Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins

EDWARD CHAMPLIN

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to illustrate the practical application of myth in public life under the early Principate. It begins by sketching the deep historical affection of the people of Rome for the twins Castor and Pollux, and the great posthumous popularity of Nero Claudius Drusus for generations after his death in 9 B.C. Concentrating on the dedicatory inscription of the Temple of Castor and Pollux in Rome, the paper argues that Tiberius Caesar, notoriously addicted to mythology, crafted a potent public association between the heavenly twins and himself and his brother Drusus, and it goes on to examine the effect of that association.

I

In March of the year A.D. 37, old, ill, and alarmed by a portent, Tiberius Caesar moved south from Rome to the Bay of Naples. Eager though he was to return to his refuge on Capri, declining health and foul weather detained him at his villa at Misenum. 'A few days before he died', says Suetonius, 'the tower of the Pharus collapsed in an earthquake on Capri'.[1] From his bedroom at Misenum the dying Princeps could surely see the great lighthouse far across the bay, on the eastern heights of the island. Was he aware that its flame had been extinguished? That may have signalled the end of a story which he had begun to write forty-five years before, at the death of his beloved brother.

The story was inspired by two men who became gods, Castor and Pollux. Originally Kastor and Polydeukes, the immensely popular twins of Greek myth were also commonly known as the Dioskouroi, Zeus' boys, or the Tyndaridai, the sons of their earthly father Tyndaros. The reports of their parentage and birth are complex and contradictory.[2] In some strands, they and their sister, Helen of Troy, were all three the children of Leda and Tyndaros, the King of Sparta; in others, they were the offspring of Leda and Zeus, who had visited the queen in the form of a swan, and they may or may not have been hatched from an egg or eggs. But, most importantly, at some point it became established that Polydeukes was, or was potentially, immortal, while Kastor was born to die: possibly because they had different fathers, Zeus and Tyndaros. Each brother had a special talent recognized as early as Homer, for in the *Iliad* their sister Helen calls them 'Kastor, breaker of horses, and the strong boxer, Polydeukes'.[3] The twins were renowned as heroes in two great expeditions, the Calydonian boar hunt and the voyage of the Argo, as well as in a few adventures of their own, but they are best remembered for what happened after their death. Kastor was cut down in a brawl. As he lay dying, Polydeukes prayed to Zeus that he be allowed to die with his brother. Zeus offered him a choice: either to live forever himself with the gods on Olympus, or

[1] S 72–4. Unless otherwise indicated, S = Suetonius, *Tiberius*; T = Tacitus, *Annales*; D = Cassius Dio.
[2] T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to the Literary and Artistic Sources* (1993), 318–28.
[3] *Iliad* 3.237.

JRS 101 (2011), pp. 73–99. © *The Author(s) 2011.*
Published by The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
doi:10.1017/S0075435811000013

to share Kastor's fate, alternating with him one day under the earth and one day on Olympus. Polydeukes chose the latter. How this alternation was effected is a matter of ancient debate, essentially over whether the brothers were together in each place for a day or actually exchanged places with each other. But invariably, in literature and in history, they appear after death as divinities together, and they represent the very incarnation of brotherly love.

Polydeukes' choice was decisive. Early on the brothers became the saviour gods, *soteres*, the averters of evil, *alexikakoi*. Like Herakles, these divinized mortals were great helpers of their fellow man, with two areas of special concern. They were famed as the protectors of sailors especially, and of all travellers by sea: in one version of their story, Zeus placed them among the stars as the Gemini, the heavenly twins, and Poseidon rewarded their brotherly love with command of the winds, whereby they became the saviours of shipwrecked mariners. They also developed an inclination to appear and bring or announce victory in battle, the most famous instance in Greek history being the Spartan defeat of Athens at the sea battle of Aegospotami in 405 B.C. On that occasion they materialized as two stars, but normally by land you could recognize them by a handful of particular human attributes: they turned up at critical moments as a pair of beautiful young men mounted on white horses, bearing spears in their hands and wearing on their heads the distinctive *pilleus*, the half-egg-shaped hat or helmet, often crowned by a star.

Their cult spread from Sparta throughout Greece, and eventually to Sicily and Southern Italy in the West, from where it early established itself in Latium around Rome. Some fifty years ago a bronze tablet was excavated at a temple in the territory of Lavinium which bore the dedication in archaic Latin: 'Castorei Podlouqueique qurois', 'to Castor and Pollux, the kuroi'.[4] The dating of the tablet to the late sixth century B.C. accords marvellously with the dramatic entrance of the Dioscuri into Roman history, at the Battle of Lake Regillus, traditionally assigned to 499 or 496 B.C. According to the common version of this story, at the height of a battle between the Romans and their Latin neighbours, the dictator Aulus Postumius vowed a temple to Castor and Pollux if they would come to his aid. They did, and the Romans won. Later that same day two tall and handsome young men, battle-weary and in military gear, appeared at Rome, to wash and water their horses in Lacus Iuturnae, the Pool of Juturna, at the eastern end of the Forum, near the Temple of Vesta. They announced the victory to passers-by before disappearing, and the next day news arrived from the dictator, reporting the details and the divine intervention.[5] Their temple, usually called the Temple of Castor, was erected in the south-eastern corner of the Forum, next to the Pool of Juturna, and it was dedicated by the dictator's son in 484 B.C. So went the standard (but not necessarily correct) version of the arrival of the heavenly twins in Rome.

Castor and Pollux reappeared in the Forum to announce victories at other crucial moments in Roman history — after the great battles of Pydna (168 B.C.), Vercellae (101 B.C.), and Pharsalus (48 B.C.) — and their temple became one of the focal points of the community by the time of the Late Republic, a meeting-place for the Senate within, a speakers' platform and voting area without, a centre for debate and riot. Above all, as

[4] *ILLRP* 1271a.

[5] For details and references to the temple and the cult of the twins at Rome: J. Sihvola in E. M. Steinby (ed.), *Lacus Iuturnae* I (1989), 76–109; B. Poulsen, 'Cult, myth and politics', in I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen (eds), *The Temple of Castor and Pollux. The Pre-Augustan Temple Phases with Related Decorative Elements* (1992), 46–53; *LTUR* I (1993), 242–5, 'Castor, Aedes, Templum' (I. Nielsen); E. La Rocca, '"Memorie di Castore": principi come Dioscuri', in L. Nista (ed.), *Castores. L'immagine dei Dioscuri a Roma* (1994), 73–90. R. M. Ogilvie argued that the main temple of the cult of Castor and Pollux in Latium was at Tusculum, in the territory of which Lake Regillus lay, and that the vow of a temple to the twins at Rome rewarded not merely their assistance to the Romans but their desertion of the Latins, analogous to an *evocatio*, the ceremonial request to the enemy's deity to change sides: R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy* (1965), 288–9, 781. See further below.

warriors on horseback the brothers became patrons of the Roman knights who, every year on 15 July, the anniversary of the battle, celebrated a great equestrian parade, the *transvectio equitum*. Up to 5,000 of them, wearing olive crowns and dressed in purple robes with scarlet stripes, attended the annual sacrifice at the Temple of Mars out on the Via Appia and then rode in procession through the city and the Forum to pass by the Temple of Castor on their way to the Capitol. The temple was also a hub of activity in daily life, a sort of bank and repository of weights and measures, surrounded by various enterprises: cobblers, moneylenders, a cloakmaker, and slave-dealers are attested, and there were certainly taverns nearby.[6] Some twenty-nine shops were actually built into the podium beneath the temple, one of which was a combination barbershop-beauty salon-gaming parlour-pharmacy and dentist's office, where dozens of extracted teeth were excavated in the 1980s, along with what may be tongue depressors and probes, not to mention coins, gaming-pieces, jars for unguents, drinking glasses, and cups.[7] If the scores of oaths in Roman comedy are any guide to life in the streets — 'Ecastor!' or 'Mecastor!', and even more 'Edepol!': By Castor! By Pollux! — the twin gods who presided over this bustle were casually called upon by everyone everywhere. In sum: Castor and Pollux were deeply embedded in the Roman consciousness; they conjured up specific vivid images; and they were very popular indeed.

According to tradition, their ancient temple was dedicated on 27 January 484 B.C. It was restored sometime in the second century; reconstructed in 117 B.C. by the triumphing general L. Caecilius Metellus Delmaticus; repaired to some extent in 74 B.C. by the notorious praetor Gaius Verres; and then rebuilt by Tiberius Caesar and dedicated by him on 27 January A.D. 6, in his own name and that of his brother Drusus, who had died in the autumn of 9 B.C.[8] Tiberius in fact completely replaced the five-hundred-year-old Temple of Castor in the heart of Rome with a new building dedicated to the immortal twins by two brothers, one by now the co-ruler with, and son and heir apparent of, the Princeps Augustus, the other dead now thirteen years and more. This association of Tiberius and Drusus with Castor and Pollux at the heart of Rome was a brilliant political statement, emotive, even provocative.[9]

[6] The classic (and only) description of the parade is that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, at 6.13.4. Cobblers, *sutores*, near the temple: Pliny, *NH* 10.121–2. Bankers or moneylenders, *argentarii*, 'behind the Temple of Castor' ('post aedem Castoris'): *CIL* VI.9177, 30748, cf. 9393 (= *ILS* 7696). A cloakmaker, *sagarius*, likewise 'behind the Temple of Castor', *CIL* VI.9872. Slave-dealers, 'mancipia ementes vendentesque, ad Castoris': Seneca, *De Constantia Sapientis* 13.4, cf. Plautus, *Curculio* 481. Taverns: Catullus 37, cf. Appian, *BC* 1.54. The Severan marble plan of the city appears to show a row of shops on the far side of a small piazza at the rear of the temple: http://formaurbis.stanford.edu/fragment.php?record=85 (T. Najbjerg, J. Trimble).

[7] Briefly: B. Ginge, M. Becker and P. Guldager, 'Of Roman extraction', *Archaeology* 42.4 (1989), 34–7. Full publication: P. Guldager Bilde and B. Poulsen, *The Temple of Castor and Pollux* II.1* *The Finds* (2008), 253–322. The rich commercial life around the Aedes Castoris and the adjacent Basilica Iulia and Scalae Graecae is vividly evoked by R. Neudecker, 'Ein göttliches Vergnügen. Zum Einkauf an sakralen Stätten im kaiserzeitlichen Rom', in R. Neudecker and P. Zanker (eds), *Lebenswelten. Bilder und Räumer in der römischen Stadt der Kaiserzeit* (2005), 81–100.

[8] References at *LTUR*, loc. cit. (n. 5).

[9] The association was first discussed by K. Scott, 'Drusus, nicknamed "Castor"', *CP* 25 (1930), 155–61, and 'The Dioscuri and the imperial cult', *CP* 25 (1930), 379–80; brought up to date by B. Poulsen, 'The Dioscuri and ruler ideology', *SO* 66 (1991), 119–46 (an influential article: cf. the Appendix, below), and La Rocca, op. cit. (n. 5). Most recently, see A. Suspène, 'Tiberius Claudianus contre Agrippa Postumus: autour de la dédicace du temple des Dioscures', *RPh* 75 (2004), 99–124, and G. S. Sumi, 'Monuments and memory: the Aedes Castoris in the formation of Augustan ideology', *CQ* 59 (2009), 167–89.

II

The story begins with the death of Castor, breaker of horses. From 12 to 9 B.C. the two young brothers had conducted brutal campaigns of conquest in the North, Tiberius in the Balkans, Drusus in Germany. Drusus penetrated with fire and sword as far the Elbe, but he withdrew, discouraged it was later said by a woman of superhuman stature who predicted his imminent end. He died at the age of thirty, sometime late in 9 B.C. Among the grim omens — wolves howling in the camp, the wailing of unseen women, shooting stars — one stands out: two young men were seen riding through the middle of the entrenchments. The uncanny appearance of two horsemen in a military camp could suggest only one thing to Romans: a visitation by the heavenly twins. Yet here, for the first time in history, they did not anticipate or report a victory, they warned of disaster.

The true magnitude of the ensuing calamity might not at first glance be obvious. Later authors are unanimous in reporting simply that Drusus died in camp of 'some illness', *morbus*, *nosos*,[10] but a markedly different account was offered by Drusus' contemporary, Livy, who was actually composing his history of Rome when the young general died. His version survives only in a brief and contorted summary of Book 142, five sentences long: Drusus carried the war against the German tribes across the Rhine, but 'he died of a broken leg, caused by his horse falling upon it, on the thirtieth day after it happened'. Perhaps we can reconcile death from a broken leg with death from 'some disease' — gangrene following on a fracture, say — but the unique detail of the broken leg is striking. Livy in fact chose to conclude his enormous history with the death and funeral of Drusus in 9 B.C., followed, apparently, by brief mention of the legendary destruction of the entire army of Quinctilius Varus in Germany in A.D. 9, some seventeen years later. His point was surely that the death of Drusus was disastrous indeed for Roman history: the young prince would have conquered Germany, as contemporaries lamented, and the tremendous Varian disaster, *clades Variana*, with its loss of three legionary eagles and 15 to 20,000 men, would never have happened.[11] It was that important for the history of Rome.

Some three or four decades later, when Tiberius was long established as Princeps, Valerius Maximus offered a dramatic narrative of his brother's death:

> It has been our fortune to behold a pair of brothers once the glory of the Claudian clan, now also of the Julian. Our Princeps and parent (*sc.* Tiberius) had so great a love implanted in his heart for his brother Drusus that when at Ticinum, where he had come as victor over enemies to embrace his parents, he learned that in Germany Drusus' life hung in the balance from a grievous and dangerous sickness, he at once dashed off in a panic. How swift and headlong his journey, snatched as it were in a single breath, is evident from the fact that after crossing the Alps and the Rhine, travelling day and night and changing horses at intervals, he covered at a full stretch two hundred miles through a barbarous country recently conquered,

[10] Suetonius, *Claudius* 1.3, cf. Porphyrio ad Hor., *Carm.* 4.4.27–8, *morbo*; D 55.1.4, *nosoi*, cf. 55.2.1; Pliny, *NH* 7.84, *aegrotum*; Seneca, *Consolatio ad Marciam* 3.1, *aegrum*; Valerius Maximus 5.5.3, *gravis et periculosa valitudo*.

[11] The main accounts of Drusus' death vary somewhat. D 55.1 has him turned back by the female apparition and dying 'from some disease' on the other side of the Rhine. (Strabo, a contemporary, mentions in passing, at 7.291, that he died across the Rhine, but gives no cause.) Suetonius, *Claudius* 1.2–3, seems to date the apparition earlier, to 11 B.C., and has Drusus die 'from disease in his summer camp' at a place thereafter called 'Scelerata', 'Accursed'. Livy, *Periochae* 142 has him die, apparently across the Rhine, thirty days after his leg was broken by his horse falling on it.

The significance of Drusus' death is emphasized by the female apparition. She represents a whole range of such figures who warn conquerors and explorers that certain boundaries are set and if those boundaries are crossed, such hubris arouses the envy of supernatural powers: A. H. Krappe, 'Der Tod des Drusus', *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum und Deutsche Literatur* 75 (1930), 290–6.

> with his guide Antabagius as his sole companion … Drusus too … at the very moment that separates life from death ordered his legions with their ensigns to go meet his brother, so that he be saluted as Imperator … To these I for my part know that no example of kindred affection can suitably be added save Castor and Pollux.[12]

Tiberius' frantic dash to his brother's bedside, from north-west Italy to Germany across the Rhine, became the stuff of legend. The drama has two acts. First, the headlong race north, recounted by Livy (now lost) and retold by others, the dying Drusus' struggle to show his brother the honours befitting a victorious general, the last fraternal kiss and embrace, the ritual closing of the eyes.[13] Then, Act 2, funereal deliberation. The German tribes cease fighting, as a sign of respect. Tiberius brings the corpse to Rome, walking ahead of it all the way. For the first stage, in enemy territory, from the summer camp to their winter quarters, probably at Mainz, the body was borne by the young general's centurions and tribunes; thence it was carried by the leading men of each town and city passed by the cortège. Augustus and Livia joined it at Ticinum, and from there they proceeded to Rome, where Drusus was eulogized extravagantly, buried with elaborate ceremony in the vast new family tomb of Augustus, and showered with honours. Among the latter was the award of the name 'Germanicus', signifying the conqueror of Germany, which was also to be borne by his two small sons.[14]

Drusus' posthumous fame as Drusus Germanicus was enormous and enduring, his family the keepers of the flame. His young widow was routinely identified for decades, in literature, inscriptions, and papyri, as 'Antonia Drusi', Antonia the wife of Drusus: she survived him by almost forty-five years and never remarried. Their elder son (born in 15 B.C.) was known, after his adoption by his uncle Tiberius in A.D. 4, as Germanicus Julius Caesar, and became the darling of the Roman people. His younger brother, the future Princeps Claudius (born in 10 B.C.), is regularly named on inscriptions as Tiberius Claudius Nero Germanicus, son of Drusus Germanicus. Claudius' predecessor and successor as Princeps, Gaius and Nero, were routinely identified as the grandson and great-grandson of Drusus. But the architect of his memory seems to have been their matriarch, Livia, later Julia Augusta, who is named on inscriptions as mother of Drusus Germanicus decades after his death.[15] Seneca, writing not too long after her demise in

[12] Valerius Maximus 5.5.3 (Loeb translation by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, slightly modified). Valuable analysis at D. Wardle, 'The heroism and heroisation of Tiberius: Valerius Maximus and his emperor', in P. Defosse (ed.), *Hommages à Carl Deroux* 2 (2002), 433–40.

[13] Various details at Livy, *Per.* 142; Valerius Maximus 5.5.3; Pliny, *NH* 7.84; D 55.2.1; *Consolatio ad Liviam* 89–94; Seneca, *Consolatio ad Polybium* 15.5. The first four of these emphasize the haste of Tiberius' journey: beyond that, how much of the story is fact and how much embroidery is unknown.

[14] S insists at 7.3 that Tiberius walked all the way with the body. But Mainz to Rome is about 800 miles by modern highways with bridges, viaducts, and tunnels, none of which was available in 9 B.C. Tiberius had also to reckon with an additional unknown distance beyond the Rhine, the heights of the Alps, and an extremely harsh winter (T 3.5.1). An epic journey indeed.

'Municipiorum coloniarumque primores': Suetonius, *Claudius* 1.3; D 55.2.1. Cf. Seneca, *Consolatio ad Marciam* 3.1: 'ingens civium provinciarumque et totius Italiae desiderium, per quam effusis in officium lugubre municipiis coloniisque usque in urbem ductum erat funus triumpho simillimum.' And *Consolatio ad Liviam* 169ff., at 173: 'funera ducuntur Romana per oppida Drusi.' At Rome the order of the scribes received the body and brought it to the Forum where Tiberius delivered the eulogy; thence it was conveyed to the Circus Flaminius, where Augustus delivered a second eulogy. From there the knights carried the corpse to the Campus Martius, where it was burned at the Ustrinum, and the ashes were buried in the Mausoleum. Drusus was posthumously given the name Germanicus, and awarded statues, an arch, and a cenotaph on the Rhine. On all of this, see the thorough commentary of P. M. Swan, *The Augustan Succession: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's* Roman History *Books 55–56 (9 B.C.–A.D. 14)* (2004), 44–7, with references.

[15] References (more have accumulated for each): *PIR*² C 857 (Drusus), A 885 (Antonia), I 221 (Germanicus), C 942 (Claudius). Nero Claudius Drusus Germanicus Imp. appears often on the coins of his son Claudius: *RIC* Claudius 69–74, 93, 98, *et al.* Livia as mother of Drusus Germanicus: named Livia Drusi f. Augusti (before A.D. 14), *CIL* IX.3304 (Superaequum); and Iulia Augusta (after A.D. 14), *CIL* II.2038 (Anticaria: 'mater Ti. Caesaris principis et conservatoris et Drusi Germanici genetrix orbis') and XI.7416 (Ferentium). In one

A.D. 29, assures us that, 'She never ceased from proclaiming the name of her dear Drusus. She had him pictured everywhere, in private and in public places, and it was her greatest pleasure to talk about him and listen to the talk of others — she lived with his memory.'[16]

Memory is never neutral, and Drusus was important to the dynasty, as Claudians supplanted Julians: contemporary writers competed in elaborate posthumous praise of his virtues. For Valerius Maximus, Drusus Germanicus was 'the particular glory of the Claudian family, his country's rare ornament, and, best of all, one who by the grandeur of his achievements, in the perspective of his years, marvellously matched the Augusti, his stepfather and his brother, the two divine eyes of the commonwealth'. For Velleius Paterculus, Drusus Claudius the brother of (Tiberius) Nero was 'a young man endowed with as many great qualities as man's nature is capable of receiving or application developing. It would be hard to say whether his talents were the better adapted to a military career or the duties of civil life; at any rate, the charm and the sweetness of his character are said to have been inimitable, and also his modest attitude of equality towards his friends. As for his personal beauty, it was second only to that of his brother.' For Seneca (who imagines Claudius referring to his father as Drusus Germanicus), he 'would have made a great Princeps, and had already shown himself a great leader. For he had penetrated far into Germany, and had planted the Roman standards in a region where it was scarcely known that any Romans existed.'[17]

Others explicitly invoked Drusus as their muse. A now anonymous poet addressed his ponderous *Consolation* to Livia on the loss of her son, praising in 474 lines not only these two but every member of the dynasty whom he could recall. And sometime in the late 40s, while serving in Germany, Pliny the Elder was inspired in a dream by an image of Drusus, *Drusi Neronis effigies*, 'who had conquered widely in Germany and died there' to write a history of all of Rome's German Wars. The image commended his memory to Pliny and begged the writer to save him from the injustice of oblivion. Oblivion was not a likely prospect under the rule of Drusus' son, Claudius, but the posthumous injunction was a neat way for a scholarly officer to win the attention of his Princeps.[18]

'Drusus Germanicus' accordingly figured prominently on public monuments and their inscriptions, most memorably in the record of elaborate posthumous honours decreed by the Senate in A.D. 20 to his elder son Germanicus, himself untimely dead in A.D. 19. These included a triumphal arch in the Circus Flaminius, surmounted by a statue of Germanicus Caesar standing in a chariot and flanked by statues of family members, of which the first named was 'Drusus Germanicus, his natural father and brother of Tiberius Caesar'; another arch near Drusus' cenotaph on the Rhine; and, set up in the portico of the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine, among the portraits of other

inscription, *CIL* XI.1165 (Veleia) she is, tortuously, Iulia Augusta, daughter of the divine Augustus, mother of Ti. Caesar Augustus, son of the divine Augustus, and of Nero Claudius Drusus (no mention of Germanicus).

[16] *Consolatio ad Marciam* 3.2, Loeb translation by J. W. Basore: 'Non desiit denique Drusi sui celebrare nomen, ubique illum sibi privatim publiceque representare, libentissime de illo loqui, de illo audire; cum memoria illius vixit.' Probably to be dated to the years A.D. 33/37: J. Bellemore, 'The dating of Seneca's *Ad Marciam de Consolatione*', *CQ* 42 (1992), 219–34.

[17] Valerius Maximus 4.3.3; Velleius Paterculus 2.97.2–3; Seneca, *Consolatio ad Marciam* 3.1, cf. *Consolatio ad Polybium* 15.5 (Loeb translations by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, F. W. Shipley, and J. W. Basore, respectively).

[18] *Consolatio ad Liviam*: whatever the origins of this poem, there is no reason to doubt that it is exactly what it claims to be, and that it was produced sometime between the dedication of the Temple of Castor and Pollux in A.D. 6 and Livia's death in A.D. 29; cf. *NP*, s.v. Compare the poetic effusions of Clutorius Priscus, one on the death of Germanicus, for which he was rewarded by Tiberius, and one anticipating the death of Drusus Caesar, for which the Senate had him executed: T 3.49–51; D 57.20.3.

Pliny's dream: Pliny, *Epp.* 3.5.4, with the remarks of H. I. Flower, *The Art of Forgetting. Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture* (2006), 3–5. Tacitus perhaps recalls Pliny's *Bella Germania* when he refers to the German deeds of 'Drusus Germanicus' in his own *Germania* (34.3, on Drusus' daring) and his *Historiae* (5.19).

distinguished men, two busts 'of Germanicus Caesar and of Drusus Germanicus, his natural father and the brother of Ti. Caesar Augustus'.[19] In so emphatically displaying the long-gone Drusus, not only did the Senate have its eye on the dynasty, both Senate and dynasty had their eyes on the public. 'Drusi magna apud populum Romanum memoria', 'the memory of Drusus among the Roman people was considerable', as Tacitus wrote about events that unfolded in A.D. 14, over two decades after the man's death, and Dio confirms that a few years earlier, in A.D. 6, during a time of urban disorder, the people had been comforted by a mark of honour to the memory of Drusus. The dead prince was a popular figure.[20]

Not only is memory never neutral but, another truism, it is contentious. Discord had arisen immediately. The soldiers wanted to burn Drusus' corpse in his armour, but 'his brother against their will snatched away the sacred body', according to the *Consolation to Livia*, while Seneca has Claudius praise Tiberius for maintaining discipline and restoring the old-fashioned way of mourning at a time when the army 'was not only disconsolate but distraught, and claimed the body of the loved Drusus for itself'. In fact a compromise was reached, as his troops were allowed spontaneously to erect a cenotaph on the banks of the Rhine, around which soldiers would run on an anniversary day each year. The soldiers' love for Drusus surely contributed to their idolatry of his elder son, Germanicus Caesar, and it even transferred to his younger son. After the murder of Caligula, the praetorian who discovered Claudius hiding in the palace called out to his companions, 'Here's a Germanicus: let's carry him off and make him emperor!'[21]

[19] Drusus Germanicus on public inscriptions: notably *CIL* VI.40329 = *ILS* 148 (Rome, from the Campus Martius); 40330 (Rome: his *elogium* in the Forum of Augustus); 40337; 40339 (Rome: the dedication of the Temple of Castor and Pollux, on which see below); 40424 (Rome, possibly from the Ara Pietatis Augustae); *AE* 1962.37 (Saepinum); and the fragment of *fasti* at *AE* 1981.316 (Hispellum). The honours of Germanicus: the third mention of his father noted in the text above appears in the Tabula Hebana, recording the Lex Valeria Aurelia of A.D. 20, the first two in the partially overlapping Tabula Siarensis, which records the decree of the Senate that preceded that law. The bibliography on these and several related fragments is enormous, their reconstruction fiendishly complicated: easily the best place to start is M. H. Crawford (ed.), *Roman Statutes* (1996), 1.507–47.

The memory of Drusus may also dominate the scenes on two well-known silver cups from Boscoreale: F. de Caprariis, 'Druso, Giove Feretrio e le coppe "imperiale" di Boscoreale', *MEFR* 114 (2002), 713–37, arguing (vs. A. L. Kuttner, *Dynasty and Empire in the Age of Augustus. The Case of the Boscoreale Cups* (1995)) that they reflect well-known images generated around the dead Drusus rather than a specific (and otherwise unattested) public monument erected to commemorate Tiberius' victory.

For some of the many posthumous portraits of Drusus: D. Boschung, 'Die Bildnistypen der iulisch-claudische Kaiserfamilie', *JRA* 6 (1993), 51; C. B. Rose, *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period* (1997), 83, 90, 100, 108, 110, 153; W. R. Megow, *Kameen von Augustus bis Alexander Severus* (1987), 180, 204, 276. Most intriguing is a veiled bust 'Found in Capri' and acquired by the British Museum in the nineteenth century, whose face shows 'a certain boyishness, in spite of his obvious maturity' (J. Pollini, 'Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus and the Ravenna Relief', *RM* 88 (1981), 129, with Tafeln 38 and 39, dating the portrait to 'the later Julio-Claudian period', 130), and who is clearly the same person as a togate figure from Caere (ibid., Tafeln 37 and 38). The man's identity is contested, but a convincing case for Drusus is offered at Rose, 63–4 with n. 75.

[20] T 1.33.2, translated by A. J. Woodman; D 55.27.3. Tacitus reverts to the theme of Drusus' popularity at 2.41.3 and 6.51.1. The obvious bears re-stating, that all of his posthumous honours were for a man who did not actually conquer Germany, although everyone agreed that it was inevitable: cf. Strabo 7.1.3; Porphyrio on Horace, *Epp.* 1.3 pr ('Drusus qui subactis Germanis Germanicus dictus est').

[21] *Consolatio* 169–72; Seneca, *Consolatio ad Polybium* 15.5: 'totum exercitum non solum maestum sed etiam attonitum corpus Drusi sui (sc. Tiberii) sibi vindicantem.' Cenotaph: D 55.2.3; Suetonius, *Claudius* 1.3, 'honorarium tumulum'. The tumulus was almost surely mentioned in the Tabula Siarensis a 26–8, in which, if we accept W. D. Lebek's ingenious restoration of the Latin, we can see the compromise as the Senate decreed in honour of Germanicus 'that a third arch either [be built onto or be placed near that burial mound] which [the army had first begun to construct on its own initiative] for Drusus, the brother of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, and then [completed] with the consent of the Divine Augustus': Crawford, op. cit. (n. 19), 1.515. Claudius 'a Germanicus': Josephus, *AJ* 19.217.

Drusus' 'great memory' among the people of the city of Rome was an even more serious matter, for as Tacitus goes on to explain, 'it was believed that, if he had been in charge of affairs, he would have given them back their freedom'. Suetonius agrees: Drusus did not hide his intention to restore the old republic whenever he should be able to, and he even wrote a letter to his brother in which he talked about forcing Augustus to restore liberty.[22] The reality of these plans of Drusus is dubious and not too important — they do have the ring of propaganda manufactured in factional struggles over the following decades. The significant element is their rôle in his posthumous popularity. Suetonius is indignant at another use to which they were put: some authors had dared to assert that Augustus was suspicious of Drusus, that he recalled him from his province, and that, when Drusus was slow to respond, Augustus had him removed by poison. Impossible, says Suetonius, offering four proofs of the Princeps' great affection for his stepson: he always named the young man co-heir with his own sons, as he once announced in the Senate; in his funeral laudation before the people, he solemnly called upon the gods to make his Caesars (that is, his sons Gaius and Lucius) like Drusus, and to give himself as honourable a death as they had given Drusus; he wrote a verse eulogy for him and had it inscribed on the tomb; and he composed a memorial of his life in prose. But what do these actions prove? Three of the four displays of affection were certainly posthumous; the fourth, the assertion about his will in the Senate, might well be too; and a fifth, omitted by Suetonius, certainly was, that is, the composition of the inscription for the statue of Drusus which the Princeps added to the galleries of Roman heroes that lined his new Augustan Forum.[23] Whatever affection he may have felt for his stepson in life, he made a great public show of that love when the man was dead.

Augustus' expropriation of the popular memory of his stepson was outrageous. Orchestrating the posthumous memorials, he delivered a lachrymose eulogy in the Circus Flaminius which quite overshadowed the words of Drusus' brother Tiberius, spoken earlier in the Forum. This was part of a creative outburst by the stricken Princeps, along with the verse epitaph, the prose memorial, the honorific inscription on the statue base.[24] But he went much farther than mere association: he essentially adopted the dead Drusus into his family. At the funeral the corpse was surrounded by the busts not only of his Claudian ancestors but of the Julii, to whom Drusus was not related. He was buried not in the family tomb of the Nerones, but in Augustus' great Mausoleum, the tomb of the Julii, *tumulus Iuliorum*: as the anonymous poet put it, somewhat obtusely, Drusus would not join in burial his forefathers of old. And among the statues of Roman heroes which lined the Forum Augusti, that of Drusus stood not with the great men on one side of the square but with the Julian family on the other. For Ovid, the brothers were from the clan of the gods (that is, Julians, not Claudians),

[22] *Claudius* 1.3, *Tiberius* 50.1. Suetonius uses the letter to introduce a grossly unfair section of the biography of Tiberius devoted to his supposed hatred of his close relatives, suggesting that Tiberius betrayed his brother's words. But this is the only instance given of such antipathy, against many displays of fraternal affection; the incident is not dated, and the Republican Tiberius might well have produced the letter after the death of Augustus, as part of his own resistance to taking up the principate; and Suetonius contradicts himself, for it can hardly have been a betrayal if Drusus himself made no secret of his intentions.

[23] Suetonius, *Claudius* 1.5. The fragmentary inscription from the Forum Augustum, published in 1933, is now *CIL* VI.40330: '[Nero] Cl[a]udiu[s] Ti(beri) f(ilius) / [Dru]sus German[i]cus / [co(n)s(ul)] pr(aetor) urb(anus) q(uaestor) aug(ur) imp(erator) / [app]ellatus in Germania'. Pliny the Elder informs us that Augustus himself composed the *elogia* in his Forum: *NH* 22.13.

[24] Memorials: inscriptions in Mausoleum and Forum Augustum; eulogy; memoir; permission for tumulus on the Rhine (Tabula Siarensis). Eulogy overshadows that delivered by Tiberius: Suetonius recalls Augustus' emotional plea to the gods, but does not mention the speech of Tiberius; while in its narrative of events, the *Consolatio*, whose author claims to have been there, likewise recalls Caesar's tearful laudation and his dramatic plea to the gods for a similar death (209–12, cf. 464–5), and completely ignores Tiberius' speech.

while Valerius Maximus called them the fraternal pair, formerly the glory of the Claudian clan, now also that of the Julian.[25]

Drusus' funeral, his burial, his memorial: all Julian. What did the man's brother, Tiberius Claudius Nero — later Tiberius Julius Caesar — make of all this? His reaction, when it came, was Tiberian in its subtlety and deliberation.

III

To reconstruct it, we must first consider three brief notices offered by Cassius Dio in what is our only narrative account of the reign of Augustus. After the funeral, Tiberius was dispatched back to Germany to renew the campaign. His success there was rewarded with the acclamation as Imperator for a second time and the promise of a triumph when he returned to take up his second consulship in January of 7 B.C.

> Tiberius on the first day of the year in which he was consul with Gnaeus Piso convened the Senate in the Portico of Octavia, because it was outside the *pomerium*. After assigning to himself the duty of repairing the Temple of Concord, in order that he might inscribe upon it his own name and that of Drusus, he celebrated his triumph, and in company with his mother dedicated the so-called Livian shrine.[26]

Thus the year began with a strong display of family unity. In the past, Tiberius' real military accomplishments had not earned him a triumph. By contrast, in 8 B.C. he had been occupied with the grimly inglorious task of pacifying the frontier in the wake of his brother's death, and he had won no notable victory. Yet now he was awarded his triumph. He had also been consul a mere seven years earlier: triumph and second consulship in 7 B.C. thus recognized him as the bulwark of the regime. Since he could not cross the sacred boundary of the city before the celebration, he summoned the Senate to meet him not in the Senate House but a few hundred metres away, outside the *pomerium*, in the Porticus Octaviae, next to the Theatre of Marcellus in the Campus Martius. Augustus had built this large and lavish portico, which enclosed several public buildings, from the spoils of his campaigns in Dalmatia in the 30s, and he had dedicated it in the name of his sister, Octavia. Tiberius' choice of setting for the Senate was thus a gracious bow to the Princeps and the Dalmatian triumph which he had celebrated in

[25] T 3.5.1: 'circumfusas lecto Claudiorum Iuliorumque imagines.'

Burial in the Mausoleum: H. von Hesberg and S. Panciera, *Das Mausoleum von Augustus. Der Bau und seine Inschriften* (1994), 74–5. None of the earlier burials in the tomb was in fact a member of the Julian family, but Agrippa was at least the natural father of Augustus' two sons by adoption, Marcellus was his nephew, and Octavia was his sister; whereas Drusus was only his stepson and the husband of his niece. *Tumulus Iuliorum*: T 16.2; cf. Livy, *Periochae* 142, Drusus buried 'in tumulo C. Iuli'. *Consolatio* 161–3: 'Quod licet, hoc certe: tumulo ponemur in uno, / Druse, neque ad veteres conditus ibis avos. / Miscebor cinerique cinis atque ossibus ossa.' Livia comforts herself: 'This at least is possible — in this tomb shall we be laid together, Drusus, nor buried shalt thou go to the sires of old; I shall be mingled with thee, ashes with ashes, bone with bone.' (Loeb translation by J. H. Mozley.)

The position of the statue in the Forum Augusti is assured by the location of the fragments of its inscription: M. Spannagel, *Exemplaria Principis. Untersuchungen zu Enstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums* (1999), 288–91.

Ovid, *Fasti* 1.707: 'fratres de gente deorum.' Valerius Maximus 5.5.3: 'fraternum iugum, Claudiae prius, nunc etiam Iuliae gentis … decus.'

[26] D 55.8.1–2 (Loeb translation by E. Cary, modified): Τιβέριος δὲ ἐν τῇ νουμηνίᾳ ἐν ᾗ ὑπατεύειν μετὰ Γναίου Πίσωνος ἤρξατο, ἔς τε τὸ Ὀκταουίειον τὴν βουλὴν ἤθροισε διὰ τὸ ἔξω τοῦ πωμηρίου αὐτὸ εἶναι, καὶ τὸ Ὁμονόειον αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἐπισκευάσαι προστάξας, ὅπως τό τε ἴδιον καὶ τὸ τοῦ Δρούσου ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἐπιγράψῃ, τά τε νικητήρια ἤγαγε καὶ τὸ τεμένισμα τὸ Λίουιον ὠνομασμένον καθιέρωσε μετὰ τῆς μητρός.

The invaluable commentary of P. M. Swan makes annotation superfluous, op. cit. (n. 14), 71–5. On the complex connotations of Concord at Rome, see especially B. Levick, 'Concordia at Rome', in R. A. G. Carson and C. M. Kraay (eds), *Scripta Nummaria Romana, Essays Presented to Humphrey Sutherland* (1978), 217–33.

29 B.C., and the gesture was neatly balanced by his subsequent dedication, immediately after his own triumph, of the equally lavish Porticus Liviae over on the Esquiline Hill, together with his mother, Livia, the wife of the Princeps.

Fitting nicely within this display of dynastic concord came the announcement that he would restore the great temple dedicated to Concordia at the north-western end of the Forum. But Dio's account prompts questions. Why choose a structure freighted with uncomfortably Republican associations, one that commemorated the bloody conclusion of a period of violent discord, the suppression of Gaius Gracchus and his followers in 121 B.C.? What 'restoration' did the temple need, and why did Tiberius in fact then completely rebuild it? Most curiously, what does Dio mean when he gives as Tiberius' motive for repairing the Temple of Concord the arresting 'so that he might inscribe upon it his own name and that of Drusus'?

The following year his rôle as champion, if not heir, of the regime was confirmed by the grant of the tribunician power, but that was soon followed by his retirement to Rhodes. *En route*, Dio tells us in an aside, Tiberius forced the people of the island of Paros to sell him the statue of their beloved goddess Hestia, the Roman Vesta, 'so that it might be set up in the temple of Concord'.[27] In time, he came back to Rome as a private citizen, in A.D. 2, but then, after the deaths of Lucius and Gaius Caesar in A.D. 2 and 4 respectively, he returned to centre stage as the second man of the Empire: he was adopted by Augustus, he received the tribunician power again, and he was dispatched for more hard fighting in Germany, returning to Rome each winter. There, on 27 January A.D. 6, he at last dedicated the great temple in the Forum in his own name and that of Drusus — but, to our confusion, it is the wrong temple.

In A.D. 6, as Dio briefly records, Tiberius dedicated 'the Temple of the Dioscuri, upon which he inscribed not only his own name — calling himself Claudianus instead of Claudius, because of his adoption into the family of Augustus — but also that of Drusus'. Not Concord: Castor and Pollux. It was to be another four years before the Temple of Concord was finally dedicated, on 16 January A.D. 10, the anniversary of the day on which Augustus had received the name 'Augustus'. Thus Dio, again very briefly: 'The Temple of Concord was dedicated by Tiberius, and both his name and that of Drusus, his dead brother, were inscribed upon it.'[28] The Forum now shone with not one but two gleaming and very new versions of its largest temples, overflowing with carefully selected old master paintings and sculptures, all allegedly paid for by the triumphal spoils of two brothers, one of whom had returned from virtual exile less than eight years before, while the other had been dead for seventeen years.[29] In short,

[27] 55.9.6, with Swan, op. cit. (n. 26). This act of imperial brutality sits ill with Tiberius' later professed concern for the provincials, and he would be the first to recognize the irony of its connection with 'concord'. However we explain it, two banal observations are valid: retired or not, he had not forgotten the Temple of Concord; and its importance to him trumped common morality.

[28] Castor and Pollux: D 55.27.3–4, Loeb translation by E. Cary, modified; full Greek text below at n. 56. Dio gives the year; the day appears in the *Fasti Praenestini* and at Ovid, *Fasti* 1.705.

Concord: D 56.25.1: τῷ δὲ δευτέρῳ τά τε ἄλλα τὰ προειρημένα ἐγένετο, καὶ τὸ Ὁμονόειον ὑπὸ τοῦ Τιβερίου καθιερώθη, καὶ αὐτῷ τό τε ἐκείνου ὄνομα καὶ τὸ τοῦ Δρούσου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τεθνηκότος ἐπεγράφη. Dio and the *FP* give the year; the *FP*, the *Fasti Verulani*, and Ovid the day, Ovid at *Fasti* 1.637ff.

[29] Good brief introductions to the two temples at *LTUR* I (1993), 316–20, 'Concordia, Aedes' (A. M. Ferroni), and 242–5, 'Castor, Aedes, Templum' (I. Nielsen). A replacement for the standard monograph on Concordia (C. Gasparri, *Aedes Concordiae Augustae* (1979)), announced in *LTUR* I as in preparation, has not yet appeared; the Augustan Temple of Castor on the other hand is now thoroughly treated in the sumptuous volumes of P. Guldager Bilde and B. Poulsen, op. cit. (n. 7), in four parts, and of S. Sande and J. Zahle (eds), *The Temple of Castor and Pollux* III. *The Augustan Temple* (2008).

Gleaming: Ovid on the *niveum templum* of *candida Concordia*, *Fasti* 1.637. So much is known of the artwork in the Temple of Concord (mainly from Pliny) that a programme has been discerned, no mere museum collection but a symbolic paean to the values proclaimed by the dynasty: B. Kellum, 'The city adorned: programmatic display at the *Aedes Concordiae Augustae*', in K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher (eds), *Between Republic and Empire:*

Tiberius Caesar took immense care to erect two enormous public shrines in the heart of Rome, marble clad, bursting with artworks, that explicitly, in their dedicatory inscriptions, and implicitly, in the deities whom they honoured, immortalized his relationship with his brother.

The gaps and curiosities in this extraordinary sequence raise questions that cannot be answered. We do not know when Tiberius vowed to rebuild the Temple of Castor. We may deduce from the sequence of the two dedications, Castor in A.D. 6 and Concord in A.D. 10, that he promised the former some time before he promised the latter in January of 7 B.C.; or we might at least assume that he vowed Castor before sailing into retirement in the latter half of 6 B.C.; but we do not know.[30] More importantly, we do not know why these two temples needed repair. The standard repertory of Roman topography suggests that Concord 'was destroyed either by a fire or by the lightning that struck the Capitoline and other areas in Rome in 9 B.C.', whilst Castor 'was probably devastated in the fire of 14 or 9 B.C.', but there is no evidence whatsoever, literary or archaeological, for either assumption. Moreover, the argument from silence is strongly against them: the damage to other monuments is recorded; how could two of the greatest temples in Rome possibly be ignored?[31] Whatever their state of disrepair — each was little more than a century old, and both had been worked on in the intervening years — the essential point is that Tiberius did not repair or restore them: he replaced them, on a larger scale. And the only motive we are given, in the case of Concord and again from Dio, is that he wanted to inscribe his own and Drusus' names on it.

The place to start is with what mattered so much to Tiberius: the dedicatory inscriptions naming the two brothers on the architrave of each temple. Concord's dedication is completely lost, but exiguous fragments of that on the Temple of Castor have survived and they have recently been the subject of meticulous analysis and hypothetical restoration by Géza Alföldy, first published in 1992 and enshrined now in his monumental 1996 edition of the inscriptions of the emperors and their families from the city of Rome. His reconstruction of the text reads as follows:

Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate (1993), 276–307; A. Bravi, 'Tiberio e la collezione di opere d'arte dell' *Aedes Concordiae Augustae*', *Xenia Antiqua* 7 (1998), 41–82 (approved by T. Hölscher, 'Greek styles and Greek art in Augustan Rome: issues of the present versus records of the past', in J. I. Porter (ed.), *Classical Pasts. The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome* (2006), 253–4, promising to return to the subject soon). These interpretations may seem over-determined to some readers, and curiously neither mentions the posthumous equestrian statues in the Temple of Concord of Gaius and Lucius Caesar, of Germanicus, and probably of Drusus Caesar, which would have been hard to miss: Tabula Siarensis b 1–12, interpreted by A. Heinemann, 'Eine Archäologie des Störfalls. Die toten Söhne des Kaisers in der Öffentlichkeit des frühen Prinzipats', in F. Hölscher and T. Hölscher (eds), *Römische Bilderwelten. Von der Wirklichkeit zum Bild und zurück* (2007), 90–3. German spoils: S 20, discussing Tiberius' German triumph in A.D. 12, adds retroactively, 'He also dedicated the Temple of Concord and that of Pollux and Castor in his own name and that of his brother, from the spoils', 'dedicavit et Concordiae aedem, item Pollucis et Castoris suo fratrisque nomine de manubiis'. Ovid confirms that 'munera triumphatae gentis' paid for Concord: *Fasti* 1.647–8.

[30] On the date of the vows, see below.

[31] Fires: *LTUR* I (1993) as above n. 29, 317 (Concordia), 244 (Castor: correctly adding 'although such a destruction is not specifically mentioned in the sources'); cf. Poulsen, op. cit. (n. 9), 121. Repeated without question at L. Haselberger (ed.), *Mapping Augustan Rome* (2002), 97, 83.

The only source for these fires, and another in 12 B.C., is Dio, who gives examples of buildings damaged in each case. 14 B.C., Basilica Paulli and Temple of Vesta, burned in the same fire, 54.24.2. 12 B.C., portents of the death of Agrippa: 'many (buildings)' burned, including the Hut of Romulus, which was set alight by crows dropping on it burning meat from an altar: 54.29.8. 9 B.C., portents of the death of Drusus: 'many (buildings)' ruined or destroyed by a storm and lightning, and many temples, and the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus and associated deities harmed: 55.1.1. How could Dio have failed to name Concord and Castor in such reports; and how could he have failed to mention such damage as the reason for Tiberius' rebuilding of them?

Even more striking, the *Consolation to Livia* carefully reminds Livia at lines 401–4 of the damage done by lightning to Capitoline Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva (along with the *sancta domus Caesaris*, on the Palatine) as portending the death of Drusus. How could the poet, who mentions the Temples of Concord and Castor at lines 283–90, possibly have ignored any damage done to them in 9 B.C. and repaired by Drusus' brother?

On the left side of the frieze:

> [Ti(berius)] C[aesar Augusti f(ilius) Divi n(epos) Claudianus],
> [co(n)]s(ul) [iter(um), imp(erator) ter, tribunic(ia) pot(estate) VII, pontif(ex)],

On the right side:

> [Nero Claudius Ti(beri) f(ilius) Drusus Germa]ni[cus],
> [Augusti privignus, co(n)s(ul), i]imp(erator) [iter(um)], au[gur],

And beneath these, in larger letters, running the entire length of the architrave:

> [aedem Pollucis e]t C[asto]r[is incendio consumptam de manubiis r]ef(ecerunt).[32]

That is, Alföldy suggests that the names and titles of the two dedicators will have appeared in shallow twin columns, side by side: 'Tiberius Caesar, son of Augustus, grandson of the god (Julius), Claudianus, consul twice, imperator three times, in the seventh year of his tribunician power, pontifex', and 'Nero Claudius, son of Tiberius, Drusus Germanicus, stepson of Augustus, consul, imperator twice, augur'. And along the bottom, in a third line, the dedication concludes 'rebuilt with their spoils the Temple of Pollux and Castor when it had been destroyed by fire'.

Alföldy's reconstruction is brilliant, based on encyclopedic knowledge of Roman, and especially Augustan, epigraphic language and conventions, and on minute attention to the size, shape, and position of both the surviving letters and the fragmentary stones on which they are inscribed. Most of what he suggests looks right, in the light of convention and close parallels, and it is argued with clarity and in great detail.[33] But it is also bold, almost preposterous, since the original dedication is all but non-existent: the proposed reconstruction of its text runs to some 180 letters, of which a mere thirteen actually survive in whole or in part, on six scattered fragments. Moreover, serious doubts have recently been expressed, carefully but briefly, by Siri Sande, one of the excavators and principal publishers of the temple and its finds.[34] Not least of these doubts are her agnosticism about the relationship of four of the six fragments to the temple, two of which may be too shallow for a structure of its size, and her belief that one of the two undoubted fragments has been wrongly located in Alföldy's reconstruction. But equally serious doubts can be raised in turn about Sande's objections, not least that her proposed single line text for the dedicatory inscription is impossible.[35] Epigrapher and archaeologist look at the world with very different eyes, and the amateur stands at an impasse.

Much of Alföldy's proposed text must be right, that is, a major monument of Augustan Rome is inconceivable without the details of the nomenclature and titles of the dedicators in some form as he presents them, whatever the physical layout of the texts may have been. On the other hand, anything suggested by an epigrapher within brackets must be taken *exempli gratia*. Within this beckoning void an elastic variety of standard contractions may be called upon to fit the space available, precise numbers may give a false sense of security, and the longer the connected prose the less accurate the proposal is likely to be — thus here, for reasons presented earlier, the words *incendio consumptam* seem more than hazardous. Rather than accept the text of *CIL* VI.40339 as right or wrong, however, let us proceed on the assumption that it is good to think with. This is above all

[32] *CIL* VI.40339 (Rome). Brackets [] indicate portions that have been lost; parentheses () the expansion of standard epigraphic abbreviations.
[33] G. Alföldy, *Studi sull'epigrafia augustea e tiberiana di Roma*, Vetera 8 (1992), 39–58.
[34] Sande and Zahle, op. cit. (n. 29), 179–80, 183.
[35] As in notes 37 and 41 below.

because of Alföldy's sharp-eyed observation and incorporation of known details the significance of which has gone unremarked. It must then be understood that nothing that follows here — nothing — depends on his reconstruction of the dedicatory inscription on Tiberius' temple: rather, his reconstruction reflects otherwise attested fact for three remarkable novelties. In its pristine condition, this was one of the largest known dedicatory inscriptions in the Roman world. It ran to over 27 metres and the letters in the bottom row were over half a metre high. Emblazoned across the façade of a major and popular temple at the very heart of the capital, it was meant to be seen.

First, on it Tiberius named himself Claudianus, so Dio tells us. We must believe him on this, for he took pointed care to note both the name and the reason for it. And of course the inscription was there for all to read in his day, any doubter could stroll down to the Forum to check it in person. It must have read Claudianus.

For the first forty-four years of his life Tiberius had been known as Tiberius Claudius Nero, the son of Tiberius. After his formal adoption by the Princeps on 26 June A.D. 4, his legal name for the rest of his days was Tiberius Julius Caesar, the son of Augustus. Invariably in literature and normally on inscriptions the family name Julius was omitted, and he was known by the austere and imposing abbreviation, Tiberius Caesar. After the death of his adoptive father in A.D. 14 he might even be known as Tiberius (or, sometimes, Tiberius Julius) Caesar Augustus. When adopted at Rome under the Republic, an adoptee took on the full name of his new father, but it was a common custom to retain a form of the original family name as an extra surname (cognomen or agnomen): thus, a Lucius Aemilius Paullus adopted by a Publius Cornelius Scipio became Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, known to all as Scipio Aemilianus; indeed, Tiberius' own grandfather, Livia's father, was a Claudius Pulcher adopted by a Livius Drusus, hence Marcus Livius Drusus Claudianus. But never, anywhere, in hundreds of Latin and Greek texts, literary, epigraphical, and papyrological, by himself or by anyone else, is Tiberius Caesar ever called Claudianus: only here.

The Roman Forum was the very centre of Roman history, and what Augustus had done with it over his decades in power well represents the heart of his programme, that is, he preserved and restored it as a living museum of Rome's glorious past while inserting himself everywhere as the culmination of that glory.[36] He restored various emotive antiques, the Pool of Juturna itself, next to Castor and Pollux, the Black Stone outside the Senate House, the little shrine to Venus of the Sewers, all reminiscent of Rome's earliest days. But pious restoration was always put to use. The obscure Temple of Janus near the Senate House was transformed into the locus of a major ceremony, the forgotten ritual of closing its bronze doors when the Roman world was at peace: Augustus, the prince of peace, closed them three times, once more than in all previous history. On a huge triumphal arch at the eastern end of the Forum he listed all of the winners of triumphs and all of the consuls in Rome's glorious history: the arch was topped with a statue of Augustus, the winner of more triumphs and holder of more consulships than any previous Roman.

Indeed he converted the old political centre of Rome into a monument to himself and his family, for wherever you turned the prospect was dominated by Augustus. The Forum was, so to speak, Julianized. At the south-eastern end, facing the Capitol, stood the new temple to the Divine Julius, flanked by the triumphal arch of Augustus and a triumphal arch dedicated posthumously to his adopted son Gaius Caesar. Along the two sides of the Forum stood Rome's two largest administrative buildings, Julius Caesar's Basilica Julia, completely rebuilt after a fire and renamed for Augustus' sons, Gaius and Lucius

[36] The following sketch is heavily dependent on P. Zanker, *Forum Romanum: die Neugestaltung unter Augustus* (1972). For the arch of Gaius Caesar, see C. B. Rose, 'The Parthians in Augustan Rome', *AJA* 109 (2005), 58–64.

Caesar, and the Basilica Paulli, now masked by a new portico likewise named after the two young Caesars. At the north-western end of the Forum stood the Rostra, adorned with the prows of ships captured over the centuries, which now acquired a golden statue of Augustus on horseback and the prows of ships captured at his victory at Actium. The Curia, the regular meeting place of the Senate, burned down after Caesar's death, was now the Julian Curia, with Augustus' name prominent on the façade. Inside was a statue of Victory, commemorating his victories in the civil wars and the golden shield listing his four cardinal virtues. The Forum as reconceived by Augustus was not a crude monument to his own achievements, it intertwined his own glory with the glories of the Roman past.

The reconstruction and dedication of the Temple of Castor marks a new stage. It too was a shrewd blend of the old and the new for, again, a completely new building replaced and yet continued a Republican structure. More precisely, it heralded the arrival of its builder in a suitably ambivalent way. At first glance, it fits the standard Augustan practice: a new Caesar, Tiberius, emerges for the first time on the monuments of the city, and the name of Augustus surely appeared on his inscription as father and stepfather of the dedicators.[37] Yet the simple word 'Claudianus' shifts the balance forever, breaching the Julian monopoly of the Forum. It undercuts the adoption of Tiberius to emphasize his old natural family, an emphasis implicit in the whole structure, dedicated by two loving Claudian brothers to two loving brother gods.[38]

Before Tiberius, Augustus had adopted his two grandsons. Yet in no surviving text, literary or documentary, is there any hint of the names with which Gaius and Lucius Caesar were born, the sons of Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa; that is, nowhere is either called Vipsanianus, or (since Agrippa had dropped the 'Vipsanius') Agrippa or Agrippianus. Augustus himself had been born Gaius Octavius and had taken, at the age of eighteen, the name of his great-uncle, through a dubious 'testamentary adoption', to become Gaius Julius Caesar and, although known briefly as Octavian — Cicero seems to be the only contemporary to call him by that name — on no public document does he ever bear the adoptive cognomen Octavianus. That is, Augustus systematically suppressed the memory of former family ties within the pseudo-Julian family he had created and imposed on the Forum. However by January of A.D. 6 he was sixty-eight years old and slowing down. Tiberius' unique addition of the adoptive Claudianus to his own name on one of Rome's central monuments in A.D. 6 emphatically marks the shift in power which had begun in A.D. 4. In fact it was not unique. Although the cognomen appears only here in our sources, it surely recurred once, in A.D. 10, when the same two loving brothers erected, at the other end of the Forum and dominating it, a similarly new-old temple from the same spoils and dedicated to a similarly fraternal ideal, Concord. The Claudians had arrived.[39]

[37] It is inconceivable that the filiation of Tiberius ('son of Augustus' in this case) would be omitted from a public monument. That Drusus also was named as *privignus Augusti*, 'stepson of Augustus' must remain a hypothesis, but is extremely probable. Alföldy, op. cit. (n. 33), 51, adduces *ILS* 148 (Rome), an exact parallel for the name and relationship restored here, and *AE* 1981.316 (Hispellum): both were highly visible public documents. The inclusion of Augustus, who loved Drusus as a son, would be a gracious gesture by Tiberius, his exclusion hard to imagine. For what it is worth, the double appearance of Augustus in the two filiations is nicely balanced visually, and the lettering fits perfectly within Alföldy's careful and elegant reconstruction of the text.

[38] Tiberius might even claim an ancestral connection with the twins, for his distant ancestor Appius Claudius Sabinus, consul in 495 B.C., had immigrated from the otherwise unknown town of Regillum, which was probably in the territory of Tusculum, the main site of the cult of Castor and Pollux in Latium, and presumably near the equally unknown site of the Battle of Lake Regillus. Note also that as Princeps Tiberius had a villa at Tusculum (*CIL* XV.7814), where he certainly stayed in A.D. 34 and 36, and that the imperial cult there became entwined with that of Castor and Pollux (*CIL* XIV.2620, 2630).

[39] Horace 4.4.73–5: 'nil Claudiae non perficiunt manus, / quas et benigno numine Iuppiter defendit'. 37–8: 'quid debeas, o Roma, Neronibus, / testis Metaurum flumen.'

There is a second anomaly in the dedicatory inscription from the Temple of Castor, one which verges on the bizarre — indeed we might take it for a joke, if a joke is conceivable set out in gilt letters half a metre high, towering over the façade of a grand public monument.

Suetonius tells us that from his German spoils Tiberius 'also dedicated the Temple of Concord as well as that of Pollux and Castor in his own and his brother's name'.[40] Pollux and Castor: not Castor and Pollux. Again, as with Dio above, we cannot doubt Suetonius: his manuscripts betray no sign of trouble, and again, any contemporary reader in Rome who had forgotten the monumental text could revisit it in the Forum.[41]

The history of the temple's name is complex, not to say confusing. Under the Republic and Augustus, in Latin authors and inscriptions it was invariably called *aedes* or *templum Castoris*, the Temple of Castor, not the Temple of Castor and Pollux. Even the Romans thought this noteworthy. In 65 B.C., so the well-known anecdote ran, the curule aediles Julius Caesar and Marcus Bibulus produced games with public funds, but Caesar alone won all the popular goodwill. Bibulus then ruefully remarked that what had happened to Pollux happened to him, for just as the temple set up in the Forum to the twin brothers was called Castor's alone, so his own and Caesar's munificence was said to be Caesar's alone.[42] This anomaly can be explained by the assumption that the original fifth-century temple was dedicated to Castor alone — despite the much later legend of the Battle of Lake Regillus, and despite his being joined at a later date by Pollux in the temple (probably at its reconstruction in 117 B.C.), and for reasons unknown.[43] The

[40] S 20: text in n. 29 above.

[41] By sheer chance, or divine intervention, one of the six fragments used by Alföldy in the reconstruction at *CIL* VI.40339 bears the remains of two letters which seemed to confirm that the dedicatory inscription did indeed identify the building as the Temple of Pollux and Castor. Viz., frag. d, (certainly from the temple) to be restored: '[aedem Pollucis e]t C[astoris]'. This was first observed by G. Tomasetti in 1890: Alföldy, op. cit. (n. 33), 48–9, with discussion. The size of the letters assigns them to the third line of the text in his version. There is an interpunct on the stone, a small triangle marking the division between words. The first word ended with T, the second, only the top of which is preserved, began with a C or possibly G, O, or Q. From this point, the possibilities for words, combinations of words, and abbreviations on such conventional public inscriptions is severely limited (Alföldy duly cites parallels): the words *aedem, Castoris*, *et*, *Pollucis*, *de* and *manubiis* are all but assured in some order, and [*r*]*ef*(*ecerunt*) is preserved.

However, Sande sees traces of relief on the left side of the fragment (her ARC 19), two little drops that are man-made, and asserts that they represent decoration appropriate to the end of the architrave, hence that the letters belong not to the middle of the line but to its beginning. 'T.' will then represent not '[*e*]*t*.' but '*T* (*emplum*) C[*astorum/is*]'. As reconstructed, this is (apparently) the beginning of the dedicatory inscription. Alföldy's two shallow columns above this, his third line, are thus rejected along with the blocks on which their fragmentary letters appear.

Readers need not be warned that 'T. Castoris/um' cannot be. To begin the dedication of a major monument with a one-letter abbreviation would be unnecessary and inelegant, indeed grotesque, and no parallels are cited. To squeeze the proper names, let alone the inevitable titulatures of the two dedicators into what Sande assumes to be space for approximately forty-one letters between 'C[astorum/is]' and 'ref(ecerunt)' would be impossible however abbreviated, and no parallels are cited. The temple, commonly known as 'Aedes', was indeed called 'Templum' on occasion, as Sande points out, but such occasions are all literary: on inscriptions it is invariably 'Aedes'. The existence and significance of Sande's traces of decoration on the stone will have to be decided by experts. For the present: non liquet. If the preserved letters 't.c(?)' do not represent the words 'et Castoris', which we may deduce from Suetonius to have been used in the text, it is impossible to say what they signify.

The historian Florus, Suetonius' contemporary, has 'youths' turn up with laurelled letters announcing victory over the Cimbri in 101 B.C., which they deliver to the 'praetor pro aede Pollucis et Castoris' (1.38.20). This, the only other reference to the Temple of Pollux and Castor as such, surely reflects the Tiberian inscription. Poets might invert the normal order of the pair, but it is hard to explain why the prosaic Suetonius and Florus would do so — unless they saw it on the temple.

[42] Suetonius, *Divus Iulius* 10.1; D 37.8.2.

[43] G. D. Hadzsits' careful assembly and analysis of the complex evidence is essential on all of this: 'History of the name of the Temple of Castor in the Forum', in G. D. Hadzsits (ed.), *Classical Studies in Honor of John. C. Rolfe* (1931), 101–14. Though not much regarded by subsequent scholarship, it nevertheless strikes me as correct, however improbable the results may first appear. Hadzsits concluded (113): 'that the temple was at first and for long, Castor's; that, once Greek mythologies were widely diffused, it was possible in popular parlance to

phenomenon of separate cults to one or other of the brothers is adequately attested in the Greek world, so the original anomaly is eminently plausible in the early fifth century B.C., but designation as the Temple of Castor alone, even after he had been joined there at some stage by his brother, and peculiar apparently to Rome, continues well into the Principate, again in both literature and epigraphy. Under the Principate it was also sometimes called the Temple of Castor and Pollux. But even then Castor might still subsume Pollux, as their shrine was occasionally called the Temple of the Castors, *aedes Castorum*, an arresting term, again peculiar to the cult at Rome, that the Romans never explained.[44]

This subordination of Pollux to Castor seems to reflect the way that people thought of the heavenly twins. Overwhelmingly, to the Romans as to us, they are 'Castor-and-Pollux': scores of literary references attest to this order, with the conjunctions 'et' or 'ac', or in lists of gods without conjunction. 'Pollux-and-Castor' are exceedingly rare. Before Tiberius they had appeared thus only twice, in Propertius and Ovid, and after him that order soon disappears.[45] In short, whatever rare exceptions there might be, to the Romans of the Republic and early Principate the twins were Castor and Pollux and their temple was inevitably, for centuries, the Temple of Castor: whatever poetic variations there might be, to solemnly proclaim the popular Temple of Castor as the Temple of Pollux and Castor was contrary to a degree. The only plausible explanation of this contrarian order is that the comparison was not general, of pair with pair, but specific: Tiberius was proclaiming himself as Pollux the immortal and Drusus as Castor, the dead twin — a comparison rendered all the more pathetic, or ironic, in that it equated Castor, the mortal tamer of horses, with Drusus, who in one version of his end died because of a fall from his horse. The Temple of Pollux and Castor cries out for attention.

think of it and speak of it as the shrine of Castor and Pollux; that Pollux did become associated with Castor in worship – to what extent, exactly, we cannot tell, nor precisely when, though it would seem that this was an established fact in the second century B.C.; that the Greeks inevitably called it the shrine of Castor *and* Pollux, regardless of dates; that it was officially rechristened by Tiberius (before he became Princeps) as "the temple of Castor and Pollux," or as the "temple of the Castors".'

The crucial witness is Livy. The standard legend of the battle of Lake Regillus, as recounted above (and conveyed by such authors as Cicero, *ND* 2.6, 3.11–13; Dionysius 6.13.1; Florus 1.5.4; Plutarch, *Coriolanus* 3.4; Valerius Maximus 1.8.1), is a much later invention, as all would agree. But in his account of the battle (2.20.12), Livy says only that at a critical stage the dictator vowed a temple to Castor, which was later dedicated by his son (2.42.5): no divine epiphany, no Pollux, cf. Hadzsits, 101–5. (Ogilvie, op. cit. (n. 5), 289, avoids the problem.) Cults and sites dedicated to one or other of the brothers alone: E. Bethe, *PW* 5.1090, *s.v.* Dioskuren; note especially Pausanias 3.13.1, 20.1. A rock near Lake Regillus was said to preserve the hoof mark of Castor's horse: Cicero, *ND* 3.11–12.

Greek authors refer to *ton Dioskouron hieron*, *Dioskoreion*, and *naos ton Dioskouron*. These last designations are clearly anachronistic when referring to the Republic, and they uniformly mislead, since the term 'Dioskouroi', so natural to the Greeks to designate the inseparable Castor-and-Pollux, does not translate any Latin equivalent: the word 'Dioscuri' seems *never* to appear in classical Latin, whether literary or epigraphical, certainly not in an alternate name for the Temple of Castor and Pollux. Cf. Hadzsits, 105–6, 110–11. Note particularly Cicero, *ND* 3.53, where the word is left in Greek, and Augustus, *RG* 20.3, where the Temple of Castor, *aedem Castorem*, of the Latin original is translated in the Greek version as the Temple of the Dioscuri, τοῦ ναοῦ τῶν Διοσκόρων.

The Roman plural for the brothers, hardly equivalent to the neutral 'Dioskuroi', was the unbalanced 'Castores'. References to the twins as such are rare in literature, the earliest being the elder Pliny (*NH* 1.2a, 7.86, 10.121 (temple), 34.23 (temple), 35.27). Their temple is called *aedes Castorum* only by Pliny (twice) and by the fourth-century *Historia Augusta* (twice) and *Notitia* of the city; and although the Castores turn up in inscriptions, their temple does not.

As far as I am aware, *aedes Castoris* and *aedes Castorum* refer only to the temple in Rome, that is, shrines to the twin gods elsewhere always mention Castor and Pollux.

[44] For ancient references to the temple, see Hadzsits, op. cit. (n. 43) and, conveniently, *LTUR* I (1993), 242–5. Add, for *aedes Castoris*, the important *I. de Delos* 1511 (a senatusconsultum of 58 B.C.); and for *aedes Castoris et Pollucis*, *CIL* VI.2203. For the widespread phenomenon of twins being designated by one name: J. R. Harris, *The Cult of the Heavenly Twins* (1906), 58–62.

[45] Propertius 3.14.17; Ovid, *Amores* 2.16.13. Thereafter at Seneca, *NQ* 1.1.13 and Pliny, *NH* 2.101, both referring, as does Ovid, to the brothers in their rôle as stars. And thereafter only in Suetonius and Florus (as above), referring to the temple.

This leads to the third and strangest anomaly of all in its dedicatory inscription, one so obvious that it is invariably overlooked. As reconstructed, the text probably informed the world that, 'They rebuilt with their spoils the Temple of Pollux and Castor'. As everyone agrees, EF were the last two letters of the text, since the fragment on which they are preserved fits into the right-hand end of the architrave, diminishing before the end, and they must represent the verb [*r*]*ef*(*ecerunt*), 'they [that is, the two dedicators just named] rebuilt'. A good parallel lies in the dedicatory inscription repeated over each gate of the southern Italian town of Saepinum: 'Ti. Claudius Ti. f. Nero pont. cos. II, [imp. I]I trib. potest. V / Nero Claudius Ti. f. Drusus Germ[anicus] augur cos. imp. II / murum portas turris d. s. p. f. c.'; or, with standard abbreviations expanded, 'Tiberius Claudius, son of Tiberius, Nero, pontifex, twice consul, twice imperator, in the fifth year of his tribunician power, (and) Nero Claudius, son of Tiberius, Drusus Germanicus, augur, consul, imperator twice, took care that the wall, gates, and towers be built with their own money'. This unique text is dated by the iteration of Tiberius' tribunician power precisely to the year between late June 2 B.C. and late June 1 B.C., roughly six or seven years before the dedication of Pollux and Castor in Rome, and roughly six or seven years after Drusus' death.[46] The final 'c', for *curaverunt*, confirms the *refecerunt* at Rome. That is, the Saepinum inscription and the enormous inscription at Rome both boldly proclaimed a grand fantasy, something that everyone knew to be untrue. Drusus did not pay for anything 'from his own purse', as proclaimed at Saepinum, or 'out of the proceeds from his military spoils': Drusus was dead. There is nothing like it in Roman history. Occasionally a dedication might be made posthumously, by relatives or friends of the dedicator, but never is his death, like that of Drusus, simply ignored.[47]

The rededication of the Temple of Castor to Pollux and Castor shows two complementary sides of Tiberius the notorious mythologist: the erudite and the practical. As an ardent lover of myth he knew the story of the Dioscuri, their joint life of constant warfare (beyond the violent adventures of the Calydonian boar hunt and the quest for the Golden Fleece, the brothers were invariably at war, raiding, harrying, liberating, laying waste). He knew of their immortal love for each other, the violent death of one, the grand sacrifice of the other to resurrect him. He also knew that amid the wildly varying accounts of the brothers' paternity and maternity, and that of their sister Helen, the one constant was that Pollux/Polydeukes was the son of the god Jupiter/Zeus (perhaps just as Tiberius was now the son of Augustus). And as an ardent lover of the obscure detail, he knew that Pollux was the elder brother.[48] With his new

[46] *CIL* IX.2443 = *ILS* 147. The inscription has had a remarkably confusing history: A. Bernecker, 'Zur Tiberius-Inschrift von Saepinum', *Chiron* 6 (1976), 185–92; A. U. Stylow, 'Noch einmal zu der Tiberius-Inschrift von Saepinum', *Chiron* 7 (1977), 487–91. The composite text presented here is that of Stylow's definitive reconstruction. Note also *AE* 1991.530, a dedication to Tiberius from a local magistrate at Saepinum in 3/2 B.C.

[47] The fantasy of the dead Drusus engaged in public works with his living brother, thus attested on the Temple of Pollux and Castor and the gates of Saepinum, reappears on *CIL* VI.40337, the dedication of an unknown building between A.D. 4 and 14: the verb is lost, but again there seems to be no indication that Drusus was not alive. It was also presumably repeated on the inscription on the Temple of Concord in A.D. 10.

Up until Tiberius, temples vowed by one Republican nobleman, normally because of military victories, were often completed after a lapse of time and dedicated by another, usually a son or other relative: e.g. Honos et Virtus, vowed by the great Claudius Marcellus and dedicated by his son in 205 B.C., Livy 29.11.13; or the original Temple of Castor, dedicated by the dictator's son, Livy as above; or the Temple of the Lares Permarini, vowed by L. Aemilius Regillus in 190 B.C. and dedicated by his clansman M. Aemilius Lepidus in 170 B.C., complete with a long eulogy on a tablet over the door listing the man's deeds and his vow, Livy 40.52.4. But I can find no instance before Drusus of a temple at Rome erected by a dead man, and no case where the dedicator's death is ignored.

[48] Polydeukes/Pollux the elder brother: Theocritus, *Idylls* 22.176, 183. It would be pedantic to observe that Tiberius and Drusus were not actually twins, for Tiberius was comparing, not identifying, the two pairs. On the dissimilarity of Castor and Pollux: Harris, op. cit. (n. 43), 45–8.

temple he did precisely what Pollux had done for Castor: he made his dead younger brother immortal.

At the same time Tiberius knew as well as anyone the practical value of the myths of the heavenly twins to a Roman statesman, the saviour gods, benefactors of mankind, talismans of victory, beloved at Rome for five centuries, patrons of the knights, casually invoked by the people every day. The death of Drusus was a stroke of luck, his resurrection a stroke of genius. Whether he was so popular during his lifetime, whether he and his brother were so close, cannot be known. What is well attested is Augustus' much-vaunted love for his younger stepson, however posthumous, and his elaborate commemoration of his virtues. These played straight into Tiberius' hand, since the Princeps could hardly object to the public exhibition of fraternal piety by his own loyal son. How he played that hand — the jolting intrusion of the name 'Claudianus', the arresting inversion of Pollux and Castor, the reminder of the lost conquest of Germany in the spoils of Drusus 'Germanicus', the insistence that Drusus was not really dead, in short the whole great display of the heavenly twins — presents Tiberius the myth-maker as he crafts an original symbolic complex, a Claudian complex, from a popular ancient monument and a wildly popular dead hero. His notorious addiction to mythology mattered: he mastered Augustus at his own game.

IV

The gaps in Cassius Dio's account leave the chronological sequence unclear. When did Tiberius first conceive of the Claudians as Castor and Pollux? And more importantly, what happened to that conception after the erection of the two temples?

As to the first, there seems to be a piece of relevant evidence, a brief inscription from the theatre of Caesarea, the capital of the province of Judaea, discovered almost fifty years ago. As recently restored, again by Géza Alföldy, it can be read as follows:

[Nauti]s Tiberieum
[— Po]ntius Pilatus
[praef]ectus Iudae[a]e
[ref]e[cit]

How to understand this? As might be imagined, the epigraphic appearance of Pontius Pilate, the prefect of Judaea from A.D. 26 to 36, has stimulated an enormous bibliography.[49] Controversy has engulfed the first line: what was the lost first word represented by the surviving 's'; and what was the 'Tiberieum' restored by Pilate?

Alföldy drew attention to two passages in Josephus, in which the historian wrote of King Herod's construction of his shining new city of Caesarea, built and named to honour Caesar Augustus. Its crowning glory was the great harbour (hence Maritima) which Josephus describes twice at admiring length. Part of this harbour's enormous breakwater was surmounted by a stone wall: 'From this wall arose, at intervals, massive towers, the loftiest and most magnificent of which was called Drusion after the step-son of Caesar', to which

[49] *AE* 1963.104. Bibliography reviewed and argument presented: G. Alföldy, 'Pontius Pilatus und das Tiberieum von Caesarea Maritima', *SCI* 18 (1999), 85–108 (whence *AE* 1999.1681). Further arguments: idem, 'Nochmals: Pontius Pilatus und das Tiberieum von Caesarea Maritima', *SCI* 21 (2002), 133–48 (*AE* 2002.1556). Conclusions summarized: idem, 'Zwei römische Statthalter im Evangelium: die epigraphischen Quellen', in E. dal Covolo and R. Fusco (eds), *Il contributo delle scienze storiche allo studio del Nuovo Testamento* (2005), 226–36 (*AE* 2005.1583).

is added, in his other version of the same account, 'he died young'.[50] The loftiest tower should correspond, as the archaeologists have recognized, to a structure the remains of which lie at the end of the southern breakwater of the harbour (now under water), and which presumably served as a lighthouse. Alföldy argued forcefully that this Drous(e)ion, in Latin 'Druseum', must have had a pendant, on the northern breakwater, the 'Tiberieum' of the Pilate inscription. He then drew attention to Josephus' remark that Herod dedicated this safe haven to the sailors there, *tois ploizomenois*, and that gives us the correct restoration of the word lost at the beginning of the Pilate inscription: [*nauti*]*s*, the Latin equivalent, which neatly fills the space available. Hence the inscription is to be read: 'Pontius Pilatus, prefect of Judaea, restored the Tiberieum for the sailors.' Not only is this elegant, it is must be correct.[51]

More speculative is the corollary, again drawn by Alföldy, that Drusus and Tiberius were being compared by King Herod, as the author of the *Consolation to Livia* would compare them, with the 'harmonious stars', the brothers Castor and Pollux, in their rôle as the protectors of sailors at sea: the lighthouses, named after the two Claudian brothers, beckoned mariners with their starry light into their safe haven. Werner Eck subsequently pointed out that the great lighthouse at Alexandria is said to have been dedicated 'to the Saviour Gods on behalf of the sailors'. That is to say, in his ambitious new harbour works at Caesarea Herod consciously recalled the dedication of the Pharos, the lighthouse *par excellence* of antiquity, to Kastor and Polydeuces, the savers of sailors in distress.[52]

The association of Tiberius and Drusus with the heavenly twins is attractive indeed and would lead to a reasonable date. There is no hint that Tiberius and Drusus were in any way compared with Pollux and Castor before the death of Drusus — indeed the death of a brother ought to be the precipitating event. Drusus died in 9 B.C., King Herod in 4 B.C.: these would give us the terminal dates for the conception.[53] As Dio tells us, Tiberius announced his intention to build the Temple of Concord on 1 January 7 B.C., in his own and his brother's name. Again, Dio does not inform us when the Temple of the 'Dioscuri' was vowed, but it too was dedicated in the name of the Claudian brothers, while Suetonius likewise links the temples as dedicated in the brothers' names and as paid for by their *manubiae*. And we can see that both temples proclaim aspects of concord. There is no proof then, and the silence of Dio is problematic, but it seems most likely that the Temples of Concordia and Pollux et Castor were conceived as a pair, and the glorious idea of comparing himself and his brother to the twin gods came to Tiberius in the year 8 B.C., very soon after Drusus died.[54] Among the grim portents of his death was the appearance of the two superhuman youths riding through his camp in Germany: Castor and Pollux, come not to announce victory but, horrifyingly, to take

[50] Josephus, *BJ* 1.412 (Loeb translation by H. St. J. Thackeray): τοῦτο δὲ πύργοις τε διείληπται μεγίστοις, ὧν ὁ προύχων καὶ περικαλλέστατος ἀπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος προγόνου Δρούσιον κέκληται. *AJ* 15.336 (Loeb translation by R. Marcus): τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν περιεῖχεν λίθινον τεῖχος πύργοις διειλημμένον, ὧν ὁ μέγιστος Δρούσιον ὀνομάζεται, πάνυ καλόν τι χρῆμα, τὴν προσηγορίαν εἰληφὼς ἀπὸ Δρούσου τοῦ Καίσαρος προγόνου τελευτήσαντος νέου.

[51] Josephus, *BJ* 1.414, with Alföldy, op. cit. (n. 49, 1999), 96–101. Must be correct: the words 'Tiberieum' on the inscription and 'Druseum' in Josephus look to be unique in literature and epigraphy, both Greek and Latin; they are structures recalling two prominent and famously close brothers; they are essentially contemporary (note that Pilate's work was a refurbishment); and of all the cities in the Roman world, they come from the same one. Coincidence is unthinkable: how could the Tiberieum be anything but a pendant to the Druseum?

[52] Alföldy, op. cit. (n. 49, 2002), 148, citing Strabo 17.1.6 and Lucian, *Quomodo* 62. Note also a ship from Alexandria named for the Dioscuri: *Acts* 28.11.

[53] Work on Herod's harbour had certainly begun long before, and the pendant towers of the Druseum and the Tiberieum might be an afterthought, but 4 B.C. appears to be the latest possible date. It is true that Josephus mentions only the Druseum, and the Tiberieum is only certified as existing by A.D. 26/36, but again it is hard to conceive the one being built without the other and, again, Pilate's task in A.D. 26/36 was to restore a previously existing structure.

[54] It has been argued, and is commonly believed, that Augustus' sons Gaius and Lucius Caesar preceded Tiberius and Drusus as Castor and Pollux. There is no evidence for this: see the Appendix below.

the young prince away. Did Tiberius the mythographer exploit, perhaps even invent, this tale?

The notion is speculative, dependent on the dedication of the Pharos of Alexandria to the Dioskouroi, but the evidence for that is uncertain, and then on the hypothetical Tiberian and Drusian lighthouses at Caesarea Maritima.[55] The later development and significance of Tiberius' heavenly twins is much clearer. What came of it all, what was the power of their myth at Rome?

As we might expect, loyal contemporaries celebrated the connection of Castor and Pollux with the Claudian brothers. In his *Fasti*, under 27 January, Ovid wrote of the new shrine: 'The sixth day before the next Kalends a temple was dedicated to Ledaean gods. Brothers from a family of gods founded it for the brother gods near Juturna's pool.' Similarly, the author of the *Consolation to Livia*: 'Add too the Ledaean brethren, concordant stars, and the temples conspicuous in the Roman Forum. … Yet — woe is me! — Drusus will never see his bounty nor read his name upon the temple's front. Often will Nero weeping humbly say: "Why brotherless, alas!, do I approach the brother gods?"' The two poets were writing within a decade or so of the dedication of the temple, while not much later Valerius Maximus would make the comparison with Castor and Pollux explicit in prose.[56] But there is much more here than the flattery of courtiers and literary men. With Castor and Pollux Tiberius, the reserved and sardonic patrician who detested crowds, continues to reveal the shrewd politician, associating himself and his family with the popular heavenly twins through his equally popular dead brother.[57]

The connection had an impact on the turbulent political situation at Rome in A.D. 6. In that year Augustus faced great public upheaval, touched off by an unpopular tax he had imposed to fund his new military treasury, and exacerbated by a severe grain shortage and widespread fires. 'This lasted', Dio tells us,

> until the scarcity of grain was at an end and gladiatorial games in honour of Drusus were given by Germanicus Caesar and Tiberius Claudius Nero, his sons. For this mark of honour to the memory of Drusus comforted the people, and also the dedication by Tiberius of the Temple of the Dioscuri, upon which he inscribed not only his own name — calling himself Claudianus instead of Claudius, because of his adoption into the family of Augustus — but also that of Drusus.[58]

The gladiatorial games are juxtaposed by Dio with the dedication of the temple, and we should assume that the two were part of one celebration: why else hold memorial games thirteen years after the death of the man honoured? Not only did they serve to remind the people of their lost hero, they presented his sons and heirs, both called Germanicus in his honour, and they underscored the closeness of Tiberius and Drusus, for Tiberius had adopted his elder nephew, Germanicus, now nineteen and quaestor designate, on the same day that he himself had been adopted by Augustus. In the midst of turmoil, the people were comforted.

[55] Considered further below.

[56] Ovid, *Fasti* 1.705–8, Penguin translation by A. J. Boyle and R. D. Woodard; *Consolatio ad Liviam* 283–90, Loeb translation by J. H. Mozley; Valerius Maximus 5.5.3 (translation above).

[57] Despite the forbidding reputation passed on by our three major sources, there is good evidence for Tiberius' exceptional popularity with the people of Rome, some of which is considered in E. Champlin, 'Tiberius the Wise', *Historia* 57 (2008), 408–25.

[58] 55.27.3–4. Loeb translation by E. Cary, modified: μέχρις οὗ ἥ τε σιτοδεία ἐπαύσατο, καὶ μονομαχίας ἀγῶνες ἐπὶ τῷ Δρούσῳ πρός τε τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ τοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ πρὸς Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Νέρωνος, τῶν υἱέων αὐτοῦ, ἐγένοντο. τοῦτό τε γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ Δρούσου μνήμῃ παρεμυθήσατο, καὶ ὅτι τὸ Διοσκόρειον ὁ Τιβέριος καθιερώσας οὐ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ μόνον ὄνομα αὐτῷ, Κλαυδιανὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ Κλαυδίου διὰ τὴν ἐς τὸ τοῦ Αὐγούστου γένος ἐκποίησιν ὀνομάσας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐκείνου ἐπέγραψε.

When Tiberius was adopted by Augustus in A.D. 4, he brought with him two sons, the adopted Germanicus and his own Drusus: almost the same age, from then on the two new brothers were known as Germanicus Caesar and Drusus Caesar. Ovid took the hint. The poet who had linked Tiberius and Drusus with the refounding of the temple of the twin gods in the Forum, shifted the association to the next generation. Writing from exile in far off Tomis during Augustus' final years, he referred to Germanicus and Drusus as 'your grandsons, the young stars'. Later, he was more explicit in his imagined recreation of Tiberius' triumph over the Pannonians and Dalmatians, which was celebrated on 23 October A.D. 12: as Tiberius proceeded, 'his dutiful offspring [Germanicus and Drusus Caesar], along with you [the poet's friends, Messalla and Cotta Messallinus], accompanied him, worthy of their parent and of the names given to them, similar to those brothers, occupants of the nearby temple [that is, Pollux and Castor] whom the Divine Julius observes from his lofty shrine.'[59]

Germanicus died in A.D. 19, but in 20 by a happy chance twin sons were born to Drusus Caesar and his wife Livilla, the sister of Germanicus: Tiberius Julius Caesar and Germanicus Julius Caesar. The normally taciturn Tiberius was so overcome with joy that he could not restrain himself from boasting to the Senate that never before had any Roman of such rank been blessed with twin sons. In A.D. 23 the mint at Rome issued some remarkable coins, depicting the heads of two little boys facing each other set atop crossed cornucopias, with a caduceus in between, both symbols of good luck.[60] The hint was taken up in the Greek-speaking provinces. Coins at Cyrene and Corinth portray the brothers, the latter as 'the twin Caesars'. An alert citizen at Salamis, in Cyprus, proclaimed himself 'priest of Tiberius for life and of the twin sons of Drusus Caesar, Tiberius and Germanicus Caesar'. Best of all, a private cult was likewise established in Ephesus, dedicated to 'the new Dioscuri, the sons of Drusus Caesar'.[61] Hopes were dashed all too soon when, to his grandfather's grief, the younger twin died some time in A.D. 23, the same year as his father Drusus. Curiously, his surviving brother came to be

[59] Germanicus and Drusus Caesar almost the same age: G. V. Sumner, 'Germanicus and Drusus Caesar', *Latomus* 26 (1967), 413–35, convincingly argued for birthdates of 24 May 15 B.C. and 7 October 14 B.C. Ovid, *Tristia* 2.167; *Ex Ponto* 2.81–4: 'Quem pia vobiscum proles comitavit euntem, / digna parente suo nominibusque datis, / fratribus adsimiles, quos proxima templa tenentis / divus ab excelsa Iulius aede videt.' The implied emphasis here, hard to catch in translation, is on four generations of Caesars.

A few years later, during his consulship in A.D. 15, Drusus Caesar was given the nickname of Castor after he struck a distinguished member of the equestrian order, almost certainly the praetorian prefect Sejanus himself: D 57.14.9, 22.1; T 4.3.2: on which see Scott, op. cit. (n. 9). Who gave him that nickname and how widespread it was is not known, but it is very curious, and not immediately explicable: Pollux was the boxer, not Castor.

I find no evidence that Drusus was *Princeps iuventutis*, as claimed at Poulsen, op. cit. (n. 9), 128. While Germanicus and Drusus were depicted as loving brothers, there seems to be no official representation of them as Castor and Pollux: but see below. One of the most attractive portrayals of their affection is a fine coin issued after their deaths by the *koinon* of Asia, showing them sitting, togate, in curule chairs, and calling them 'Drusus and Germanicus Caesar the new gods of brotherly love', *neoi theoi philadelphoi*. The reference is to a cult of the old Attalid dynasty of Pergamum, paid to dead kings or their dead relatives: B. Levy, 'The date of Asinius Pollio's proconsulship', *JNG* 44 (1994), 79–89. Its application to Tiberius' dead sons is particularly neat.

[60] The birth: *I.It.* 13, 1.216; T 2.84.1 (dating it to A.D. 19, and adding the usual nasty Tacitean comment, 'for he turned everything, however chance, to glory'). The coins: *RIC* 32 (Rome). The complex of symbols — crossed cornucopiae, heads (the children assure the future), and caduceus (the wand of Mercury) — came to represent *felicitas temporum*, the good fortune of the age: for date, parallels, and precedents, see E. Meise, 'Der Sesterz des Drusus mit den Zwillingen und die Nachfolgepläne des Tiberius', *JNG* 16 (1966), 12–14.

[61] Coins: *RPC* 946 (Cyrenaica: 'Tiberius and Germanicus Caesar', with portraits on the reverse, 'Drusus Caesar son of (Tiberius) Augustus', with portrait, on the obverse); *RPC* 1171 (Corinth: 'Twin Caesars', with facing busts). Near Salamis: *IGRR* 3.997. Ephesus: *IK Ephesos* VII.2.4337. All of this material is presented at Poulsen, op. cit. (n. 9), 128–9. (*Pace* Poulsen, portraits on glass medallions from the north-western provinces do not appear to represent the infant twins: D. Boschung, 'Römische Glasphalerae mit Porträtbüsten', *BJ* 187 (1987), 193–258.)

known informally as Tiberius Gemellus, Tiberius the Twin, a reminder of what might have been.[62]

The evidence for the association of the heavenly twins with the emerging Claudian dynasty is sparse but clear, and there is one overlooked tale that brilliantly illustrates just how deeply meaningful it was for the people of Rome.

In his *Natural History*, Pliny tells a marvellous story. Talking birds are the subject, and he comes to the raven:

> Let us also remember the favour in which ravens are held, as is attested not only by the Roman people's sense of propriety but by their actual indignation. During the principate of Tiberius a young bird, from a brood hatched on top of the Temple of the Castores, flew down to a shoemaker's shop nearby, where it was welcome to the owner of the workshop because of religious considerations. It soon learned how to talk, and every morning it flew to the Rostra facing the Forum and greeted Tiberius by name, then Germanicus and Drusus Caesar, and, after that, the people of Rome as they passed by; finally it returned to the shop. The raven was remarkable in that it performed this duty faithfully for several years.
>
> The tenant of the shoemaker's shop next door killed the bird, either out of rivalry or in a sudden fit of anger, as he claimed, because his shoes had been stained by its droppings. This aroused such dismay among the plebs that the man was first driven out of the district and subsequently done away with, while the bird's funeral was celebrated with enormous ceremony. The draped bier was carried on the shoulders of two Ethiopians, preceded by a flutist and with garlands of all kinds along the way to the pyre, which had been constructed on the right-hand side of the Appian Way at the second milestone on what is called Rediculus' Plain.[63]

The emotional intensity of the People is astonishing. As the tale would have it, the killer is ostracized and indeed murdered. A bird is honoured with elaborate obsequies, complete with flutist, flowers, appropriately dark pallbearers, procession, and cremation — all this in an age when many of the mourners might expect no funeral for themselves. Much more is at stake than the loss of a favourite popular performer, which would soon have died in the course of nature. The physical setting in the heart of Rome is key. The bird is accepted as a guest by the cobbler out of piety, *religione commendatus*, before ever it begins to speak: it has come, after all, from Castor and Pollux. And, when it does quickly learn to talk, it does not perform in the shop. It flies rather to the other end of the Forum to address the world from, of all places, the Speakers' Platform — sensation! — and there, directly in front of the Temple of Concord, the messenger from the gods loyally salutes the dynasty.

[62] Death of Germanicus: T 4.5.1. Tiberius' nickname of The Twin seems to be attested only at Josephus, *AJ* 18.206 (explicitly) and on the papyrus *BGU* 156.6.

[63] Pliny *NH* 10.121–2, Penguin translation, J. F. Healey, substantially modified.

> (121) Reddatur et corvis sua gratia, indignatione quoque populi Romani testata, non solum conscientia. Tiberio principe ex fetu supra Castorum aedem genito pullus in adpositam sutrinam devolavit, etiam religione commendatus officinae domino. Is mature sermoni adsuefactus, omnibus matutinis evolans in rostra in forum versus, Tiberium, dein Germanicum et Drusum Caesares nominatim, mox transeuntem populum Romanum salutabat, postea ad tabernam remeans, plurium annorum adsiduo officio mirus. (122) Hunc sive aemulatione vicinitatis manceps proximae sutrinae sive iracundia subita, ut voluit videri, excrementis eius posita calceis macula, exanimavit, tanta plebei consternatione, ut primo pulsus ex ea regione, mox interemptus sit funusque aliti innumeris celebratum exequiis, constratum lectum super Aethiopum duorum umeros, praecedente tibicine et coronis omnium generum ad rogum usque, qui constructus dextra via Appiae ad secundum lapidem in campo Rediculi appellato fuit.

Pliny appends his usual moralizing comment, 10.123: 'The Roman people considered the bird's talent a sufficiently good reason for a funeral procession and for the punishment of a Roman citizen. Yet in Rome many leading men had no funeral rites at all, while no one avenged the death of Scipio Aemilianus after he had destroyed Carthage and Numantia.'

But the uncanny aspect of the incident is this. After deploring the whole affair, Pliny gives us a precise date for it: 'hoc gestum M. Servilio C. Cestio cos. a.d. kal. V Apriles', the raven's funeral took place on 28 March A.D. 35. Now Germanicus Caesar had departed from Rome as long ago as A.D. 17, and he had died in Antioch on 10 October A.D. 19. Drusus Caesar died at Rome on 14 September A.D. 23. Tiberius himself left the capital in A.D. 26 and never set foot within the *pomerium* again. That is, for several years, *plures annos*, the raven saluted two long dead princes and a long absent Princeps. In A.D. 6, the people had been consoled in their affliction by the games and the temple that honoured Drusus, their fallen hero. Now, three decades later, they honoured the talisman of his departed family and his gods, and (whether true or not) they drove out and murdered its destroyer. Their devotion in life and death is amazing: with it we catch a glimpse into a world we have lost, but one that Tiberius understood.[64]

V

Suetonius records three omens predicting Tiberius' death two years later. The first was a straightforward prophetic dream on his last birthday, 16 November A.D. 36: he had brought a famed statue of Apollo from Syracuse to set up in the library of a new temple of the divine Augustus, and the statue had warned him in the dream that it would not be dedicated by him. The second was the collapse of the lighthouse on Capri in an earthquake a few days before he died, 16 March A.D. 37. And the third was the curious behaviour of a brazier at Misenum, with no date specified but surely in his last days there. 'At Misenum the ashes from the glowing coals and embers which had been brought in to warm his dining-room, after they had died out and been for a long time cold, suddenly blazed up in the early evening and glowed without cessation until late at night.'[65]

As to the second of these portents, Suetonius' Latin reads *turris phari*, with 'pharus' being taken to mean lighthouse, referring to *the* lighthouse, the famous Pharos at Alexandria.[66] In his recent exhaustive study of the ruins of the 'Villa Jovis' on Capri, Clemens Krause has argued that it was indeed modelled on the famous lighthouse of Alexandria, but there is a surprise. The Pharus of Tiberius is not to be identified, as it commonly is, with the remains of the rather small, so-called 'Torre del Faro' near the modern entrance to the site, if only because the massive villa itself, lying directly to the north, would have blocked a large segment of its light from the Bay of Naples. (This conclusion seems to be right and has been accepted by reviewers.) Rather the Pharus should be seen as a much, much larger structure which dominated the far end of the great *ambulatio* to the north-west of the villa. Its ruins are meagre, but calculating from the impressive dimensions of the rectangular base of this so-called 'Loggia della Marina' — assuming a length of 49 m for the outer walls, which appear to have been over 4 m thick — Krause offers the striking deduction that the multi-storied structure, far from

[64] Compare the popular reaction to a false rumour spread at Rome in A.D. 19 that Germanicus had recovered from what was to prove his final illness at Antioch: 'a general rush was made from every side to the Capitol with torches and victims, and the temple gates were all but torn off, that nothing might hinder them in their eagerness to pay their vows. Tiberius was roused from sleep by the cries of the rejoicing throng, who all united in singing: safe is Rome, safe too our country, for Germanicus is safe.' (Suetonius, *Caligula* 6.1, Loeb translation by J. C. Rolfe).

Whether the raven incident is fact or folklore is moot. Macrobius relates two anecdotes about ravens trained to salute Augustus as *imperator*, the second of them by a poor shoemaker, indeed Augustus has a houseful of such avian *salutatores*: *Saturnalia* 2.4.30. There are also echoes of our tale at Plutarch, *Moralia* 973B–D.

[65] S 74.

[66] The standard work remains H. Thiersch, *Pharos. Antike Islam und Occident. Ein Beitrag zur Architekturgeschichte* (1909).

being a mere model or small-scale replica, rivalled in height and dimensions the great Pharos of Alexandria itself. That is, it would have towered some 300 feet above the cliff top, which itself loomed just over 1,000 feet above the sea. To judge from the extent of its platform and the thickness of its foundation walls, the structure must have been enormous, dwarfing even the massive villa. If not the Pharus of Tiberius, it is very difficult indeed to imagine just what else it might have been.[67]

Like their great model at Alexandria, ancient lighthouses signalled harbours, havens for sailors, more often than dangerous coastlines. Tiberius' Pharus, perched high on a sheer and soaring cliff really did neither: rather it drew attention to itself and the fabulous, many-storied palace of the supposed recluse who lived in its shadow. An enormous lighthouse of little practical importance, perhaps 300 feet high and visible from afar, erected on his private estate by a princeps who shunned extravagance, should be something more than a general symbol of imperial benevolence. Like the dedicatory inscription on his temples at Rome, it demanded attention. If it did bear a special meaning to him and the world, how better to remember the Saviour Gods whose kindly symbol the Pharos was, the heavenly models for the brothers Claudius?

The evidence for that symbol is, admittedly, slim. There is no doubt of the rôle of the Dioskouroi as the great saviours of sailors in peril at sea. And, intimately connected with this, there is also no doubt of the twins' close identification with what is now known as St Elmo's Fire: that is in the midst of storms at sea they appeared with their twin stars (which are repeatedly described as flames) to play harmlessly and reassuringly about the masts of ships in danger and to calm the threatening seas.[68] Was the security of their heavenly fire around the masts at sea extended to that offered to mariners by the flame on high in a lighthouse? That seems plausible but, against all the references to St Elmo's Fire reassuring seafarers in storms at sea, there is only one to a lighthouse beckoning them to a safe haven. That is precisely Lucian's version of the dedicatory inscription on the Pharos of Alexandria: 'Sostratos, the son of Dexiphanes, the Cnidian, dedicated this to the Saviour Gods on behalf of those who sail the seas.' Doubts have been expressed about its reliability: Lucian lived half a millennium after the Pharos was dedicated; Strabo appears to give a different version of the text; other 'saviour gods' have been proposed, perhaps all of the sea gods, perhaps the reigning Ptolemies. But against this it can be urged that Lucian saw what he saw, indeed reported it in a work on how to write history; Strabo's version does not contradict his; and there is overwhelming evidence that 'Theoi Soteres' without further definition would evoke the divine twins before any other divinities.[69]

[67] C. Krause, *Villa Jovis: die Residenz des Tiberius auf Capri* (2003), a sumptuously illustrated work in the popular series *Zaberns Bildbänder zur Archäologie*: the Pharus is the subject of an appendix, 'Anmerkungen zur Gesamtanlage' (92–7). In a particularly sceptical review of this book (*GFA* 7 (2004), 1063–9), U. Wulf-Rheidt drew attention to both errors and fragile speculations. At p. 1067 Wulf-Rheidt agrees with Krause's argument that the 'Torre del Faro' cannot be the Pharus, but she finds the essentially unexcavated remains of the 'Loggia della Marina' too exiguous to support his elaborate reconstruction of the Pharus there. In the only other serious review of Krause, P. Gros (*JRA* 17 (2004), 593–8) appears to accept the identification of the 'Loggia' with the Pharus. Cf. in slightly more detail the version in Krause's full-scale reconstruction of the villa: C. Krause, *Villa Jovis. L'edificio residenziale* (2005), 251–8. This work has thus far escaped the notice of both reviewers and standard bibliographies.

[68] Providing enough material for an entire dissertation: K. Jaisle, *Die Dioskuren als Retter zur See bei Griechen und Römern und ihr Fortleben in christlichen Legenden* (1907); cf. Harris, op. cit. (n. 43).

[69] Lucian, *Quomodo* 62; Strabo 17.1.6. There is a large, complex, and contentious bibliography on the construction and dedication of the Pharos in the third century B.C., well summarized by P. Bing, 'Between literature and the monuments', in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Walker (eds), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (1998), 21–43 = (revised) P. Bing, *The Scroll and the Marble. Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry* (2009), 194–216. The only matter relevant here is that it is established beyond reasonable doubt that a statue of Zeus Soter stood atop the enormous structure (thus Bing, building on P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), II.47–8; *et al.*): that is clear from ancient representations and from an epigram

Lucian's text is offered in support of his contention that history ought to be written not for the present generation but for eternity, and as such it concludes the tale of the inscription on the Pharos, which recorded the name of the king in plaster which was intended to fall off over time to reveal that of Sostratus in stone beneath. The fable is unlikely, but what of the text? Hundreds of Lucian's readers had seen the inscription, including some of the most learned men in the world, and it was there for all to observe: how or why would he get it wrong? Indeed, he draws our attention to the physical text visible in his own day, in commenting on Sostratus' aim: 'In this way not even he was looking to the immediate present or his own brief lifetime, but forward to our time and to eternity, as long as the tower stands and his skill survives.'[70]

If we are then justified in accepting that Lucian's text of the inscription on the great Pharos in his day is accurate, and that the Saviour Gods are who they should be, Kastor and Polydeukes, it maps neatly on to the only known near-life-size replica of the lighthouse, the enormous Pharus on Capri almost two centuries later, the construction of a Princeps known for his close personal identification with Castor and Pollux.[71] The collapse of the latter structure would then indeed be an especially fitting portent of the imminent end of the surviving brother.

Its personal significance to Tiberius is signalled by the flaring up of the ashes over at Misenum. The tale of that phenomenon must have been inspired by a Claudian family tradition, as recorded by Suetonius of the Princeps:

> Although he left very little to fortune and chance, he entered battles with considerably greater confidence whenever it happened that, as he was working at night, his lamp suddenly and without human agency died down and went out; trusting, as he used to say, to an omen in which he had great confidence, since both he and his ancestors had found it trustworthy in all of their campaigns.[72]

by the contemporary Posidippus (Gow-Page XI). Where then are the Theoi Soteres, the Dioskouroi? They appear only in Lucian, writing almost 500 years after the construction of the Pharos, and the problem is compounded by the two versions of the dedicatory inscription as presented by Strabo and by Lucian. P. M. Fraser translates these as follows: 'Sostratos the Cnidian, friend of the sovereigns, dedicated this for the safety of those who sail the seas, as the inscription says'; and 'Sostratos, the son of Dexiphanes, the Cnidian, dedicated this to the Saviour Gods on behalf of those who sail the seas'. The two texts do not fully overlap in either form or content, but they do not actually disagree with each other and, as Fraser noted, Strabo's may be read as a paraphrase.

We cannot dismiss Lucian as a late source, or as erroneously altering Dis Soter to Theoi Soteres. Such arguments are library-bound, and they stumble on the test of autopsy. Fraser (I.19), following an older scholarly tradition, reasonably remarked that 'the explanation may simply be that the dedication was in fact to all the deities who protect seafarers, and that Posidippus singled out Zeus, pre-eminent among such, because his statue crowned the lighthouse'.

It might be noted in this regard both that the lighthouses inferred by Alföldy at Herod's harbour at Caesarea were probably dedicated 'to the sailors' (Josephus), just as the Pharos was at Alexandria (Strabo and Lucian), and that they (the Druseum and the Tiberieum) would have been dominated by the great temple of Rome and Augustus, the Sebasteion or Caesareum. In that temple at Caesarea stood a colossal statue of Augustus, allegedly equal in quality to and modelled on the statue of Zeus at Olympia. That is to say, if Herod at Caesarea was indeed recalling the sailors' safe haven at Alexandria, Augustus, Tiberius, and Drusus at Caesarea would have nicely complemented Zeus and the Dioskouroi at Alexandria.

[70] Lucian, *Quomodo* 62, as translated by C. D. N. Costa, *Lucian, Selected Dialogues* (2005).

[71] Readers need not be reminded of the uncertainties involved, not only those noted already, but the assumption that the inscription in Lucian's Alexandria read the same in Tiberius' day; that Strabo is paraphrasing, not quoting, it; that Tiberius was responsible for constructing the Pharus on Capri; that the tower could accommodate both a statue of Zeus and a dedicatory inscription to Kastor and Polydeukes; that the Tiberieum and Druseum at Caesarea were lighthouses; *et al.*

[72] S 19: 'Proelia, quamvis minimum fortunae casibusque permitteret, aliquanto constantius inibat, quotiens lucubrante se subito ac nullo propellente decideret lumen et exstingueretur, confidens, ut aiebat, ostento sibi a maioribus suis in omni ducatu expertissimo.'

The two portents are clearly opposites: if the lamp dying out without human intervention is an omen of success for a Claudian, the brazier reviving without human intervention should foretell disaster.[73] This small flame at Misenum is then intimately connected with the history of the second Princeps. So too, we may now suspect, was the great flame of his lighthouse on Capri. When both were extinguished, the surviving brother departed and brought to an end his new tale of the heavenly twins.

APPENDIX: GAIUS CAESAR, LUCIUS CAESAR, AND THE DIOSCURI

In an excellent paper on 'The Dioscuri and ruler ideology', B. Poulsen argued 'that Augustus had already set the precedent of using Castor and Pollux as deities for the propagation of heirs in connection with Gajus and Lucius', and that he 'had planned a rededication of the temple of Castor in connection with Gajus and Lucius'. These conclusions are in danger of becoming orthodoxy, but what is the evidence for them?[74]

(1) As *principes iuventutis*, Gaius and Lucius supposedly led the revived *transvectio equitum*, the parade of the knights past the Temple of Castor and Pollux every 15th July, dressed like the two gods. This is fantasy. Gaius and Lucius headed the parade not as *principes iuventutis* but as *seviri turmae* (D 55.9.9), that is each led but *one* of the *six* squadrons of knights. More generally, there is no evidence that the twins were ever considered leaders of the parade, or that the *principes iuventutis* were thought to represent them as such. And *all* participants wore the same dress according to Dionysius (cf. Valerius Maximus 2.2.9a), and *all* of them rode white horses. Moreover, if Lucius gained the honours of the *principatus iuventutis* and the sevirate in 2 B.C. — as is standardly assumed, but the date may be 4 B.C.[75] — and if Gaius left for the East in 1 B.C., it would follow that at most they were able to join in one parade together (Lucius died in A.D. 2). Indeed, if, as C. B. Rose has argued forcefully,[76] Gaius left in May of 2 B.C., they did not ride together at all. That might of course be ignored in public images, but it is very awkward. Moreover, the brothers are simply *not* portrayed on coins with any of the attributes of the divine twins.

(2) Augustus had two paintings of Alexander the Great by Apelles installed in his Forum, one showing Alexander with Victory and the Dioscuri. As Alexander was Augustus, the two young Caesars were the Dioscuri, so the argument goes. Wishful thinking.

(3) There are 'several' provincial examples of 'these parallels' with the twins. In fact only three are presented, one of which is very dubious and one of which is not relevant. (3a) First is a Cypriot inscription, from Salamis, *IG* III.997, re-read by T. B. Mitford in 1947 (whence *AE* 1950.7) and 1974[77] as the bottom layer of a palimpsest, in the last instance supposedly naming Gaius and Lucius as 'twin sons' and Augustus as Zeus Caesar, but the reading is most suspect and the interpretation both error-ridden and unconvincing. (3b) A coin from Tarraco in Spain calls Gaius and Lucius twin Caesars, Caesares Gemin(i), *RPC* I.211. (3c) An inscription from Ephesus honours Trajan's doctor, T. Statilius Crito as (among other things) priest of Anaktores, of King Alexander, and of Gaius and Lucius, in that order, in the early second century A.D.: *IK Ephesos* III.719. What this tells us about the plans of Augustus over a century earlier is unclear, whether (the) Anaktores must be the Dioskouroi is by no means demonstrated, and there is no obvious

[73] The link is noted by H. Lindsay, *Suetonius, Tiberius* (1995), 98, 185. A. Vigourt, *Les présages impériaux d'Auguste à Domitien* (2001), 335–8, is disappointing on the death of Tiberius. The contrary nature of the omen is noteworthy, in that a lamp going out is good for the Claudii, just as the appearance of the Dioscuri was bad for one of them. Tiberius' special relationship with fire and the sun, indeed his unique mastery of flame, will be pursued elsewhere.

[74] Poulsen, op. cit. (n. 9), 122–6, Cf. the contributions of La Rocca, op. cit. (n. 5); Spannagel, op. cit. (n. 25), 28–34; Heinemann, op. cit. (n. 29), 45–8, 75–6; Sumi, op. cit. (n. 9), 179–81.

[75] See Swan, op. cit. (n. 26), 88–91.

[76] Rose, op. cit. (n. 36), 45.

[77] T. B. Mitford, 'A note from Salamis', in D. W. Bradeen and M. F. McGregor (eds), *ΦΟΡΟΣ* (1974), 110–16.

connection between them and Gaius and Lucius in the text. Even if these three texts were all unproblematic, there is no explicit or clearly implicit reference to the Dioscuri in them, and such random items can hardly reflect any broadcast imperial policy.

That is all there is, and from this Poulsen deduces that Augustus intended to rededicate the Temple of Castor to his grandsons, with the Claudians as his fallback choices. Despite this assurance, there is no sign that Augustus ever had any particular interest in the temple or its gods, and in all the public documents concerning Gaius and Lucius — some of them recording elaborate honours at length: the Tabula Hebana and the Tabula Siarensis, and the funerary decrees from Pisa, *ILS* 139, 140 — there is no sign of any association with Castor and Pollux. Indeed, the statues of the two princes later used in processions were apparently stored, as that of Germanicus would be, in the Temple of Concord, not that of the Castores: *Tab.Siar.* b. III.

A pair of statues found at Corinth (not adduced by Poulsen *et al.*) *may* show the young princes as Castor and Pollux: but not merely does this again tell us nothing about Augustus' policy at Rome, these two alone among forty-one sculptural representations of one or other of the supposed 'twins' offer a good instance (along with their non-representation as the Dioskouroi on coins) of the dog not barking in the night. The standard work on their portraiture is properly circumspect.[78]

Finally, it should be noted that powerful arguments were presented not long ago for the view that Tiberius' retirement to Rhodes in 6 B.C. caused, rather than was caused by, Augustus' promotion of Gaius and Lucius as his heirs.[79] That is to say, any putative alignment of the two Caesars with the heavenly twins would have come after that of Tiberius and Drusus.

The association with Castor and Pollux is made explicitly in our sources not with the Caesares but with the Claudii, first Tiberius and Drusus, then Tiberius' twin grandsons. The conclusion should be that it was invented by Tiberius the mythographer and has nothing to do with Augustus and his Julian sons.

Princeton University
champlin@princeton.edu

[78] J. Pollini, *The Portraiture of Gaius and Lucius Caesar* (1987): they 'recall classical figures like the Dioskouroi' (p. 19, and especially n. 4); they are 'in a sense like the Dioskuroi' (p. 20).
[79] B. Buxton and R. Hannah, '*OGIS* 458, the Augustan calendar, and the succession', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* XII (2005), 290–306.