

Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics

*Tiberiana 4: Tiberius the Wise*

Version 1.0

July 2007

Edward Champlin

Princeton University

Abstract:

Abstract: This is one of five *parerga* preparatory to a book to be entitled *Tiberius on Capri*, which will explore the interrelationship between culture and empire, between Tiberius' intellectual passions (including astrology, gastronomy, medicine, mythology, and literature) and his role as *princeps*. These five papers do not so much develop an argument as explore significant themes which will be examined and deployed in the book in different contexts.

This paper examines the extraordinary but scattered evidence for a contemporary perception of Tiberius as the wise and pious old monarch of folklore.

© Edward Champlin. [champlin@princeton.edu](mailto:champlin@princeton.edu)

## Tiberius the Wise

### I

The paranoia and cruelty of the aged tyrant in his island fastness are stunningly captured in the horrific tale of the fisherman:

A few days after he reached Capreae and was by himself, a fisherman appeared unexpectedly and offered him a huge mullet; whereupon in his alarm that the man had clambered up to him from the back of the island over rough and pathless rocks, he had the poor fellow's face scrubbed with the fish. And because in the midst of his torture the man thanked his stars that he had not given the emperor an enormous crab that he had caught, Tiberius had his face torn with the crab also.

Suetonius *Tiberius* 60<sup>1</sup>

Inevitably the tale has been conflated with the charge that Tiberius had the victims of his tortures thrown into the sea below (Suetonius 62. 2), and it is assumed that the poor fisherman was tossed over the cliff.<sup>2</sup> Fortunately, his story is almost certainly untrue.

A century later the emperor Hadrian (his bones be ground to dust!) was on his way to Tiberias in Judaea when he passed an old man planting fig-tree shoots. He mocked him for thus investing in the future, especially when he learned that he was 100 years old. The man calmly replied that if he was worthy he would eat the figs, if not, he

---

<sup>1</sup> Loeb trans. by J.C. Rolfe: In paucis diebus quam Capreas attigit piscatori, qui sibi secretum agenti grandem mullum inopinanter obtulerat, prefricari eodem pisce faciem iussit, territus quod is a tergo insulae per aspera et devia erepsisset ad se; gratulanti autem inter poenam, quod non et lucustam, quam pergrandem ceperat, obtulisset, lucusta quoque lacerari os imperavit.

<sup>2</sup> Reported as early as Orgitano 1858: 2. 137-138.

was working for his children as his ancestors had worked for him. Hadrian told him to let him know if he did eat the figs. In due course the trees produced and the old man set off with a basket of figs to “the king”. Hadrian ordered that he be seated on a chair of gold and that his basket be emptied and filled with denarii, saying to detractors: “His Creator honors him, and shall I not honor him too?” When she heard this, the wife of the old man’s neighbor (“a woman of low character”) prodded her husband into going with another sack of figs to the palace, in hopes of likewise exchanging them for denarii. But the king ordered this man to stand before the palace gate, where everyone coming in or out was to pelt his face with a fig. When he reproached his wife later that evening, she replied, “Go and tell your mother the gladsome tidings that they were figs and not citrons, or that they were ripe and not hard!”<sup>3</sup>

Some 1200 years later and much further east, an even more frightening conqueror, Timur (Tamerlane), was preparing to attack the city where dwelt the holy fool, Khoja Nasr-ed-Din Efendi. The Khoja offered himself as ambassador to the emperor and asked his wife which would be the better present to take, figs or quinces. Quinces, she assured him, but, ever dubious of a woman’s advice, he filled a basket with figs and hurried off to Timur. Timur had him brought in and ordered his servants to throw the figs at his bald head – as each one struck him the Khoja called out “Praised be Allah!” When the emperor asked why, he replied, “I thank Allah that I followed not my wife’s advice; for had I, as she counseled me, brought quinces instead of figs, my head must have been broken.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> *Midrash Rabbah. Leviticus*, translated by J.J. Slotki (London, 1939).

<sup>4</sup> Clouston 1887: 2. 468-469.

About a hundred years earlier, the tale was told in Italy of a vassal who had brought his lord a basket of figs, knowing that he was fond of them, but unaware that figs were plentiful after a large harvest. Insulted, the lord had his servants strip the man and bind him and throw the figs one after another into his face. When one almost hit him in the eye, he cried out, “May the Lord be praised!” When the signore inquired why, he replied, “Sire, because I had been encouraged to pick peaches instead, and if I had picked them I would be blind by now.” Laughing, his lord had him untied and dressed, and rewarded him for the novelty of what he had said.<sup>5</sup>

The tale passed into proverb. The people of Poggibonsi paid an annual tribute of peaches to the court of Tuscany, to be enjoyed by the ladies-in-waiting and the pages. One year, peaches being scarce and expensive, they sent some juicy figs instead. Outraged, the pages dumped the pulpy figs over the ambassadors from Poggibonsi, who recalled, as they ran away, that peaches would have had pits in them, and they cried out, “Luckily they weren’t peaches!”<sup>6</sup>

In brief, the story of the fisherman is a dark variant of the comic motif J2563 in Stith Thompson’s *Motif-Index of Folk Literature (MI)*, “Thank God they weren’t peaches!” Even better, it is a variant not merely of a motif but of a whole tale, number 1689 in Aarne-Thompson-Uther’s *The Types of International Folktales (ATU)*, “Thank God They Weren’t Peaches”:

A poor man (fool) plans to bring peaches (beets) to the king (another high-placed person) as a present. His wife persuades him to bring figs (plums, onions)

---

<sup>5</sup> *The Novellino, or One Hundred Ancient Tales*, translated by J.P. Consuli (New York, 1997).

<sup>6</sup> Retold by Isaac D’Israeli in his “Curiosities of Literature”, quoted by Clouston 1887: 2. 467-468.

instead. (Because they are not ripe,) the king throws them at the man's head. He is glad (thanks God) that they were not peaches.<sup>7</sup>

*ATU* lists variants reported in some 22 countries, regions, and cultures, spread from Southern and Southeastern Europe through the Near and Middle East, with outliers in North and South America.<sup>8</sup> Obviously details vary considerably, misogyny seems to intrude, and the story may intertwine with others<sup>9</sup>, but the soft fig is ubiquitous and the essential elements are the same: a powerless man presents a powerful one with an edible gift; the powerful man takes offense and punishes the head of the offender with the food itself; whereupon the unfortunate victim unexpectedly gives thanks that the present was not a similar but harder, more damaging edible which he had almost given in its stead. The historicity of the Tiberian anecdote is thus highly unlikely.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *MI*, Stith Thompson's great motif-index of folk literature, was first published in six volumes from 1932 to 1936 at Helsinki in the series *FF Communications*. The now standard "revised and enlarged edition" was issued in six volumes from 1955-1958 at Bloomington, Indiana. It is a classic work much in need of revision.

*ATU*, in three volumes, edited by H.-J. Uther is the fourth version (2004), much revised and expanded, of Antti Aarne's likewise indispensable classification of folktale types, originally published at Helsinki in 1910 (A. Aarne, *Verzeichnis der Märchentypen*), and twice revised by Stith Thompson in 1928 and 1961 as *The Types of the Folk-Tale (AaTh)*. All four works appear in the *FF Communications* series, "edited for the Folklore Fellows" and published by the Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

<sup>8</sup> *Viz.*, French, Spanish, Catalan, Italian, Hungarian, Serbian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Ukrainian, Turkish, Jewish, Kurdish, Tadjhik, Syrian/Lebanese/Iraqi, Palestinian, Iranian, US-American, Mexican, Brazilian, West Indies, Egyptian.

<sup>9</sup> In Hadrian's case, compare *MI* J2415.1, "The two presents to the king: the beet and the horse," and *ATU* 1689A, "Two Presents for the King": "A man (farmer, gardener) produces a huge turnip .... and takes it to the king as a present. The king rewards him well. His neighbor (gentleman, noble, rich man) learns about this and decides to give the king a much better present (his daughter in marriage), in the hope of an even better reward ..... The king gives him the giant turnip as his reward."

Also *ATU* 928, Planting for the Next Generation, cf. *MI* J701.1 and Hansen 2002: 331-332.

<sup>10</sup> As was seen long ago by G. Amalfi, 1893: 15-16. I leave open the slight chance that the tale of the fisherman might be historical: Adrienne Mayor points out the process of

The lens of folklore, if we choose to use it, offers a rather different view of Tiberius' career. First, some examples wherein his alleged adventures can be seen in a different context:

While he was studying as a young man on the island of Rhodes, according to Plutarch's lost biography, a donkey gave off large sparks while it was being groomed, thus predicting his future rule.<sup>11</sup> *MI* H171, Animal (object) indicates election of ruler; particularly H171.3, Horse indicates election of emperor.

After his accession, "when a funeral was passing by and a jester called aloud to the corpse to let Augustus know that the legacies which he had left to the people were not yet being paid, Tiberius had the man haled before him, ordered that he be given his due and put to death, and bade him go tell the truth to his father." (Suetonius 57. 2, cf. Dio 57. 14. 1, dating the incident to AD 15). A classical scholar rightly drew attention to the similarity between this most unlikely tale and the scene in Book 2 of the *Aeneid*, where Priam bitterly reproaches the cruel Pyrrhus as no true son of Achilles – Pyrrhus bids Priam go as a messenger to the dead, to tell Achilles of his degenerate son, and kills him.<sup>12</sup> In fact both are unheroic versions of *MI* H1252.4, King sends hero to otherworld to carry message to king's dead father.

---

"ostentation", "in which people act out what they have heard in myth or legend, thereby making a folklore motif come true." Tiberius, like other Roman dynasts, certainly acted out mythological situations (but this is neither myth nor legend), and he certainly had grim sense of humor; on the other hand, the anecdote is so anti-Tiberian the odds are that it was attached to him by ill-wishers, of whom there were many.

<sup>11</sup> Plutarch *fr.* 182. Adrienne Mayor points out that the sacred light or fire designating a new ruler "goes back to ancient Iranian kingship beliefs, in which Mithra signals his approval of a new ruler by sending an omen via his favorite animal, the horse."

<sup>12</sup> *Aen.* 2. 535-550. Turner 1943.

Likewise early in the reign, a slave named Clemens masqueraded as his recently dead master, Agrippa Postumus, the last grandson of Augustus, and stirred up trouble in Italy. Tiberius had him captured by a trick and brought to the Palatine. After torturing him, the emperor asked how he had become Agrippa. Clemens is said to have replied, “The (same) way in which you became Caesar.” Tiberius had him executed and the body disposed of (Tacitus 2. 39-40, cf. Dio 57. 16. 3-4: all of this supposedly in private). Centuries earlier, when Alexander the Great had asked a prisoner, “Why are you a pirate on the sea?” the man replied, “Why are you a pirate for the whole world?” And, two hundred years after Tiberius, the praetorian prefect Papinian asked the notorious brigand Bulla Felix, “Why did you take to robbing?” only to receive the by now inevitable, provocative reply, “Why are *you* prefect?”<sup>13</sup> All three anecdotes are versions of *MI* U11.2, He who steals much called king; he who steals little called thief: in each of the three cases here, the question is predicated on the answer. In the Tiberian anecdote we can see how easily they were grafted onto the supposed interrogation.

Another tale concerns the inventor of unbreakable glass, which appears in various versions. Petronius has him bring it to “Caesar”, drop it on purpose, and hammer out the resulting dent. He thinks his fortune is made, but Caesar, after carefully inquiring whether anyone else knows the secret, has the man executed for, if it got out, gold would be worthless. The Elder Pliny was skeptical. “They say” that a method for making glass flexible was invented *Tiberio principe*. Without actually implicating the emperor, he reports that the artisan’s workshop was destroyed so as not to devalue copper, silver and gold, “but the story has for long been more repeated than certain.” Much later, Cassius

---

<sup>13</sup> Cicero *Rep.* 3.24; Dio 77. 10. 7 (AD 212). Discussed by La Penna 1979.

Dio (via Zonaras) relates a quite different version under the year 23. An architect devised a brilliant method for shoring up a large portico which had begun to lean (details are given): his name is unknown because the jealous Tiberius would not let it be entered in the records. The resentful emperor simultaneously rewarded the man and exiled him. The inventor later approached him to beg pardon, purposely dropping a glass cup and miraculously restoring it – for which the emperor had him executed.<sup>14</sup> The tale has been garbled in Dio’s transmission, and has surely been influenced by Hadrian’s supposedly lethal jealousy of the architect Apollodorus to weave together two separate stories. It does not appear in *MI* or *ATU*, but has been identified as the earliest example of a new motif, “The Impossible Product.”<sup>15</sup>

When Tiberius withdrew at the height of power into self-imposed retirement on Rhodes and later on Capri, he allegedly did so in time-honored fashion. Tacitus tells us, in the former instance, of Lucilius Longus, “a sharer in all his sadnesses and delights and from among the senators the only companion in his Rhodian withdrawal”; and, in the latter, of the single senator, Cocceius Nerva, learned in the law, and the single knight, Curtius Atticus, who accompanied Tiberius to Capri.<sup>16</sup> In fact, however few may have joined him on the initial journeys, he certainly dwelt on those islands surrounded by a large retinue and with many friends and relatives, including senators and equestrians, among his long-term guests.<sup>17</sup> The misleading impression of the single faithful

---

<sup>14</sup> Petronius 51 (retold by Trimalchio); Pliny *NH* 36. 195; Dio 57. 21. 5-7.

<sup>15</sup> Lassen 1995.

<sup>16</sup> 4. 15.1, trans. A.J. Woodman; 4. 58. 1.

<sup>17</sup> For companions on Capri see the impressive roster compiled at Houston 1985. No proof of the fantasy of the single companion is needed, but Tacitus elsewhere writes of two men who followed (*secuti*) Tiberius to Rhodes and Capri (6. 10. 2), one of whom, Vesularius Flaccus, he himself has identified as a knight (2. 28. 2)

companion following his king into exile reflects not reality but romance, as with *MI* J1634, To follow the king. Not surprisingly, after naming Nerva and Atticus, Tacitus adds that the rest of his company on Capri “were endowed in liberal studies, mostly Greeks, in whose conversations he might find alleviation”: *MI* J146.1, King prefers educated men as company.

And, to return to the fisherman and Tiberius’ love of high places, there is the marvelous story of the astrologer and Platonic philosopher, Thrasyllus. All three of our sources give confusing accounts. According to Tacitus, Tiberius, as he became adept in the art of astrology on Rhodes, would have its practitioners brought to him high in his house, high on the cliffs, to consult about the future. If he suspected any fraud, he would have a strong freedman throw the offender into the sea on their return journey.

Thrasyllus was thus brought to him over the rocks and Tiberius, impressed with the astrologer’s knowledge of his future greatness, asked him if he could comment on his own situation. After some calculation Thrasyllus fell into a panic and cried out that an uncertain and almost final crisis was upon him. Whereupon the prince embraced him, congratulated him on his knowledge, assured him of his safety, and took him among his most intimate friends.

So Tacitus. Suetonius tells a very different story, placing it just before Tiberius’ return from his Rhodian exile. Among different omens of his good fortune, Thrasyllus, one of his learned friends, predicted that the ship coming into view was bringing good news. This at the moment that Tiberius had decided to throw him into the sea, because his prophecies were false and he knew too many secrets. And Dio, in his turn, had both tales. Once in Rhodes, Tiberius was about to push Thrasyllus off the walls, because he

was the only one who knew all his thoughts, when he noticed and commented on the astrologer's depressed demeanor, and Thrasyllus replied that he felt some danger loomed over him. Whereupon Tiberius valued him even more, and spared him. Then, apparently separately, Dio related the story of the ship.<sup>18</sup>

Although there are significant differences among the three versions, the bones of the story are clear: in a high place the seer foresees his own imminent danger at the hands of his master, who spares him at the last moment, impressed by his skill. Although it may not appear so at first glance, this is closely related to *MI J2133.8*, Stargazer falls into well, and *ATU 1871A*, Star Gazer Falls into Well, and hence folkloric:

A philosopher (Thales) always looks up in order to observe the stars. He falls into a well. An old woman asks him why he wants to learn about the stars, when he cannot even walk on earth without stumbling.<sup>19</sup>

The missing link here, as A.H. Krappe saw, is the death of Nectanebus in the Alexander Romance (14). Nectanebus – magician, astrologer, trickster, and former king of Egypt – was of course the real father of Alexander the Great, unbeknownst to Alexander, and to Philip of Macedon. When the young prince asked him about the stars, Nectanebus took him to an out of the way place in the country and showed him the night sky. Alexander led him to a pit and let him fall into it, and when the grievously injured astrologer asked why, the prince replied because he concerned himself with the heavens but knew nothing

---

<sup>18</sup> Tacitus 6. 21; Suetonius 14. 4; Dio 55. 11. 1-3 (the first comes from Zonaras, the second from Xiphilinus: how the two were related in Dio's original text is unknown).

<sup>19</sup> The story is told by Plato at *Theaetetus* 174a. It became proverbial: in his tragedy *Iphigenia*, Ennius has Achilles remark of *astrologi*, "quod est ante pedes nemo spectat, caeli scrutantur plagas" (Cicero, *De Re Publica* 1. 30. 3; cf. *Div.* 2. 30). In their defense, the astrologers might quote Lord Darlington: "We are all in the gutter, but some of us are looking at the stars."

of what happened on earth. Nectanebus exclaimed that no man could avoid his fate: his art had told him that he would be slain by his son, and he explained to the amazed Alexander the complicated tale of how this had come to pass. Grieving, Alexander carried the body back to his mother, and together they raised a great tomb for him. In short, this tale combines the story of the comical Thales, the philosopher so intent on the stars that he falls into a ditch, a wise man unable to see his own fate, and the story of the murderous prince who throws down the astrologer, or means to throw him down, from a height, a wise man who can do nothing to alter his fate, whether he perceives the danger or not.<sup>20</sup> The common elements are the seer who cannot see or cannot avoid his fate, and the danger from falling – which leads us back to Thrasyllus.

Two elements in the stories thus far catch the attention. First, some of the bad ones, while casting Tiberius in a harsh light, are not intrinsically, or at least in other variants, negative. Where Tiberius is cruel and suspicious, Hadrian recognizes his error and rewards the old man, or the lord laughs and rewards his vassal – and in general, pelting with squashy figs is intended to be comical and humiliating, not lethal. Where Tiberius is merely jealous of the craftsman he executes, the prudent “Caesar” acts in statesmanlike manner to save the economy of his empire from collapse. And while Tiberius at first doubts the prophecies of Thrasyllus and fears his knowledge, he comes to recognize his abilities, and indeed the story of the paranoid prince has a happy ending: on an objective reading, it would have been dangerous for a wise monarch to let a real seer live, and it is a tribute to his learning and perspicacity that the prince who preferred to

---

<sup>20</sup> Krappe 1927 pointed out the relevance of Nectanebus to Thrasyllus, but denied any connection with the seer unable to foresee his own fate: I prefer the connection described here.

converse with other men of learning saw through charlatans and recognized the genuine article. It is well enough established that one at least of our lost sources, behind Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio, was violently hostile to Tiberius: we might suspect that the dark cast of stories, which are in other contexts more positive or at least neutral, can be attributed to someone who did not like the emperor, and in some cases they have obviously been tacked on to Tiberian anecdotes.

Second, these tales are concerned with power, its use and abuse: the lord's overhasty reaction to the underling's gift; the omen of future rule; the similarity between rule and banditry; the companions of the king in exile and in daily conversation; above all the removal of danger through summary violence (the public critic, the pretender to the throne, the thoughtless craftsman, the wise man who knows too many secrets). Tales of power are appropriate to an emperor, and the cumulative effect of these monarchical stereotypes is to cast doubt on the historical truth of any single item.

Moreover, three extraordinary stories should be added to the account, anecdotes told of Tiberius Caesar that raise him far above any stereotype. Each one is marvelous; taken together, they make him a figure unique in ancient folklore. *Assem para et accipe auream fabulam, fabulas immo*, as the storyteller says, give me a penny and you will hear a golden tale, or rather tales:

## II.

First, there is the haunting story told by Plutarch, in his essay on the decline of oracles. It was related to him by a historian named Philippus, who had in turn heard it from an eyewitness:

The father of Aemilianus the orator, to whom some of you have listened, was Epitherses, who lived in our town and was my teacher in grammar. He said that once upon a time in making a voyage to Italy he embarked on a ship carrying freight and many passengers. It was already evening when, near the Echinades Islands, the wind dropped, and the ship drifted near Paxi. Almost everybody was awake, and a good many had not finished their after-dinner wine. Suddenly from the island of Paxi was heard the voice of someone loudly calling Thamus, so that all were amazed. Thamus was an Egyptian pilot, not known by name to even many on board. Twice he was called and made no reply, but the third time he answered; and the caller, raising his voice, said, 'When you come opposite Palodes, announce that Great Pan is dead.' On hearing this, all, said Epitherses, were astounded, and reasoned among themselves whether it were better to carry out the order or to refuse to meddle and let the matter go. Under the circumstances Thamus made up his mind that if there should be a breeze, he would sail past and keep quiet, but with no wind and a smooth sea about the place he would announce what he had heard. So when he came opposite Palodes, and there was neither wind nor wave, Thamus from the stern, looking toward the land, said the words as he had heard them: 'Great Pan is dead.' Even before he had finished there was a great cry of lamentation, not of one person, but of many, mingled with exclamations of amazement.

The proximity in time of the death of the god Pan to the death of Jesus excited comment in later antiquity, but the point here lies in its immediate sequel:

As many persons were on the vessel, the story was soon spread abroad in Rome, and Thamus was sent for by Tiberius Caesar. Tiberius became so convinced of the truth of the story that he caused an enquiry and investigation to be made about Pan; and the scholars (*philologoi*), who were numerous at his court, conjectured that he was the son born of Hermes and Penelope.<sup>21</sup>

Plutarch reports the story with a wealth of circumstantial detail and on the basis of irrefutable eyewitness evidence: a character in one of his dialogs reports having heard it from a man who happened to be sailing with Thamus. Nevertheless the uncanny tale of the wanderer who is ordered by a (supernatural) voice to announce that a superhuman figure has died, and who is then greeted by loud (supernatural) mourning when he does so, is undeniably folkloric, and often vouched for by what folklorists call a FOAF, the Friend of a Friend. Plutarch's tale, beautifully told, is a version of *MI F442.1*, "Mysterious voice announces death of Pan" (cf. B342, "Cat leaves house when report is made of death of one of his companions"), and indeed one version of a folktale type in itself, *ATU 113A*, "Pan is Dead"<sup>22</sup>:

A man (dwarf) hears a voice (of a cat) that tells him to announce that a third figure (the god Pan, the king of the cats) is dead. The man does not recognize either the voice or the name of the dead person. When he comes home he tells what happened. When the maid (cat) hears this, she says she has to leave (is now king of the cats), goes away, and never comes back.

---

<sup>21</sup> Plutarch *Mor.* 3. 419B-E, *De defectu oraculorum* 27, Loeb translation, F.C. Babbitt. The rationale here is, presumably, that the god's mother was mortal and therefore, yes, he could die.

<sup>22</sup> Formerly *AaTh* 113A, "King of the Cats is Dead". The whole tale is splendidly illuminated at Hansen 2002: 131-136 ("Fairies Send a Message. Death of Pan"), obviating much of the large and often misguided bibliography.

The arresting aspect of Plutarch's account is not that a folk motif or tale is applied to Tiberius, but rather that it is a tale told to Tiberius. A supernatural mystery is presented to the emperor, who turns to his wise men for a rational explanation. It is a curiously liminal situation, as if a flesh-and-blood American president were one day confronted with strong evidence that a folk belief turned out to be real, the return of Elvis Presley for instance. Why the tale should attach itself to the passionately intellectual Tiberius is worth considering. For a start, his obsession with mythology was notorious, and marvels were reported to him (as they were to other emperors): an embassy from Olisipo reported that a triton had been seen, and heard playing on a conch shell (in time-honored fashion), in a nearby cave; various monsters, *beluae*, and many Nereids turned up on the coast of the Santones; and the enormous tooth, over a foot long, from the skeleton of a giant hero was brought to him for measurement after an earthquake.<sup>23</sup>

### III

In his *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus discussed Tiberius' legendary procrastination in receiving embassies, replacing governors, and conducting trials. When the emperor's friends asked about his slowness, he replied, in the matter of governors, that those who stayed in their provinces for short terms worked hard at extortion from the provincials, but those who remained for a long time grew sated with their profits:

He told them this fable by way of illustration. Once a man lay wounded, and a swarm of flies hovered about his wounds. A passer-by took pity on his evil plight and, in the belief that he did not raise a hand because he could not, was about to

---

<sup>23</sup> Pliny *NH* 9. 9; 9. 10; Phlegon 14 (on which, more below).

step up and shoo them off. The wounded man, however, begged him to think no more of doing anything about it. At this the man spoke up and asked him why he was not interested in escaping from his wretched condition. “Why,” said he, “you would put me in a worse position if you drove them off. For since these flies have already had their fill of blood, they no longer feel such a pressing need to annoy me but are in some measure slack. But if others were to come with a fresh appetite, they would take over my now weakened body and that would be the death of me.” He too, he said, for the same reason took the precaution of not dispatching governors continually to the subject-peoples who had been brought to ruin by so many thieves; for the governors would harry them utterly like flies.<sup>24</sup>

The fable told by Tiberius is a classic version of *MI J215*, Present evil preferred to change for worse, and specifically of *J215.1*, Don’t drive away the flies. As a tale it is one of three different forms taken by *ATU 910L*, Do Not Drive the Insects Away:

A sick (injured) man covered with sores is bothered by flies. He refuses any help, saying that hungry flies bite twice as hard as full ones.

Another of the three versions is assigned to Aesop in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* (2. 20), and later variants appear across southern and central Europe, from Portugal to Bulgaria. But the real Tiberius is not the fictional Aesop. An exhaustive survey of “Fables in Ancient Historiography” produced a striking observation: all known fables told by ancient historians are embedded by them in speeches from a leader to his people or to his friends, usually to dissuade them from a foolish course of action by pointing out the inevitable

---

<sup>24</sup> *AJ* 18. 174-176, Loeb translation, L.H. Feldman.

consequences which only he is wise enough to foresee.<sup>25</sup> The overwhelming majority of these wise leaders are Greeks: Aesopean fables were traditionally the refuge of the downtrodden, often slaves, allowing them to say things they couldn't say openly. But however such foreigners might act, fables weren't quite the thing for a proud Roman nobleman – the only other secure historical example is a chilling tale attributed to Sulla, the blood-drenched dictator of the old Republic, a patrician like Tiberius, who shared several of his cultural interests.<sup>26</sup> Why an Aesopean fable should be related by Tiberius is worth considering.

Tiberius the good governor joins Tiberius the curious intellectual as a figure of folkloric interest. A remarkable cluster of popular proverbs about government adheres to him. Soon after taking over sole rule, he told his friends that the empire was a monster, and so beset was he by dangers that he often, we are told, repeated the old maxim that he had a wolf by the ears.<sup>27</sup> (The problem is that you don't know whether to hold on or to let go.) On another famous occasion, when his governors wanted to load the provinces with new taxes, the wise emperor, again the people's champion, famously wrote back to them in the words of another beloved proverb, that it was the job of a good shepherd to shear his flock, not skin it.<sup>28</sup> As chance would have it, the imperial shepherd had learned about the rapacity of lupine governors from an astute barbarian who had surrendered to

---

<sup>25</sup> van Dijk 1993-1994.

<sup>26</sup> At Appian *BC* 1. 101.

<sup>27</sup> *Belua*: Suetonius 24. *Lupus*: Suetonius 25; from Terence *Phormio* 506; et alibi. Probably Greek in origin: Otto 1890: 199.

<sup>28</sup> Suetonius, at *Tiberius* 32. 2, generalizes the remark as a reply to governors who wished to raise taxes: *Boni pastoris esse tondere pecus, non deglubere*. Cf. Orosius 7.4; *Suda*, *Tiberius*. Dio has a more precise, less folkloric version at 57. 10. 5: Aemilius Rectus, supposedly Prefect of Egypt in AD 14, sends more taxes than were required, to which the emperor replies that "I [not "a good shepherd"] want my flock shorn not shaved clean." Otto 1890: 267. In fable form: Babrius 51.

him some years before. He asked why the man's newly conquered people had rebelled and fought against the Romans for so long, and the barbarian replied, recalling yet another old proverb, "You Romans are to blame for this; for you send as guardians of your flocks, not dogs or shepherds, but wolves."<sup>29</sup> Sometimes people criticized his actions, not realizing that they were for the common good. To these he replied mildly with another proverb, taken from the most famous half line in Latin popular drama, *oderint dum metuant*, "Let them hate me so long as they fear me." These hateful words of a stage tyrant he cleverly molded into a virtuous new form: *oderint dum probent*, something like "Let them hate me so long as they approve of my deeds."<sup>30</sup>

#### IV

Golden tale number three:

Once Tiberius Caesar on his way to Naples had reached his country seat at Misenum, which, built on the summit of a mountain by the hand of Lucullus, commands a view of the Sicilian sea in front and the Tuscan sea behind. Here one of the high-girt flunkies, whose shirt of Egyptian linen was drawn smoothly down from his shoulders and embellished with hanging fringes, began, while his master was strolling through the cheerful shrubbery, to sprinkle the scorching earth with a wooden watering-pot, making a display of his function as an

---

<sup>29</sup> Dio 56. 16. 3: Bato the Pannonian to Tiberius, AD 9. Otto 1890: 198-199. Cf. *MI K* 206.1, Wolf offers to act as shepherd; plan detected; K346.2 Fox as shepherd; K934, Fox in sheepskin gains admission to fold and kills sheep; et al. Bato combines the figures of the wise barbarian and the prisoner speaking truth to power (cf. Clemens, above).

<sup>30</sup> Otto 1890: 252. For the history of the use of the phrase, Champlin 2003: 307-308.

attendant upon the emperor; but he was laughed at. Thereafter, by detours well known to himself, he runs ahead into another promenade and proceeds to lay the dust there. Caesar recognizes the fellow and realizes what he is after. “Hey, you!” says the master. Whereupon the fellow, as you might know, bounces up to him, propelled by the thrill of a sure reward. Then in jesting mood his mighty majesty, the prince, thus spoke: “You haven’t done much, and your efforts are labour lost; manumission with me stands at a much higher price.”<sup>31</sup>

So Phaedrus in the fifth fable of his second book, with a promythium more pointed than usual: this is a “true story”, *vera fabella*, intended to correct the behavior of the flocks of busybodies, *ardaliones*, at Rome. But *vera fabella* is at best ambiguous: it is also a “true fable”, that is, truly a fable, and it is also *MI J554*, Intemperance in service. But the point here is that Tiberius is for the third time to be discovered in a highly unusual, if not quite unique, situation: not just that a folkloric theme is applied to him and presented as if it were history, but that soon after his death he passes over into folklore and becomes explicitly the subject of a fable, an honor accorded to very few historical figures.<sup>32</sup>

Common to these three extraordinary tales is the striking quality of liminality noticed in the first: in each Tiberius Caesar is poised between the world of popular belief and the world of historical action, investigating the death of a minor deity, explaining his policy by means of a proverbial fable, rebuking an obnoxious servant within a fable.

What binds them together is the supreme virtue of wisdom, or at least shrewdness, and it

---

<sup>31</sup> Phaedrus 2. 5. 7-25, Loeb translation, B.E. Perry.

<sup>32</sup> On the date of Phaedrus’ Fables (Claudian or Neronian) and their purpose: Champlin 2005. It is argued there that “Phaedrus” too was a Roman aristocrat with an unusual taste for fables.

is not just wisdom in daily life, but precisely that statesmanlike wisdom in the public service which we have already seen in the tale of unbreakable glass and (perhaps) the testing of Thrasyllus: Caesar consults with his wise men to reassure the people on a matter of religion, he explains to his less perceptive friends why he acts in the public interest by prolonging governors, he curbs the antics of a servant in the imperial household. Tiberius the tyrant is a familiar figure from the histories of the period – we are told that when news of his death reached Rome some ran around crying out “Tiberius to the Tiber” – but we can now see that the people may have enjoyed, for however brief a moment, another quite different image as well, an image of Tiberius the wise king.

## V

There is a Bad Tiberius and a Good Tiberius. Tiberius the monster is all too familiar. Notorious for the cruel persecution and the murders of his nearest kin; notorious for lethal assaults on the aristocracy through the revival of the treason law and the machinations of Sejanus, the all-powerful prefect of his praetorian guard; notorious for the bloodbath after the fall of Sejanus in 31: he was perhaps most infamous for his escape from Rome during the last eleven years of his life, to his massive cliff-top palace on the island of Capri, the so-called Villa of Jupiter with its sheer drop of 1,000 feet to the sea, there to live out his old age in a wild fantasy of scholarship, sadism, and sex. Tiberius is not an attractive figure. This is thanks above all to the attacks of the three Furies of early imperial historiography: Tacitus, Suetonius, and Cassius Dio. In their indelible portrait of the second emperor he will forever be for us the old monster who

hounds to death family, friends, and enemies alike: cold, proud, bitter, gloomy, secretive, duplicitous, savage, depraved.

And yet no modern historian would accept this picture. At a glance we can see that Suetonius is at his worst, constantly contradicting himself and repeatedly misunderstanding his sources, whether intentionally or inadvertently, while Tacitus is at his most ambivalent, portraying a man at once noble and vicious, simple and devious. The crucial question is: what were the sources on which Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio depend? There is staggeringly little evidence, and the nature of these lost sources has been hotly debated, with no conclusion in sight. This is not the place to go into the matter, so let me state a central hypothesis here, leaving argument for elsewhere. As Eduard Schwartz saw over a century ago, chief among the now lost writers was “an unknown annalist of great talent, probably writing soon after Tiberius’ death”.<sup>33</sup> This man was extremely well informed about the principate of Tiberius, which he obviously experienced firsthand. I believe that he knew Tiberius well and disliked him intensely. More specifically, he was intimately familiar with the emperor’s complex character and with his tastes, in literature, mythology, and popular culture – in fact, he was rather like Tiberius – and he was able brilliantly to distort and even to fabricate evidence to paint the portrait of a monstrous human being.

As a modern popular biographer of the emperor asserted long ago, vividly but not inaccurately,

he has always been, and he remains, the greatest psychological problem in history. He is Hamlet and Lear and Othello rolled into one; and he is more than

---

<sup>33</sup> For a recent, brief and level-headed summary of the source problem, with bibliography, see Martin 2001: 22-26, with 6-7.

this. We have a mass of evidence about Tiberius that for nearly nineteen hundred years baffled any attempt to understand him. We can easily construct two men out of the material, both of which are perfectly credible ....<sup>34</sup>

This schizophrenia is easily visible in any of our three main sources, and quite understandable. We know that they had access to at least two annalistic histories written within a generation of Tiberius' death, not to mention minor commentaries (including the memoirs of the younger Agrippina, who had good reason to abhor her great-uncle), the *acta senatus* (a major source, as Syme argued, for Tacitus), and even (for Suetonius and Tacitus) the memories of old men. Not all of these were necessarily inimical. But there is also something else, quite different from them. Consider the following three items:

First, our historians offer a cluster of standard charges against the second *princeps*. According to Suetonius' catalogue of Tiberian vices, the floodgates of *maiestas* charges were opened by the denunciation of a man (unnamed) for removing the head of Augustus from a statue and substituting another (unidentified): the senate heard the case, witnesses were examined under torture, and the defendant was condemned. Thereafter it became a capital crime to beat a slave or even to change one's clothes (!) near a statue of Augustus, to carry a ring or a coin with his image on it into a latrine or a brothel, or to express an adverse opinion about any word or deed of his – indeed, a man died for having an honor decreed him by his *colonia* on a day honors had been decreed to Augustus. Thus Suetonius, not in control of his material, and in fact, according to

---

<sup>34</sup> Baker 1929: viii-ix. He continues, p. 8, "... he remained shy, a little gauche, with the fastidiousness which shows itself in apparently inconsistent ways, as a dislike of sentiment, an appreciation of poetry, an intolerance of fools, a sympathy with simplicity; he distinguished so accurately between those opposites which men habitually confuse that he puzzled his critics."

Tacitus' fuller and much clearer account, the case of the substituted head (Tiberius for Augustus) actually resulted in the acquittal of the defendant (Granius Marcellus) on the charge of *maiestas*.<sup>35</sup> The pollution caused by the contact of a ring or coin bearing the emperor's image with latrine or brothel, finds an echo in what appears to be a fragment of Dio, to the effect that a noble ex-consul lost his life and his fortune for carrying a coin with the emperor's image on it into a latrine. Tiberius the stage tyrant is made to explain, ploddingly, "With my coin in your bosom you turned aside into foul and noisome places and relieved your bowels." Again, this appears to be free embroidery of the truth. According to Seneca, an informer had observed a senator of praetorian rank reach for a chamber pot at dinner while wearing a ring with the image of Tiberius Caesar. The informer called on their fellow diners to note that it had been brought near to his private parts and was, as it were, already preparing the accusation, when a quick-thinking slave showed that the ring was on his own hand – he had removed it from his drunken master.<sup>36</sup>

So: an atmosphere of paranoia and persecution. No one today would believe the silly libels retailed by Suetonius and Dio (Tacitus corrects one, and Seneca makes no claim that his anecdote is representative of any law); the legal basis of the charge is non-existent; and, most importantly, another tale offers a markedly alternate view. It was said that in his travels the sage Apollonius of Tyana once arrived at the city of Aspendus in Pamphylia in the middle of a famine, which had been caused by powerful men hoarding grain for export. The people blamed their magistrate and wanted to burn him alive, but

---

<sup>35</sup> Suetonius 58; Tacitus 1. 74: a quite separate charge of extortion was referred to *recuperatores*, and presumably he was convicted of that. I suspect that the changing of clothes occurs in the baths, and is to be aligned with the shameful acts in latrines and brothels.

<sup>36</sup> Dio 68 fr. 2; Seneca *de Beneficiis* 3. 26. 1-2.

they held back, giving time for Apollonius to arrive and save the situation. The mob had hesitated because the magistrate clung to statues of the emperor, and statues of Tiberius were even more feared and inviolable than the great statue of Zeus at Olympia. It was even said, Philostratus continues in his *Life of Apollonius*, that a man was held guilty of impiety (*asebeia*, the rough Greek equivalent for Latin *maiestas*) simply for striking his own slave when the slave was carrying a silver drachma with the emperor's image on it.<sup>37</sup> That is, a Greek novel of the third century preserves an echo of the same tales but, as often in the folkloric versions of charges leveled against Tiberius, the view of him is *positive*: as a protector of the persecuted high and low, the godlike emperor was unmatched, for not only did his great statues provide sanctuary more sure than that of Zeus, even his smallest image was a talisman against oppression.

Second, there are the truly stunning judgments of Tiberius written within ten or fifteen years of his death by a man who had little reason to love him:

He held sway over land and sea for twenty-three years without allowing any spark of war to smoulder in Greek or barbarian lands, and he gave peace and the blessings of peace to the end of his life with ungrudging bounty of hand and heart. Was he inferior on birth [to Gaius]? No, he was of the noblest ancestry on both sides. Was he inferior in education? Who among those who reached the height of their powers in his time surpassed him in wisdom or !learning!? Was he inferior in age? What other king enjoyed a happier old age? Why, even when !still young he was called "the elder" because of his diffidence about quick-wittedness.

And

---

<sup>37</sup> Philostratus *Apollonius* 1. 15.

Tiberius detested childish jokes; he had been inclined to seriousness and austerity since childhood.

And

Tiberius was a man of profound common-sense and the cleverest of all his contemporaries at knowing a person's secret intentions, and he surpassed them as much in sagacity as in rank.<sup>38</sup>

This admiration comes from Philo of Alexandria, a scholar whose estimate of another man's learning is not to be taken lightly. It has been asserted that Philo writes like this to make the contrast with Caligula, but there was nothing to be gained by it and he could just as easily have condemned Tiberius for paving the way for his successor. More to the point: how could he possibly have published this sort of panegyric so soon after the death of Tiberius if it were patently absurd?

And third, there is the arresting snapshot of Tiberius in, of all places, the Apology of the combative Christian polemicist, Tertullian:

It was in the age of Tiberius, then, that the Christian name went out into the world, and he referred to the Senate the news which he had received from Syria Palestine, which had revealed the truth of his [Christ's] divinity; he did this exercising his prerogative in giving it his endorsement. The Senate had not approved beforehand and rejected it. Caesar held to his opinion and threatened danger to accusers of Christians.<sup>39</sup>

And again, the context is one of piety.

---

<sup>38</sup> Philo *Legatio ad Gaium* 141-142; 167; 33, trans. E.M. Smallwood.

<sup>39</sup> *Apologeticus* 5. 2.

The stories of Philostratus and Tertullian, and the opinions of Philo, join the tales noted earlier in Plutarch, Josephus, and Phaedrus. All six of the authors record material not found elsewhere, and all but Josephus stand outside of the historiographical tradition (Philo and Phaedrus were contemporaries of the emperor, Josephus and Plutarch born soon after his death). What their vignettes combine to offer us is a consistent sketch of a good emperor, marked by his now familiar twin virtues, wisdom and piety. Along with his learning, Philo praises his wisdom, his commonsense and, twice, his shrewdness, the ability to see farther than others into the hearts of men and affairs, and to act appropriately: this accords with what we have already seen, his ability to distinguish true men of learning from false, to see the virtue in retaining governors (all were bad shepherds, as he well knew, but the older ones were less harmful), to discern the fatal effects of a marvelous new invention, to find the rational (and comforting) explanation for the death of a deity, to see through the falseness of a servant. And allied with this vision is a religious authority, reflected in his judgment of Pan, in the power of his statues greater than that of Zeus' image at Olympia, in impiety as the putative charge against one who abuses a coin with his portrait.

Tiberius' interest and skill in religious matters is well attested in our mainstream sources, but it is the outsiders who bear powerful witness to the emperor's piety. Just as Tertullian offers us the protector of the Christians against the senate, so Philo offers us the protector of the Jews against his own governor, Pontius Pilate: when Pilate set up gilded shields in Herod's palace and the Jews sent a complaint to the emperor,

What words, what threats Tiberius uttered against Pilate when he read it! It would be superfluous to describe his anger, although he was not easily moved to

anger, since his reaction speaks for itself. For immediately, without even waiting until the next day, he wrote to Pilate, reproaching and rebuking him a thousand times for his new-fangled audacity and telling him to remove the shields at once.....<sup>40</sup>

And perhaps most revealing of this imperial piety is the story of the giant's bones in yet another historiographical outsider, Phlegon, mentioned earlier. An embassy brought Tiberius an enormous tooth and offered to deliver the rest of the bones. Wishing to know the size of the dead hero but feeling it a sacrilege (*anosia*) to disturb the body, he had a geometer estimate the size of the body from the tooth, and then sent the tooth back. A brilliant example of the combination of punctilious piety and extraordinary shrewdness that is so Tiberian – signaled by a typical consultation of his wise men by the learned emperor: “He summoned a certain geometer, Pulcher by name, a man of some renown whom he respected for the man's skill.”<sup>41</sup>

Imperial wisdom and imperial piety are not abstractions but powerful weapons for the public good. They make Tiberius the champion of the people against oppression by his own governors, repeatedly, by the senate, and by private citizens. This is not to say that the historical Tiberius was or was not a good emperor – there is indeed lots of evidence in the mainstream tradition to show his concern for good government and the *pax deorum*, his modesty and restraint, above all his *providentia* for the empire (a major slogan), his constant vigilance.<sup>42</sup> Good man or bad, there was a potent *image* of him, all

---

<sup>40</sup> *Legatio* 304-305.

<sup>41</sup> Phlegon 14, trans. W. Hansen.

<sup>42</sup> A shining portrait of Tiberius the Good can be painted from Dio 57. 7 – 11 (all packed under the year 14) and Suetonius 26-40, both clearly derived from the same source.

but forgotten now, as the good ruler, wise and clever, pious and just, an image rooted in folklore, fable, and anecdote.

## VI

There is a curious balance between the beginning of Tiberius' sole rule and its end, as presented by Suetonius. For two years after taking over the empire the *princeps* did not set foot outside the gates of the city, *pedem porta non extulit*, and thereafter he went no further than the neighboring towns, *propinqua oppida*, and then but rarely and for a few days only. However after the deaths of his sons Germanicus (AD 19) and Drusus (23), he sought retirement in Campania, and never returned to Rome for the rest of his life, although twice he came very near.<sup>43</sup> The years of not-leaving are strikingly true: we can place the emperor outside the city gates only twice in his first twelve years, once in 16 with the dedication of suburban temples in the Horti Caesaris and at Bovillae (that is, just around the end of the two-years-within-the-gates period), and once in 21 with a long visit to Campania, allegedly in contemplation of retiring there.<sup>44</sup> But his not-returning for his last eleven years is strikingly untrue, or rather deeply misleading: Tacitus writes of an emperor not secluded on Capri but spending "his extreme old age nearby [Rome] in the countryside or on the shore, often encamping at the walls of the City" (under AD 26), "on frequent detours encircling and dodging his fatherland" (under AD 33), while we know that Tiberius came up to the very outskirts of the city not merely

---

<sup>43</sup> Suetonius 38; 39, cf. 72. 1.

<sup>44</sup> Tacitus 2. 41. 1 (AD 14); 3. 31. 3 and 47. 3 (AD 21, not 22: Bellemore 2003). Tiberius referred to the latter trip as a *peregrinatio suburbana*. Otherwise I know only of an undated visit to Praeneste: Gellius 16. 13. 5, cf. Suetonius 63. 1.

twice, as Suetonius would have it, but in each of his last six years.<sup>45</sup> That is to say, the reign has been neatly bifurcated between Rome-alone for its first half and not-Rome for its second: the former somewhat, the latter considerably exaggerated for effect, by Suetonius or his source. And in each half, Tiberius acquired a nickname.

In the paragraph describing the emperor's time in Rome, before the paragraph on his final departure to Campania with which it is balanced, Suetonius describes his repeated and elaborate preparations for a visit to the provinces and the armies, various logistics arranged, vows undertaken for his safe return. Eventually people joked about it, calling him Callipides, who was known (as the biographer glosses helpfully) from the Greek proverb, for his running and not getting even a foot forward.<sup>46</sup> Who Callipus (the proper form) may have been is unknown, but the original Greek proverb has survived elsewhere, and it is referred to by Cicero in a letter to Atticus.<sup>47</sup> The point here is that the new emperor Tiberius was seen as a proverbial figure, bringing him again into the realm of folklore, and it should be noted that the nickname, while mocking, is not necessarily unfavorable, indeed it might be affectionate.

Which brings us back to Capri and the fictitious fisherman in the latter half of the reign. Unbeknownst to classicists, it has long been clear that the anecdote was an exceedingly hostile version of a standard folktale about figs, known from very widespread (if later) sources elsewhere. The raw material for this attack can be found in two places. First, the fish: had the fisherman been literate and familiar with the *acta*

---

<sup>45</sup> Tacitus 4. 58. 3; 6. 15. 3 (the translations are those of T. Woodman). Other references to his movements are in my "Itinera Tiberi".

<sup>46</sup> Suetonius 38: ut vulgo iam per iocum "Callipides" vocaretur, quem cursitare ac ne cubiti quidem mensuram progredi proverbio Graeco notatum est.

<sup>47</sup> Cicero *Ad Atticum* 13. 12. 3, with Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.* (320. 3). A runner? a character in a play? an entertainer renowned for running on the spot? Otto 1890: 66.

*diurna* published in the capital, he might have known better than to present a *grandis mullus* to this particular *princeps*. For some years earlier a *mullus ingentis formae* had been sent to Tiberius Caesar, who ordered it to be sold at the market (in Rome). “Unless I am mistaken, friends,” he said, “either Apicius or P. Octavius will buy it.” And sure enough, one of the two epicures, Octavius, bought the 4½-pound mullet for 5,000 sesterces.<sup>48</sup> That is to say, the horrific fisherman story at Capri is a doublet (emperor rejects large mullet) inspired by a real incident (or another story) at Rome, one that actually presented Tiberius in favorable fashion, shrewd, witty, and moderate.

At the same time, the creator of the Tiberian fisherman has been inspired by one of the best known folktales in the world, *ATU 736A*, The Ring of Polycrates:

When King Amasis learns about the military success of Polycrates he advises him not to provoke the jealousy of the gods. As sign of his humility he should throw away the thing he likes most. Thereupon Polycrates throws his most precious ring into the sea. Some days later a fish is given to him in which the ring is found. Of the many accounts in ancient authors, Herodotus offers the classic version.<sup>49</sup> A few days after the tyrant Polycrates had solemnly thrown his ring into the sea, a fisherman caught an enormous fish and decided to present it to the tyrant. On being granted an audience he explained that he had decided not to sell such a treasure in the market but to bring it as gift truly worthy of Polycrates and his rule. Pleased as much with the compliment as with the gift, Polycrates invited the man to dine with him. It was while

---

<sup>48</sup> Seneca *Epp.* 95. 42. In fact, as part of his general drive for austerity, and supposedly outraged by the fact that three mullets had been sold for 30,000 sesterces, he urged the senate to control market prices annually: Suetonius 34. 1.

<sup>49</sup> 3. 40-42. Also *MI N211.1*, Lost ring found in fish (Polycrates).

preparing the fish that the cooks found the ring in the fish's stomach. What has this to do with Tiberius?

Again, the creator of the story has given us an adaptation of another tale, but here cleverly inverted. In both, a fisherman honors his ruler with a fish of marvelous size: Polycrates accepts it with pleasure and grace, and disaster ensues for him (in the form of crucifixion by a treacherous Persian satrap); but Tiberius rejects it with fear and brutality, and disaster ensues for the fisherman. The moral of the story is that Tiberius died in full possession of his power, a luckier Polycrates who had outwitted fate to the end.

It may be that the image of Tiberius as Polycrates was not fabricated by the inspired creator of the fisherman of Capri, but that it was in the air at the end of the emperor's days. Dio tells us, in excerpt, that Sejanus was so powerful and arrogant that "he himself seemed to be emperor and Tiberius a kind of island potentate (*nesiarchos*), inasmuch as the latter spent his time on the island of Capri." The way that this is expressed, with the explanation appended, strongly suggests that the pointed remark was not Dio's own but a comment contemporary to Tiberius and Sejanus. The Greek term "nesiarch" is uncommon. It appears on a handful of inscriptions from Aegean islands, designating governors. But it can also be something grander: in the age of Alexander, Agathocles, the tyrant of Syracuse, was flatteringly called nesiarch, which might better be translated as Lord of the Isles. The Greek word does not happen to be attested for Polycrates, but Pliny the Elder has a close Latin equivalent when he discusses *Polycrates Samius, insularum ac litorum tyrannus*.<sup>50</sup> That is to say, the image of Tiberius the

---

<sup>50</sup> Dio 58. 5. 1, Loeb translation, E. Cary. Inscriptions: *LSJ* gives a selection, not complete, under *nesiarches* and *nesiarchos*. Agathocles: Plutarch *Demetrius* 25. 8;

nesiarch could have had a double point, likening him not just contemptuously to the petty governor of a small island, but ironically as well to the great Polycrates, lord of the islands, like Tiberius a conqueror in war, a patron surrounded in his island home by the leading Greek intellectuals of his day, and a monster of vice.

It would not be surprising if this comparison with a figure of legend had occurred to the contemporaries of Tiberius, friend or foe: as it happens, he actually *had* the Ring of Polycrates. But the emperor of Rome had learned from the fabled unhappy end of the tyrant of Samos. He kept the ring safe and not much valued in the Temple of Concord, which he had vowed in 7 BC to restore, and which he had long ago dedicated in his own name and that of his dead brother Drusus, on January 16<sup>th</sup>, AD 10.<sup>51</sup> This retention and neutralizing of the ring of fate irresistibly recalls the last scene in *Raiders of the Lost Ark*: Tiberius was, indeed, *sagacissimus senex*.<sup>52</sup>

---

*Praec. ger. reip.* 823D. Pliny *NH* 37. 2. 3. That Polycrates conquered many islands was obvious: thus, explicitly Herodotus 3. 39. 4 and Thucydides 1. 13. 6.

<sup>51</sup> Pliny *NH* 37. 2. 4, skeptically: *Sardonychem eam gemmam fuisse constat, ostenduntque Romae, si credimus, in Concordiae delubro cornu aureo Augustae [i.e., Livia, Tiberius' mother] dono inclusam et novissimum prope locum praelatis multis optinentem.*

<sup>52</sup> *Caligula* 11. 1. Many thanks yet again to Bob Kaster and Adrienne Mayor for commenting on a first draft.

- ATU = Uther, Hans-Jörg, 2004. *The Types of International Folktales. A Classification and Bibliography Based on the System of Antti Aarne and Stith Thompson.* (FF Communications, vol. 284-286.) 3 vol. Helsinki.
- Amalfi, G., 1893. *Tiberio a Capri secondo la tradizione popolare.* Trani (repr. Capri 1991). (Originally in: *Rassegna Pugliese* 10 (1893) 3-20)
- Baker, G.P., 1929. *Tiberius Caesar: Emperor of Rome.* London. (repr. New York, 2001)
- Bellefleur, J., 2003. "Cassius Dio and the Chronology of A.D. 21," *CQ* 53: 268-285.
- Bowersock, G.W., 1965. "Some Persons in Plutarch's *Moralia*," *CQ* 15: 267-270.
- Champlin, E., 2005. "Phaedrus the Fabulous," *JRS* 95: 97-123.
- Clouston, W.A., 1887. *Popular Tales and Fictions. Their Migrations and Transformations.* London.
- Hansen, W., 2002. *Ariadne's Thread. A Guide to International Tales Found in Classical Literature.* Ithaca, NY.
- Houston, G.W., 1985. "Tiberius on Capri," *G&R* 32: 179-196.
- Krappe, A.H., 1927. "Tiberius and Thrasylus," *AJP* 48: 359-366.
- Lassen, H., 1995. "The Improved Product: a Philological Investigation of a Contemporary Legend," *Contemporary Legend* 5: 1-37.
- La Penna, A., 1979. "Il bandito e il re," *Maia* 31: 29-31.
- MI = Thompson, Stith, 1955-1958. *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature; a Classification of Narrative Elements in Folktales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Mediaeval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-Books, and Local Legends*<sup>2</sup>. 6 vol. Bloomington.
- Martin, R., 2001. *Tacitus. Annals V & VI.* Warminster.

- Orgitano, G., 1858. "Capri," in F. de Bourcard, *Usi e costumi di Napoli e contorni* (Naples, repr. Milan 1955): 765-782.
- Otto, A., 1890. *Die Sprichwörter der Römer*. Leipzig.
- Turner, A., 1943. "A Vergilian Anecdote in Suetonius and Dio," *CP* 38: 261.
- van Dijk, J.G.M., 1993-1994. "Fables in Ancient Historiography," *Bestia* 5: 27-41; 6, 118-135.