.⁵⁵ Tiberius was too cunning. What he saw happening (and presumably encouraged) was the gradual building up of support in the Greek East, so that when the moment of succession to Augustus should occur, his claims would be so strong in that part of the Empire that they could not be ignored. Accordingly, the effort to establish Gaius Caesar as a friend and defender of the Greeks and as a victor over the Parthians was, in large measure, designed to counteract the increasing support for Tiberius.

The ultimate recall of Tiberius in AD 2 seems not to have been altogether fortuitous. It may be wondered why, after Tiberius had remained for three years of continued residence on Rhodes without a renewal of the tribunician power, Augustus finally decided to authorize a return when Gaius was still alive. From the evidence of Suetonius we may presume that Gaius himself concurred in this decision, although he was at the time far away, on the eastern frontier. To be sure, Gaius was expected back in the Greek provinces very soon, as the enthusiastic inscription from Messene attests. But what appears to have made the removal of Tiberius a particularly urgent matter was the fact that, after long years of waiting, the Greek supporters of the exile had taken a bold step. They had declared outright their firm expectation that Tiberius would succeed Augustus. This is incontrovertibly established by a passage in Suetonius, taken in conjunction with a precious epigram of Apollonides in the *Greek Anthology*. Shortly before the recall of Tiberius, says Suetonius, an eagle – a bird never before seen on Rhodes – took up its place on the roof of Tiberius' house.⁵⁶ There are ample parallels to prove that the appearance of an eagle above a potential ruler was presumed by the Greeks to be a certain portent of succession.⁵⁷ It scarcely

matters whether or not an eagle was actually observed on the roof of Tiberius' house. It was quite sufficient for someone to have said that the bird was there. And that someone said it is clear not only from Suetonius but from the epigram of Apollonides.⁵⁸

The holy bird, in former days no visitant of
Rhodians – the eagle, in former days a mere
fable to the sons of Cercaphus – just then I
arrived, borne aloft on high-flying wings through
the broad sky when Nero held the island of the
Sun (*Ἡελίου νῆσον ὅτ' εἶχε Νέρων*).
And in his house I lodged, tame to the ruler's
hand, not shrinking from the future Zeus (*οὐ
φεύγων Ζῆνα τὸν ἐσσόμενον*).

This poem confirms Suetonius' report of the portent of the eagle at Rhodes. From the words 'when Nero held the island of the Sun' (*Ἡελίου νῆσον ὅτ' εἶχε Νέρων*), scholars have reasonably judged the poem to have been written after Tiberius' departure from Rhodes.⁵⁹ Such an interpretation is made the more likely by the chronology in Suetonius, according to which the eagle appeared shortly before Tiberius' recall. But these verses cannot have been written very long after the report of the eagle. Tiberius is still called by the name Nero, which he abandoned in AD 4 upon his adoption as Tiberius Iulius Caesar. While it is true that historians of a subsequent age, such as Velleius Paterculus and Tacitus, felt free to use the name Nero in describing the career of Tiberius under Augustus, there is no evidence whatever that this name was perpetuated at the time,⁶⁰ and there was every reason for Tiberius and his friends to parade the imperial name of Caesar from the moment of his adoption. The Athenians, for example, upon learning the news in AD 4, promptly erected a monument celebrating the Emperor's new heir as Tiberius Caesar, even though they had honoured him in at least five earlier inscriptions as Tiberius Claudius Nero.⁶¹

It must also be remembered that the Greek poets of the *Anthology* often composed occasional poetry. Those who consorted with members of the imperial house regularly wrote their slight, but graceful, commemorative epigrams soon after

the occasion they were celebrating. In the case of Apollonides we have good reason to believe that he lived in the general area of Greek Anatolia and that he had been at least a visitor on Rhodes. One of his most inconsequential poems celebrates the beauty of a youth who lived on that island, described as the most blessed of islands, 'lit by such a sun'.⁶² It would be reasonable therefore to see in Apollonides one of the cultivated Greeks who had seen Tiberius on Rhodes. His epigram on the eagle would have been a natural and appropriate tribute to the man he believed to be the future Zeus (*Ζήνα τὸν ἐσσόμενον*), the next Augustus.⁶³

The suggestion of Gow and Page, in their commentary on the poems of the *Anthology* in Philip's Garland, that Apollonides composed his eagle epigram soon after the adoption of Tiberius cannot be supported.⁶⁴ Those scholars supposed that Apollonides was writing before it became generally known that Tiberius, on acquiring his new name, had abandoned the names of Claudius and Nero. It should be clear enough from what has already been said that Tiberius had too many intimate friends in the East for such ignorance to prevail, least of all in the circle of those with whom he had associated on Rhodes. And it is inconceivable that news of the adoption was spread without news of the change of name. In short, Apollonides' epigram stands as precious testimony of the aspirations of Tiberius' Greek adherents in the uncertain period just after his departure from the East.

When Tiberius returned to Rome he took with him a scholar well versed in Greek philosophy and, more importantly, in the science of astrology. In a walk along the cliffs of Rhodes Tiberius had tested Thrasyllus' skills of prediction and found them so impressive that he was willing to share his inmost thoughts with him.⁶⁵ Thrasyllus foretold Tiberius' rise to power and thereby provided the exile of Rhodes with the encouragement he needed to wait and to dissemble until his hour should come. Among the other Greeks whom Tiberius learned to cherish in the East was, as we have already seen, the descendant of Theophanes, Cn. Pompeius Macer, the noted Homeric poet. Since Macer appears as chief librarian at Rome in the latter years of Augustus and remains to be named by Strabo as one of Tiberius' most intimate friends after the

accession,⁶⁶ it is likely that Tiberius also prevailed upon Macer to join Thrasyllus in going to Rome in AD 2.

Along with his most precious Greek friends Tiberius took back to Italy his memories of the exile, memories which he stored up in characteristic fashion for future use. He nourished a deep loathing for M. Lollius, who had accompanied Gaius Caesar in the opening phase of his travels; and, as can be seen in Velleius and Tacitus, much of Tiberius' resentment over the Rhodian episode was deflected, in later years, away from Augustus and Gaius to the malign figure of Lollius.⁶⁷ By contrast P. Sulpicius Quirinius had treated Tiberius with respect during Gaius' mission. When Quirinius died in AD 21 Tiberius, then Emperor, requested a public funeral for this good man and eulogized him fulsomely in a speech that included a bitter attack on Lollius as the evil genius of Gaius Caesar.⁶⁸ Nor, as we have seen, did Tiberius forget the offence of the king of Cappadocia. In addition, among his memories back in Rome after AD 2 was probably the hypnotic and attractive figure of a strong young man whom he must have met in the entourage of Gaius, L. Aelius Sejanus.⁶⁹ Ambitious and immoral, crafty and patient, Sejanus, who had already exploited the sexual weaknesses of the rich old Apicius,⁷⁰ must have spotted the vulnerability of Tiberius. What Syme has called so perceptively Tiberius' 'infatuation' with Sejanus, 'a delusion more than intellectual',⁷¹ may already have begun in the lifetime of Augustus. It may partially explain the sudden rise to prominence of Sejanus' father as Prefect of the Guard in the year of Augustus' death.⁷² All within Tiberius' very first year as Emperor, Sejanus himself was named a colleague of his father in the guard prefecture, only to become sole prefect when his father was swiftly transferred to the prefecture of Egypt.⁷³

Upon returning to Rome Tiberius was without a wife. His second wife, Julia, Augustus' daughter, had been banished three years previously after scandalous revelations about her private life.⁷⁴ From the list we possess of her alleged lovers a suspicion naturally arises that these men were more active in political conspiracy than in the bedroom.⁷⁵ Their misdemeanours had contributed to the urgency of the crisis of 2 BC, but inasmuch as Tiberius had never really been happy with

Julia he is unlikely to have had any role in her machinations during his absence. Furthermore Tiberius was much too clever to involve himself in a sordid and desperate scheme. Hesitation and dissimulation, the hallmarks of his character as Emperor, may be presumed to antedate his accession. Everything about his sojourn on Rhodes and his immersion in Hellenic culture shows his willingness to wait as he carefully prepared himself and his eastern clients for the time Thrasyllus had told him would surely come. In the two years of uncertainty after leaving Rhodes Tiberius must have been delighted not to have Julia beside him. His mother, Livia, had taken the place of a wife.

In the end Augustus' plan to entrust his Empire to Gaius Caesar collapsed, and Tiberius was waiting. The competition between these two rivals was rooted in the Greek East, where divided loyalties inherited from the age of Antonius gave ample scope for political manipulation. The growing support for Tiberius demanded counter-measures, which Augustus supplied through the mission of Gaius. Friends in Athens, such as Nicanor, together with the enemies of Sparta, joined forces to welcome the heir-apparent as he passed toward Parthia, a new Ares. But as he waited on the island of Rhodes Tiberius continued to consolidate those resources of personal allegiance which were, in the fullness of time, to serve him well. The house of Eurycles would be rehabilitated, and Nicanor disgraced. Thrasyllus and Pompeius Macer would join him in Rome, and the son of Macer would attain the praetorship in AD 15, leading the way for later generations of Greek senators. And perhaps more telling than anything else was the celebration of Tiberius' own son Drusus at Athens, early in his reign, as a new Ares.⁷⁶ Less than two decades had elapsed since the last one.

It is ironic that in Tiberius' final years on the throne he turned against many of those upon whom his career had depended. The treachery of Sejanus had perhaps unhinged him to some degree, even though he had proved himself the cleverer man. The family of Pompeius Macer fell into disgrace in AD 33, and with it a grandson of the great Eurycles. One wonders whether the nexus of Greek supporters from the days of the Rhodian exile had not disintegrated in the ruin of the

irresistible Sejanus, upon whom Tiberius had perhaps first pinned his hopes, as upon the families of Macer and Eurycles, in the aftermath of the crisis of 2 BC.

NOTES

1. Paus. IV. 31. 1 (Sparta); VIII. 8. 12 and VIII. 9. 6 (Mantineia).
2. For Zoilus, see J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (1982), 156–64; on the Pythodori, G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (1965), 8 and 53.
3. G. W. Bowersock, *CQ* NS 14 (1964), 120–1, discussing [Plut.], *Mor.* 207 E.
4. Dio LV. 9. 4; Suet. *Tib.* 10. 2; Vell. Pat. II. 99. 2.
5. Suet. *Tib.* 11. 1–3. Tiberius' decision not to proceed reflected his recognition that Augustus had chosen to prefer the young Gaius to him. Augustus' new choice became apparent with the designation of Gaius as *princeps iuventutis* in 5 BC (Dio LV. 9. 9). Later Tiberius said that he had not wanted to get in the way: Suet. *Tib.* 10. 1–2; Vell. Pat. II. 99. 2.
6. Suet. *Tib.* 12. 1. Livia is said to have been instrumental in obtaining the title *ad velandam ignominiam*.
7. e.g. H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres* III (1961), 957 ('son exil volontaire à Rhodes').
8. Suet. *Tib.* 12. 1.
9. Suet. *Tib.* 13. 2.
10. R. Syme, *Sitzungsber. der Bay. Akad. der Wiss.*, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1974. 7.
11. Ovid, *Ars Amat.* I. 178–9. Cf. R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (1978), 8–10.
12. Ovid, *Ars Amat.* I. 181 and 203.
13. Augustus, *Res Gestae* 29. On Dio LIV. 8. 3, see F. E. Romer, *TAPA* 108 (1978), 192–3.
14. Cf. Syme, *op. cit.* (n. 10 above), 13.
15. *Anth. Pal.* IX. 297 (Gow–Page, Antipater no. 47). In addition to Parthia and Armenia, Gaius had business in Arabia: G. W. Bowersock, *Roman Arabia* (1983), 56.
16. *Anth. Pal.* IX. 59 (Gow–Page, Antipater no. 46).
17. *IG* II². 3250, cf. p. 349, and *Hesperia* 16 (1947), 68–9.
18. *Anth. Pal.* XI. 319 (Gow–Page, Automedon no. 5). On this poem and the form of honour it mocks, see the important analysis by L. Robert, *REG* 94 (1981), 338–61.
19. Ovid, *Ars Amat.* I. 203.
20. W. Dinsmoor, *Hesperia* 9 (1940), 49–50; H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens* (1972), 163. Cf. P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste* (1927), 51, whose views influenced the subsequent writers on this matter.
21. Romer, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 202 n. 35. Mars also figures in the great inscription of Nicopolis on the site of the victor's camp at Actium. It is usually assumed that this text belongs to the years immediately after the battle: J. H. Oliver, *AJPh* 90 (1969), 178–82; J. M. Carter, *ZPE* 24 (1977), 227–30. But it is clear from Dio LI. 1. 3 that the first structure on the camp site was an open-air platform dedicated to Apollo. The temple dedicated to Neptune and Mars on the same spot cannot be the same structure (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 18. 2 and 96. 2 with the inscription fragments [*Nep*]tuno [*et Ma*]rt[i]). A date for this temple c.2/1 BC would be worth considering. One fragment of the inscription has the letters *VL*, conventionally restored [*cons*]ul. But, as I suggested in *Augustus* (n. 2), p. 95, n. 5, *ul*[tor]i would be attractive.
22. Romer, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 187–202. The coins appear in Mattingly–Sydenham, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, I. *Aug.* (1923), as nos. 348–9.

23. *IG II²*. 4239, 4140 (Lollius); 4144 (Domitius). On the journey through the Balkans, Dio LV. 10. 17, with the comments in Romer, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 202, n. 36. For the date of summer, 2 BC, for Gaius' departure for the East: Romer, 200-1.
24. Paus. IV. 31. 1; *Ἀγούστῳ γὰρ βασιλεύοντι Ῥωμαίων ἐπολέμησαν Ἀντώνιος, γένοι καὶ οὗτος Ῥωμαῖος· καὶ οἱ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἄλλοι τε καὶ οἱ Μεσσηνιοὶ προσέθεντο, οἱ ἐφρόνουν Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰ Ἀγούστου.* (I am grateful to Christian Habicht for drawing my attention to this important text.) On the reaction to Sparta's allegiance, see also Paus. VIII. 8. 12: all Arcadia except Mantinea supported Antonius at Actium *οἱ ἐφρόνουν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰ Ἀγούστου.*
25. *SEG XXIII*. 206 (cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épig.* 1966, 201).
26. *SEG XXIII*. 207 (cf. *Bull. épig.* 1966, 200). For the inscription *in situ*, A. K. Orlandos, *Πρακτικά* 1959, 169 fig. 10.
27. *SEG XXIII*. 207, lines 36-7. The expression *ὑπὲρ φροντίδος* presumably represents *pro cura* in Latin.
28. H. A. Thompson, *AJA* 66 (1962), 200.
29. Ovid, *Ars Amat.* I. 171-2.
30. Augustus, *Res Gestae* 23. Cf. Dio LV. 10. 7. A. E. Raubitschek mistakenly tried to transfer the whole *naumachia* to Athens: *Hesperia* 23 (1954), 317-19, on which see the criticism in *Bull. épig.* 1955, 79.
31. Dio LV. 10. 7.
32. Syme, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 15.
33. *IG II²*. 1069 (line 6), 1723 (line 4), 3786-9. See further the new fragment of *IG II²*. 1723 in M. Mitsos, *Arch. Eph.* 1972, 55-7, and the discussion of it in C. P. Jones, *Phoenix* 32 (1978), 227-8.
34. Dio Chrys., *Or.* XXXI. 116. On Nicanor, see L. Robert, *Siele*, *Festschrift Kontoleon* (1977), 14-16, and C. P. Jones, *op. cit.* (n. 33), 222-8.
35. Erasures in *IG II²*. 3786, 3788, and 3789.
36. Syme, *RR*, 428.
37. On the descendants of Theophanes, Tac. *Ann.* VI. 18, erring in the number of generations down to Q. Pompeius Macer: cf. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 748-9, and *History in Ovid* (n. 11), pp. 73-4. On Cn. Pompeius Macer, Strabo XIII. 2. 3 (618 C): *καὶ νῦν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ἐξετάζεται τῶν Τιβερίων φύλων.* See further, Pflaum, *op. cit.* (n. 7), I. 11, and H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.* (1979), 100.
38. Suet. *Tib.* 6. 2: 'Lacedaemoniis publice, quod in tutela Claudiorum erant, demandatus'.
39. On the evidence for Eurycles, especially Strabo VIII. 5. 5 (366 C), see G. W. Bowersock, *JRS* 51 (1961), 112-18.
40. *SIG³* 781, reprinted as no. 69 in R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (1969). An inscription at Pergamum shows another priest of Tiberius Claudius Nero, but the precise date - sometime before AD 4 - cannot be determined: *Ath. Mitt.* 32 (1907), 321 (*IGR IV*. 454), with the acute observations of D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor II* (1950), 1297.
41. Bowersock, *Augustus* (n. 2), p. 118, n. 4.
42. *SIG³* 782 (Olympia); *BCH* 82 (1958), 159 (Thespieae), as interpreted in *Bull. épig.* 1959, 184, p. 194. At Olympia Tiberius is called *Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Τιβερίων υἱὸς Νέρων*; at Thespieae the formula is the same except for the absence of *Νέρων*.
43. Jos. *BJ* I. 531 (*ἐπὶ τῆς στάσεως ἐμπλήσαι τὴν Ἀχαΐαν καὶ περιδύειν τὰς πόλεις*); also *AJ XVI*. 310.
44. S. B. Kougeás, *Ἑλληνικά* (1928), 16, reprinted in *AE* 1929, 99 and in E. Kornemann, *Neue Dokumente zum lakonischen Kaiserkult* (1929).
45. Bowersock, *op. cit.* (n. 39), 116.

46. Ibid.
47. C. Julius Argolicus, grandson of Eurycles, married Pompeia Macrina: Tac. *Ann.* VI. 18. For the generations of the family at Mytilene and Strabo's comment on Cn. Pompeius Macer, see above, n. 37.
48. The title of 'new Homer' appears alongside that of 'new Themistocles' in IG II². 3786-9, and where the erasures occur (i.e. in 3786, 3788, 3789), they cover both titles. Jones, op. cit. (n. 33), 224, excludes from the honours to Nicanor the statue-base inscribed 'Ἰλιάς ἢ μεθ' Ὀμηρον ἐγὼ καὶ πρόσθεν Ὀμή[ρο]ν / πάροισις ἰδρῦμαι τῷ με τεκόντι νέω[ι]', published by H. A. Thompson, *Hesperia* 23 (1954), 62-5. Jones follows Thompson in believing that the base for a statue of the personified *Iliad* (which survives) stood on one side of a statue of Homer himself, and a statue of the *Odyssey* (which also survives) on the other side. The inscription on the *Iliad* base alludes to the ancient opinion that Homer wrote the *Iliad* when he was young (τῷ με τεκόντι νέω) and the *Odyssey* when he was old. In other words, νέος here means 'young' rather than 'new'.
49. Ovid, *Amores* II. 18. 1-3: 'carmen ad iratum dum tu perducis Achillem / primaque iuratis induis arma viris, / nos, Macer, ignara Veneris cessamus in umbra'. Cf. *Amores* II. 18. 35. See also Syme, *History in Ovid* (n. 11), 73.
50. Ovid, *Ex Pont.* IV. 16. 6. Cf. *Ex Pont.* II. 10.
51. Dio LVII. 17. 3-5.
52. Suet. *Tib.* 13. 1.
53. Suet. *Tib.* 12. 2, says the two met on Samos, whereas Dio LV. 10. 19 puts the meeting on Chios.
54. Suet. *Tib.* 13. 2.
55. Suet. *Tib.* 12. 3.
56. Suet. *Tib.* 14. 4: 'ante paucos vero quam revocaretur dies aquila numquam antea Rhodi conspecta in culmine domus eius assedit'.
57. Cf., e.g., Plut. *Mor.* 340 C.
58. *Anth. Pal.* IX. 287 (Gow-Page, Apollonides no. 23).
59. Cf. A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Garland of Philip II* (1968), 160.
60. For the proof, see K. Müller, *Die Epigramme des Antiphilos von Byzanz* (1935), 14-21. Even Gow and Page, op. cit. (n. 59), p. 120, admit this in their discussion of Antiphilus' poem, *Anth. Pal.* IX. 178, which they believe must refer to the Emperor Nero.
61. IG II². 3254, part of a monument representing the adoptions of A1) 4, with Tiberius, Germanicus, and Drusus: see Graindor, op. cit. (n. 20), 46-7. For the five earlier inscriptions: IG II². 3243-7.
62. *Anth. Plan.* B 49 (Gow-Page, Apollonides no. 28).
63. Gow-Page, op. cit. (n. 59), p. 160, oddly misunderstand Ζῆνα τὸν ἐσομένον as 'the man who will be Divus some day'. By a familiar convention Zeus simply denotes the current ruler: C. P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysotom* (1978), 44, comparing in n. 83 on p. 174 R. Riewald, *Diss. Phil. Halenses* 20 (1912), 273-7 and 287-96.
64. Gow-Page, op. cit. (n. 59), 160.
65. Suet. *Tib.* 14. 4; Tac. *Ann.* VI, 21; Dio LV. 11. 1-2. On Thrasyllus, see F. H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (1954), 92-108.
66. Suet. *Jul.* 56. 7: 'ad Pompeium Macrum, cui ordinandas bibliothecas delegaverat [sc. Augustus]'. For citation of Strabo, see n. 37 above. Pflaum, op. cit. (n. 7), III. 957, seems to opt for placing Macer's library post as well as an Asian procuratorship in the last decade of Augustus' rule, although there is no necessity to fix the Asian post 'vers l'année 5 ap. J.-C.'.
67. Vell. Pat. II. 102. 1; Tac. *Ann.* II. 48.
68. Tac. *Ann.* III. 48.

69. Tac. *Ann.* IV. 1: 'prima iuventa C. Caesarem, divi Augusti nepotem, sectatus'.
70. Tac. *Ann.* IV. 1: 'non sine rumore Apicio diviti et prodigo stuprum veno dedisse'. Cf. Dio LVII. 19. 5.
71. R. Syme, *Historia* 23 (1974), 488.
72. Tac. *Ann.* I. 7.
73. On Sejanus' appointment to the guard: Tac. *Ann.* I. 24 and VI. 8; Dio LVIII. 19. 6. His father, L. Seius Strabo, is already in Egypt in AD 15: Dio, loc. cit., and Pliny, *NH* XIX. 3, together with the fact that Seius' successor, C. Galerius, (*PIR*² G 25) is in office in AD 16. The ascription of *ILS* 8996 to L. Seius Strabo has been persuasively challenged by G. V. Sumner, *Phoenix* 19 (1965), 134-45.
74. Cf. Syme, *Sitzungsber. Bay. Akad.* (n. 10), 18-24.
75. Vell. Pat. II. 100. 4-5. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* IV. 44 and Dio LV. 10. 15.
76. *IG* II². 3257.