The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Clavdivs and the Pavian Inscription

Tenney Frank

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 2 / Issue 02 / April 1908, pp 89 - 92

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800005462, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800005462

How to cite this article:

Tenney Frank (1908). Clavdivs and the Pavian Inscription. The Classical Quarterly, 2, pp 89-92 doi:10.1017/S0009838800005462

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

CLAVDIVS AND THE PAVIAN INSCRIPTION.

THE Pavian inscription (*C.I.L.* v. 6416), which is usually interpreted as indicating Augustus' last settlement of the succession, contains the name of Claudius besides those of the Julian line. Mommsen (*Ber. d. sächs. Gesellsch.* 1850, pp. 315 ff.) takes this fact as indicating that Claudius, though not adopted into the Julian line, was still in some way considered a member of the imperial household. I think that there is good ground for suspecting the part relating to Claudius as probably added by him at a later day, and that all arguments regarding his early life which are based upon its presence on the arch should submit to a resifting.

This inscription bears the stamp of imperial editing, showing clearly the definite plan of Augustus to assure a carefully selected line of successors, for, through order of precedence, he points first to Tiberius, then to the adopted Germanicus (no doubt because in the sons of Germanicus, male representatives of his own blood would again enter the line), thirdly to Tiberius' son Drusus, and finally to the young sons of Germanicus. It seems surprising that the much-despised Claudius should be included in the list. At the time that the statues with these inscriptions were erected, Claudius was about eighteen years old, and yet had received no recognition from the imperial family. Fortunately, we know from letters of Augustus and memoirs of Claudius what his early life was (*Suet. Claud.* 2-4). He was closely guarded and freely chastised by a severe *paedagogos* who had once been *superintendentarius*; his mother used to call him 'portentum hominis, nec absolutum a natura sed tantum inchoatum'; his grandmother, the powerful Livia, utterly despised him (*pro despectissimo semper habuit*) and refused to meet him. The letters of Augustus show that the Emperor did not dare to let the young man appear in public lest he disgrace everyone concerned. Indeed, when the Emperor died, he left Claudius, then a man of twenty-four, only a slight legacy *inter tertios ac paene extraneos*.

In spite of such literary evidence to the contrary, it is often affirmed, chiefly because of the Pavian inscription, that Claudius was considered a possible successor to the imperial office. Mommsen (*ad l.c.* p. 319) thinks this inscription shows that he was looked upon as a 'Prinz von Geblüt,' continuing: 'Die Aenderung seines Beinamens Drusus in Nero Germanicus scheint gewissermassen als eine Adoption betrachtet worden zu sein: man löste dadurch die Verlegenheit über die August mit Livia correspondierte (*Suet. Claud.* 4).' These assumptions seem gratuitous. Suetonius does not say that Claudius adopted the name Nero at this time (*Suet. Claud.* 2), inscriptional evidence contradicts the assumption, and indeed this change of name would not indicate any kind of adoption. Furthermore, the correspondence between Augustus and Livia here mentioned falls five years later than

this inscription (cf. Smilda, Suet. *Claud.*, *ad l.c.*). Nevertheless, these suggestions of Mommsen have been adopted without question, and have been made the basis for wider assumptions regarding Claudius' early position.

So, for instance, Gaheis, in *Pauly-Wissowa*, iii. 2781, says: 'Als kaiserlicher Prinz ist Claudius immer angesehen worden,' citing as evidence the following: *C.I.L.* v. 6416 (the Pavian inscription), vi. 4338, 4340, 4345; *Tac. Ann.* i. 54, and iii. 18. Now were it not for v. 6416 certainly the other references would give little basis for his statement. The other three inscriptions that he cites are from the tombs of the Drusan *familia*. The cemetery in which they occur is in no sense one of the Julian household, though it includes some names (*e.g.* Germanicus) of Drusans who had been adopted into the Julian line.

As for Tacitus *Ann.* iii. 18, the evidence is made by Tacitus to indicate the opposite of what Gaheis infers. Messalinus proposed to thank Tiberius, Augusta, Antonia, Agrippina, and Drusus, *ob uindictam Germanici*. Another senator then asked why he omitted the name of Claudius, Germanicus' own brother, at which the motion was amended so as to include him also. The inclusion does not make him a 'kaiserlicher Prinz,' for Agrippina and Antonia are also in the list. It was simply a matter of close relationship to Germanicus. Certainly the previous exclusion of Claudius in these circumstances implied that he was utterly negligible, and so Tacitus interprets it, for the incident leads him to say: 'mihi quanto plura recentium seu ueterum reuoluo, tanto magis ludibria rerum mortalium cunctis in negotiis obuersantur. Quippe fama spe ueneratione potius omnes destinabantur imperio quam quem futurum principem fortuna in occulto tenebat.'

The only remaining reference of Gaheis is Tacitus *Ann.* i. 54, which relates that Tiberius includes Claudius among the four honorary sodales Augustales in the year 14 A.D., the other three being Tiberius, Drusus, and Germanicus, all of the imperial household. This act of Tiberius, however, after the death of Augustus, can in no way be interpreted as revealing what the attitude of Augustus towards Claudius had been some six or seven years before. Moreover, we are well informed that Tiberius throughout his whole reign proved that he never intended to give any but the emptiest of honours to Claudius, cf. Suet. *Claud.* 5-6; *Tac. Ann.* vi. 46. The granting of this priesthood, therefore, had no significance.¹

Thus there is not the slightest indication elsewhere that Claudius was at this time or for thirty years to come in any sense considered as 'kaiserlicher Prinz,' and I do not think that the Pavian inscription can be made the basis for the assumption.

¹ Because of the order of the priesthoods (auguri, sodali Aug., sodali Titio) found in *C.I.L.* v. 24, a titulus of Claudius, it is usually affirmed that the Titian priesthood was conferred upon Claudius after the others. However, there is no good reason for assuming that the order is chronological. It is the regular order, as in *C.I.L.* iii. 2974 and 2975. It seems very likely that Augustus in restoring the ancient Sabine worship would have made the members of the Claudian family (Tiberius, Drusus,

Germanicus, and Claudius) its priests, since the antiquarians were then busy tracing the Claudian line back to that tribe. If this is the case we can well understand why these very same men should have been made the first honorary priests of the Augustales: the latter worship was deliberately shaped after the former, or, perhaps we may go a step further and say that Augustus, in rehabilitating the worship connected with the name of the Sabine king, was simply giving a mild hint that the growing practice of erecting

The form of the name as it occurs on the Pavian inscription (Ti. Claudio Drusi Germanici f. Neroni Germanico) is that which Claudius liked to use for a brief period during and immediately following his consulship thirty years later, and does not occur in any datable inscriptions before or after. This fact suggests the solution that Claudius himself while passing through Pavia a year after his consulship, on his way to Caligula in Germany, may have had his statue placed among those of the Julians and had it inscribed with the more pompous name that he then bore, omitting of course the few official titles which he had received since the erection of the other statues in A.D. 7-8. Hirschfeld (*Wiener Studien* 1881, p. 266) has pointed to at least one other inscription traceable to his hand during this journey (*C.I.L.* xii. 1026).

The facts regarding the form of his name can easily be summarised from Ruggiero, ii. 295.¹ Suetonius (*Claud.* 2) says that he was at birth called *Tiberius Claudius Drusus*, adding however the statement: 'mox fratre maiore in Iuliam familiam adoptato Germanici cognomen assumpsit.' These words can only mean that his new cognomen was *Germanicus* (not *Nero*) and that after 4 A.D. he was accordingly called *Tiberius Claudius Germanicus*. In this form the name actually appears at its fullest, *C.I.L.* 4334, 4348. The other inscriptions of the same cemetery always give his cognomen as *Germanicus*, never as *Nero*. The statement of Suetonius is therefore supported by all the early inscriptions except the Pavian, and yet, on the strength of the Pavian, Mommsen, Klebs, and others try to disprove Suetonius' words. Mommsen says (*Hermes* 13, p. 262, f. n. 4) referring to this inscription and one of thirty years later: 'evidently he had also taken the cognomen of *Nero* from his brother when the latter was adopted into the Julian family.' Klebs (*Prosopographia*, ii. p. 389) in the same strain discredits Suetonius: 'quod Claudius certe post pueritiam ut tituli docent praeter Germanicum Neronis cognomine usus est.' Now we know that Germanicus gave the name of *Nero* to his first-born, whereas Claudius did not continue the name in his line. Claudius' first-born is *Claudius Drusus*, and his son by Messalina is *Tiberius Claudius Germanicus*, later *Britannicus*. This points to the fact that *Nero* was not his regular cognomen.² In regard to the inscriptions, as I have said, none of the group of thirteen from the Drusan cemetery gives the form *Nero*. *Nero* occurs only in the Pavian inscriptions (v. 6416), in two dating from his consulship (iii. 381, v. 24), and in one undatable inscription (x. 6561) that may well come from the same period. Among the something over three hundred inscriptions bearing his name

shrines to the present ruler had good Roman precedence, and might well be incorporated in a regular custom. This interpretation may be gathered from Tac. *Ann.* i. 54: 'Idem annus nouas caerimonias accepit addito sodalium Augustalium sacerdotio, ut quondam T. Tatiui retinendis Sabinorum sacris sodales Titios instituerat.' See also *Hist.* ii. 95. My point is then that Claudius was probably made a *Sodalis Titius* as a member of the Claudian gens, and later when the Augustan sodality was formed on the model of the Titian he was elected to the new priest-

hood together with the other honorary members of the parent institution. His election to these priest-hoods is probably due to his position in the Claudian family, not to any supposed standing with the Julian line.

¹ Ruggiero's citations need verifying. Read 6416 for 6417, and 4334 for 4344.

² The name of the later emperor Nero does not help us here, as we do not know whether he received that name at birth as a grandson of Germanicus or at adoption.

after his accession to the throne the supposed cognomen *Nero* does not occur once, while that of *Germanicus* occurs in more than half. Accepting, therefore, the statement of Suetonius and the evidence of the other inscriptions, adding, too, the fact that the name *Nero* was continued in Germanicus' line but not in the Claudian, it appears that the form of Claudius' name in the Pavian is unusual, unless we attribute its assertion to something like thirty years later than the date of the rest of the arch. It seems likely then that Claudius assumed the additional cognomen of *Nero* during his brief term of empty honour as consul suffectus in 37, just as later when emperor he assumed the cognomen of *Caesar* without right or precedent; and that, always eager as he was for recognition by the imperial house, he seized the opportunity of brief power during his journey northward in 39 to gratify his vanity by adding his own statue to those of the Imperial family that had been recognised by Augustus in the year 7/8.

By excluding Claudius' name from the original inscription we then have a symmetrical group of nine with the emperor in the centre, flanked on the right by his successor, on the left by the empress—the very same order as used in the similar inscription of Apollonius (see below); then in the second remove to the right the adoptive living grandsons, Germanicus and Drusus, on the left the two adopted grandsons who had died, Gaius and Lucius; and finally at the ends the two great-grandsons by adoption, Nero and Drusus.¹ Thus :

The Greek inscription just mentioned was probably made some six years later than the Pavian. I give it as restored by Waddington (*Inscr. Gr. ad R. R. Pert.* iii. No. 312):

τοὺς κοινούς σωτήρας] καὶ ἰδίου θεοὺς Σεβαστοὺς καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτ[ῶ]ν
 [Ἀπολλωνιατῶν Λυκίων ὁ δῆμος]
 [Γαίῳ Καίσαρι, Γερμ]ανικῷ, Τιβεριῷ Καίσαρι, θεῷ Σεβαστῷ [θεᾷ Ἰουλίᾳ Δρούσῳ,
 Λευκίῳ Καίσαρι]

Here again Augustus' name is in the centre, flanked by Tiberius' on the right and Livia's on the left. The next rank is held by Germanicus and Drusus. The dead sons of Julia (more than ten years after their burial) are still remembered, but yet no place for Claudius!

TENNEY FRANK.

Bryn Mawr.

¹ It seems impossible to decide whether the *tituli* were inscribed upon the arch or upon the bases of the appropriate statues which probably stood on the arch. If the second assumption is true, the later addition of

Claudius' statue at one end may account for the crowding of the statues that misled the anonymous Einsiedler into confusing the *tituli* as he did, reading the last four as one: cf. *C.I.L.* vi. p. xv.