

The Portrayal of Germanicus in Tacitus' *Annales* and the Historicity of the Germanicus-Tiberius Conflict

Sarah Limoges

There has been much debate about the historicity of the Germanicus/Tiberius incidence in Tacitus' *Annales*. This is due to the fact that Tiberius is portrayed in a very bad light, whilst Germanicus comes out whiter than snow. However, by closely looking at a number of passages, one notices that things are not as polarized as they may seem. In fact, Tacitus criticizes Germanicus on a number of occasions, mostly in Book I, while giving credit to Tiberius in his funerary oration. As many historians before him, Tacitus is not only a child of his time, but also a prisoner of his sources. This means that since he is removed from the Germanicus/Tiberius epoch by about 100 years at the time in which he is writing the annals, he must rely on a number of early imperial sources that had their own biases about Tiberius' reign. In Tacitus' time, Tiberius had already acquired the reputation of a bad and tyrannical emperor, and Tacitus became a victim of the same perception. This essay will have a threefold mission: first of all, it will examine the sources that Tacitus could have possibly used for his *Annales*, and compare Tacitus' narrative to two other primary sources, mainly the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre* and Cassius Dio. Second, it will examine the portrayal of Germanicus in order to determine if it was credible or idealized and finally, it will try to shed some light upon the relationship between Germanicus and Tiberius in order to determine whether there was some animosity amongst them, or if it is possible that the tensions between the two were a later construct.

It is interesting to note that on many accounts Tacitus concurs with other primary sources,¹ such as Pliny the Elder, Pliny the Younger, Suetonius and Cassius Dio. Cassius Dio is writing quite some time after Tacitus, and his account could have been discarded as relying heavily on that of Tacitus itself but the numerous discrepancies between both accounts rather suggest a common source rather than a heavy reliance on Tacitus on the part of Cassius Dio.² The same would seem to apply to Suetonius for his *Life of Tiberius Caesar*, which coincides on a number of occasions with what Tacitus says.³ As for Pliny the Elder, there is only one instance in which he discusses something related to Tacitus' annals, namely the appearance of Germanicus' heart after his death⁴ This would demonstrate that the rumor Tacitus speaks of, that Germanicus was poisoned by Piso on the orders of Tiberius, had indeed been very present much earlier than Tacitus' time.

Now is the time to turn to the sources that Tacitus most likely used in order to shape his nar-

¹ Although many of the sources are later than Tacitus himself, as is Cassius Dio, they will still be considered primary sources.

² Martin. *Tacitus*, 203, 205.

³ *Ibid.*, 203.

⁴ Plin. *NH*.11.71.

rative of the Germanicus/Tiberius opposition. Although some scholars, such as Phillippe Fabia, believe that Tacitus was not one to use primary sources such as inscriptions, speeches, biographies, autobiographies and the senate archive⁵ most evidence would tend to point us in the other direction. In fact, it is highly likely that Tacitus had access to Tiberius' speeches, as well as a number of his letters.⁶ The consensus seems to be that Tacitus was a rather diligent researcher who used sources as obscure as the *commentarii Agrippinae* written by Agrippina the Younger.⁷

Ancient historians saw no need to footnote sources, or even name them; rather, they avoided such superfluous details because they did not want to bore the reader with useless facts⁸ Unfortunately for modern historians, that leaves no concrete proof of who was used as a source as well as their possible bias. There is reason to believe that Tacitus used a number of primary and secondary sources for the Annals, as well as for his other monographs. For instance, it is highly likely that he used the historian Aufidius Bassus for the Tiberius portion of the annals, as well as Servilius Nonianus,⁹ an orator, for the later books of the annals. Cluvius Rufus would have been used for portions of the Histories, whilst Fabius Rusticus was also consulted for the annals.¹⁰ It is clear by Pliny the Younger's letters to Tacitus that he too was used as a source.¹¹ Pliny the Elder was mentioned briefly in the annals as being used for the description of Agrippina the Elder's character, and, as mentioned above, the memoirs of Agrippina the Younger, as well as Corbulo,¹² were consulted. Tacitus would have had access to the autobiographies of Tiberius as well as Claudius. Also, he seems to have consulted his friends Verginius Rufus and Spurinna for their accounts of the Civil War of 69.¹³ Furthermore, he consulted the acts of the senate as well as the daily gazette for speeches. Finally, he most likely had access to the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre* due to the similarities between this document and his narrative in Book III of the Annals.

This shows that Tacitus was considerably thorough, as the sources are quite varied, ranging from memoirs to speeches and histories. Pliny the Younger commends his friend for his adherence to the truth when sending him the story of the death of Pliny the Elder and the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius: "You ask me to describe for you the death of my uncle, to enable you to transmit *a more truthful account* for the benefit of posterity."¹⁴ This demonstrates two crucial elements of Tacitus' methodology: he seeks to portray the events as impartially as possible (*sine ira et studio*)¹⁵ and this also proves that he does thorough research by questioning eye witnesses, which would in turn suggest that he would consult histories, archives, speeches and the likes in order to portray the reality as it occurred.

How does the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre* (henceforth *SCPP*) fit into all this? It is a very good test in order to determine Tacitus' historicity because here is an event for which we have two different narratives, from two very different perceptions. The *SCPP* was a decree made by the Senate under the guidance of Tiberius himself, which must be taken into account when comparing it to Tacitus' narrative. There are similarities, but also discrepancies between the two, which is not surprising in itself. Both accounts can be considered biased since it is inconceivable that Tiberius would not have influenced the decree in order to distance himself from Piso, if such was the need.

⁵Mendell. *Tacitus: The Man and His Work*, 211.

⁶Ibid. 204. Tiberius' speeches would have either been published separately, or within the *acta diurnal*. For the availability of the *acta diurnal* and *acta senatus* see Benario, *An Introduction to Tacitus*, 84; cf. Mendell, *Tacitus: The Man and His Work*, 211-214, also Martin, *Tacitus*, 201-202 and Mellor, *Tacitus*, 33.

⁷Martin. *Tacitus*, 199, also Mellor, *Tacitus*, 32, 34; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.53.2.

⁸Mendell. *Tacitus: The Man and His Work*, 205.

⁹Martin. *Tacitus*, 202; Mendell, *Tacitus: The Man and His Work*, 211-214; Benario, *An Introduction to Tacitus*, 82.

¹⁰Benario. *An Introduction to Tacitus*, 82-83; Mellor, *Tacitus*, 32.

¹¹Benario. *An Introduction to Tacitus*, 84; Mellor, *Tacitus*, 32; cf. Plin. *Ep.* 6.16.

¹²See n.7; for Pliny the Elder, see Martin, *Tacitus*, 199; Benario, *An Introduction to Tacitus*, 83; Mellor, *Tacitus*, 32; also Tac. *Ann.* 1.69.2.

¹³Mellor. *Tacitus*, 32.

¹⁴Plin. *Ep.* 6.16.

¹⁵Tac. *Ann.* 1.1.8.

It is interesting to note that in both accounts there is an allusion to the fact that Germanicus had been poisoned by Piso. Tacitus states that Piso was merely following Tiberius' orders, and the reason why the *SCPP* does not dwell on this is evident. The fact that they both allude to this poisoning, both without giving any credence to the rumor, suggests in fact that there was a prevailing perception that Germanicus did not die of natural causes. Pliny the Elder agrees with this incident, and relates the examination of Germanicus' heart in the *Natural Histories* in which he states that Germanicus' heart could not be cremated because of poisoning.¹⁶ Martin argues that although Piso's poisoning charges failed, there was widespread belief that he had indeed perpetrated such a crime, perhaps even under the orders of Tiberius; on many occasions, Piso had been seen carrying what was believed to be orders from the emperor.¹⁷ Tacitus does not give credence to this rumor, but his profound distrust of the emperors made him especially susceptible to believing the most negative of sources, which in this case were eye witnesses.¹⁸

Mellor believes that Tacitus hints at Tiberius' responsibility in Germanicus' death, although the ancient historian has no evidence to support this claim, and this is exactly why he does not elaborate on the event. However, it would seem that Tacitus might be projecting the characteristics of the Tiberius of the later reign onto that of the earlier period, a time in which there was little reason to hate the sovereign.¹⁹ Suetonius also speaks of this common belief, stating that the people held Tiberius responsible for Germanicus' death through the agency of Piso.²⁰

In light of this, it is easily understood why Tiberius would not want the Senate to dwell on Germanicus' death, even though most people seemed to have believed that he did not die of natural causes. Therefore, the difference between the *SCPP* and Tacitus' narrative can hardly be attributed to Tacitus' bias since he would seem to have taken what he believed was unbiased from the sources he used in order to recount the event.

Another instance in which we can test Tacitus' accuracy is when we put his narration of the events of 34–35 against that of Cassius Dio.²¹ For instance Tacitus: "The bird called the phoenix, after a long succession of ages, appeared in Egypt and furnished the most learned men of that country and of Greece with abundant matter for the discussion of the marvelous phenomenon,"²² and Dio "And if Egyptian affairs touch Roman interests at all, it may be mentioned that the phoenix was seen that year. All these events were thought to foreshadow the death of Tiberius."²³ These excerpts seem to coincide quite accurately, but it is important to point out that Tacitus' version goes on to take all of chapter 28, whilst that of Dio takes but one line, that cited above. This would indicate a common source rather than Dio relying strictly on Tacitus, which could have accounted for the similarities. Another such instance is when Tacitus recounts that: "Pomponius Labeo, who was, as I have related, governor of Moesia, severed his veins and let his life ebb from him. His wife, Paxaea, emulated her husband,"²⁴ whilst Dio states that:

¹⁶ Plin.*NH*.11.187: *negatur cremari posse in iis qui cardiaco morbo obierint, negatur et veneno interemptis. certe exstat oratio Vitelli, qua Gnaeum Pisonem eius sceleris coarguit, hoc usus argumento palamque testatus non potuisse ob venenum cor Germanici Caesaris cremari. contra genere morbi defensus est Piso.*

¹⁷ Martin. *Tacitus*, 123; cf Tac. *Ann.* 3.16.

¹⁸ Mellor. *Tacitus*, 38; cf Tac. *Ann.* 3.16.1.

¹⁹ Mellor. *Tacitus*, 42.

²⁰ Sue.*Cal.* 2.

²¹ Respectively Tac. *Ann.* 6.28–39 and Dio 58.24–27.1. Although these events fall out of the time period covered in this essay, namely the lifetime of Germanicus, it is important to note the similarities between the two authors.

²² Tac. *Ann.* 6.28.1.

²³ Dio.27.1.

²⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 29.1.

Among the various persons who perished either at the hands of the executioners or by their own act was Pomponius Labeo. This man, who had once governed Moesia for eight years after his praetorship, was indicted, together with his wife, for taking bribes, and voluntarily perished along with her.²⁵

Here again is an instance in which it is obvious that both authors are relying on the same source, whilst taking what they thought was important from this other historian. This can be seen by Tacitus' choice of including the name of Pomponius Labeo's wife, whilst Dio chose to include the number of years during which Pomponius Labeo had been governor of Moesia. These two instances in which both narratives coincide reinforce the belief in Tacitus' accuracy.

Tacitus' accuracy and loyalty to his sources having been established, now is the time to turn to Germanicus himself in order to determine if Tacitus was exceedingly kind in his depiction of the general. At first glance, it would indeed seem that Tacitus was biased in his portrayal of Germanicus, and it has been suggested that this was because Germanicus was Tacitus' hero.²⁶ After a thorough reading however, this cannot be seen as being the case simply because Tacitus criticizes Germanicus quite harshly on numerous occasions, and these must be discussed.

On a few occasions, Germanicus seems particularly inept in his functions of general and it is curious that, if indeed his intent was Germanicus' glorification, Tacitus would include these in his narrative. Yet very early on he presents a rather unsure man who does not quite know how to deal with his legions, or control his camp. Indeed, Agrippina seems more apt than her husband on some of these occasions.²⁷

In 1.35, Tacitus depicts Germanicus in a much more pejorative light than one would expect if Germanicus had indeed been his hero.²⁸ After suppressing the mutiny of soldiers in Germany, he tried to bring out the old values in his troops by speaking of obedience and ancient discipline. The soldiers would hear none of it as they felt that they were underpaid and overworked; they would rather have Germanicus as emperor. Although Germanicus' devotion to the emperor seems to pervade the passage, there is a much more prominent message that Tacitus is trying to demonstrate. Germanicus, being unable to control his troops and to ensure their loyalty to the emperor, was threatened by his own soldiers to remain in the camp. Only after they seemingly turned against him did he opt for a grandiose gesture of loyalty, claiming that he would rather give up his life than his devotion to the sovereign. And indeed many seem to have encouraged the suicide attempt, indicating that Germanicus did not have control over his troops: "The remotest and most densely crowded part of the throng [...] urged him to strike the blow, and a soldier, by name Calusidius, offered him a drawn sword, saying that it was sharper than his own."²⁹ This is hardly the portrayal of a capable man, hardly the image of a hero opposing the evils of the emperor! And indeed Pelling states that "if Tacitus was trying to do his best for Germanicus, he would have done a lot better than this."³⁰

²⁵ Dio.24.3.

²⁶ Benario. *An Introduction to Tacitus*, 113; cf Mierow, "Germanicus Caesar Imperator," 137

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Pelling, "Tacitus and Germanicus," in Luce, T.J. and A.J. Woodman eds. *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition*. 63.

²⁹ *Tac. Ann.* 1.35.

³⁰ Pelling, "Tacitus and Germanicus," 66.

Another such questionable act on the part of Germanicus was his fake letter to the troops from Tiberius in 1.36:

They [Germanicus and his friends] decided that a letter should be written *in the prince's name*, to the effect that full discharge was granted to those who had served in twenty campaigns; that there was a conditional release for those who had served sixteen, and that they were to be retained under a standard with immunity from everything except actually keeping off the enemy; that the legacies which they had asked, were to be paid and doubled.³¹

The letter was to have been written some time previously, and suspiciously Tiberius' offerings coincided strangely with the very recent demands the soldiers had made. The men, not being so easily duped, saw right through Germanicus' ploy and pressed even more for their demands.³² Once more, Germanicus is hardly seen as a capable general and his handling of the crisis is hardly commendable; indeed, his letter infuriated the soldiers and he accomplished exactly the opposite of what he had set out to do, which was to stop the mutiny from spreading. It seems obvious in this case that Tacitus did not set out to create an idealized hero, but rather tried to portray a great individual as accurately as possible, no matter how he felt about him.

Finally, in 1.44, Germanicus seems to have lost complete control of his legions, as he lets the soldiers sit on the judgment of their own centurions! Tacitus states explicitly that: "nor did Caesar [Germanicus] check them, seeing that without order from himself, the same men were responsible for all the cruelty and all the odium of the deed" indicating that Germanicus knew that the very soldiers judging the chief mutineers were as guilty of the crime of mutiny as their ringleaders. This is but one aspect of the incident in which Germanicus seemed inept in his task of leader. Continuing in the same passage, it is clear that his camp had degenerating and Roman soldiers were pitted against other Romans, often their superiors in rank. This completely undermined the carefully constructed Roman military hierarchy that had given the Roman army its predominance in the Mediterranean. Germanicus was undermining the whole military system with his mock-trial and Tacitus felt that this was too important a detail to be left out.

[they] dragged the chief mutineers in chains to Caius Caetronius, commander of the first legion, who tried and punished them one by one in the following fashion. In front of the throng stood the legions with drawn swords. Each accused man was on a raised platform and was pointed out by a tribune, *if they shouted out that he was guilty, he was thrown headlong and cut to pieces*. The soldiers gloated over the bloodshed *as though it gave them absolution*.³³

Such mob justice was hardly in accord with the Roman judicial system, and it is remarkable that Germanicus was not punished by Tiberius for such blatant lack of judgment in such an affair. The soldiers were given too much power and clearly it went to their heads, as is made evident in the passage where it describes their bloodlust. His lack of judgment is further emphasized a few lines down when Tacitus states that: "if the tribunes and the legion commended his [the centurion's] good behavior, he retained his rank; where they unanimously charged him with rapacity or cruelty, he was dismissed service."³⁴ Such questionable behavior would not have been tolerated from any other general, and it would seem

³¹ Tac.*Ann.*1.36. Emphasis mine.

³² Pelling, "Tacitus and Germanicus," 63; cf Tac.*Ann.*1.36-37; cf Martin, *Tacitus*, 117.

³³ Tac.*Ann.*1.44. Emphasis mine.

³⁴ Tac.*Ann.*1.44.

that Tiberius endured Germanicus because he was his adopted son rather than an exemplary general at this point in his career.

This last passage exemplifies Germanicus' inaptitude to control the legions under his command, as well as his questionable judgment when dealing with mutinies and conflicts within his troops. It would seem counterfactual for Tacitus to include these three incidents, only a selection of many such instances in the *Annales*, if his main aim was to glorify the general in order to contrast his moral standings to the depravity of Tiberius. This would indicate that Tacitus was accurate when depicting Germanicus rather than what has been suggested, mainly that because Germanicus was Tacitus' hero, he was extremely generous in his portrayal. It is not the purpose of this essay to suggest that Germanicus was only portrayed badly in the *Annales*, but rather that the portrayal of Germanicus was well balanced and suggests veracity rather than exaggeration. Indeed, Suetonius glorifies Germanicus much more than Tacitus does in his *Life of Caligula*.

He was so much loved by the people that [...] on the day he died temples were attacked with stones, the altars of the gods were overturned, the household gods of some families were cast out into the street, and others exposed their wives' new babies. Indeed, they say that even the barbarians, some of whom were engaged in a civil war while others were at war with us, agreed to a truce, as if they themselves had suffered a common loss.³⁵

Tacitus' Germanicus would hardly warrant such a display of affection after his death. It would indeed seem that Tacitus depicted Germanicus as much more human than Suetonius did, and that would suggest, as mentioned previously, a stricter adherence to the true character of Germanicus.

Finally, it is essential to look at the relationship between Germanicus and Tiberius in order to determine the veracity of their conflict. So far, it has been established that Tacitus adhered quite accurately to his sources, and that his portrayal of Germanicus was much more impartial than some would tend to suggest. Now it is time to examine Tiberius' actions towards Germanicus.

Tacitus is highly critical of Tiberius' recall of Germanicus from Germany in order to place him in the East.

Meanwhile, the commotion in the East was rather pleasing to Tiberius, as it was a pretext for withdrawing Germanicus from the legions which knew him well, and placing him over new provinces where he would be exposed both to treachery and disasters.³⁶

However, as Tacitus was prisoner of his sources, it cannot be affirmed that his admiration for Germanicus was the reasoning behind his dreadful portrayal of Tiberius' motives. In fact, later in book 2 Tacitus mentions that: "He, Tiberius, had himself been sent *nine times* by Augustus into Germany, and had done more by policy than by arms. By this means the submission of the Sugambri had been secured, and the Suevi with their king Maroboduus had been forced into peace."³⁷ By joining these two passages, Tiberius' motives become much more obvious; he had not recalled Germanicus out of spite, but rather because he himself had been a veteran many times of the German wars and knew very well how to deal with those people. Indeed he had brought into submission two major tribes by diplomacy, and denied

³⁵ Suet. *Cal.* 4-5.

³⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 2.5.

³⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 2.26.

Germanicus' demand for another year of fighting because he knew, by experience, that the Germans reacted much better to diplomacy than force. Therefore, Tacitus' demonstration of Tiberius' bitterness, greed, and jealousy towards Germanicus is actually, when taken in context, a very wise decision taken by a very experienced man in order to prevent any harm from befalling his legions as well as to his adopted son.³⁸

In the incident at Teutoburg forest in which Germanicus buries the fallen Varan legions, Tacitus agrees with what Tiberius believed, although felt the need to include some cynicism into the narrative.

This [the burying of the dead] Tiberius did not approve, either interpreting unfavorably every act of Germanicus, or because he thought that the spectacle of the slain and unburied made the army slow to fight and more afraid of the enemy, and that a general invested with the augurate and its very ancient ceremonies ought not to have polluted himself with funeral rites.³⁹

Tiberius would at first glance seem unwelcoming of *anything* that Germanicus did; however, after further scrutiny, he was correct in his disapproval. The Roman troops were terrified of Arminius and came close to replaying the Varus disaster,⁴⁰ and therefore seeing a large number of fallen soldiers could not have helped their moral at all. Furthermore, as an augur, Germanicus was strictly forbidden by religious law to be in contact with funerals or the dead,⁴¹ a law he unscrupulously broke when he went, contrary to the wishes of the emperor, at the site of the Teutoburg battle.

Finally, the list of honors bestowed upon Germanicus is much too impressive to have been possible had the emperor profoundly distrusted and loathed him. First of all, Tiberius gave Germanicus proconsular *imperium* over Germany, powers which were not bestowed upon Tiberius' real son Drusus: "But for Germanicus Caesar he asked pro-consular powers, and envoys were dispatched to confer them onto him, and also to express sympathy with his grief at the death of Augustus. The same request was not made for Drusus."⁴²

Next came the membership to the new priesthood of the Augustales, to which, unlike other prominent members of the aristocracy, he was appointed by Tiberius along with the emperor himself and his son Drusus: "The same year witnessed the establishment of religious ceremonies in a new priesthood of the brotherhood of the Augustales [...] twenty-one were chosen by lot from the chief men of the state; Tiberius, Drusus, Claudius, and Germanicus *were added to the number*."⁴³ Rather than suggesting a profound dislike for Germanicus, this passage would indicate that Tiberius was trying to solidify his succession mechanism by conferring an enormous amount of titles onto the most likely candidate to the emperorship, Germanicus (Germanicus received many more honors than Drusus, the birth-son of Tiberius).

Finally, the most telling of all honors perhaps, was that Tiberius permitted Germanicus to take on the title of *Imperator* suggesting that he had been singled out as a successor to the Principate rather than his adoptive brother Drusus: "He [Germanicus] then led back the army and received *on the proposal of Tiberius* the title *Imperator*."⁴⁴

³⁸ Martin. *Tacitus*, 117.

³⁹ *Tac. Ann.* 1.62.

⁴⁰ Pelling. "Tacitus and Germanicus," 76-77.

⁴¹ Mierow. "Germanicus Caesar Imperator," 143.

⁴² *Tac. Ann.* 1.14.

⁴³ *Tac. Ann.* 1.54. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁴ *Tac. Ann.* 1.58. Emphasis mine.

Germanicus was also awarded a triumph, gladiatorial shows were given in his honor, an arch was erected in his honor at Rome, donatives were given to the populace in his name, an ovation was voted to him by the Senate and another arch was erected in order to celebrate his victories in the Orient.⁴⁵ These honors can hardly be seen as bestowed by a hostile emperor upon a man he detested. Furthermore, the list of posthumous honors is as impressive, and only the most ludicrous ones were vetoed by the emperor, most pertaining to the glorification of the imperial family for having avenged Germanicus as well as to the destruction of the Piso family.⁴⁶

In conclusion, Tacitus was quite faithful to his sources, but was indeed prisoner of their biases and opinions. Furthermore, by his time the reputation of the Julio-Claudians had been profoundly imbedded in Roman society and he could not help but portray Tiberius in a bad light. However, his portrayal of Germanicus, as proven previously, is quite accurate since it presents a balanced view of Germanicus' character. For the purpose of this essay, only the instances in which Germanicus is critiqued were presented because the inclusion of all those in which he is glorified would have been too lengthy. Indeed, it was not the purpose to prove that Tacitus viewed Germanicus unfavorably, but simply that he critiqued him when necessary. Finally, the conflict between Germanicus and Tiberius was clearly present before the Tacitean tradition, as Cassius Dio and Suetonius also speak of these tensions, and it is therefore not a Tacitean creation. For this portion especially Tacitus was subject to the bias of his sources and therein lies the reason why he inaccurately portrays the relation between Tiberius and Germanicus. However, after a thorough examination it is obvious that the relationship was not spiteful, quite the contrary; it was Tacitus' portrayal that led famed scholar Theodor Mommsen to declare that Tiberius was the most capable of emperors.⁴⁷ Therefore, the Germanicus/Tiberius conflict as portrayed by Tacitus, although he did remain very loyal to his sources, was not historical, as Tacitus had to deal with one hundred years of scholarship between himself and the events, and there was no way to escape the bias of his sources. However he did, possibly unconsciously, demonstrate the good relations between Tiberius and Germanicus on a number of occasions and that seems much more historical than the more obvious message of the historian.

⁴⁵ Mierow, "Germanicus Caesar Imperator," 151.

⁴⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 3.17-18; cf. Mierow, "Germanicus Caesar Imperator," 151.

⁴⁷ Mellor, *Tacitus*, 43.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Cassius Dio. *Roman History*. Trans. Ian Scott-Kilvert. Penguin: London, 1987.
- Pliny the Elder. *Natural History*. Trans. John Bostock, 1855. <www.perseus.tufts.edu>.
- Pliny the Younger. *Epistles*. Trans. P.G. Walsh. Oxford University Press: New York, 2006.
- Suetonius. *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*. Trans. Catherine Edwards. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Tacitus. *Annals* Trans. by Moses Hadas. Modern Library: New York, 1942.

Secondary Sources

- Benario, Herbert W. *An Introduction to Tacitus*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1975.
- Damon, Cynthia. "Relatio vs. oratio: Tacitus, Ann.3.12 and the senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone patre" *CQ* 49 (1999): 336-338.
- . "The Trial of Cn. Piso in Tacitus' Annals and the Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre: New Light on Narrative Technique" *AJP* 120 (1999): 143-162.
- Gonzalez, Julian. "Tacitus, Germanicus, Piso, and the Tabula Siarensis" *AJP* 120 (1999): 123-142.
- Harrer, G.A. "Tacitus and Tiberius" *AJP* 41 (1920): 57-68.
- Martin, Ronald. *Tacitus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Mellor, Ronald. *The Roman Historians*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- . *Tacitus*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Mendell, Clarence W. *Tacitus, the Man and his Work*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Mierow, Charles Christopher. "Germanicus Caesar Imperator" *CJ* 39 (1943): 137-155.
- Pelling, Christopher. "Tacitus and Germanicus." In *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition*, edited by Luce, T.J. and A.J. Woodman. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Stuart, Meriwether. "Tacitus and the Portraits of Germanicus and Drusus" *CP* 35 (1940): 64-67.