

## SUETONIUS AND THE *HONORES* OF THE PATRICIAN CLAUDII

Abstract: The first chapter of Suetonius' biography of Tiberius attempts to quantify the prestige of the patrician Claudii in the form of the *honores* they amassed over an unspecified timeframe. Mommsen was unable to validate any of the figures in Suetonius, and successive commentators have failed to satisfactorily account for Suetonius' estimates of the consulships, dictatorships, censorships, and triumphs amassed by the patrician *gens Claudia*. In the following note it is argued that Suetonius' figures are accurate and explicable.

Keywords: Claudii, *honores*, Suetonius, *Life of Tiberius*, accuracy

Suetonius' biography of the emperor Tiberius opens with the migration of the patrician Claudii to Rome and their admission to the patriciate. Next, before beginning a brief selective survey of the most revered and reviled members of the family, Suetonius makes an anticipatory observation that has puzzled commentators:

*Deinceps procedente tempore duodetriginta consulatus, dictaturas quinque, censuras septem, triumphos sex, duas ovationes adeptus est.*<sup>1</sup>

Suetonius does not offer any explicit chronological parameters for this observation, and thus far, no one has been able to satisfactorily explain his figures for the *honores* accumulated by the patrician *gens Claudia*.<sup>2</sup>

Mommsen posited that both here and in the parallel passages where Suetonius enumerates the *honores* attained by the Livii Sali-

---

1) Tiberius 1.2: In the course of time they amassed 28 consulships, 5 dictatorships, 7 censorships, 6 triumphs, and 2 ovations. The reading *triumphos septem* found in some early modern editions has no manuscript authority, see Ihm 1907, I 119; Ailloud 1961, iii; and Kaster 2016, 133, 297.

2) The vague idiom *procedente tempore* recurs in Aug. 2.1 and Tib. 49.1 (cf. Val. Max. 3.1.1, 5.6.4; Pliny, NH 11.49, 24.172; Seneca, Nat. Quaest. 7.5.4; Pliny, Epist. 3.20.8, 6.31.17; Celsus, De Med. 4.19.3, 8.4.11).

natores / Drusi and the Domitii Ahenobarbi,<sup>3</sup> the biographer limited his reckoning to the period before the fall of the Republic in 49 or 44 B. C.<sup>4</sup> However, Mommsen calculated that between 509 B. C. and 49/44 B. C. the patrician Claudii amassed only 22 consulships (495, 471, 460, 451, 349, 307, 296, 268, 264, 249, 240, 212, 207, 202, 185, 184, 177, 143, 130, 92, 79, 54 B. C.), 4 dictatorships (362, 337, the dictatorship of Ap. Claudius Caecus circa 292–285, 213 B. C.),<sup>5</sup> 6 censorships (312, 225, 204, 169, 136, 50 B. C.), 4 triumphs (268, 207, 177, 143 B. C.),<sup>6</sup> and 1 ovation (174 B. C.). That is to say, Mommsen's figures fall short of Suetonius' totals by 6 consulships, 1 dictatorship, 1 censorship, 2 triumphs, and 1 ovation. Mommsen nevertheless defended his conjecture on the grounds that if the reckoning is extended down to Tiberius' adoption by Augustus in A. D. 4, an additional 4 consulates (38, 13, 9, 7 B. C.) and 1 triumph (33 B. C.) accrue, but this still does not match the figures given by Suetonius, and so, Mommsen averred, there is no reason to reject the 'natural assumption' ("natürliche Annahme") that Suetonius only counted the Republican *honores* down to 49 or 44 B. C.<sup>7</sup> With regard to the numerical discrepancies Mommsen maintained that Suetonius' figures for the dictatorships, censorships, and triumphs of the Claudii could be accurate in as much as the extant records for these *honores* contain lacunae, but since the consular *fasti* of the Republic is complete, the figure of 28 (XXIIX) consulships must be emended to 22 (XXII).<sup>8</sup> Yet Mommsen's hypothesis does not work

---

3) Tiberius 3.1: *Quae familia* (sc. Livii), *quanquam plebeia, tamen et ipsa admodum floruit, octo consulatibus censoris duabus triumphis tribus, dictatura etiam ac magisterio equitum honorata*. Nero 1.1–2: *Ahenobarbi ... functi ... consulatibus septem* (or VII) *triumpho censuraque duplici et inter patricos allecti perseveraverunt omnes in eodem cognomine*.

4) Mommsen 1864, I 73–4 n. 5, 290–1 n. 14. Followed without argument by Vogt 1975, 11.

5) See MRR I 187.

6) Ap. Pulcher (cos. 54) gave up his hopes of a triumph when he was indicted by P. Dolabella in 50 B. C. (see M. Caelius Rufus, Ad fam. 8.6.1).

7) Mommsen failed to take account of the triumphs voted to Tiberius and Drusus (vide infra).

8) Although numerals are prone to corruption by copyists, the figures in Suetonius, Tiberius 1.2 are all spelt out, with the exception of *sex* in R and T (see the apparatus of Ihm and Ailloud), and Mommsen did not venture to explain how *viginti duo* (or *duo et viginti*) was corrupted to *duodetriginta* (for *duodetriginta* as

any better for the Livii or Domitii: for operating on the assumption that Suetonius' calculations were based on a chronological terminus of 49 or 44 B. C., Mommsen was only able to identify 6 consulships for the Livii (not 8), and 6 (not 7) for the Domitii,<sup>9</sup> and he concluded that the Suetonian figures were too high in both instances either because of mechanical errors by copyists, or because Suetonius was misled by the kind of family traditions which, Cicero complains, contained many spurious claims including fictional triumphs and consulships.<sup>10</sup>

But once Mommsen's 'natural assumption' is set aside Suetonius' figures become immediately comprehensible. Münzer confirmed the accuracy of Suetonius' account of the Livii by identifying the eighth consul, as well as the *magister equitum* and the *triumphator*, who had eluded Mommsen. The *magister equitum* of 324 B. C. (M. ? Livius) Drusus allegedly held office in the second of the so-called 'dictator years', which are unknown to Livy and Diodorus, but are registered in the *fasti Capitolini* and the sources dependent on it.<sup>11</sup> The 'missing' third triumph was celebrated by Tiberius' adoptive maternal great-great-grandfather, M. Livius Drusus (cos. 112, cens. 109), over the Scordisci and Macedonians on the

---

an authentically Suetonian usage see Aug. 46.1). von Ungern-Sternberg 2006, 293 attributes the discrepancy to a 'slight exaggeration' on Suetonius' part rather than textual corruption.

9) Livii: 302, 219, 207, 188, 147, 112 B. C. Ahenobarbi: 192, 162, 122, 96, 94, 54 B. C. Hence Bradley 1978, 26; Kierdorf 1992, 154–5; and Warmington 1999, 22 all assume that Suetonius actually counted the *honores* of the Domitii down to 31 B. C. which permits the inclusion of Cn. Ahenobarbus (cos. 32 B. C.) and produces the Suetonian total of 7 consulships, whereas Sansone 1986, 270 postulates that Suetonius was relying here on a source written between 32 and 16 B. C., but this does not satisfactorily explain the omission of the consuls of 16 B. C. and 32 A. D. because both consulships are mentioned by Suetonius (Nero 4.1, Galba 6.1, Otho 2.1, Vitellius 2.2).

10) Cicero, Brutus 62; cf. Livy 8.40.4, 22.31.8–11; Plutarch, Numa 1.1; Ridley 1983, 372–82; and Bastien 2007, 85–118.

11) See Münzer 1920, 225–6, 228 and 1926, 810–11, 853; MRR I 148–9. Münzer suggested that the *magister equitum* may have been the father of M. Livius Denter (cos. 302). The link with Suetonius was already made by Bandel 1910, 91–2. On the dictator years (333, 324, 309, and 301 B. C.) see Bandel, 83–4, 91–2, 108, 113–4; MRR I 141, 148–9, 163–4, 171; Werner 1963, 80, 174–5, 192–209, 214–15; Drummond 1978, 550–572; and Mora 1999, 42–6. In Livy's account the dictator L. Papirius Cursor was appointed in 325 B. C. and his *magister equitum* was Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, not a Livius Drusus (see MRR I 147–8).

Kalends of May 110 B. C.<sup>12</sup> And the Republican consul that baffled Mommsen, was M. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus (cos. 77), who was a Livius by birth as his second *cognomen* indicates.<sup>13</sup> Consequently, between the last quarter of the Fourth Century B. C. and the principate of Augustus the Livii Salinatores / Drusi could lay claim to 8 consulships (302, 219, 207, 188, 147, 112, 77, 15), 2 censorships (204, 109), 3 triumphs (219, 207, 110), 1 dictator (207), and 1 *magister equitum* (324) – which is an exact match with the testimony of Suetonius. Moreover, Suetonius' figures for the Domitii are equally precise. In the case of the Ahenobarbi, Suetonius implies that the chronological terminus he had in mind was the occasion of their adlection into the patriciate in 30 B. C. and this accords with his figures.<sup>14</sup> Prior to 30 B. C. the Domitii Ahenobarbi produced 7 consuls (192, 162, 122, 96, 94, 54, 32), 1 *triumphator* (120), and 2 censors (115, 92). The only residual uncertainty concerns whether Suetonius intended *duplici* to be understood with *triumpho* as well as *censura* – in which case he alludes to a second otherwise unattested triumph.<sup>15</sup>

12) See MRR I 544. The fragment of the *fasti triumphales Capitolini* relating to the Macedonian triumph of M. Livius Drusus (cos. 112) in 110 B. C. was unknown when Mommsen published the first volume of *Römische Forschungen*, see Henzen 1881, 256–7; CIL I<sup>2</sup> pp. 49, 53 a.u.c. 644; and Münzer 1926, 813, 858.

13) Münzer 1926, 810; cf. Sansone 1986, 274. Münzer 1920, 282, 311–2 and 1926, 812–3, 859 argued that Livianus was a biological son of M. Livius Drusus (cos. 112, cens. 109); cf. Sumner 1973, 64, 66, 111; Shackleton Bailey 1991, 66, 97; and Treggiari 2019, 40. Even with the addition of Livianus the Livii still only produced 7 consuls prior to 49/44 B. C.

14) On the *Lex Saenia* see Res Gestae 8.1; Tacitus, Ann. 11.25.3; Dio 52.42.5; and Baudry 2008, 348–52. Mommsen 1883, 34–5, 1887, II 1100–1 showed that the adlections recorded by Dio 49.43.6 in 33 B. C. are apocryphal. On the adlection of the Ahenobarbi see Heiter 1909, 48–9; Pistor 1965, 21–2; Bradley 1978, 27; and Kierdorf 1992, 155. The mutual hostility between L. Ahenobarbus (cos. 54), Cn. Ahenobarbus (cos. 32) and Caesar excludes the elevation of the Ahenobarbi under the *Lex Cassia* of 44 B. C. (MRR II 324), and it is probable that Augustus elevated L. Ahenobarbus (cos. 16) who was closely associated with the *domus Augusta*.

15) The blatant hyperbole of Velleius 2.10.1 makes his testimony worthless as corroboration. Mommsen rightly rejected the suggestion of Borghesi 1864, 54–5 that Suetonius is alluding to the *triumphalia ornamenta* won by L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 16) in Germany (Suet. Nero 4.1). The two honours were not synonymous and Suetonius is careful to distinguish between triumphs proper and *triumphalia ornamenta* (see e.g. Aug. 38.1, Claud. 17.1, and Tib. 1.2 where the 6 triumphs cannot include the *ornamenta* awarded to Tiberius and Drusus, see Suet. Tib. 9.2, Claud. 1.3, and Dio, 54.31.4, 33.5). Mommsen, Bradley, and Kierdorf considered

The accuracy of Suetonius' arithmetic on the Domitii and Livii prompts the obvious question whether his calculation of the *honores* acquired by the patrician Claudii can also be explained without resorting to emendation. Firstly, we must dispense with Mommsen's periodization, which is neither a 'natural assumption', nor based on any statement of the biographer, and manifestly fails to account for the figures in Suetonius' text. Secondly, it is evident that Suetonius did not intend a complete record of the *honores* of the patrician Claudii from start to finish or else he must necessarily have included the *honores* of the emperors Claudius and Nero.<sup>16</sup> It follows that Suetonius selected a terminus before the reign of

---

that the lacunae in the triumphal *fasti* might conceal a second triumph of the Ahenobarbi. But Livy supplies a virtually complete list of triumphs for the period 218–167, plus the *fasti triumphales Capitolini* is extant for the years 197–191 and 189–187 (where the triumph of M'. Acilius Glabrio in 190 probably filled the short intervening gap of 2 or 3 lines, see Degraasi 1947, 553), as well as for the period 178–155 which effectively excludes a triumph for Cn. Ahenobarbus (cos. 192) and Cn. Ahenobarbus (cos. suff. 162) as (pro)praetor or (pro)consul (see Rich 2014, 200–1 and table 1, 207 table 2). Cn. Ahenobarbus (cos. 122) can only have triumphed once because the *fasti triumphales Capitolini* is preserved for the years 129–104 B.C., and had he triumphed after his praetorship the *fasti* would have indicated that his Gallic triumph was not his first (the inscriptions from Treilles and Tusculum likewise contain no indication of iteration, see Arce / Dupré / Saquete 1997, 287–296). The *fasti* is also extant for the period 98–81 B.C. and the 5 triumphs known from other sources require all the available space between 104 and 98 B.C. (see Rich, 207 table 2, 251), which rules out a triumph by Cn. Ahenobarbus (cos. 96) or L. Ahenobarbus (cos. 94). Similarly, L. Ahenobarbus (cos. 54) cannot have triumphed after his praetorship or consulship because the *fasti triumphales Capitolini* survive from 62–54 B.C. and the 8 triumphs recorded in other sources account for the lacuna between 54 and 45 B.C. (see Rich, 202, 207 table 2). Moreover, he seems to have declined a province after his praetorship and consulship (see Brennan 2000, 402, 754, 792 nn. 89, 90, 793 n. 96, 926 n. 453), and we would surely have heard of any application for a triumph as it would have been vigorously opposed by the Triumvirs and their agents. Lastly, although Cn. Ahenobarbus (cos. 32) was acclaimed *imperator* for his victory in the Adriatic in 42 (see RRC I 527 no. 519: the filiation on the *aureus* makes it clear that the acclamation does not refer to the consul of 122 contra Arce 290 n. 18; cf. Eilers 2002, 233), he was out of Rome for most of the period from 44 B.C. until his death in 31 B.C. and we have a complete record of the triumphs decreed between 49 and 19 B.C. (see Rich, 202, 207 table 2). It seems highly unlikely therefore that the Domitii Ahenobarbi did earn a second triumph.

16) Between them they accumulated 10 consulships (37, 42, 43, 47, 51, 55, 57, 58, 60, 68 A.D.), 1 censorship (48 A.D.) and 1 triumph (44 A.D.). The proposed *ovatio* of A.D. 54 (Tac. Ann. 13.8.1) did not eventuate.

Claudius and the logical end-point was the principate of Augustus. Tiberius' second consulship in 7 B.C. was the last consulship that he held during the lifetime of Augustus and the next patrician Claudius was consul in the reign of Caligula.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, as a consequence of his adoption in A.D. 4 Tiberius technically ceased to be a member of the patrician *gens Claudia* and he became Ti. Iulius Caesar as he was known thereafter. Tiberius reportedly took the legal ramifications of his adoption very seriously,<sup>18</sup> but it may be doubted whether this was uppermost in Suetonius' mind when he was adding up the *honores* of the Claudii. It was perhaps more significant for Suetonius that a terminus in the principate of Augustus is consistent with the overall structure of the *Vita Tiberii* which is divided into two parts consisting of events before and after the accession of Tiberius.<sup>19</sup> If therefore Suetonius' figures include the *honores* of the patrician Claudii down to the principate of Augustus, and the 3 consulships of Tiberius and Drusus (13, 9, 7 B.C.), as well as the *ovatio* and triumph of Tiberius (9 and 7 B.C.),<sup>20</sup> are factored in, we arrive at a total of 26 consulships (495,

17) The future emperor Claudius held his first consulship in A.D. 37. Tiberius' son Drusus Caesar, as well as Germanicus and his offspring were technically Iulii from A.D. 4.

18) See Suetonius, Tib. 15.2; cf. Dio 55.27.4.

19) That is, chapters 4–21 and 22–76. This is explicitly enunciated at 7.1. The first two consulships of Tiberius are rapidly recorded at 9.3, the remaining 3 (18, 21, 31 A.D.) at 26.2. Note also that while Suetonius sometimes treats all the consulships held by his subject together (see Aug. 26; Titus 6), he more often distinguishes between consulships held before and after their accession (see Caesar 19, 76; Tiberius 9.3, 26.2; Claudius 7, 14; Vespasian 4, 8; Domitian 2, 13; Vitellius 3, 11). All the consulships held by Caligula, Nero, and Otho post-dated their accession, so no such distinction was possible in their case, and Suetonius only mentions the first consulate of Galba (Galba 6).

20) Drusus did not live to celebrate the ovation he was voted in 11 B.C. (Suet. Claud. 1.3; Dio 54.33.5, 55.2.4–5). A brief summary of the triumphs of Tiberius is requisite as there is a certain amount of confusion on this subject (see Lindsay 1995, 81, 100 who credits Tiberius with ovations in 11, 9, and 7 B.C. and Wardle 2014, 293 table 7 which includes “triumphs awarded but not celebrated”, yet omits the *ovatio* decreed for Drusus in 11, as well as the *ovatio* of Tiberius in 9 B.C. which are treated merely as grants of *ornamenta triumphalia* in table 8 p. 294 – compare Wardle, 170 and Rich 2014, 238 n. 211. See further Rohde 1942, 1902 and Swan 2004, 42, 47–9, 367–9). Velleius Paterculus, who was a witness to these events, says Tiberius celebrated 3 triumphs in total (2.122.1: *tribus*). An *ovatio* in 9 B.C. for his victory over the Pannonians (2.96.3: *Nero ovans triumphavit* – which is the ‘equestrian triumph’

471, 460, 451, 349, 307, 296, 268, 264, 249, 240, 212, 207, 202, 185, 184, 177, 143, 130, 92, 79, 54, 38, 13, 9, 7 B. C.), 4 dictatorships (362, 337, c. 292–285, 213 B. C.), 6 censorships (312, 225, 204, 169, 136, 50 B. C.), 6 triumphs (268, 207, 177, 143, 33, 7 B. C.), and 2 ovations (174, 9 B. C.). This eliminates the ‘missing’ Claudian triumph and *ovatio*, which puzzled Mommsen, and leaves only 2 consulships, 1 dictatorship, and 1 censorship outstanding.<sup>21</sup>

How then are we to account for the remaining *honores*? One method that has found favour with several commentators is to suppose that Suetonius mistakenly included some plebeian Claudii among the patricians. Slater, who pioneered this approach, rejected Mommsen’s terminus of 49 or 44 B. C. in favour of 31 B. C. on the grounds that Suetonius’ figures did not apparently include any triumphs or ovations after 31 B. C.,<sup>22</sup> and because the Re-

---

in Dio, 55.2.4. Sometimes dated to the 16th of January based on a fragmentary entry in the *fasti Praenestini*, but see Swan 48, 367–9). A triumph on January 1st 7 B. C. for his campaign in Germany (2.97.4: *alter triumphus*; Dio 55.8.1–2). He retired to Rhodes in 6 B. C. having held two consulships and celebrated two triumphs (2.99.1: *duobus consulatibus totidemque triumphis*). The third triumph, decreed in A. D. 9 for his victories over the Pannonians and Delmatae was eventually celebrated in 11 or 12 A. D. (Vell. 2.121.3; Dio 56.17.1. Probably on the 23rd of October, see the *fasti Praenestini*: *Ti. Caesar curru triumphavit ex Il(l)urico*). This agrees with the account of Suetonius who indicates 1 *ovatio* and 1 full or ‘curule’ triumph (Tib. 9.2: *ovans et curru urbem ingressus est*), and lastly the full postponed triumph (Tib. 17, 20).

21) Mommsen 1864, I 291 suggested that one of the ‘missing’ triumphs or ovations could be the costly victory of the dictator Ap. Crassus over the Hernici in 362 B. C. (cf. CIL I<sup>2</sup> pp. 51, 170), but Livy 7.7–8 makes no mention of a triumph or ovation, and there is insufficient room in the *fasti triumphales Capitolini* (see Degraffi 1947, 66–7, 539–40 and MRR I 118 n. 2). Rich 2014, 205, on the other hand, assumes Suetonius followed the tradition found only in Silius Italicus 6.660–2 and Eutropius 2.18.3, 19.3 that Ap. Claudius Caudex (cos. 264) triumphed over the Carthaginians and king Hiero in 264. Suetonius certainly mentions the victory of Caudex (Tib. 2.1), but both conjectures become superfluous when the *honores* of Tiberius prior to his adoption are given their proper due. On the claim made in De vir. ill. 48.5 that C. Claudius Nero (cos. 207) celebrated an ovation rather than a triumph see Itgenshorst 2005, 149–152 no. 162; Rich 2014, 222–3, 238, 249; and Fugmann 2016, 333–4. On the *elogium* of Ap. Claudius Caecus, which credits him with some questionable victories, but no triumph see Ridley 1983, 376–7.

22) Slater 1906, 4–7. Slater came to this conclusion because he himself counted not only the triumph of the plebeian C. Claudius Canina, but also the non-triumph of 362 B. C., as well as the highly dubious triumph of Ap. Claudius Caudex (vide supra), and treated the triumph of C. Nero as an ovation, which leaves no room for any triumphs or ovations after the triumph of Ap. Pulcher (cos. 38).

public could not in Slater's opinion be considered to have fallen before that date,<sup>23</sup> and so by counting the 2 consulships and the triumph (273 B. C.) of the plebeian C. Claudius M. f. C. n. Canina (cos. 285, 273),<sup>24</sup> as well as the dictatorship of M. Claudius C. f. Glia (249 B. C.), plus the decemvir of 450 B. C. Ap. Claudius Crassus Inregillensis Sabinus,<sup>25</sup> but not Appius' first tenure of the decemvirate in 451 B. C. (!), together with the consular tribunes of 424 and 403 B. C.,<sup>26</sup> Slater was able to match all the Suetonian figures, except for the censorship, where he came up 1 censor short. Holtzhauser also included the triumph of Canina, plus the triumphs of the Claudii Marcelli in 222, 196, 166 and 155, whilst omitting M. Marcellus' triumph on the Alban mount and his *ovatio* in 211, as well as several well-attested triumphs of the patrician Claudii.<sup>27</sup> In short, this expedient is self-evidently untenable. In the first place, Suetonius explicitly distinguishes the patrician *gens* from the plebeian Claudii at very the outset, and he patently cannot have included the Claudii Marcelli in the reckoning since they would have accounted for 16 consulships (331, 287, 222, 215, 214, 210, 208, 196, 183, 166, 155, 152, 51, 50, 49, 22), 1 dictatorship (327), 1 censorship (189), 5 triumphs (222, 211, 196, 166, 155), and 1 *ovatio* (211) by themselves.<sup>28</sup>

23) This was plainly not the view of Suetonius (see Divus Augustus 8.3, 26.1, 27, 28.1–2).

24) Münzer 1918, 252–3 notes that Canina's patrician consular colleagues prove his plebeian status (correcting the misstatement in 1899, 2692). Mora 1999, 95 posits that Canina was a brother of M. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 287).

25) RE no. 123. The *decemviri legibus scribundis* were invested with consular *imperium* (see Varro in Gellius, NA 14.7.5; the *fasti Capitolini* and Kübler 1901, 2258).

26) Ap. Claudius Crassus (RE no. 121) and Ap. Claudius Crassus Inregillensis (RE no. 122).

27) Holtzhauser 1918, 9. See also Du Four 1941, 8–9 and Lindsay 1995, 55–6 who refer to 2 unidentified patrician and 4 unidentified plebeian triumphs, count the censorship of M. Marcellus in 189 to make the required 7, and invent 2 non-existent dictatorships (citing 2 in the *fasti Capitolini* in CIL 1<sup>2</sup> p. 20, where there is actually only 1, and Livy 22.53.4).

28) Tib. 1.1: *Patricia gens Claudia – fuit enim et alia plebeia, nec potentia minor nec dignitate ...* The statement that the plebeian Claudii were just as powerful and distinguished (as the patricians) must be a reference to the Marcelli (see similarly Asconius 25.24–26.1 C) since the other plebeian Claudii / Clodii of senatorial rank were few and far between (see RE Claudius nos. 20a, 60–63, 98, 115, 165, 204, 376, and Clodius nos. 1 and 9) and none reached the consulship between C. Claudius Canina (cos. 285, 273) and the historian C. Clodius Licinus (cos. suff. A. D. 4).



The advocates of this method are consequently reduced to employing the most erratic and indefensible accounting, arbitrarily including and excluding *honores* in order to reach the desired totals. What is more, the missing dictator cannot be the plebeian M. Claudius Glicia appointed by P. Claudius Pulcher (cos. 249), because Suetonius was well-aware of his low social status as his appointment was a notorious instance of Claudian hauteur.<sup>29</sup> Nor it is likely that the two missing consulships are those held by the plebeian C. Claudius Canina because the triumph of Canina would bring the total number of triumphs to 7 which exceeds the Suetonian figure of 6. And it is not as though Suetonius simply assumed that every Claudius who held high office was necessarily a patrician, for the patrician dictator of 337 B. C., C. Claudius Inregillensis, is said to have appointed as his *magister equitum* a certain C. Claudius Hortator, but the office of master of horse is noticeably absent from Suetonius' tally of the *honores* of the patrician Claudii.<sup>30</sup> Clearly, a more credible and logically consistent solution to the numerical discrepancies is required.

Mommsen accepted that the missing dictator and censor might be due to gaps in the record as both these offices are imperfectly documented.<sup>31</sup> Cornell recently remarked that our three main sources on the dictatorship, Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and the *fasti Capitolini*, provide a relatively comprehensive coverage of

---

29) Suetonius, Tib. 2.2 states that Glicia was the consul's own *viator*. The *fasti Capitolini* agrees that Glicia was an *apparitor*, but calls him a *scriba* (MRR I 215), and Livy described him as a man of the lowest birth (Per. 19: *sortis ultimae homo*). On *viatores* see now David 2019, chapters 2 and 5.

30) The episode is sometimes dismissed as fictive on the grounds that Hortator is otherwise unknown, but that is scarcely probative (see Jahn 1970, 82–3; and Ridley 1997, 160). Münzer 1899, 2725 and Bandel 1910, 80–1 say nothing about the social status of Hortator, whereas Broughton, MRR I 139 treated him as a patrician. The fact that Suetonius omits Hortator implies that he was a plebeian (the first plebeian *magister equitum* was appointed in 368 B. C., see MRR I 112). Note that Inregillensis was reportedly compelled to resign due to a fault in his election, which was the fate of a notable proportion of the patrician dictators who appointed plebeian masters of horse, see Mommsen 1887, III 364–5 and MRR I 140, 151, 234, 244.

31) Although some early dictatorships and censorships are regarded as later inventions, their historical reliability is irrelevant for present purposes as we are solely concerned with established traditions that could have influenced Suetonius' calculations.

the Republican epoch down to 72 B. C., and since the dictatorship was in abeyance in the years 202–82 and 80–49 B. C. this further mitigates the problems posed by the gaps in the record.<sup>32</sup> There are, however, some important caveats. Livy and the *fasti Capitolini* are not always in agreement. The fragmentary entry in the *fasti Capitolini* for 348 B. C. records a dictator and *magister equitum*, appointed *comitiorum habendorum causa*, who are not mentioned by Livy.<sup>33</sup> The *fasti Capitolini* does not preserve their names, but it was long ago suggested that the dictator of 348 B. C. might have been C. Claudius Crassus Inregillensis (the future dictator of 337 B. C.).<sup>34</sup> It is probable that the dictator of 348 B. C. was indeed a patrician, but realistically we can say no more than that.<sup>35</sup> Two other lacunae call for comment. In the years 292–285 and 221–219 B. C. Livy and the *fasti Capitolini* both fail us, but we know that dictators held office in both periods. In 292–285 B. C. at least 4 dictators were appointed including Ap. Claudius Caecus.<sup>36</sup> There is a chance that more than 4 dictators held office in this turbulent period, but the *elogium* of Caecus indicates that he was dictator only once,<sup>37</sup> and it

32) Cornell 2015, 109 n. 40 noted that we have the full text of Livy from 509–292 and 218–167, Dionysius from 509 to 443, and the *fasti Capitolini* is partially preserved for the years 483–472, 466–450, 422–414, 409–390, 380, 371–358, 350–346, 332–329, 320–299, 296–293, 284–222, and 218–72 B. C. Another important source, Diodorus Siculus, is extant for the period 486–302 B. C. For the full range of sources see Hartfield 1982, 8–13 plus Bandel, MRR, and Hartfield under the relevant years.

33) Livy's account of 348 B. C. is extremely short and does not refer to the elections (7.27.1–3). The dictator years (333, 324, 309, and 301 B. C.) are also unknown to Livy, but the dictators in these years are all recorded in Livy under the previous year and there are no Claudii among them.

34) Thus Panvinus 1557, 16 and Pighius 1615, I 296, 323, II viii. The conjecture has generally been dismissed, see Drumann 1835, II 170 n. 69; CIL I<sup>2</sup> pp. 20, 32; Bandel 1910, 71; MRR I 130; Jahn 1970, 72–3; Degrassi 1947, 34–5, 406–7, 1954, 44–5, 182; Hartfield 1982, 389.

35) Apart from C. Marcius Rutilus, the first plebeian dictator appointed in 356 B. C., all the other dictators prior to Q. Publilius Philo in 339 B. C. were patrician.

36) The other 3 were Q. Hortensius, M. Aemilius Barbula, and P. Cornelius Rufinus (see MRR I 185, 187).

37) CIL XI 1827 = ILS 54 = Inscript. Ital. XIII 3,79: *Appius Claudius C. f. Caecus censor co(n)s(ul) bis dict(ator) interrex III pr(aetor) II aed(ilis) cur(ulis) II q(uaestor) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) III complura oppida de Sammitibus cepit Sabinorum et Tuscorum exercitum fudit pacem fieri cum [P]yrrho rege prohibuit in censura viam Appiam stravit et aquam in urbem adduxit aedem Bellonae fecit.*

does not seem very likely that any other Claudii held the dictatorship in these years.<sup>38</sup> The lacuna in the years 221–219 B. C. coincides with the first dictatorship of Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus, which was abruptly terminated by the squeak of a *sorex*,<sup>39</sup> and the suffect dictator and *magister equitum* are nowhere named.<sup>40</sup> Yet all the dictators in this period were ex-consuls, and for the most part senior consulars (apart from Q. Caecilius Metellus cos. 206, dict. 205 and C. Servilius Geminus cos. 203, dict. 202), which effectively rules out the patrician Claudii.<sup>41</sup> If therefore the lacunae of 292–285 and 221–219 B. C. are unlikely to explain the missing Claudian dictator, the dictatorship of 348 B. C. at least serves as a reminder that the intermittent lacunae in the *fasti Capitolini* in the period prior to 296 B. C. could conceal other dictatorships not registered by Livy.

At first sight the gaps in the *fasti censorii* in the Fifth to Third Centuries B. C. hold greater promise in the search for the elusive seventh Claudian censor. Due to the lacunae in the *fasti Capitolini*, and Livy's erratic documentation of the censorship, we are lacking 1 censor in 418 B. C., both censors in c. 414/410, 389, 358 and c. 340 B. C., and 1 censor in 319 and 283 B. C.<sup>42</sup> The missing

---

38) Even allowing for the fact that not all dictators in this epoch were ex-consuls – C. Poetelius Libo Visolus dict. 313 (MRR I 158) and M. Aemilius Barbula dict. c. 285 (MRR I 187) were never consul – no other prominent patrician Claudii are known at this juncture aside from Caecus.

39) Val. Max. 1.1.5 (with Fabius Maximus as dictator and C. Flaminius as *magister equitum*); Plutarch, Marcellus 5.4 (with a Minucius as dictator and C. Flaminius as *magister equitum*).

40) See MRR I 234. Some scholars favour an alternative reconstruction in which M. Minucius Rufus (cos. 221) as dictator with C. Flaminius (cos. 223, 217) as his *magister equitum* were compelled to resign due to the *vitium* of the *sorex* and were replaced by Fabius Maximus and an unidentifiable *magister equitum*, see Jahn 1970, 113–5; Hartfield 1982, 489–93; and MRR III 143–4.

41) The only Claudian consular available in this period was C. Claudius Centho (cos. 240), but C. Centho was dictator in 213 B. C. (MRR I 263), and as there is no indication in Livy or the *fasti Capitolini* that he was *dictator iterum* on that occasion that must have been his first and only appointment. The next nearest Claudian consular, P. Claudius Pulcher (cos. 249), was dead by 246 B. C. (see Münzer 1899, 2858, 2885) and would not have been a viable appointment in any case in view of his behaviour in 249.

42) Livy does not mention the censors of 430, 418, c. 414/410, 403, 389, 366, 363, 358, c. 340, 319, or 318 B. C. and his account of the censorship 283 B. C. is lost,

censors of 418, c. 414/410, 389, and 358 B. C. must all have been patricians,<sup>43</sup> and there is one possible candidate among the patrician Claudii for each censorship – namely Ap. Claudius Crassus the consular tribune of 424 B. C. for 418 or 414/410 B. C.,<sup>44</sup> and Ap. Claudius Crassus Inregillensis the consular tribune of 403, dictator of 362, and consul of 349 B. C. for 389 or 358 B. C. There is, however, no corroboratory evidence to suggest that either man was censor,<sup>45</sup> and it is sometimes supposed that the two extra consular tribunes named in Diodorus 15.22.1 (L. Papirius and M. Furius) are actually the censors of 389 B. C.<sup>46</sup> No known patrician Claudius was available for the censorship of circa 340 B. C.,<sup>47</sup> and the censors responsible for the twenty-third *lustrum* and the *ensus* of circa 340 are often conjecturally identified with the two Scipionic brothers mentioned by Velleius.<sup>48</sup> The unknown censor in 319 B. C., on the other hand, was almost certainly a plebeian,<sup>49</sup>

---

while the *fasti Capitolini* is missing for 430, 389, 358 and 340 B. C. and only partly preserved for the years 418, 414, 319, and 283 B. C. The existence of the censorships of c. 414–410, 389, 358, and c. 340 is revealed by evidence of censorial activity including the surviving figures for the *lustra* in the *fasti Capitolini* (see Leuze 1912, 32–4 and Suolahti 1963, 176, 181, 197, 204, 614, 626).

43) The first plebeian censor was elected in 351 B. C. (see MRR I 127).

44) His father Publius is entirely unknown, and despite Livy's reference to the many Claudii in Rome in 449 B. C. (3.58.3) very few are attested in high office in the generations before the sons of Caecus came of age.

45) Vide infra on Johannes Lydus.

46) See MRR I 97, 98 n. 3 and Suolahti 1963, 181–2.

47) The consul of 349 B. C. died in office (MRR I 128).

48) Velleius 2.8.2: *Nam censura Metellorum patruelium, non germanorum fratrum fuit, quod solis contigerat Scipionibus*. Identified as L. Cornelius Scipio (RE no. 322) and P. Cornelius Scipio (RE no. 329) see MRR I 136 and Suolahti 1963, 204–6, 548–9. The Scipionic censorship of c. 340 is accepted by some and rejected by others, but an all-patrician censorship at this juncture might explain the passage of the *Lex Publilia de censore plebeio creando* of 339 B. C. which seems to have been intended to reinforce the plebeian claim on the censorship, much like the *Lex Genucia* of 342, which was passed after the election of a series of all-patrician consular colleges in the 350's and 340's, see Münzer 1920, 38–9; and Suolahti 1963, 76, 92–3, 204.

49) The known censor of 319 B. C. was the patrician [C. Su]lpicius [Longus] and from the election of the first plebeian censor in 351 B. C. until the election of the first all-plebeian censorial college in 131 B. C. in every instance, but one, 1 patrician and 1 plebeian was elected. The exception is the censorship of circa 340 B. C. (vide supra). It is virtually certain therefore that the unidentifiable colleague of C. Sulpicius Longus was a plebeian, see Suolahti 1963, 212–6, 630–6.

which leaves the anonymous patrician colleague of Q. Caedicius Noctua (cos. 289, cens. 283), but virtually all censors by this date were consulars and no patrician Claudius fitting this description was available in 283 B.C.<sup>50</sup> The final gaps in the *fasti censorii* in 64 and 61 B.C. can be discounted as all the censors between 209 and 42 B.C. were ex-consuls and there were no Claudian consulars among the living in the 60's.<sup>51</sup> Lastly, we must address the brief account of the censorship in the work of the sixth century Byzantine bureaucrat and antiquarian Johannes Lydus in which the following statement occurs:

βαρείς δέ τινες καὶ ἀναιδεῖς ἀστεμφεῖς τε καὶ στιβαροὶ τὸν τρόπον οἱ κήνσωρες τοῖς ἀσώτοις ἐτύγχανον, μὴ τύχης, μὴ ἀξιώματος ἐξαιρουμένου τὸν αἴτιον, ὅτι δὲ ἀληθῆ ταῦτα, μάρτυς ἡ ἱστορία· λέγει δέ· 'Πρώτος Ἄππιος Κλαύδιος κήνσωρ προεβλήθη. ἀρχὴ δὲ ἦν αὐτῆ τῶν μεγίστων· καὶ ἔργον ἦν αὐτῇ τοὺς τῶν πολιτῶν διερευνᾶσθαι τε καὶ κρίνειν βίους, τιμωρίας τε ἐπάγειν τοῖς ἀμαρτάνουσι κατὰ πάσης δυναστείας· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἦν ἔξω τῆς τοῦ κήνσωρος ἐξουσίας.' κύριοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ κήνσωρες καὶ ἔργοις κοινοῖς κατακοσμεῖν τὴν πόλιν.<sup>52</sup>

According to the dominant tradition the censorship was created in 443 B.C. and the first censors were L. Papirius Mugillanus and L. Sempronius Atratinus.<sup>53</sup> The question therefore becomes

50) See MRR I 188. The only living Claudian consular in 283 B.C. was Ap. Claudius Caecus, who had been censor in 312 B.C., and even before the *Lex Marcia* of 265 B.C. (MRR I 202) iteration in the censorship was unknown (see MRR I 105–6, 115 on the censors of 380 and 366 B.C.). Suolahti 1963, 249–51, 636–44 posits that Ser. Cornelius Lentulus (cos. 303) was the colleague of Q. Caedicius Noctua in 283.

51) On the identity of the censors of 64 and 61 B.C. see Suolahti 1963, 472–7, 644–72; MRR III 2–3, 9, 128–9, 186; and Lintott 1993, 89.

52) De magistratibus populi Romani 1.43 (Wünsch 1903, p. 44): The censors were stern and implacable, with an unwavering firmness in their attitude toward malefactors: neither rank nor office could shield the guilty. History is witness to the veracity of this and affirms: "The first censor appointed was Appius Claudius. This office was one of the most important and its duties consisted of examining and passing judgement upon the lives of citizens, and meting out punishment to offenders with untrammelled authority. No one was beyond the jurisdiction of the censors." The censors were also charged with providing the city with public works.

53) See MRR I 53–4. Cicero, Ad fam. 9.22.2, Livy 4.8.2–7, and Zonaras 7.19 supply the names and the date, cf. Dion. Hal. 11.63.1–3 and the Digest 1.2.2.17. The censorship was nevertheless rejected by Mommsen, Soltau, and Beloch, see Leuze 1912, 95–107; Klotz 1939, 31–6; and Suolahti 1963, 168–71, 673–9.

whether Lydus preserves an alternative tradition in which an Ap. Claudius took the place of Mugillanus or Atratinus?<sup>54</sup> Anyone familiar with Johannes Lydus will be aware that his work must always be approached with extreme caution, for while he sometimes preserves genuine information from trustworthy sources, he is also capable of misinterpreting his sources and adding erroneous conjectures of his own.<sup>55</sup> Schamp speculated that in *De magistratibus* 1.43 Lydus somehow managed to confuse Ap. Claudius Caecus (cens. 312) with his distant ancestor Ap. Claudius Sabinus Inregillensis (cos. 495).<sup>56</sup> But Lydus signals that the passage from Πρῶτος to ἔξουσίας, which contains the claim that an Ap. Claudius was the first censor, is a quote from an unnamed source, and the verbal reminiscences leave no doubt that that source is the explanatory gloss inserted by Paeianius in his translation of Eutropius' account of the censorship of Ap. Claudius Caecus.<sup>57</sup> Yet Lydus omits the final sentence of Paeianius, which refers to the construction of

---

54) Richardson 2014, 17–37 assembles the evidence for some variant traditions of this kind.

55) The first consuls, for example, are correctly identified as Iunius Brutus and Publicola (*De mag.* 1.31,33 although Tarquinius Collatinus, Lucretius Tricipitinus, and Horatius Pulvillus do not rate a mention, see *MRR* I 1–3), and the first dictator 'T. Marcus' (*De mag.* 1.37,38) is recognizable as the T. Larcus of the mainstream tradition (an alternative tradition claimed that M'. Valerius M. f. Volesi n. was the first, see *MRR* I 9), but the rest of his account of the dictatorship is "ganz verwirrt" (Mommsen 1887, II 141 n. 6). See further Mommsen 1887, I 663–4 n. 3, II 147 n. 4, 196 n. 2, 275 n. 3, 570 n. 4, 1055 n. 4, 1061 n. 2, III 104 n. 3. In addition to factual errors there are some purposeful distortions (see for instance Maas 1992, 45, 83–96).

56) Schamp 2000, 109–128 and 2006, dxxv–dxxxiii. For the *elogium* of Ap. Claudius Sabinus Inregillensis (cos. 495) see *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> p. 199 no. xxxi = *Inscript. Ital.* XIII.3 no. 67 = *ILS* 44.

57) Paeianius: Κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον χρόνον Ἄππιος Κλαύδιος κήσωρ αἰρεῖται, ἤγουν τιμητῆς ἀρχὴ δὲ ἦν αὐτῆ τῶν μεγίστων, καὶ ἦν ἔργον αὐτῆ τοῦς τῶν πολιτῶν διερευνᾶσθαι τε καὶ κρίνειν βίους, τιμωρίας τε κατὰ πάσης ἡδύνατο δυναστείας, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἦν ἔξω τῆς τοῦ κήσωρος ἔξουσίας. Κύριοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ κήσωρες καὶ ἔργοις καινοῖς κατακοσμεῖν τὴν πόλιν. Ὁ Κλαύδιος γοῦν πηγὴν ὠχέτευσεν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην, ἥτις αὐτῷ μέχρι νῦν ἐπονομάζεται Κλαυδία, ὁδὸν τε ἐστόρεσεν, ἥτις ἐπεκλήθη καὶ αὐτῆ τῷ πεποικῶτι, Ἀππία προσαγορευθεῖσα. Οὕτως ἡ μὲν τὸ ἐπόνυμον ἔσχε τοῦ πεποικῶτος, ἡ δὲ αὐτὸ τοῦνομα (see Droysen 1879, 30–1). Eutropius, *Breviarum* 2.9 says only: *Eo tempore Ap. Claudius censor aquam Claudiam induxit et viam Appiam stravit*. Paeianius sometimes adds material on aspects of Roman culture and history that might be unfamiliar to his Greek audience (see Fisher 1982, 192 with further references).

the *Via* and *Aqua Appia* (substituting a general statement on the censors' responsibility for public works), and adds the erroneous claim that 'Ap. Claudius' was the first censor.<sup>58</sup> What motivated Lydus to make this misleading editorial intervention is a mystery as it serves no obvious aetiological or ideological purpose. Unless therefore we hang our hopes on an otherwise unattested censorship of Ap. Claudius Crassus in 418 or 414/410 B.C. or Ap. Claudius Crassus Inregillensis in 389 or 358 B.C. there is still 1 Claudian censor unaccounted for.

There remains Suetonius' 28 consulships. Mommsen rightly observed that the additional Suetonian consulates cannot be attributed to gaps in the record because the *fasti consulares* are complete up to the principate of Tiberius.<sup>59</sup> Consequently another explanation is needed for the 2 missing Claudian consuls. One possible explanation has already been mentioned. Although there

---

58) One cannot exculpate Lydus by rendering: Πρῶτος Ἄππιος Κλαύδιος κήνσωρ προεβλήθη as: The first Appius Claudius was censor (thus Schamp 2006, 53–54: "Le premier, Appius Claudius fut nommé censeur" – echoing Humm 2005, 361 n. 51). For the first Ap. Claudius was not censor, nor was the censor Ap. Claudius Caecus the first Ap. Claudius, and Humm and Schamp 2006, dxv, dxix concede that the natural meaning of the passage is that Appius Claudius was the first censor (cf. Schamp 2000, 121: "Le premier à avoir été nommé censeur fut Appius Claudius").

59) Now that the number and identity of the consuls of A.D. 13 is assured (see Gorostidi Pi 2014, 265–75), the earliest gaps in the *fasti* occur in 21 and 22 A.D. (see Syme 1981, 371–4 and Buongiorno 2015, 102–9. The attempt by Buongiorno [108] to insert additional *suffecti* into the year 18 A.D. takes insufficient account of the format of the surviving fragments of the *fasti* for 18 A.D., see Degrassi 1947, 185 no. 5, 260 no. 11, 303–4 no. 26 plus AE [1991] 307, which indicate that the 4 known *suffecti* were the only *suffecti* to hold office in that year). Wiseman 1970, 217–18 followed the lead of Groag, PIR<sup>2</sup> C 986 in tentatively identifying the consul P. Clodius Pulcher named on the *Porta Romana* at Ostia (CIL XIV 4707) with the consul P. Claudius Pulcher recorded as patron of Nola (CIL X 1250). Groag's conjecture that the consul was perhaps a *suffect sub finem liberae rei publicae* was ruled out by the discovery of the *fasti magistrorum vici*, and Wiseman proposed making him a *suffect* in A.D. 21 or 22. But Camodeca 2012, 300 posits that CIL X.1250, which is known only from the sixteenth century *Historia Neapolitana* of Fabius Giordanus, actually read: [A]p. Claudio Pulcro cos patrono and referred to Ap. Pulcher (cos. 54), or more probably Ap. Pulcher (cos. 38), who owned property in Campania and was honoured at Herculaneum (CIL X 1423–4). And the consul who allegedly restored the *Porta Romana* at Ostia is a phantom (see Gordon and Reynolds 2003, 228; and Zevi and Fedeli 2013, 137–60 with earlier bibliography).

is no reference to the *tribuni militum consulari potestate* of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries in the surviving works of Suetonius, he can hardly have been ignorant of their existence.<sup>60</sup> And while Suetonius does not specifically mention the consular tribunes of 424 or 403 B.C. in his selective survey of the Claudii, his figures include the dictator of 362 B.C. and the consul of 349 B.C. who were reputedly identical with the consular tribune of 403 B.C.<sup>61</sup> Moreover, Suetonius does not register the consular tribunate as a separate category in his list of *honores*: so he either omitted the institution altogether or subsumed it under the consulship. A strict constitutionalist might well object to the notion that a consular tribune was the equal of a consul,<sup>62</sup> but Suetonius is unlikely to have been troubled by technicalities of that nature.

There is, however, a better explanation, overlooked by Mommsen, which not only accounts for the 2 missing Claudian consuls, but the 1 outstanding censor as well. Suetonius demonstrably counted adoptees when adding up the *honores* of the Livii. His calculations not surprisingly include some individuals adopted into the *gens* like M. Livius L. f. Drusus Libo (cos. 15), who is thought to have been a biological son of L. Scribonius Libo (cos. 34) adopted in the testament of M. Livius Drusus Claudianus.<sup>63</sup> But Suetonius

---

60) In the preface of the *Chronicon* (p. 6–7 Helm) Jerome acknowledges his use of Suetonius as a source, but his reference to the consular tribunate (p. 118 Helm) goes back to Eutropius 2.1 who adopts the same unorthodox date for the introduction of the office (i. e. 388 instead of 444 B.C. Our other authorities all employ different chronologies, see the sources collected by Helm, p. 356). On Jerome's use of Suetonius see Vessey 2010, 280–90 with additional references.

61) Münzer 1899, 2697 wondered whether in reality they might have been two distinct individuals. The alleged consular tribunes Capitos Clodius, Claudius Ugo, and M. Clodius are only found in some *Mss* of Diodorus 14.38.1, 14.82.1, 14.110.1 and are plainly corrupt (see Vogel 1893, III 243, 307, 344 and MRR I 83 n. 1, 86 n. 1, 96 n. 2).

62) See Linderski 1990, 43–6; and Bunse 1998, 113–123.

63) On the background of the consul of 15 B.C. see Münzer 1926, 813, 884; Weinrib 1967, 247–78; and Syme 1986, 37, 257–8. Note too that the father of C. Livius Drusus (cos. 147) was a patrician Aemilius by birth (see Münzer 1920, 235–7, 1926, 812, 855; Sumner 1973, 64–6). However, Suetonius omits L. Livius Ocella Sulpicius Galba (cos. 33 A.D.). The future emperor Galba was 'adopted' by his step-mother Livia Ocellina and bore the additional *nomen* until he became emperor (Suet. Galba 4.1; Salomies 1992, 15, 32–3). The Livii Ocellae were apparently related in some fashion to the Livii Drusi / Salinatore (see Plutarch, Galba 3.2; cf. Plutarch,



also, somewhat inconsistently, counted M. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus (cos. 77), who had passed by adoption out of the *gens Livia* and into the patrician Aemilii.<sup>64</sup> Now it so happens that the patrician Claudii had never resorted to adoption before the emperor Claudius gave his name to the last of the Domitii Ahenobarbi,<sup>65</sup> but a propensity for relatively large families meant that the Claudii could afford to be magnanimous with their own surplus offspring.<sup>66</sup> Indeed, Tiberius' maternal grandfather, M. Livius Drusus Claudianus, was a Claudius Pulcher by birth.<sup>67</sup> And in view of Suetonius' treatment of Lepidus Livianus we must turn our attention to Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus (cos. 72, cens. 70) and M. Valerius Messalla Barbatus Appianus (cos. 12).

The sources give no indication of the natal ancestry of Lentulus Clodianus, and opinions differ on whether he was born into the patrician or plebeian Claudii. Münzer and Cichorius contended that Clodianus should be identified with the plebeian tribune Cn. Lentulus and that he must accordingly have been a plebeian Claudius by birth.<sup>68</sup> But that argument is invalid for two reasons. Firstly,

---

Galba 14.3 and Suetonius, Galba 5.2; and Münzer 1926, 811–14, 887, 891) and the omission presumably cannot be due to the fact that the adoption was merely testamentary for the adoption of M. Livius Drusus Libo (cos. 15) is also believed to have been testamentary. Therefore Suetonius either simply overlooked Galba, or he did not include Galba among the consular Livii because his survey of the Livii, like his treatment of the Claudii, only extended to the principate of Augustus.

64) Similarly, Suetonius does not regard the testamentary adoption of Tiberius in childhood by M. Gallius (Tib. 6.3) as having effected his status as a Claudius except in a superficial and ephemeral fashion.

65) Suet. Claud. 39; Tac. Ann. 12.25.2.

66) Witness the 4 sons and 5 daughters of Caecus, the 3 sons and 1 daughter of Ap. Pulcher (cos. 212), the 2 surviving sons and 3 daughters of Ap. Pulcher (cos. 143), the 3 sons and 3 daughters of Ap. Pulcher (cos. 79), and the 9 children of Germanicus.

67) Suetonius, Tib. 3.1. A rare lapse of judgement on Münzer's part has obscured this fact. After repeatedly and correctly identifying Claudianus as a Claudius Pulcher, Münzer 1926, 882 abruptly declared that despite the express testimony of Suetonius, Claudianus may have been a Claudius Nero by birth and Münzer's authority has misled the unwary (see e.g. Themann-Steinke 2008, 512; Huntsman 2009, 124–7, 129–31, 138–9, 166; and the stemma of J. Heinrichs in PIR<sup>2</sup> pars VIII fasc. 2 [2015] opposite p. 518).

68) Münzer 1900, 1380; Cichorius 1922, 147–8. Tribune Cn. Lentulus: Cicero, Imp. Pomp. 58; cf. ILS 58 and 5800.

even if the identification was admissible, it would only establish that the adoptive father of Clodianus was a plebeian and would reveal nothing about the status of Clodianus' biological family. Secondly, Syme and Sumner proved that the identification is impossible – not least because Sallust testifies that Clodianus belonged (by adoption) to the patrician Cornelii.<sup>69</sup> Conversely, it cannot be safely assumed that Clodianus is identical with the Cn. Cornelius Cn. f. Pal(atina) of ILS 8888, and that he was registered in the tribe *Palatina* because he was a Claudius Pulcher by birth,<sup>70</sup> since it is entirely possible that some of the Lentuli were enrolled in the *Palatina* in their own right,<sup>71</sup> and the conjecture is predicated on the assumption that Clodianus continued to be registered in his natal tribe after his adoption, which, while seemingly permissible by the late Republic, was highly irregular.<sup>72</sup> Lastly, the orthography of the *cognomen* Clodianus offers no way out of this impasse.<sup>73</sup> It is true that the only patrician Claudii known to have employed an adoptive *cognomen* of this type apparently preferred the spelling Claudianus.<sup>74</sup> But the *cognomina* Claudianus and Clodianus are not reliable indicators of status.<sup>75</sup> The belief that the alternative spellings Claudius and Clodius functioned as status markers distinguishing the patricians

---

69) *Historiae* 4.1 M: *Cn. Lentulus patriciae gentis, collega eius, cui cognomen- tum Clodiano fuit* ... Syme 1963, 55–60; Sumner 1973, 124–7.

70) As postulated by Shackleton Bailey 1991, 58, 72.

71) Note the conjecture of Taylor 2013, 206, 208 on the tribe of L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus (cos. 49).

72) See Linderski 2007, 137–8 and Taylor 2013, 392; and Kunst 2005, 21, 171–3. No certain cases are documented and not even Octavian attempted that gambit.

73) The *cognomen* occurs three times in the surviving sources. Twice in reference to the consul of 72 B.C. – Cicero, *Ad Att.* 1.19.2: *Lentulus Clodi(a)e filius* (Clodiani Sigonius); Sallust, *Historiae* 4.1 M: *Cn. Lentulus ... cognomentum Clodiano* (from Gellius, *NA* 18.4.4: *clodiano Fy : claudiano δ*). And once in relation to his son – Cicero, *In Vatinius* 27: *Cn. Lentulum Clodianum*.

74) Namely the father of Livia Drusilla, M. Livius Drusus Claudianus (*Vel-leius* 2.75.3, 94.1; *CIL* IX 3660 = ILS 124), and Tiberius (*Dio* 55.27.4: *Κλαυδιανός* with Swan 2004, 186).

75) Much has been written about the significance of the alternative forms Claudius and Clodius, see especially Münzer, 1920, 274; Allen 1937, 107–110; Hildard 1976, 425–34; Tatum 1990, 299–300 and 1999, 247–8; Riggsby 2002, 117–23; Adams 2007, 181–2; Hernández de la Fuente 2009, 29–39 with additional references.

from the plebeians ignores the fact that the majority of the plebeian Claudii of rank, including the most prominent of them all, the Marcelli, were Claudii not Clodii,<sup>76</sup> and it is possible, as Borghesi suggested, that M. Valerius Messalla Appianus (cos. 12) was given the *cognomen* Appianus precisely because Claudianus did not clearly differentiate between the various branches of the Claudii.<sup>77</sup> Plus the conviction that the so-called vulgar or rustic form of the *gentilicium* was somehow intrinsically plebeian is a misconception due to its association with Cicero's nemesis P. Clodius Pulcher, who actually affected that style years before he became a plebeian,<sup>78</sup> and in Ciceronian parlance the *gens Clodia* was the patrician Claudii Pulchri.<sup>79</sup> There is therefore no definitive evidence on the status of the biological family of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus (cos. 72, cens. 70), but nothing precludes the conclusion that he was born a patrician Claudius and that Suetonius duly included him when calculating the *honores* of the patrician *gens*.<sup>80</sup>

It is generally accepted that the additional *cognomen* of M. Valerius Messalla Appianus (cos. 12), along with the name of his presumed daughter Claudia Pulchra, signify that Appianus was a Claudius Pulcher by birth who had been adopted into the Valerii

---

76) The descendants of the only Claudius Marcellus known to have undergone an adoption, P. Lentulus Marcelli filius, used the *cognomen* Marcellinus instead of Claudianus.

77) Borghesi 1862, 416. Claudianus could denote a Claudius Pulcher (like the father of Livia Drusilla), or a Nero (like Tiberius), or even a plebeian Claudius, whereas Appianus evoked the distinctive *praenomen* Appius, which, although it was also used by the Neronēs, was particularly associated with the Claudii Pulchri.

78) The abortive attempt at a *transitio ad plebem* took place in 60 B.C. and the adoption by P. Fonteius in 59 B.C., whereas in the correspondence of Cicero his *inimicus* is already Clodius in 61 and 60 B.C. (Ad Att. 1.12.3, 13.3, 14.2.5–6, 16.4.8–9, 13, 18.4–5, 19.5–6). The tribune's brother Caius (RE no. 303), who never renounced his patrician status, is also twice called Clodius by Cicero (Ad Att. 3.17.1, 4.15.2), and both forms of the *gentilicium* were used of the tribune himself (Dio 36.14.4), his son (see ILS 882 and Ad Att. 14.13a.2 versus Ad Att. 14.13b.4), and at least one of his sisters (Clodia Metelli is Claudia in Ad fam. 5.2.6).

79) Ad Q. fr. 2.12.2, De domo 34, 116.

80) Clodianus was in a suitable age to be a biological son of C. Claudius Pulcher (cos. 92), see Sumner 1973, 20, 24, 100, 124, but he might stem from a more obscure branch of the patrician Claudii like the *rex sacrorum* L. Claudius (see Taylor 2013, 203). And it is not out of the question that he was a Claudius Nero by birth.

Messallae,<sup>81</sup> and the natural father of Appianus is usually identified as one of the two sons of Clodius' brother, C. Claudius Pulcher, either Ap. Claudius Pulcher (cos. 38), or his younger brother Appius Minor.<sup>82</sup> The only conceivable alternative would be to take Appianus as a matronymic, and suppose that Claudia Pulchra was named after her grandmother.<sup>83</sup> But it is undeniable that *cognomina*

---

81) That was the inference of Borghesi, 1862, 414–18, which has been universally endorsed (see *inter alios* Münzer 1891, 54; Degrassi 1947, 139; Hanslik 1955, 129–30, 169; Wiseman 1970, 212 and 1979, 139; Syme 1986, 57, 147, 149, 228, 243; Salomies 1992, 14; Settipani 2000, 202, 204; Baudry 2008, 459, 722; K. Wachtel and M. Heil, PIR<sup>2</sup> V 141). The reservations of Stein, PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1103 and Groag 1899, 2891, 2899, PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1116 about the paternity of Claudia Pulchra were founded on the mistaken belief that Claudia Marcella Minor married Paullus Lepidus before Messalla Appianus, but the marriages occurred in the reverse order (see Syme 1986, 147–151 and 1987, 17–18; Fusco and Gregori 1996, 226–32; and Manacorda 2014, 22–31). The conjecture of Wiseman 1970, 215–17 that Claudia Pulchra was a daughter of Marcella Maior and the wastrel son of Clodius was untenable (see Syme 1986, 149; cf. Raepsaet-Charlier, PFOS I 220–1 no. 242; Corbier 1994, 255–7) and he later abandoned it (see 1979, 139 and 1982, 61 n. 32). If Claudia Pulchra was not the daughter of Messalla Appianus, only one approach has been left untried which could account for her name and her relationship to Agrippina. If Octavia Maior and Sex. Appuleius had an otherwise unattested daughter Appuleia who married a Claudius Pulcher – perhaps Ap. Pulcher (cos. 38) or Appius Minor – their putative daughter Claudia Pulchra would have been the second cousin (*sobrīna*) of Augustus' granddaughter Agrippina. But since we know that Appianus was related to the Claudii Pulchri and was married to a niece of Augustus this hypothesis seems otiose.

82) See Münzer 1899, 2853–5 nos. 298 and 299 and Groag, PIR<sup>2</sup> C 982 and 983. The nomenclature of Claudia Pulchra requires some explanation. Borghesi 1862, 417 maintained that she was so called because she was born before the adoption of her father (so also Fusco / Gregori 1996, 230), or because Appianus wanted to name her after his natal family rather than his adoptive one. Strictly speaking, the former explanation holds good only if Appianus underwent the form of adoption known as *adoptio* (Digest 1.7.40 pr.; Caius, Inst. 1.135; Justinian, Inst. 1.12.9). If Appianus was adrogated, then any children in his *potestas* at the time of his adoption would have been transferred into the *potestas* of his adoptive father (Caius, Inst. I.107; Digest 1.7.2.2, 1.7.15 pr., 1.7.40 pr., 4.5.3 pr.; Ulpian, Epit. 8.8; Justinian, Inst. 1.11.11), and ought to have changed their names accordingly (see Linderski 2007, 136). However, already in the late Republic the Roman elite had begun to take great licence with established norms of nomenclature and the adrogation of Clodius is one of several instances where adoption had no impact on the nomenclature of the adoptee or his offspring (see Shackleton Bailey 1991, 58–9).

83) Compare Livia Iulia (PIR<sup>2</sup> L 303), the daughter of Drusus and Antonia, who was named after her paternal grandmother Livia Drusilla (and her maternal great-grandmother Iulia); and Claudius' daughter Antonia named for her paternal

with the suffix *-ianus* normally denote adoption and that matronymics of this type are far rarer prior to the First Century A. D.<sup>84</sup> After the younger son of Cato the Censor, dubbed Salonianus to distinguish him from his older paternal half-brother, the first certain instance is Sex. Nonius Quinctilianus (cos. 8 A. D.), who was the son of L. Nonius Asprenas by a sister of P. Quinctilius Sex. f. Varus (cos. 13).<sup>85</sup> In addition, since Appianus must have been born by 45 B. C., his putative mother, Claudia Ap. f., would have to have been born no later than circa 59 B. C., which would make her rather old for a daughter of Ap. Pulcher (cos. 38) or Appius Minor,<sup>86</sup> and rather late-born for a daughter of Ap. Claudius Pulcher (cos. 54).<sup>87</sup> It would be necessary therefore to posit that an otherwise unknown Ap. Claudius was her father, or else that Appianus was born when his mother was in her mid-to-late 20's thereby making her a suitable age to be a daughter of Ap. Pulcher (cos. 54) and wife of Appianus' presumed father M. Valerius Messalla (cos. suff. 32).<sup>88</sup> That is by no means impossible, but on balance it seems preferable to retain Borghesi's inference that Messalla Appianus was a Claudius Pulcher adopted into the Valerii Messallae.

---

grandmother (PIR<sup>2</sup> A 886). Note also Stilia Messallina (PFOS 731; PIR<sup>2</sup> S 865), Plautia Urgulanilla (PFOS 619; PIR<sup>2</sup> P 368), and Iunia Claudia or Claudilla (PIR<sup>2</sup> I 857; PFOS 470) whose *cognomina* recall the names of their grandmothers.

84) Adoptive nomenclature see Shackleton Bailey 1991, 53–64 and Salomies 1992, 11–14. Matronymics see Doer 1937, 95–109 and Salomies 1992, 61, 85 and 1999, 141–156, esp. 144–6.

85) L. Sestius Quirinalis (cos. suff. 23 B. C.), the son of Cicero's friend P. Sestius and his first wife Albania, is also sometimes credited with the matronymic Albanianus based on the abbreviation *Alb* on a series of stamped *tegulae*, see Shackleton Bailey 1991, 5, 88 and PIR<sup>2</sup> S 611.

86) The brothers were probably born between 80 and 75 B. C., see Rawson 1973, 238; and Kaster 1995, 143–5. Two possible daughters of Ap. Pulcher (cos. 38) are thought to have married younger men: Appianus' consular colleague P. Sulpicius Quirinius and the father of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. 10 A. D.), see PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1058 = PFOS 214 and PIR<sup>2</sup> C 1059; Wiseman 1970, 219; Syme 1986, 73, 193).

87) The two attested daughters of Ap. Pulcher (cos. 54) married Cn. Pompeius Magnus junior and the tyrannicide M. Brutus by the mid-50's (see Münzer 1899, 2886, 1920, 256, 340; Gelzer 1918, 977; Hillard 1982, 36 n. 18, 37–9; Syme 1986, 19–20; and Tatum 1991, 127–9).

88) The suffect of 32 B. C. was a *monetalis* in 53 B. C. and was born circa 80 B. C. (see RRC I 457 no. 435; Syme 1986, 228).

That being so, once Mommsen's unwarranted periodization is discarded and all the *honores* accumulated by the patrician Claudii, including Cn. Lentulus Clodianus and M. Messalla Appianus, down to Tiberius' adoption by Augustus are added up we get: 28 consulships (495, 471, 460, 451, 349, 307, 296, 268, 264, 249, 240, 212, 207, 202, 185, 184, 177, 143, 130, 92, 79, 72, 54, 38, 13, 12, 9, 7 B.C.), 4 dictatorships (362, 337, c. 292–285, 213 B.C.), 7 censorships (312, 225, 204, 169, 136, 70, 50 B.C.), 6 triumphs (268, 207, 177, 143, 33, 7 B.C.), and 2 ovations (174, 9 B.C.). That represents an exact match with the figures supplied by Suetonius minus 1 dictatorship, and it remains possible that this discrepancy is due to the gaps in the record of the dictatorship in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries. Thus although Suetonius is sometimes, not unjustifiably, taxed with being a careless and inaccurate writer, it seems that in this instance at least that imputation is undeserved. Moreover, this apparently esoteric mathematical exercise has proved instructive in other ways. It has shed some unexpected light on the status of the *magister equitum* C. Claudius Hortator, and on the backgrounds of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus (cos. 72, cens. 70) and M. Valerius Messalla Appianus (cos. 12). And it suggests that despite the complaints of Cicero and Livy about the distorting influence on Roman historiography of spurious aristocratic family traditions, the patrician Claudii were sufficiently confident in their genuine accomplishments that they felt no need to embellish them with false consulships and triumphs.

## Bibliography

- Adams, J. N., *The regional diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600* (Cambridge 2007)
- Ailloud, H., *Suétone. Vies des douze Césars. Tome II* (Paris 1961)
- Allen, W., *Claudius or Clodius*, CJ 33 (1937) 107–110
- Arce, J. / X. Dupré / J. C. Saquete, *Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus en Tusculum. A propósito de una nueva inscripción de época republicana*, Chiron 27 (1997) 287–296
- Bandel, F., *Die römischen Diktaturen* (Breslau 1910)
- Baudry, R., *Les patriciens à la fin de la République romaine et au début de l'Empire* (Université Paris Sorbonne dissertation 2008)
- Bastien, J.-L., *Le triomphe romain et son utilisation politique à Rome aux trois derniers siècles de la République* (Rome 2007)

- Borghesi, B., *Œuvres complètes* I (Paris 1862), II (Paris 1864)
- Bradley, K. R., *Suetonius' Life of Nero: An historical commentary* (Brussels 1978)
- Brennan, T. C., *The praetorship in the Roman Republic* (Oxford 2000)
- Bunse, R., *Das römische Oberamt in der frühen Republik und das Problem der "Konsulartribunen"* (Trier 1998)
- Buongiorno, P., *Ad legem Glitiam*, ZSS 132 (2015) 96–125
- Camodeca, G., *Nola: vicende sociali e istituzionali di una colonia romana da Silla alla tetrarchia*, in: *Gérer les territoires, les patrimoines et les crises. Le Quotidien municipal II* (Clermont-Ferrand 2012) 295–328
- Cichorius, C., *Römische Studien* (Berlin 1922)
- Corbier, M., *La Maison des Césars, in: Épouser au plus proche* (Paris 1994) 243–291
- Cornell, T. J., *Crisis and deformation in the Roman Republic: The example of the dictatorship*, in: *Deformation and Crises of Ancient Civil Communities* (Stuttgart 2015) 101–125
- David, J.-M., *Au service de l'honneur: Les appariteurs de magistrats romains* (Paris 2019)
- Degrassi, A., *Inscriptiones Italiae XIII.1: Fasti consulares et triumphales* (Rome 1947)
- Degrassi, A., *Fasti Capitolini* (Turin 1954)
- Doer, B., *Die römische Namengebung: Ein historischer Versuch* (Stuttgart 1937)
- Droysen, H., *Eutropi Breviarium ad urbe condita cum versionibus graecis et Pauli Landolfique additamentis* (Berlin 1879)
- Drumann, W., *Geschichte Roms II* (Berlin 1835)
- Drummond, A., *The Dictator Years*, *Historia* 27 (1978) 550–572
- Du Four, M. J., *C. Suetonii Tranquilli vita Tiberii chapters I to XXIII* (Pennsylvania State University dissertation 1941)
- Eilers, C., *Roman patrons of Greek cities* (Oxford 2002)
- Fisher, E., *Greek translations of Latin literature in the 4th century A.D.*, in: *Later Greek Literature* (Cambridge 1982) 173–216
- Fugmann, J., *Ps. Aurelius Victor. De viris illustribus urbis Romae* (Darmstadt 2016)
- Fusco, U. / G. L. Gregori, *A proposito dei matrimonio di Marcella Minore e del monumentum dei suoi schiavi e liberti*, ZPE 111 (1996) 226–232
- Gelzer, M., *Iunius* (53), RE X (1918) 973–1020
- Gordon, R. / J. Reynolds, *Roman inscriptions 1995–2000*, JRS 93 (2003) 212–294
- Gorostidi Pi, D., *Sui consoli dell'anno 13 d. C.: Nuovi dati dai fasti consulares Tusculani*, ZPE 189 (2014) 265–275
- Groag, E., *Claudius* (423, 434), RE III.2 (1899) 2891–2, 2898–9
- Hanslik, R., *Valerius* (260, 268), RE VIII. A.1 (1955) 129–31, 166–9
- Hartfield, M. E., *The Roman dictatorship: Its character and evolution* (University of California Berkeley dissertation 1982)
- Heiter, H. C., *De patriciis gentibus quae imperii Romani Saeculis I, II, III fuerint* (Berlin 1909)
- Henzen, W., *Additamentum ad tabulas triumphales Capitolinas*, *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 4 (1881) 256–258
- Hernández de la Fuente, D., *Entre Claudio y Clodio: fonética y política en la traducción de Plutarco, Luc. 21,1*, *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios Griegos e Indoeuropeos* 19 (2009) 29–39

- Hillard, T. W., *The Claudii Pulchri 76–48 B. C.: Studies in their political cohesion* (Macquarie University dissertation 1976)
- Hillard, T. W., P. Clodius Pulcher 62–58 B. C.: ‘Pompeii adfinis et sodalis’, *PBSR* 50 (1982) 34–44
- Holtzhauser, C. A., *An epigraphic commentary on Suetonius’s Life of Tiberius* (University of Pennsylvania dissertation 1918)
- Humm, M., *Appius Claudius Caecus: La république accomplie* (Rome 2005)
- Huntsman, E. D., Livia before Octavian, *Ancient Society* 39 (2009) 121–169
- Ihm, M., *C. Suetoni Tranquilli de vita Caesarum libri VIII* (Leipzig 1907)
- Igenshorst, T., *Tota illa pompa: Der Triumph in der römischen Republik* (Göttingen 2005)
- Jahn, J., *Interregnum und Wahldiktatur* (Kallmünz 1970)
- Kaster, R. A., *C. Suetonius Tranquillus. De grammaticis et rhetoribus* (Oxford 1995)
- Kaster, R. A., *Studies on the text of Suetonius’ De uita Caesarum* (Oxford 2016)
- Kierdorf, W., *Sueton: Leben des Claudius und Nero* (Munich 1992)
- Klotz, A., *Zur Geschichte der römischen Zensur*, *RhM* 88 (1939) 27–36
- Kübler, B., *Decemviri*, *RE* IV.2 (1901) 2258
- Kunst, C., *Römische Adoption. Zur Strategie einer Familienorganisation* (Hennef 2005)
- Leuze, O., *Zur Geschichte der römischen Censur* (Halle 1912)
- Linderski, J., *The auspices and the Struggle of the Orders*, in: *Staat und Staatlichkeit in der frühen römischen Republik* (Stuttgart 1990) 34–48
- Linderski, J., *Q. Scipio Imperator*, *Roman Questions II* (Stuttgart 2007) 130–174
- Lindsay, H., *Suetonius Tiberius* (London 1995)
- Lintott, A. W., *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration* (London 1993)
- Maas, M., *John Lydus and the Roman Past: Antiquarianism and Politics in the Age of Justinian* (London 1992)
- Manacorda, D., *Marcella Minore e i sepolcri della sua familia*, *Studi Romani* 62 (2014) 22–31
- Mommsen, T., *Römische Forschungen I* (Berlin 1864)
- Mommsen, T., *Res Gestae divi Augusti. Ex monumentis Ancyrano et Apolloniensi* (Berlin <sup>2</sup>1883)
- Mommsen, T., *Römisches Staatsrecht I–II* (Leipzig <sup>3</sup>1887), III.1 (Leipzig 1887), III.2 (Leipzig 1888)
- Mora, F., *Fasti e schemi cronologici: la riorganizzazione annalistica del passato remoto romano* (Stuttgart 1999)
- Münzer, F., *De gente Valeria* (Oppeln 1891)
- Münzer, F., *Claudius* (98, 122, 180, 298, 299, 304, 382, 388, 389), *RE* III.2 (1899) 2692, 2697–8, 2725, 2853–5, 2857–8, 2885–6
- Münzer, F., *Cornelius* (216), *RE* IV (1900) 1380
- Münzer, F., *Claudius* (98), *RE Suppl. III* (1918) 252–3
- Münzer, F., *Römische Adelparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart 1920)
- Münzer, F., *Livius* (12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 25, 26, 31), *RE* XIII.1 (1926) 810–14, 853–9, 881–4, 887, 890–1
- Panvinus, O., *Fasti et triumphus Romanorum a Romulo rege usque ad Carolum V. Caes. Aug.* (Venice 1557)
- Pighius, S. V., *Annales Romanorum* (Antwerp 1615)



- Pistor, H. H., *Prinzepts und Patriziat in der Zeit von Augustus bis Commodus* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1965)
- Rawson, E., The eastern *clientelae* of Clodius and the Claudii, *Historia* 22 (1973) 219–239
- Rich, J., The triumph in the Roman Republic: Frequency, fluctuation and policy, in: *The Roman Republican triumph beyond the spectacle* (Rome 2014) 197–258
- Richardson, J. H., ‘Firsts’ and the historians of Rome, *Historia* 63 (2014) 17–37
- Ridley, R. T., *Falsi triumphi, plures consulatus*, *Latomus* 42 (1983) 372–382
- Ridley, R. T., The missing *magister equitum*, *ZPE* 116 (1997) 157–160
- Riggsby, A. M., Clodius / Claudius, *Historia* 51 (2002) 117–123
- Rohde, C., *Ovatio*, *RE* XVIII (1942) 1890–1903
- Salomies, O., *Adoptive and polyonymous nomenclature in the Roman Empire* (Helsinki 1992)
- Salomies, O., Names and adoptions in ancient Rome: The possibility of using personal names for the study of adoption in Rome, *Adoption et fosterage* (Paris 1999) 141–156
- Sansone, D., Atticus, Suetonius, and Nero’s ancestors, in: *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman history IV* (Brussels 1986) 269–277
- Schamp, J., Le poète et les Claudii de la République (Jean le Lydien, *Mag. I*, 39–44), *Latomus* 59 (2000) 109–128
- Schamp, J. / M. Dubuisson, *Jean Le Lydien, Des magistratures de l’État romain. Tome 1* (Paris 2006)
- Settipani, C., *Continuité gentilice et continuité familiale dans les familles sénatoriales romaines à l’époque impériale: mythe et réalité* (Oxford 2000)
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., *Two studies in Roman nomenclature* (Atlanta 21991)
- Slater, J. H., *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Tiberii pars prior* (Amsterdam 1906)
- Suolahti, J., *The Roman Censors* (Helsinki 1963)
- Sumner, G. V., *The Orators in Cicero’s Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology* (Toronto 1973)
- Swan, P. M., *The Augustan Succession: An historical commentary on Cassius Dio’s Roman History books 55–56* (Oxford 2004)
- Syme, R., Ten tribunes, *JRS* 53 (1963) 55–60
- Syme, R., Vibius Rufus and Vibius Rufinus, *ZPE* 43 (1981) 365–376
- Syme, R., *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford 1986)
- Syme, R., Paullus the Censor, *Athenaeum* 65 (1987) 7–26
- Tatum, W. J., P. Clodius Pulcher and Tarracina, *ZPE* 83 (1990) 299–304
- Tatum, W. J., The marriage of Pompey’s son to the daughter of Ap. Claudius Pulcher, *Klio* 73 (1991) 122–129
- Tatum, W. J., *The patrician tribune Publius Clodius Pulcher* (Chapel Hill 1999)
- Taylor, L. R., *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic, with updated material by Jerzy Linderski* (Ann Arbor 2013)
- Themann-Steinke, A., *Valerius Maximus: Ein Kommentar zum Zweiten Buch der Facta et Dicta memorabilia* (Trier 2008)
- Treggiari, S., *Servilia and her family* (Oxford 2019)
- von Ungern-Sternberg, J., *Die gens Claudia: Adelsstolz und Republik*, in: *Erinnerungsorte der Antike: Die römische Welt* (Munich 2006) 290–299

- Vessey, M., Reinventing history: Jerome's Chronicle and the writing of the post-Roman West, in: *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians: Later Roman History and Culture, 284–450 CE* (Cambridge 2010) 280–290
- Vogel, F., *Diodori bibliotheca historica* (Leipzig 1893)
- Vogt, W. C., *Suetonius Tranquillus Vita Tiberii. Kommentar* (Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg Dissertation 1975)
- Wardle, D., *Suetonius: Life of Augustus* (Oxford 2014)
- Warmington, B. H., *Suetonius: Nero* (London <sup>2</sup>1999)
- Weinrib, E. J., The family connections of M. Livius Drusus Libo, *HSCP* 72 (1967) 247–278
- Werner, R., *Der Beginn der Römischen Republik: Historisch-chronologische Untersuchungen über die Anfangszeit der libera res publica* (Munich 1963)
- Wiseman, T. P., Pulcher Claudius, *HSCP* 74 (1970) 207–221
- Wiseman, T. P., Clio's cosmetics: Three studies in Greco-Roman literature (Leicester 1979)
- Wiseman, T. P., Calpurnius Siculus and the Claudian Civil War, *JRS* 72 (1982) 57–67
- Wünsch, R., *Ioannis Lydis. De magistratibus populi romani libri tres* (Leipzig 1903)
- Zevi, F. / P. Fedeli, *Fam. I, 9, 15 e il monumentum di Cicerone*, *RFIC* 141 (2013) 137–160

Sydney

Patrick Tansey