

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



The Emperor Claudius and the Chiefs of the Aedui

H. F. Pelham

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 09 / December 1895, pp 441 - 443

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202667, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202667

How to cite this article:

H. F. Pelham (1895). The Emperor Claudius and the Chiefs of the Aedui. The Classical Review, 9, pp 441-443 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202667

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

4. In *Ant.* 795 sq.,
νικᾶι δ' ἐναργῆς βλεφάρων ἱμερος εὐλέκτρον
νύμφας,

Professor Campbell's sound adherence to the Greek order of words has led him to join νικᾶι and ἐναργῆς ('i.e. ἐναργῆς ἐστὶ νικῶσα'). But this is not the end of the matter. In Thuc. 7, 55. 1 we find Γεγενημένης δὲ τῆς νίκης τοῖς Συρακοσίοις λαμπρᾶς ἤδη κτέ. Here the parallel passages

cited make it extremely probable that we should accept Classen's λαμπρῶς (Mr. Holden, who keeps λαμπρᾶς, cites λαμπρῶς ἐνίκα from Plut. *Sull.* 29, 5). At all events, νικᾶν λαμπρῶς seems to have been a current expression (cf. Schol. Ar. *Ran.* 73 Dind.), and we need not hesitate to see in the Sophoclean phrase a poetical νικᾶι δὲ λαμπρῶς. Shall we not then read νικᾶι δ' ἐναργῶς?

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

THE EMPEROR CLAUDIUS AND THE CHIEFS OF THE AEDUI.

IN connection with his account of Claudius' censorship, Tacitus¹ tells us that when the revision of the senate was in progress, the chiefs of Gallia Comata, that is to say, of the [provinces known as the 'Three Gauls' who had been for a long time Roman citizens, asked for the right of obtaining honours in the city (*jus adipiscendorum in urbe honorum*); or, as Tacitus expresses it in a later passage, for the right of senators (*senatorum jus*). The question at once arises how it was that these chiefs being already Roman citizens were disqualified from standing for office in Rome; and secondly, what was the nature of the relief which Claudius gave them.

The ordinary explanation is that given by Mr. Furneaux² in his note on the passage. It is supposed that when the Roman franchise was conferred by Julius or Augustus upon the fathers or grandfathers of these Gallic chieftains, it was granted in a restricted and imperfect form and that the *jus honorum* was withheld. In support of this supposition, the analogy is quoted of the imperfect franchise (*civitas sine suffragio*) anciently granted by Rome to some of the Italian communities. It is further assumed that what Claudius did was to make this imperfect franchise complete. There are however serious objections to this view of the matter. The granting of the *civitas sine suffragio* has not been infrequent at one period in the history of Rome, but there is no instance of its bestowal later than 184 B.C., and the great majority of the instances known to us belong to a much earlier period. It is scarcely likely that so

antiquated a precedent should have suggested a policy to Julius or Augustus. There is again no evidence that the *jus honorum* was treated as a distinct privilege separable from the other rights included in the franchise. It is obviously unlikely that the separation should have been made in this one case alone and that a peculiar disability should have been imposed upon the chiefs of Gaul, especially in view of the pains taken by both Julius and Augustus to conciliate these powerful chieftains, and of the fact that Julius in particular went to the length of admitting some of them to the senate.

The truth is that inability to stand for public office in Rome was not a disqualification peculiar to the Gaulish chiefs or even to provincials generally, but one which extended equally to natives of Italy whose ancestors had for generations been Roman citizens. It seems to be certain that in the time of Claudius even a Roman knight was not accepted as a candidate for a magistracy unless he were possessed of the broad stripe which marked senatorial rank. It must also be remembered that this case of the Gaulish chieftains arose directly in connection with the revision of the senatorial roll, and that Tacitus, in the later of the two passages referred to above, implies that it was the dignity of senator or, more accurately, the rights of senators for which the chiefs asked and which they obtained. If we turn to the fragments that remain of Claudius' speech, it becomes clear that what he is dealing with is not so much a constitutional disability or any inherent defect in the status of the Gauls as Roman citizens, but a deep-seated Roman prejudice against the admission of these barbarians to the senate. The inference seems to be that

¹ *Ann.* 11, 23.

² Furneaux, *Ann. Tac.* vol. 2, p. 186. Schiller, *Gesch. d. Kaiserzeit.* 1. 329.

the real obstacle in the path of these noble Gauls was the fact that, though Roman citizens and very probably in some cases Roman knights, they had not the broad senatorial stripe and that therefore the doors of the senate-house were closed to them. There were two recognized methods by which such an obstacle could be removed. In the first place, the emperor might have granted to them the broad stripe alone. The effect of such a concession would have been that the Gaulish nobles (*insignes viri*) whom Claudius saw before him as he spoke would have been at once enabled to offer themselves for the quaestorship and would thus have found the way open both to a seat in the senate and to the higher magistracies. Their course would have been that concisely described by Pliny (*ep.* 2, 9), when speaking of what he had done for a countryman of his own. 'I obtained for him,' he says, 'from Caesar the broad stripe and I afterwards obtained for him the quaestorship.' Many other instances might be quoted from the inscriptions. This however does not seem to have been the method employed by Claudius on this occasion. He was acting as censor, and he alludes in his speech 'to this part of my censorship,' but the grant of the broad stripe was not a censorial act. It seems to have been connected with the emperor's right of nomination, or in other words with his right of testing and approving the qualifications of candidates, in doing which he was free to supply the qualifications which were lacking, whether it were the broad stripe or the required amount of property. Moreover, the general tenor of Claudius' speech seems to imply that it is not the grant of the broad stripe, but the alternative method, that of direct admission into the senate (*adlectio*), which he has in view.

In other words, the conclusion to which Claudius' speech points, is that, in revising the senate as censor, he had proposed directly to admit these Gaulish chieftains to the senate, and probably to admit them into the ranks of the *Quaestorii*, the lowest category of senators, a precedent followed in many cases by Vespasian. The Gauls who were thus 'adlecti inter quaestorios,' would become senators and eligible for the higher magistracies. Moreover their sons would rank as *laticlarvii*, along with other senators' sons and would be qualified in their turn to stand for the quaestorship, and to obtain through the quaestorship a seat in the senate. This direct admission to the senate was an act well within the rights of

Claudius as censor. Why then did he feel it necessary to consult the senate on the point? In all probability, because the admission of Gaulish chiefs from the Three Gauls was a new departure for which it was at least politic to obtain the sanction of the senate. Never before, it would seem, had provincials found their way into the senate except from such old established and thoroughly Romanized provinces as Narbonese Gaul and Spain. Indeed Claudius himself, when justifying this part of his censorship, confesses that he is stepping with some timidity outside the limits hitherto observed. He had in fact to encounter a strong prejudice. Nothing that Julius did excited more odium at Rome than his admission to the senate of 'semibarbari Galli,' and the prejudice reappears in Seneca's Satire on Claudius. Nor was the prejudice altogether unreasonable. The Gaulish chiefs of Gallia Comata were not only disliked on sentimental grounds as belonging to the race which had once sacked Rome, but their actual position was somewhat different from that of the wealthy citizens of a Greek or Asiatic community. They were wealthy, they were ambitious, but the distinctive feature of their position was that, though the communities to which they belonged were outwardly organized on the Roman model, these men were still great chiefs enjoying great prestige among their countrymen and with large followings of obedient vassals and clansmen. Very much of the old tribal feeling still survived among the clans of the Three Gauls, and their leading men retained much of the peculiar influence and authority associated with the tribal chieftainship. This tribal feeling, supported as it was by a strong national sentiment, was throughout the first century A.D. a possible element of danger to Roman authority. In the reign of Tiberius, at the time of the rebellion of Sacrovir, Julius Florus appeared in the field with a vast train of clients and dependents much in the style of a Highland chief of the eighteenth century. More recently, according to Tacitus, Valerius Asiaticus, though a native of Narbonese Gaul and of the colony of Vienne, had been suspected of treasonable designs which were rendered more dangerous from his extensive connections among his countrymen (*gentiles*). A similar feeling of clanship is mentioned by Dio Cassius as a source of strength to the Aquitanian chief Gaius Julius Vindex, when he rose against Nero.

The speech in which Claudius combated

this prejudice and advocated the continuance of the liberal policy which had made Rome great, was as a matter of course convincing. A decree of the senate was passed, no fragments of which have survived, but which probably merely expressed approval of Claudius' intended action. The result was the admission to the senate of the chiefs of one single tribe, the Aedui. There is no evidence that the chiefs of any other tribes were admitted at this time, or that any general concession, such as Mr. Furneaux speaks of, was now made to the Gauls. The selection of the Aeduan chiefs as the first recipients of this special favour was quite natural. It was due, as Tacitus tells us, to the old and intimate connection between the Aedui and Rome, a connection which would render the new departure more acceptable in their case than in that of any other tribe; but the precedent thus set by Claudius was

an important one, and the example of Claudius was followed on a more liberal scale by Vespasian, and by the emperors of the second century. If however the view which I have stated above is correct, the credit of initiating the policy of freely admitting provincials of the senate, and of thus investing the senate with a genuinely imperial character, must be given to Claudius. I will close with one more suggestion. It is at least conceivable that this admission of Gaulish chiefs to the senate may not have been unconnected with the measures which Claudius is said to have taken against Druidism. Claudius may have hoped by this concession to render those measures more acceptable, and to strengthen Roman sympathies among the leading men of central and northern Gaul.

H. F. PELHAM.

THREE GEOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON PROPERTIUS.

iii. 7, 21, 22.

*Sunt Agamemnonias testantia litora curas
Qua (Quae V) notat Argynni poena
minantis aquae.*

In my dissertation of 1872 I suggested that 22 should be written either

Qua notat Argynni poena Mimantis aquas

or—

Quae notat Argynni poena, Mimantis aquae.

But I had then found to connect Argynnus or Agamemnon with the neighbourhood of Mount Mimas, besides the promontory Argennon, only the statement of Paus. vii. 5, 6, that Agamemnon was specially honoured in the neighbourhood of Clazomenae. To this may now be added the legend mentioned by Strabo xiv. C 639, where he speaks of Ephesus and the places adjacent, *εἴτα Νεάπολις...εἴτα Πύγελος πόλις*—*νιον, ἱερὸν ἔχον Ἀρτέμιδος Μουνυχίας, ἱδρυμα Ἀγαμέμνονος, οἰκούμενον ὑπὸ μέρους τῶν ἐκείνου λαῶν πνυαλγίας γάρ τινας καὶ γενέσθαι καὶ κληθῆναι, κάμνοντας δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους καταμείναι, καὶ τυχεῖν οἰκείου τοῦδε τοῦ ὀνόματος τὸν τόπον.* Cf. *Etym. M.* s.v. Πύγελος. From Clazomenae Teos and M. Mimas the distance along the coast to Ephesus is

inconsiderable, and there is nothing wonderful in Agamemnon's rowers being found here and giving their name, traditionally, to a place called Pygela. Livy xxxvii. 11 calls it *Pygela portus*.

Amongst others who were shipwrecked in the neighbourhood of M. Mimas, Phaedrus *Fab.* iv. 23, 17 mentions the poet Simonides.

ii. 13, 47, 48.

*Cui si longaevae minuisset fata senectae
†Gallicus Iliacis miles in aggeribus.*

The allusion, I believe, is to the Gallograeci whose reputation for daring and desperate courage is mentioned by Livy xxxvii. 8 *Etiam in Gallograeciam miserat: bellicosiores ea tempestate erant, Gallicos adhuc, nondum exoleta stirpe gentis, servantes animos.* ib. 18 *Plurimum terroris in Gallorum mercede conductis quattuor milibus erat.* 'Had Nestor encountered at Troy some fierce Galatian soldier, instinct with the fury of his native country Gaul, and thus died prematurely.' The anachronism is (no doubt) patent; but (1) it is not alien from Propertius' practice, (2) *Gallicus* need mean nothing more than a soldier of the type so well known as Gallo-Greek, *i.e.* desperate and unsparing.