

## THE END OF THE RHINE MUTINY IN TACITUS, SUETONIUS, AND DIO\*

Scholars have long argued that there are two distinct traditions for the end of the Rhine mutiny of A.D. 14, one in Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.39–44), the other in Dio (57.5.4–7); Suetonius primarily draws on the tradition found in Tacitus, but corrects it (*Calig.* 9), and he also shows an awareness of the tradition behind Dio (*Calig.* 48.1).<sup>1</sup> The differences occur in detail and in presentation. Tacitus has Agrippina and Gaius leave camp for the Treviri (1.40.4); this comes to the notice of the soldiers, who are moved at the turn of events, and Germanicus addresses them (1.41.3–43.4); the troops repent of their mutinous behaviour and request that mother and son be recalled; Germanicus declines to recall Agrippina but promises the return of Gaius (1.44.1). On the other hand, Dio has Germanicus send Agrippina and Gaius secretly from camp; both are seized by the soldiers (57.5.6), and on Germanicus' request the mother is released and the son retained; the soldiers are frustrated in their endeavours and the mutiny fades away (57.5.7). These divergences are supposedly the result of Dio, more realistically, placing the soldiery in control of the situation, and of Tacitus placing Germanicus in control, an implausible recasting of events to present him in a more favourable light.<sup>2</sup> Any suggestion that Tacitus and Dio could be narrating the same scene is regarded as reading the sources 'unnaturally'.<sup>3</sup>

The crucial failing of the 'two traditions' thesis lies in its discounting 'the notion, widespread in antiquity, that a work of historical research should also be considered a work of creative literary art', whose composition demanded that the writer apply his rhetorical skills to shape and embellish his narrative for maximum, though plausible, effect.<sup>4</sup> An awareness of the literary nature of ancient historiography will anchor discussion in this paper, since the problems to be encountered are literary, not historical. My argument is that Tacitus and Dio are not based on different traditions on the end of the Rhine mutiny: they display similarities to one another which indicate

\* Earlier versions of this paper were read in Wellington and Cambridge. For criticisms and suggestions I should like to thank A. B. Bosworth, J. A. Crook, M. D. Reeve, and *CQ's* editor and the anonymous referee.

<sup>1</sup> This paper engages primarily with the thesis of 'two traditions' as it has recently been argued by D. W. Hurley, 'Gaius Caligula in the Germanicus tradition', *AJPh* 110 (1989), 316–28 (= Hurley, *art.*, hereafter), which has found its way into the recent commentaries on Suetonius' life of Gaius: D. W. Hurley, *An Historical and Historiographical Commentary on Suetonius' Life of C. Caligula* (Atlanta, 1993), 26, cf. 172 (= Hurley, *comm.*, hereafter); H. Lindsay, *Suetonius: Caligula* (London, 1993), 68, 150; D. Wardle, *Suetonius' Life of Caligula: A Commentary*, Collection Latomus 225 (Brussels, 1994), 137. The thesis was first expressed in the nineteenth century by W. Liebenam, 'Bemerkungen zur Tradition über Germanicus', *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie* 143 (1891), 730, and has been argued since; Th. Mommsen, 'Die Familie des Germanicus', *Hermes* 13 (1878), 258, n. 1 = *Historische Schriften* (Berlin, 1965), 1.283, n. 1, argued that the version of Tacitus and Suetonius is the same as that found later in Dio, who cast his 'in seinem trockenen Pragmatismus' typical of later Greek writers. See Hurley, *art.*, for further bibliography.

<sup>2</sup> Hurley, *comm.*, 26; Hurley, *art.*, 317, 318, 319, 321, 327.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Wardle (n. 1), 137.

<sup>4</sup> S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X*, vol. 1: *Introduction and Book VI* (Oxford, 1997), 3ff. for excellent and convenient discussion and bibliography.

that they drew on a common source;<sup>5</sup> discrepancies in detail and in presentation, on the other hand, arise as a result of their different narrative strategies. What is at stake here can be illuminated by a question: is it a likely assumption that Tacitus would have changed his source for a scene within an episode when narrative strategy is a sufficient explanation of any modifications he might choose to make? It is unlikely that he would have made such a change, and to argue that he did simply moves the 'problem' of his version of events back one historiographical generation, thereby denying him autonomy as an author and recalling to mind the fallacy that only lost sources can produce innovations.<sup>6</sup> Moderns emphasize Tacitus' rhetorical embellishment of the Pannonian and Rhine mutiny narratives, but when examining his methodology they are quick to ignore the preconditions of such colouring: Tacitus engaged with his source material and considered it a legitimate part of his task to contribute artistically to his narrative. Dio worked in the same tradition as Tacitus, but the results are different. He collected, selected, and recast his material, yet the sheer size of his historical project meant that he had less narrative 'space' than Tacitus for individual episodes and less opportunity or reason to record *minutiae*, indulge in rhetorical effect, and develop narrative themes.<sup>7</sup> Compression was the result, and the greater the compression the more likely that Dio diverged from his source material and produced differences from the other extant accounts. Such is the case for the Rhine mutiny, as Dio condenses into one chapter what Tacitus covers in twenty-one. Yet Dio's allocation of one chapter apiece to the Pannonian and Rhine mutinies shows that, like Tacitus, he considered the events of comparable historical and thematic importance.

Both historians produce common material for their accounts of the Pannonian mutiny: the time of the mutiny (1.16.1–2; 57.4.1) and the motives of the troops (1.16.1; 57.4.3, cf. 4.1); the demands of the soldiers: a sixteen-year limit for service (1.17.5, cf. 19.4, 26.1; 57.4.2), pay of one denarius per day (1.17.5, cf. 26.1; 57.4.2), and financial compensation to be paid immediately (1.17.5; 57.4.2); Q. Junius Blaesus' success in winning the troops back to order (1.18–19; 57.4.3); the envoys sent to Rome (1.19.3–4; 57.4.3); Drusus' mission from Rome (1.24.1; 57.4.4), its unsatisfactory result and subsequent rioting (1.25–8, cf. 24.3; 57.4.4); the eclipse of the moon (1.28.1; 57.4.4); the storm (1.30.2; 57.4.5); the punishment of the guilty, by Drusus (1.29.4; 57.4.5) or

<sup>5</sup> Dio did not use Tacitus here—or much at all. As Syme remarked, Dio would have gone back to the first-century sources, thus here to the common source. For Dio and Tacitus, see R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 271, 482, n. 1, 688–92; 'The year 33 in Tacitus and Dio', *Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 19–20 = A. Birley (ed.), *Roman Papers* 4 (Oxford, 1988), 240–1; *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986), 446; R. H. Martin, *Tacitus* (London, 1981), 202–6; J. Edmondson, *Dio: The Julio-Claudians: Selections from Books 58–63 of the Roman History of Cassius Dio* (London, 1992), 30–1; C. L. Murison, *Rebellion and Reconstruction Galba to Domitian: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 64–67 (A.D. 68–96)* (Atlanta, 1999), 17.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art*, trans. J. G. Howie (Leeds, 1971), 3, 5, 38, 178, 182, 195. Cf. too the pertinent remark by W. W. Tarn (*Alexander the Great II: Sources and Studies* [Cambridge, 1948], 306–7), '... the well known belief that no writer we possess can ever have done any work for himself, but always had it done for him by some unknown predecessor who has perished without trace'.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. frs. 1.2; 2.4; 59.18.3, 22.5; 60.11.6; 63.17.2; 63.18.3. For discussion of Dio's method, see F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 32ff.; M. Reinhold, *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 49–52 (36–29 B.C.)* (Atlanta, 1988), 9–11; J. W. Rich, *Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement (Roman History 53–55. 9)* (Warminster, 1990), 5ff.; Edmondson (n. 5), 32–5; C. B. R. Pelling, 'Biographical history? Cassius Dio on the early principate', in M. J. Edwards and S. Swain (edd.), *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1997), 117–44; Murison (n. 5), 12.

by the soldiers themselves (1.29.4; 57.4.5);<sup>8</sup> and the return of quiet (1.30.5; 57.4.5–5.1). The differences between the accounts are the result of Dio's selectivity and/or Tacitus narrating material omitted by the later historian. Thus, Tacitus puts names to faces: the wounded companion of Drusus in Dio (57.4.4) is Cn. Lentulus in Tacitus (1.27.1); and Tacitus focalizes the narrative through personae: he presents the demands of the soldiers through a speech of a certain Percennius (1.17); Dio simply narrates them (57.4.2).

Dio omits one episode, which is included to good effect by Tacitus. At 57.4.3, Dio records that, after Blaesus had calmed the troops, envoys were sent to Rome to convey the demands of the soldiers; the account resumes with Drusus' arrival at camp from Rome (57.4.4). Nearly five chapters in Tacitus' narrative fill this gap between the departure of the envoys and Drusus' arrival. Some companies of troops, which had left camp before the mutiny, returned and the disturbances broke out afresh (1.20–21.1). There was a scuffle when Blaesus attempted to reassert order, and this only intensified the unrest (1.21). A common soldier, Vibulenus, addressed the mutinous crowd (1.22), violence erupted, and a centurion was killed (1.23). The reader leaves the scene with the eighth, ninth, and fifteenth legions at one another's throats (1.23.5), and the focus turns to Rome. Alarmed at the reports from the north, Tiberius sends Drusus out to Pannonia (1.24.1); at this point Dio's narrative resumes. Tacitus does much with this small episode. Attention is drawn to the emotions of the soldiers and to the charged atmosphere.<sup>9</sup> The transfer of focus from a potentially bloody confrontation in the north (1.23.5) to Rome (1.24.1) creates a juxtaposition that recalls the transition from *res internae* to *res externae* at 1.16.1. By the end of 1.15 the picture of Augustus' *dominatio* (1.3.1) and its smooth transference to Tiberius is established. Tacitus records the changes to elections and the holding of games for Augustus (1.15), switches focus to Pannonia for nearly fifteen chapters of mutiny (1.16–23, 24.3–30), then transfers to Germany for twenty-one chapters of mutiny (1.31–52). Stability in Rome is explicitly contrasted with unrest in the provinces (*hic rerum urbanarum status erat, cum Pannonicas legiones seditio incessit*, 1.16.1), and the impression is that civil war threatened Tiberius on his accession;<sup>10</sup> Dio has much the same message at 57.3.1–2 and 57.7.1, but his compression of the mutiny narratives places it outside their compass and offers less opportunity for exploitation. The legions' display of power through mutiny demonstrates that they had the potential to make or break an emperor. Such honesty throws into relief the hypocrisies of Tiberius' accession (cf. *Ann.* 1.46.1), when the *princeps* and the senate endeavoured to gloss over the reality of where the real

<sup>8</sup> Cf. E. Koestermann, *Cornelius Tacitus Annalen, Band I: Buch 1–3* (Heidelberg, 1963), 142; F. R. D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus, Books 1–6, Vol. I: Annals 1–1.54* (Cambridge, 1972), 235. Both argue, to quote Goodyear, that 'Dio 57.4.5 gives only the version of T.'s *plerique*. T., here as elsewhere, seems to have consulted a number of sources.' Dio however gives what may be considered the same two versions as Tacitus: the bodies were buried in Drusus' tent or by his followers. Dio does not include the sensational detail of Tacitus that those who were not buried in the tent were 'cast outside the entrenchments for all to see' (*corpora extra vallum abiecta ostentui*, 1.29.4), but the similarity is there and is indicative of a common source.

<sup>9</sup> Emotions: 1.21.2, 23.1; atmosphere: 1.22.1.

<sup>10</sup> Thus, on a narrative level, the mutinies look back to the *res internae* of 14, as much as, on an historical level, they look forward to the strife of 68–9. Cf. E. Keitel, 'Principate and civil war in the *Annals* of Tacitus', *AJPh* 105 (1984), 318, n. 27. D. O. Ross, Jr, 'The Tacitean Germanicus', *YCS* 23 (1973), 219, argues that Germanicus' handling of the Rhine mutiny results in the 'spectre' of civil war, and that Dio offers no such interpretation. Yet the atmosphere of civil war is established above and beyond Germanicus' specific actions and is not dependent on them; the role of the legions is crucial.

power lay, and the theme would presumably have appeared, 'ring-fashion', in reworked form at the end of the *Annals*.<sup>11</sup> The soldiers thus reveal an *arcanum imperii*, but they are not the first in the *Annals* to do so: Sallustius Crispus makes it clear during the Agrippa Postumus affair that power at Rome lay with one man alone, not with the senate (1.6.3).<sup>12</sup> Crispus utters a truth which offers the same commentary on politics at Rome as that implied in the juxtaposition created by the mutinies in the north.

Tacitus' subsequent shift to Rome at 1.24.1 enables that threat of civil war to be read back onto the earlier image of domestic stability in the capital. Tiberius is the focus, and Tacitus immediately draws attention to his withdrawn and secretive nature (*abstrusum et tristissima quaeque maxime occultantem*, 1.24.1), features that will become hallmarks of his personality as the history proceeds.<sup>13</sup> Circumstances forced the emperor to act (*haec audita . . . Tiberium perpulere*, 1.24.1) and he is obliged to take the drastic measure of sending Drusus, without specific *mandata*, to deal with the situation. Tacitus here introduces Sejanus into the narrative (1.24.2), and it says nothing good about him, or about Tiberius, that he makes his first appearance in such a troubled context. It reveals too how shaken Tiberius was by news of the mutiny and deemed it necessary to send a confidant as *rector* to his son. Sejanus takes no further part in the action and his introduction appears designed to draw attention to his great influence over Tiberius (*magna apud Tiberium auctoritate*) at the start of his reign—perhaps even before—and to foreshadow his eventual prominence in *Annals* 4.<sup>14</sup> More immediately Tacitus is again interested in locating the real sources of authority at Rome: Sejanus was a power behind the throne. By transferring the focus back to Rome, Tacitus builds on his characterization of Tiberius and represents through him the concern generated at Rome by the mutinies,<sup>15</sup> at such variance with the image of domestic stability and control sketched in the first fifteen chapters of the book.

Tacitus and Dio again exhibit a stock of shared information for their accounts of the Rhine mutiny: the soldiers' wish to see Germanicus as *princeps* (1.31.1, 35.3; 57.5.1); Germanicus' suicide attempt (1.35.4–5; 57.5.2); the forged letter, its detection by the soldiers, and the demand for its concessions (1.36, 37.1; 57.5.3,5; see below); the subsequent cessation of seditious behaviour (1.37; 57.5.4); envoys from Rome (1.39; 57.5.5; see below); the threat to Germanicus (1.39.3; 57.5.6), and the departure of Agrippina and Gaius from camp (1.40.3–41.3, cf. 42.1; 57.5.6). Tacitus' is the fuller

<sup>11</sup> C. B. R. Pelling, 'Tacitus and Germanicus', in T. J. Luce and A. J. Woodman (edd.), *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition* (Princeton, 1993), 69.

<sup>12</sup> This comes in a conversation Crispus allegedly had with Livia, which of itself is revealing in its insinuation of where power lay at the start of Tiberius' reign (cf. 1.4.5, 5.3–4; 4.57.3; Dio 57.12; A. J. Woodman, 'A death in the first act: *Annals* 1.6', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 8 [1995], 266–8 = *Tacitus Reviewed* [Oxford, 1998], 35–6). Note, however, that the word *princeps* is not used by Crispus; he uses *uni*, which, given Livia's role hitherto, takes on a subtle irony and ambiguity.

<sup>13</sup> Tacitus has already drawn attention to Tiberius' secretive nature (cf. 1.4.3, 4; 1.11.2) and will 'keep this picture before us' (Goodyear [n. 8], 219 with further references).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Goodyear (n. 8), 221. Foreshadowed too perhaps is Tiberius' appointing Cn. Calpurnius Piso as *adiutor* to Germanicus in his eastern command (*Ann.* 3.12.1; cf. *Ann.* 2.43.2; *SCPP*, line 29).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *SCPP*, lines 46–7: *iam pridem numine divi Aug(usti) virtutibusq(ue) Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti) omnibus civilis bellisepultis malis*. W. Eck, A. Caballos, and F. Fernández, *Das Senatum consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*, Vestigia 48 (Munich, 1996), 168, argue that when the senate refers to Tiberius' role in suppressing the evils of civil war, it has in mind the mutinies of 14 (also M. Griffin, 'The senate's story', *JRS* 87 [1997], 256). But would the senate wish to draw attention to the mutinies? The meaning may simply be that Tiberius maintained by his *virtutes* the stability established by Augustus at the end of the civil wars.

account. He provides additional information about the mutiny prior to Germanicus' arrival (1.31–2), and furnishes detail that Dio omits: he is more specific about which German legions mutinied (1.31.2; cf. 57.5.1); and, as in his Pannonian narrative, he puts names to faces: Tacitus' Munatius Plancus (1.39.3) is one of Dio's unnamed envoys who are nearly killed (57.5.6). There are also differences in detail and in structure. Tacitus and Dio give a different origin for the envoys from Rome: Tacitus has them come *ab senatu* (1.39.1), Dio *παρὰ τοῦ Τιβερίου* (57.5.4). Dio may well be reflecting the political reality, whereas Tacitus is perhaps again pointing to the hypocrisies of power at Rome by having Tiberius and Drusus hide behind the name of the senate. The scene involving Germanicus' forged letter points to a difference in structure. Tacitus records that the soldiers immediately sensed that Germanicus' letter was forged, and pressed their demands (1.37.1). Dio postpones notice of the detection until the arrival of the envoys and has the soldiers react to both simultaneously (57.5.5): the troops feared that their concessions, now known to be 'unofficial', would be reversed by the envoys. Dio's compression allows for a smooth narrative, but Tacitus' structure presents a more plausible sequence of events in having the soldiers perceive the fact of the forgery straightaway,<sup>16</sup> which in turn adds drama to the scene and offers an indictment of the ill-considered approach of Germanicus and his *consilium*.<sup>17</sup> Elsewhere, Tacitus asserts that a group of recruits, lately arrived from Rome to fill the hole left by the Varian disaster, was chiefly responsible for the mutiny (1.31.4). He places the recruits early in his account of the mutiny and sets the scene by playing on their city origins and vices (*lasciviae sueta, laborum intolerans*) as the Rhine equivalent of the Sallustian *otium* which had affected the troops in Pannonia at the start of their troubles (1.16.2).<sup>18</sup> Dio, on the other hand, delays noticing them until the information is required to explain the concessions made to the troops after Germanicus' failed suicide attempt (57.5.4);<sup>19</sup> the result is a loss of narrative fluidity.

Let us now turn to the conclusion of the Rhine mutiny. Germanicus' forged letter has been a dismal failure (1.36.3–37.3; 57.5.5). With the arrival in camp of the envoys, the soldiers fear that the concessions recently won from Germanicus will be reversed, and they recommence disturbances (1.39.2–4; 57.5.5). Germanicus is threatened (1.39.3; 57.5.6) and, in Tacitus' account, is made to realize the danger to his family and, despite Agrippina's protestations, compels her to depart (1.40.3; cf. Suet. *Calig.* 9). In Dio's version, the troops threaten Germanicus and seize Agrippina and Gaius, who had been secretly sent away (57.5.6). Tacitus' fuller account makes for easy

<sup>16</sup> So, Koestermann (n. 8), 158; Goodyear (n. 8), 267.

<sup>17</sup> Tacitus does, however, water down Germanicus' responsibility by not directly attributing the decision to forge the letter to him alone: *igitur volutatis inter se rationibus placitum ut epistulae nomine principis scriberentur* (1.36.3). Dio's version less easily leaves Germanicus open to criticism. Germanicus alone is responsible for the letter, and the soldiers later see through it; omitted, therefore, is the loss of face in Germanicus having immediately to pay concessions because the forgery had been detected on presentation of the letter to the troops. Unlike Tacitus, who defers Tiberius' reaction (cf. 1.52.1), Dio again records the emperor's suspicions of Germanicus, and he says that the emperor told the envoys only what he wanted Germanicus to know (57.5.5). The appearance of the envoys and the soldiers' suspicions that they would reverse the concessions allow little opportunity for the idea to occur to the reader that the forgery was ill considered. Rather, the reader knows of Tiberius' hostility and his 'secret' communication to the envoys, and, like the soldiers, becomes less well disposed towards them and the emperor.

<sup>18</sup> For *otium*, see Goodyear (n. 8), 105, 258.

<sup>19</sup> For the technique of delay in ancient narrative, see E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1950), app. A; T. Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford, 1998), index s.v. delay, narrative.

reading, whereas Dio becomes quite convoluted at 57.5.6 and leaves the reader to assume that Germanicus sent his wife and son away because of the renewed disturbances. Dio also dispenses with a parting exchange between Germanicus and Agrippina, unnecessary for his account, but effective in Tacitus' in its emotionalism and in its prefiguring their final parting in A.D. 19 (1.40.3; cf. 2.72).

Dio offers no indication as to how Agrippina and Gaius were removed from the camp other than that it was done secretly (*ὑπεκπεμφθέντας*, 57.5.6). Tacitus uses the verb *incedere* to describe their departure (*incedebat*, 1.40.4).<sup>20</sup> Moderns have favoured a translation of 'to proceed on foot, step, walk',<sup>21</sup> although Goodyear showed that the meaning here is not explicit, and suggested that, regardless of the conveyance, the verb indicates that the women moved slowly.<sup>22</sup> Now, at *Calig.* 9, Suetonius employs material derived from the context of the Rhine mutiny as evidence of the soldiers' fondness for the young Gaius. He records the scene of Gaius' departure<sup>23</sup> and states that the troops laid hold of the *vehiculum* in which Gaius was being borne away (*tunc demum ad paenitentiam versi reprenso ac retento vehiculo invidiam quae sibi fieret deprecata sunt*, *Calig.* 9). That Agrippina and her young son were being removed in a carriage is more probable than their leaving on foot, given that they were travelling some distance away, to the Treviri (Tac. *Ann.* 1.41.1, 3, cf. 42.1), Suetonius' *proxima civitas*. But this does not clarify Tacitus' meaning. Suetonius portrays the scene as betraying some emotion—the soldiers realize what they have forced Germanicus to do and beg to be spared the disgrace—and the emotion is focused on their act of stopping and restraining the *vehiculum*. For Tacitus, on the other hand, emotion permeates the narrative as a whole. His predilection for vignettes featuring Agrippina with her children<sup>24</sup> has him give the soldiers a wider view: they are touched at the scene of the women leaving, before they rush to take matters into their own hands.<sup>25</sup> Tacitus might have expected the reader to assume that Agrippina would have left in a carriage or litter, but he makes no explicit mention of the means of conveyance because it was irrelevant to the atmosphere of the departure and had the potential to disrupt the parallel with the sketches of Agrippina's departure from Antioch (*Ann.* 2.75.1) and arrival at Brundisium (*Ann.* 3.1.4). *incedere* combines well with the image of wailing and moaning women (1.40.4, 41.1) in heightening the pathos of the scene;<sup>26</sup> and on a pragmatic level, the noise made by the women alerts the soldiers to the removal of Agrippina and the scene runs smoothly into that which follows.

Tacitus can be explicit, however, where Suetonius and Dio are vague. He records as a perception of the soldiers, not as an authorial comment, that the Treviri were the destination of Agrippina and Gaius (1.41.1, 3, cf. 42.1). The troops become the

<sup>20</sup> Tacitus' account perhaps implies that Agrippina's departure was intended to be secret, given that the soldiers are in their tents and seem shocked at her departure (1.41.1).

<sup>21</sup> Definition: *OLD* s.v. 2; *TLL* 7.1.853.61ff. Cf. H. Furneaux, *The Annals of Tacitus*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1896<sup>2</sup>), 233; Koestermann (n. 8), 165; Hurley, *art.*, 318.

<sup>22</sup> Goodyear (n. 8), 280. He noted that the context of the use of *incedere* at *Ann.* 2.2.3 shows the Parthian Vonones to have been carried in a litter; a parallel use in Livy indicates that the soldier left on horseback (2.6.7).

<sup>23</sup> For Agrippina's absence from the account, see pp. 206–7 below.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Ann.* 1.69.4, 2.75.1, 3.1.4. For Agrippina as an 'iconic woman' in Tacitus, see E. O'Gorman, *Irony and Misreading in the Annals of Tacitus* (Cambridge, 2000), 69–77. See also pp. 204–5 below.

<sup>25</sup> Although the motivation for the soldiers' action is similar in Tacitus (1.41.3) and Suetonius (*Calig.* 9).

<sup>26</sup> Furneaux (n. 21), 233; Koestermann (n. 8), 165; Goodyear (n. 8), 279–80; Hurley, *art.*, 318 with n. 4; Hurley, *comm.*, 26–7.

focalizers of the narrative and the destination is transformed from being perceived simply in geographical terms to being read as a commentary on the soldiers' own bad faith: Agrippina and Gaius would be safer with the Treviri, an *externa fides* (1.41.2). The destination is thus made to function by working on the soldiers' emotions (see below). Neither Suetonius nor Dio is as explicit, or as sophisticated in his method. Dio gives the destination of Agrippina and Gaius as 'somewhere' (ποῖ, 57.5.6): a more specific designation would have conflicted with the sense of secrecy surrounding their departure, but also it has no such function on a narrative level as that information has in Tacitus. Similarly, Suetonius has only *proxima civitas* (Calig. 9). He perhaps chose to avoid anything as explicit as Tacitus' 'Treviri' since it risked moving the focus away from Gaius towards his destination as the cause of the soldiers' repentance. Here Suetonius possibly reacts against the common source, or even Tacitus' narrative, and does not permit it to influence the reading of his account.

Agrippina and Gaius thus enter into the action. For Dio it is their first appearance in his history. Tacitus had already mentioned Agrippina and her unnamed children in his formal introduction of Germanicus earlier in the same mutiny narrative (1.33.1), but there he had given little background information. Tacitus and Dio introduce Agrippina and Gaius to the reader, and again the similarities are close: Agrippina is introduced before Gaius (1.41.2; 57.5.6); Tacitus mentions her father Agrippa, her grandfather Augustus, and her father-in-law Nero Drusus (1.41.2); Dio mentions her father Agrippa and mother Julia, who is described as the daughter of Augustus (57.5.6). The order and statement of biographical information can only be derived from a common source which included such information: it is highly unlikely that two independent sources chose this moment to supply background biographical information. Admittedly Dio does not mention Nero Drusus, nor does he comment on Agrippina's character and fertility, as Tacitus does (1.41.2). Yet neither detail is important for Dio's narrative, here or elsewhere. He records only the necessary background information, but it is awkwardly executed and sits uneasily with the dramatic context of near death and violence, and it results in a long and involved sentence. Tacitus puts the material to a more rhetorical use. He has already presented the reader with the pitiful scene of Agrippina and her women departing from the camp. At 1.41.1 he has the soldiers come out of their tents exclaiming at their departure, which Tacitus divides between direct speech (*quis ille . . . externae fidei*, 1.41.1) and narrative (*pudor inde . . . induebatur*, 1.41.2). The narrative keeps the spotlight fixed on the soldiers by being focalized through them: the reader sees what the soldiers see, and more.<sup>27</sup> Focalization enables Tacitus to represent the soldiers' realization that their behaviour has driven off to an *externa fides* so important a person as Agrippina, which puts into context their *pudor* and *misericordia* and the *invidia* they feel for the Treviri (1.41.2, 3). Tacitus thus skilfully converts the biographical material to an immediate narrative purpose, and it has a wider narrative function too. Julia is omitted from the sketch, perhaps to avoid anticipating her obituary at 1.53.1–2, which includes biographical information, and Tacitus instead concentrates on Agrippina's male ancestry. Drusus adds another layer to Agrippina's illustriousness by evoking memories of the military glory he won in Germany and fuels the sense of shame felt by the soldiers at her departure; he is also evoked elsewhere in the *Annals* in relation to Germanicus (1.33.2, 43.3; 2.41.3, 82.2); Agrippina as wife and mother is part of a

<sup>27</sup> Tacitus presents the thoughts of the soldiers, and explains and comments on what they see (e.g. the background to Gaius' nickname). Cf. Furneaux (n. 21), 234–5; Goodyear (n. 8), 286.

broader characterization;<sup>28</sup> and Gaius as 'Caligula', *alumnus legionum* (1.44.1; cf. Sen. *Constant.* 18.4), would gain importance later in the account of his reign.<sup>29</sup>

Part of the biographical material focuses on Gaius. Tacitus records that he was born and raised in camp (*in castris genitus, in contubernio legionum eductus*, 1.41.2), and that he was given the nickname 'Caligula' by the troops because of his footwear, which he was made to wear mainly as a popular gesture (1.41.2, cf. 69.4). Dio states that Gaius was reared largely in camp (*ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τὸ πλεῖστον τραφεῖς*) and that he was given the nickname 'Caligula' by the soldiers because of the military boots he wore in place of the sandals normally seen in cities (57.5.6). Suetonius too records a version, but does not link Gaius' nickname with his birthplace: his research revealed to him that the tradition of the birthplace which found its way into the common source used by Tacitus and Dio was mistaken. At *Calig.* 8, therefore, he sets out to refute this and other accounts of the birthplace,<sup>30</sup> and to establish the correct one. The relevant evidence here contains some verses that were current after Gaius succeeded Tiberius, which Suetonius interprets to mean that Gaius was born in camp (*in castris natus, patriis nutritus in armis, iam designati principis omen erat*, *Calig.* 8.1). Suetonius rejects the evidence of the verses and concludes his excursus by reasserting his theory that Gaius was born at Antium (*Calig.* 8.5). The origin of Gaius' nickname is explained in the next chapter (*Calig.* 9): 'Caligula' derived from a joke of the troops, who saw Gaius grow up amongst them, dressed in the garb of a soldier. Having disproved one central feature of the tradition on the Rhine mutiny (Gaius' birth in camp), Suetonius does not reject the tradition as a whole but carefully chooses material from it and the manner in which it is employed.

Dio differs from Tacitus in not explicitly stating that Gaius was born in camp, and it has been argued that Dio was using a separate source or was influenced in his account by his reading of Suetonius, which would have disproved the *in castris natus* version.<sup>31</sup> Dio's version, however, is not necessarily incompatible with Tacitus', nor does it betray any knowledge of Suetonius.<sup>32</sup> Dio is primarily concerned with narrating and explaining Gaius' nickname. The statement of the time Gaius spent in camp as a youth is framed by the notice of the nickname and its explanation:

<sup>28</sup> 1.33.1, 3, 40.2, 3, 4, 41.2, 44.1; 2.43.6, 54.1; 3.17.2; 4.12. 2, 53.1, 68.1. See also p. 203 above.

<sup>29</sup> Note too the appearance of Cassius Chaerea and the explicit foreshadowing of Gaius' assassination at 1.32.2. Tacitus' remarks about Chaerea hint that the savagery displayed by the soldiers could potentially be used against Germanicus' family—as would come to pass in A.D. 41. This adds to the atmosphere of danger in the camp and looks forward to the need for Germanicus to evacuate his wife and son. There is poignancy too in the fact that the young Gaius, introduced later than Chaerea, is in the company of his future killer; consequently his assassination earns Chaerea *memoria*—not, for example, *gloria*, which would have been out of place in light of the later threat to Gaius and Agrippina (cf. Pelling [n. 11], 83, n. 60, quoting A. J. Woodman, who suggests an alternative in *gloria* but reads the passage differently).

<sup>30</sup> It has been argued that Suetonius actually targets Tacitus here or is prompted by his account to refute earlier versions (Goodyear [n. 8], 286, n. 3; Hurley, *art.*, 327; Hurley, *comm.*, 19, 22; Lindsay [n. 1], 64). In Tacitus' defence, he may have known the truth about Gaius' birthplace, but chosen to ignore it because it did not serve his narrative aims in the same way as the *in castris natus* theme of the common source.

<sup>31</sup> See Hurley, *art.*, 326; Hurley argues for Suetonius' influence on Dio.

<sup>32</sup> Dio might have read Suetonius' account on Gaius' birthplace (cf. fr. 1.2), but as the biographer's corrected tradition (Gaius' birth at Antium) did not sit well with the notice and explanation of Gaius' nickname as found in the common source, he might have preferred to continue with the common source and retain narrative and thematic unity; observing that Gaius was born at Antium was not going to explain 'Caligula'. As in the case of Tacitus, Dio's relationship with Suetonius is problematic; he more than likely did not draw on the biographer



... τὸν υἱόν, ὃν Γάιον Καλιγόλαν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τὸ πλεῖστον τραφεῖς τοῖς στρατιωτικοῖς ὑποδήμασιν ἀντὶ τῶν ἀστικῶν ἐχρήτο, προσωνόμαζον. (57.5.6)

Space is at a premium, and Dio opts for a brief remark about Gaius' upbringing that is true in itself (Gaius was in Germany from 14 and in Syria in 17)<sup>33</sup> and compatible with the idea that the future emperor was born in camp. Tacitus makes the birth explicit since it was a feature of the tradition (cf. *hoc [Caligula] . . . in castris natus*, Sen. *Constant.* 18.4; Suet. *Calig.* 8.1), and, happily, tied in with his interest in Agrippina's fertility.

Tacitus has the soldiers emerge from their tents at the noise made by the women leaving the camp (1.41.1). The men are portrayed as having been moved by the pitiful sight of the women, without an escort, departing for the Treviri, and especially at the sight of Agrippina and the associations she evoked (1.41.1–2). Tacitus then remarks that nothing moved them more than jealousy (*invidia*) of the Treviri (1.41.3). Suetonius, however, states that the sight of Gaius alone unquestionably calmed the soldiers (*solus haud dubie ex conspectu suo flexit*): they did not become quiet until they noticed that he was being sent away *ob seditionis periculum* (*Calig.* 9). Now it has been argued that Tacitus and Suetonius differ because Suetonius 'must have had at hand a text that put the child at the center of the anecdote'. He uses *solus haud dubie* to convince the reader of Gaius' centrality to the episode 'against what he regarded as a Tacitean distortion of the source',<sup>34</sup> a 'distortion' because Tacitus embellished Agrippina's role and downplayed that of Gaius.<sup>35</sup> A more persuasive explanation is that Tacitus and Suetonius have used a common source, but have used it differently as dictated by their respective narrative strategies. Suetonius' emphasis on Gaius is a result of his being the subject of the biography<sup>36</sup> and, at this point, the object of favourable or neutral presentation. It is Agrippina who presents the problem. Firstly, to include her in this scene would have resulted in an awkward and isolated intrusion into the story, which is essentially about the young Gaius and his popularity with the troops. Secondly, Agrippina would have been prominent in the common source. This is only natural, given her relationship to Germanicus and her presence in the camp; moreover, the sight of a pregnant mother departing with her son and her servants was an image begging to be exploited, as Tacitus' account well shows. The lack of emphasis on Gaius in Tacitus is appropriate too. Agrippina provides the context for his mention at 1.41.2, when the soldiers ponder the sight of his mother leaving the camp with him; and indeed later Tacitus states that Agrippina carried him about (*circumferat*, 1.69.4).

directly, but went to the first-century sources (cf. above n. 5); see further E. Schwartz in *RE* 3.1714; Syme (n. 5), 690; Millar (n. 7), 85–7, 105; B. Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus* (Wiesbaden, 1979), 258–68; Murison (n. 5), 17.

<sup>33</sup> Germany: Tac. *Ann.* 1.41.2, 42.1, 2, 44.1; Suet. *Calig.* 9, 48.1; Dio 57.5.6–7. Syria: Suet. *Calig.* 10.1; *IGRR* 4.251; Tac. *Ann.* 3.1.4, with A. J. Woodman and R. H. Martin, *The Annals of Tacitus Book 3* (Cambridge, 1996), 83; cf. *Ann.* 2.70.1, with F. R. D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus, Books 1–6, Vol. II: Annals 1.55–81 and Annals 2* (Cambridge, 1981), 411.

<sup>34</sup> Hurley, *art.*, 322, 325, cf. 324, 'Tacitus appears to be reworking the source that he shared with Suetonius and to be deemphasizing the engaging child . . .'

<sup>35</sup> Hurley, *art.*, 324–5 (discussing 1.69.4); Hurley, *comm.*, 26. It should be remembered that, at 1.69.4, the 'escalation' of Agrippina's influence is made to occur in the mind of Tiberius (*id Tiberii animum altius penetravit* . . ., 1.69.3); it does not mean that Tacitus increased her role.

<sup>36</sup> Hurley, *art.*, 322–3, notes this argument, but does not think that it explains why Suetonius 'defended' Gaius' role. This is surely the easiest and most persuasive explanation, especially in light of Suetonius' practice elsewhere: cf. *Calig.* 26.2 with *Galba* 6.3 for his reworking of the same material; cf. Wardle (n. 1), 84, 240; M. P. Charlesworth, 'The tradition about Caligula', *Cambridge Historical Journal* 4 (1933), 110.

At 1.42.2 Germanicus refers to the soldiers' 'besieging' his son, but there the concern is not with Gaius, who remains unnamed, but with the conduct of the soldiers towards their general; Germanicus uses his *filius* for emotive force (*militesne appellem, qui filium imperatoris vestri vallo et armis circumsestistis?*). Only at 1.44.1, when the soldiers beg for the return of Agrippina and Gaius, does the son appear to receive attention independently from the mother (*rediret legionum alumnus neve obses Gallis traderetur*). Tacitus does not present Gaius' role in the mutiny as singularly decisive: he plays a secondary role to the more central figure of Agrippina and functions mainly within the context of Tacitus' interest in presenting Agrippina as a mother. Suetonius had to work against such a tradition and accordingly he removes Agrippina from the scene and focuses solely on Gaius.

Suetonius has the soldiers seize and stop the carriage in which Gaius was being transported from camp (*repreſso ac retento vehiculo*, *Calig.* 9), and later in the biography has Gaius represent the soldiers as having laid siege to him and his father (*quod et patrem suum Germanicum ducem et se infantem tunc obsedisſent*, *Calig.* 48.1). Dio states that the soldiers seized (*συνέλαβον*) Agrippina and Gaius, who had been secretly sent away (57.5.6). At Germanicus' request they released Agrippina and retained Gaius (57.5.7). Tacitus has the soldiers entreat and obstruct Agrippina so that she may return and remain, some of the soldiers rushing to her, while most returned to Germanicus (*orant, obsistunt, rediret maneret, pars Agrippinae occursantes, plurimi ad Germanicum regressi*, 1.41.3).<sup>37</sup> At 1.42.2 Germanicus is made to represent this scene as the soldiers' 'besieging' his son (*vallo et armis circumsestistis*; cf. *Suet. Calig.* 48.1 *obsedisſent*). Later in the same speech, at 1.43.4, Germanicus states that the soldiers will stand untainted and will separate the mutinous from among them if they return the legates to the senate and give obedience to the emperor, and return to him his wife and son (*si legatos senatui, obsequium imperatori, si mihi coniugem et filium redditis*). The soldiers are effusive in their repentance: Germanicus is to punish the guilty, pardon those who had lapsed, and lead them against the enemy. Agrippina is to be recalled (*revocaretur*) and Gaius to return (*rediret*) and not be handed over as a hostage to the Gauls (*neve obses Gallis traderetur*). Germanicus deprecates the return of Agrippina (*reditum Agrippinae excusavit*), but promises that of Gaius (*venturum filium*, 1.44.1).

Dio is more explicit on the matter of Agrippina and Gaius being seized than Tacitus and Suetonius. At *Calig.* 48.1 Suetonius has Gaius claim that the soldiers besieged Germanicus and himself, whereas at *Calig.* 9 Suetonius has the troops seize and stop the carriage, just as in Tacitus they obstruct the way of Agrippina (1.41.3). The similarity in imagery suggests a common source. The second and later of the two versions in Suetonius is different because it is focalized through Gaius and becomes his reading of events: his belief that the soldiers posed a threat to his father and him is the basis for his supposedly planning to decimate them (*quod . . . obsedisſent*).<sup>38</sup> Tacitus'

<sup>37</sup> Goodyear (n. 8), 287 remarked that this sentence has a 'complex syntactical structure'. I accept his first interpretation, although I am not entirely convinced that *orant* has Germanicus as its object too. Hurley (*art.*, 323) claims that the singular verbs *rediret* and *maneret* are 'ambiguous'; she concedes that they probably refer to Agrippina, but since Gaius is the last of the two mentioned by Tacitus, 'Perhaps they are a remnant of a text which focused on only one of them' (i.e. on Gaius, as in Suetonius' version). The idea that anything in Tacitus is a 'remnant' is as unconvincing as it is impossible to prove. *rediret* and *maneret* are singular, not because they derive directly from a source with a different emphasis, but because Tacitus' focus is on Agrippina, and, until 1.44.1, only through her does Gaius come into independent focus.

<sup>38</sup> Note the subjunctive.

focus on Agrippina is a result of her centrality to the episode and hints at her influence in camp, which receives more explicit statement and illustration at 1.69. That the soldiers in Tacitus' account impeded Agrippina and Gaius and were considered a threat is suggested by Germanicus' language in his speech. At 1.43.4 Tacitus has Germanicus remark that the *legati* should be returned to the senate, allegiance to the *princeps*, and his *coniunx et filius* to him. The use of *redditis* with *obsequium imperatori* is 'normal and straightforward',<sup>39</sup> but it should be understood figuratively with the other two *si*-clauses. The *legati* were not literally to be returned to the senate, as they had already departed and were not being held by the soldiers (1.39.6).<sup>40</sup> Rather they were to remain safe in their journey to Rome, not 'nearly killed' by the troops as Tacitus and Dio report earlier (1.39.4; 57.5.5), and so metaphorically were as though they had been returned to the senate.<sup>41</sup> Likewise, Agrippina and Gaius were not literally to be handed over to Germanicus in camp: what Germanicus requests is that the soldiers refrain from impeding their departure and allow them safe passage to the Treviri. Germanicus' wife and son metaphorically return to him by once again coming under his power and being able to carry out his wish that they leave the camp.<sup>42</sup> In Tacitus, Germanicus dictates the terms and is seen to have the upper hand. In Dio too, the soldiers obey Germanicus' request, which reveals him to be more in control of the situation than he seems at first glance (57.5.7).<sup>43</sup> Germanicus' speech has its effect on the soldiers and they start pleading (*orabant*) with him. The troops impeding Agrippina and Gaius are made to represent the situation as though it were a matter simply of Germanicus calling them back. And in a sense it is as simple as that: the troops have repented of their rebellious spirit, and they make clear their submission by telling Germanicus what they think that he should do—recall Agrippina and Gaius.

The difference in treatment here stems from the emphasis of Tacitus and Suetonius on the emotions of the soldiers and how those emotions influence their behaviour, an approach appropriate to the context of a mutiny. This focus makes the soldiers' actions less clear and less understandable: in Tacitus' narrative and in Suetonius' account at *Calig.* 9 there is no suggestion that the soldiers intended harm to Agrippina and Gaius.

<sup>39</sup> Goodyear (n. 8), 296.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Goodyear (n. 8), 296.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. N. P. Miller, *Tacitus: Annals Book I* (London, 1959), 166, who took *redditis* in relation to the *legati* as 'give the Senate's envoys their proper status'. Goodyear (n. 8), 296 thought that the truth was still to be discovered, unless one of Furneaux's explanations was accepted: Germanicus represents 'them [sc. *legati*]' rhetorically as still in the power of the legions, and not yet in safety'. This is quite possible. The envoys had been threatened with death earlier by the soldiers (1.39.4), and might still have been in danger: they had been dismissed only recently (1.39.6), on the same day as Germanicus delivered his speech, and, if Tacitus' order of events is accepted, prior to Agrippina's departure.

<sup>42</sup> Furneaux (n. 21), 238, glossed *si mihi coniugem et filium redditis* as 'They would give him back his wife and son by so behaving that he could safely recall them.' Unless he meant 'safely recall them at some future date of his own choosing', he was only half right: in his speech, Germanicus expresses no desire to recall them: he only considers the matter when the soldiers suggest it at 1.44.1. The interpretations of Miller (n. 41), 166, and Goodyear (n. 8), 296, are similar to Furneaux's and invite the same query and reservation.

<sup>43</sup> *Contra* Hurley, *art.*, 318, 319, 321; *comm.*, 26. Dio makes it appear that the soldiers are in control by their being the subject of the sentence (expressed in the verb *ἀφῆκαν*) and by placing Germanicus' request in a participial phrase: *καὶ τὴν μὲν Ἀγριππινὰν ἐγκύμονα οὖσαν ἀφῆκαν αὐτῷ δευθῆναι, τὸν δὲ δὴ Γάιον κατέσχον* (57.5.7). The soldiers are easily the subject since they have been the subject for most of the present narrative: they were last explicitly mentioned at 57.5.5 (*οἱ στρατιῶται*). The syntactical structure of the passage accounts for this impression that the soldiers are in control, but it is not entirely convincing in its translation to reality since the troops readily give in to Germanicus.

Dio's account lacks this obvious indication of intention, but his stating that Agrippina and Gaius had been removed secretly and were seized by the troops makes it seem that they might come to harm. But one cannot be sure from his narrative alone. Similarly, Dio is silent on the soldiers' change of heart, which makes them return Agrippina and Gaius to Germanicus; it seems that it cannot simply be the request of Germanicus that prompts them, as they had just been 'very insistent' with him after nearly killing some of the envoys (57.5.6); but clearly it is indeed the request, as Tacitus brings out so well in his account (1.43.4–44.1). Thus, for what Dio's more direct and simplified account gains in clarity of action, it loses in lacking a sophisticated interpretative framework for the actions of the personalities in the account.<sup>44</sup> What Tacitus at times loses in clarity of action is made up for by a dramatic and entertaining account. Both authors deal with what was a complicated series of events, impossible for us, and no doubt for them, completely to disentangle.

In Tacitus' account, Germanicus declines Agrippina's return to camp and indicates that he would have Gaius back with him. He leaves the soldiers to deal with the rest (*cetera ipsi exsequerentur*), thus prompting a slaughter (1.44.2–3). Dio states that, on Germanicus' request, the soldiers released Agrippina but retained Gaius (*κατέσχον*); they fell quiet after a time because they were achieving nothing, and then proceeded to punish their own (57.5.7). Dio has been interpreted to mean that the soldiers retained Gaius as a hostage, but when that 'strategy' did not work, the mutiny 'faded away'.<sup>45</sup> This reading produces a version of events obviously different from that in Tacitus, but it does not explain what happened to Gaius and it accounts inadequately for the termination of the mutiny. Dio states that the soldiers released Agrippina, 'released' so that she might continue on her way from camp, but retained Gaius, 'retained' in the sense that he returned to the camp because Germanicus said that he could stay, as Tacitus makes explicit at 1.44.1. The subsequent remark 'then too they became quiet after a time, since they were accomplishing nothing' (*χρόνῳ δ' οὐδὲν ποτε καὶ τότε, ὡς οὐδὲν ἐπέβαινον, ἡσύχασαν*, 57.5.7) picks up the similar earlier statement at 57.5.4 (*τότε μὲν οὖν οὕτω στασιάζοντες ἐπαύσαντο*) and refers to the second period of mutinous behaviour (*ὑστερον* . . . , 57.5.4); in other words, it is not specific to the soldiers' supposed 'strategy' of holding Gaius. That second period ended once the issue of Agrippina and Gaius had been resolved, and so the mutiny as whole 'faded away' thereafter. Dio then has the soldiers arrest the guiltiest among them, either killing them immediately or bringing them before an assembly, which voted life or death (57.5.7). Tacitus' version of the aftermath is much the same, but he makes the soldiers' change of heart more immediate (*discurrunt mutati* . . . , 1.44.2), which adds drama and enhances his emphasis on the public killings, the soldiers' pleasure in bloodshed, and Germanicus' refusal to take responsibility for it (1.44.2–3). Tacitus maintains the focus on the north for a further five chapters (1.45, 48–51) and then records Tiberius' reaction at Rome (1.52). Dio mentions Germanicus' dispatch of the quieted troops to 'enemy' territory (57.6.1; Raetia in Tacitus, 1.44.4) and then turns to the emperor's reaction (57.6.2); the versions of Tacitus and Dio again bear traces of a common source.

Tacitus, then, shares with Suetonius and Dio a common source for his narrative

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Pelling (n. 7), 137 with n. 71, who argues that Dio's interest in psychology is still there in the early empire; he cites passages from the mutiny narratives (e.g. 57.5.5) with the remark that 'most of these go well beyond the equivalent passages in Tacitus', but that cannot be said of 57.5.6–7.

<sup>45</sup> Hurley, *art.*, 318.

of the end of the Rhine mutiny—a conclusion that should not come as a complete surprise to those who find a parallel in the use of a common source by Tacitus, Plutarch, and Suetonius for sections of their narratives of 68–9.<sup>46</sup> A close reading of the mutiny narrative also reveals that Tacitus' presentation of Germanicus and his family is not the model of revisionism that has been taken as evidence for his abandoning the common source for the end of the mutiny. For example, Germanicus' initiation and disavowal of the slaughter amongst his troops at 1.44.3 has the effect of undermining the control that he displayed when Agrippina and Gaius were under threat, and is consistent with the broader characterization of Germanicus during the Rhine mutiny as, at times, a flawed character.<sup>47</sup> And Dio's presentation of Germanicus is not so negative as to indicate that the common source painted a picture of the prince so bleak that Tacitus felt obliged to use another tradition. Dio does not blame Germanicus for prompting the slaughter at the end of the mutiny; indeed he states that the soldiers acted of their own accord (αὐτοκείμενοι, 57.5.7).<sup>48</sup>

This essay has not been an extended call for a return to Nissen and his theory of an unthinking attachment to a single source on the part of ancient writers;<sup>49</sup> no writer here is a slave to an earlier literary authority. The accounts of Tacitus, Dio, and Suetonius reveal that they engaged with the common source, selecting and recasting material from it as dictated by their respective narrative strategies. To effect changes they did not need automatically to reach for another source; their method was not a 'scissors-and-paste' one.<sup>50</sup>

*St John's College, Cambridge*

S. J. V. MALLOCH

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Syme (n. 5), 180ff., 190, 674; G. E. F. Chilver, *A Historical Commentary on Tacitus' Histories I and II* (Oxford, 1979), 26; C. B. R. Pelling, 'Plutarch's method of work in the Roman lives', *JHS* 99 (1979), 92 = *Plutarch and History* (London, 2002), 20; Martin (n. 5), 189–96; M. Sage, 'Tacitus' historical works: a survey and appraisal', *ANRW* 2.33.2 (1990), 893–4; cf. C. L. Murison, *Suetonius: Galba, Otho, Vitellius* (London, 1992), xii; Murison (n. 5), 15, 17; C. Damon (ed.), *Tacitus Histories Book I* (Cambridge, 2003), 22–30.

<sup>47</sup> For Tacitus' portrayal of Germanicus, see Pelling (n. 11), 59–85, with earlier bibliography. Add: O. Devillers, 'Le rôle des passages relatifs à Germanicus dans les Annales de Tacite', *Anc. Soc.* 24 (1993), 225–41; M. Griffin, 'Tacitus, Tiberius and the Principate', in I. Malkin and Z. W. Rubinson (edd.), *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World: Studies in Honour of Zvi Yavetz* (Leiden, 1995), 33–57; F. Römer, 'Kontrastfiguren in den Annals des Tacitus', *Acta Ant. Hung.* 39 (1999), 297–312.

<sup>48</sup> Dio also omits notice of the second slaughter of the mutinous troops, in the fifth and twenty-first legions, for which, in Tacitus' version, Germanicus is again directly responsible (1.45.2, 48.1–49.2).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Murison (n. 5), 17, n. 61.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. R. H. Martin, 'Tacitus and his predecessors', in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Tacitus* (London, 1969), 133 with n. 80.