CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

The Deification of Claudius
Author(s): Duncan Fishwick
Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 52, No. 1 (2002), pp. 341-349
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3556461
Accessed: 07/05/2013 08:41

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press and *The Classical Association* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Quarterly*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Classical Quarterly **52.1** 341–349 (2002) *Printed in Great Britain*

THE DEIFICATION OF CLAUDIUS*

At first sight the ancient authorities give conflicting versions of the process by which Claudius achieved apotheosis.[1] Under the events of A.D. 54 Tacitus states that the Senate decreed celestial honours to Claudius, also that his funeral was celebrated in the same manner as that of Augustus; to all appearances the decree and the funeral are mentioned in chronological order: *caelestesque honores Claudio decernuntur et funeris sollemne perinde ac divo Augusto celebratur, aemulante Agrippina proaviae Liviae magnificentiam* (*Ann.* 12.69.4). A later passage makes no mention of the funeral itself but lists various honours decreed by the Senate: the grant of two lictors (to Agrippina) and the establishment of a priesthood of Claudius (held by Agrippina), at the same time a censorial funeral for Claudius,[2] *et mox apotheosis: decreti et a senatu duo lictores, flamonium Claudiale, simul Claudio censorium funus et mox consecratio* (*Ann.* 13.2.6). On the convincing analysis of Timpe all of these measures would have been passed by the senate following the emperor's death on 13 October, when Nero, having been hailed by the Guard at the praetorian camp, was taken to the *curia*, where he was overwhelmed *immensis honoribus* (Tac. *Ann.* 12.69.3, Suet. *Nero* 8).[3] While honours to the new ruler look to have had pride of place, there can be no doubt that on Tacitus' version the vote of *caelestes honores* to Claudius preceded his funeral. Descent from a *divus*, of course, could consolidate the claims of a usurper and the Senate would be anxious to oblige.[4]

The same sequence of events is plainly followed in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, where the debate on Olympus takes place on 13 October in the aftermath of the decision to consecrate Claudius: *quid actum sit in caelo ante diem III idus Octobris anno novo, initio saeculi felicissimi, volo memoriae tradere* (1.1).[5] The point at issue is whether what has already been decided on earth is acceptable on Olympus.[6] Diespiter, the son of Vica Pota, moves that Divus Claudius should be a god just like anyone before him who with the best justification became a god, and that a record of the matter should be added to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: *censeo uti divus Claudius ex hac die deus sit ita uti ante eum quis optimo iure factus sit, eamque rem ad Metamorphosis Ovidi adieciendam* (9.5). When the motion looks like being carried, Divus Augustus proposes that, as a punishment for his multitude of murders, Divus Claudius should rather be deported as soon as

* I am much indebted for advice and corrections to the editor and the anonymous referee.

[1] For earlier discussion, see D. Fishwick, 'Seneca and the temple of Divus Claudius', *Britannia* 22 (1991), 137–41 at 139–40.

[2] On the term *funus censorium*, see S. Price, 'From noble funerals to divine cult: the consecration of Roman emperors', in D. Cannadine and S. Price (edd.), *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Tradional Societies* (Cambridge, 1987), 56–105 at 64 (hereafter 'Funerals').

[3] D. Timpe, *Untersuchungen zur Kontinuität des frühen Prinzipats. Historia Einzelschriften* 5 (Wiesbaden, 1962), 102–5 with analysis of the hurried change of leadership in A.D. 54.

[4] For the preferment of Nero over Britannicus, see the overview of A. A. Barrett, *Agrippina. Sex, Power, and Politics in the Early Empire* (New Haven and London, 1996), 143–6.

[5] Fishwick (n. 1), 138. Followed by M. Clauss, '*Deus praesens*. Der römischer Kaiser als Gott', *Klio* 78 (1996), 400–33 at 425; id., *Kaiser und Gott. Herrscherkult im römischen Reich* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1999), 95.

[6] P. T. Eden, *Apocolocyntosis* (Cambridge, 1984), 113 on 9.5. Cf. 5.1, where Seneca remarks that the proceedings on earth are too well known to need recounting. For an overview of the debate on Olympus see Price (n. 2), 87–9, 91.

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

possible: he ought to leave heaven within thirty days and Olympus within three (ibid.).[7] On the adoption of this amendment, Mercury hurries Divus Claudius off to Hades for trial. The circumstance that, *en route* along the Via Sacra, they come across the funeral of Claudius clearly shows that according to Seneca's skit the vote for deification had come long before the funeral (*Apoc.* 12–13.1).[8] The point is confirmed by the author's sneer that you could tell at a glance that it was a god being carried for burial, so splendid was the send-off, with no effort spared: *et erat omnium formosissimum et impensa cura, plane ut scires deum efferri* (12.1).

The testimony of Suetonius, in contrast, has been taken to place the Senate's decision *after* the funeral of Claudius: *funeratusque est sollemni principum pompa et in numerum deorum relatus; quem honorem a Nerone destitutum abolitumque recepit mox per Vespasianum* (*Claud.* 45). The latter statement, it may be noted, is inexact: Nero never annulled Claudius' deification though he did pull down *prope funditus* the temple of Divus Claudius on the Mons Caelius, where it was later rebuilt by Vespasian (Suet. *Vespas.* 9).[9] Suetonius gives essentially the same account in his life of Nero, where he combines the consecration of Claudius with the eulogy spoken by Nero at his funeral: *orsus hinc a pietatis ostentatione Claudium apparatissimo funere elatum laudavit et consecravit* (*Nero* 9). Furneaux makes no reference to the evidence of Suetonius but, on his interpretation of *Annals* 13.2.6, the account of Tacitus would be closely in line since he separates the preliminary measures of the Senate from the decree of apotheosis, which he places after the funeral; Tacitus' words *et mox* would in that case refer to a later session of the Senate,[10] the funeral having intervened between the preliminary arrangements for his cult and the culminating decree of apotheosis. By and large, most later commentators have followed Furneaux's lead. Thus Griffin puts the Senate's vote of lictors and the priesthood of the new cult of Divus Claudius immediately after Nero's salutation by the praetorian cohort, the consecration itself within the next month.[11] Similarly, on Barrett's reconstruction, Nero's speech to the Senate on 19 October, the day after the funeral, included a request that his late stepfather should be deified.[12] Much the same opinion evidently lies behind Price's view that in the first

[7] For a summmary of the charges against Claudius, see Eden (n. 6), 10–11.

[8] Strictly speaking, the funeral would not have taken place until 18 October if the same plan was followed as at Augustus' funeral, since for five days after his death Augustus lay in state; cf. Barrett (n. 4), 147. Seneca is here indulging his literary licence, therefore. The same interval of five days may have been observed between the death (29 August) and burial (3 September?) of Marciana, Trajan's sister, in A.D. 112 (*InscrIt* 13.1, 201: lines 40–3 = L. Vidman, *Fasti Ostienses*[2] [Prague, 1982], 48: lines 39–43, 107). Whether in that case this deliberately copied a feature of Augustus' funeral can hardly be said. See further below, p. 348.

[9] M. T. Griffin, *Nero. The End of a Dynasty* (London, 1984), 98, 133, 137; D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West. EPRO* 108 (Leiden, 1987), 1.2.296–7, with n. 16 and bibl. (hereafter *ICLW*); R. Turcan, '*Templum Divi Claudii*', in Y. Burnand, Y. Le Bohec, and J.-P. Martin (edd.), *Claude de Lyon, Empereur romain* (Paris, 1998), 161–7 at 167, plays down the reconstruction of the temple by Vespasian: 'Si plus tard, Vespasian l'a reconstruit et rendu officiellement au cult du divus, c'est pour en faire un lieu de détente et de refraîchissement, dont Martial appréciait les ombrages' (*Spect.* 2.9–10).

[10] H. Furneaux, *The Annals of Tacitus XI–XVI* (Oxford, 1896), ii, 311, on 13.2.6, drawing on the analogy of the apotheosis of Augustus, which was not decreed until after his funeral; cf. H. Pitman, *Cornelii Taciti Annalium Libri XIII–XVI* (Oxford, 1904), 7. E. Koestermann, *Cornelius Tacitus Annalen* (Heidelberg, 1967), iii, 237–8, notes that the decree providing for the *flamonium Claudiale* presupposes the deification of Claudius and that *simul* and *mox* emphasize the interval between the preliminary decree and the vote for deification, which is mentioned almost incidentally—though not specifically after the funeral.

[11] Griffin (n. 9), 33, 96–7. [12] Barrett (n. 4), 147 with n. 17.

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

century A.D. the culmination of the funeral was the debate and decree of the Senate, based on the report of an eyewitness.[13]

I

For a resolution to this impasse one can turn to a recent study of *funus* and *consecratio* by Kierdorf.[14] Review of the uses of the term, based on the word-bank of the *ThLL*, leads Kierdorf to conclude that *consecratio* can have two possible meanings: either the general procedure of introducing a new cult or the specific act by which an emperor, for example, is deified.[15] Both senses call for brief elaboration in the context of the present enquiry.

As Weinstock points out, the consecration of a *divus* would have involved in the first place the creation of the statutes of his cult, the *lex templi*. This provided essentially for the name of the new god, his priest, and his temple: all belong together.[16] To this can be added his invocation as *propitius*, which would appear to have taken place usually after the funeral.[17] Yet, for enrolment as an official god of the state, something further was required—or at least had been until now: a witness. Caesar certainly received various divine honours before his assassination,[18] but the circumstance that a comet, popularly thought to be his soul in heaven, appeared at the games held in his honour in July 44 B.C. was a critical factor in his eventual consecration by the Senate in 42. The model was followed in the case of Augustus, whose formal deification was first raised in the Senate well after his funeral on 24 August, A.D. 14. On 17 September, Numerius Atticus, a witness well paid by Livia, swore that he had seen Augustus ascend to heaven,[19] much as Julius Proculus had testified of the deified Romulus.[20] As Bickermann has emphasized, in reacting to the testimony of a witness the Senate did not *create* Augustus a god but rather recognized that the emperor *was* a god by virtue of having gone to heaven: the decree was declarative not constitutive, and the case for deification with the decision to found a cult was based on the merits of the emperor.[21]

[13] Price (n. 2), 91.

[14] W. Kierdorf, '*Funus* und *consecratio*. Zu Terminologie und Ablauf der römischen Kaiserapotheose', *Chiron* 16 (1986), 43–69 (hereafter 'Funus').

[15] Ibid. 46–9, showing that these usages of *consecratio* are observed in references to the deification of the emperor and members of the imperial house, likewise in equivalent Greek terminology. See further Clauss (n. 5, 1999), 356–60.

[16] S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford, 1971), 390–4. Price (n. 2), 77, adds a priestly college, noting that the 'heavenly honours' could be voted singly or together to the new (therefore existing) *divus*.

[17] According to the *Vita* of Marcus Aurelius, the rite of acclamation took place *before* his funeral, an unparalleled circumstance: *denique priusquam funus conderetur, ut plerique dicunt, quod numquam antea factum fuerat neque postea, senatus populusque non divisis locis sed in una sede propitium deum dixit* (*M. Ant.* 18, 3). It follows from this episode that such an acclamation was part of the ritual of apotheosis, on Weinstock's view the concluding rite and one taken over from the long-standing ritual of the gods; cf. id., *RE* 23.1 (1957), 824–5.

[18] Fishwick (n. 9), 1.1, 56–72; Price (n. 2), 71–2; M. Beard, J. A. North, and S. R. F. Price, *Religions of Rome* 1 (Cambridge, 1998), 140–1.

[19] For the dates see *InscrIt*. 13.2.510 with sources; Eden (n. 6), 65–70; Fishwick (n. 9), 1.1, 159; Price (n. 2), 73 with n. 30, 91; R. Turcan, *Rome et ses dieux* (Paris, 1998), 206; Beard, North, and Price (n. 18), 208–9.

[20] Price (n. 2), 74; Beard, North, and Price (n. 18), 148–9.

[21] E. Bickerman, 'Consecratio', in W. den Boer (ed.), *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire romain. Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 19 (Vandoeuvres and Geneva, 1972), 3–25 at 13l; Price (n. 2), 73, 86–7.

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The same procedure was used later at the deification of Drusilla, whom the senator Livius Geminius (Geminus?) declared on oath he had seen go up to heaven (C.D. 59.11.4).

As for the specific act of consecration, this is revealed by the process of apotheosis itself.[22] In the case of Augustus the funeral was celebrated first, well before the question of deification was raised.[23] The sources report that after Tiberius had delivered the traditional public eulogy following an address by Drusus, the procession passed through the triumphal gateway and proceeded a mile north-west to the Campus Martius, where priests, knights, and praetorians marched round the pyre, the troops casting on it the decorations they had received from Augustus. Several of these details correspond to ceremonies reported at the cremation of Caesar. As a final step, the centurions of the Guard lit the pyre from below; five days later Livia gathered up the bones and placed them in the Mausoleum. The proceedings closely followed the ancient practice described by Varro *apud* Plutarch (*Quaes. Rom.* 14). The custom at funerals, he relates, was for sons to surround their father's tomb, revering this as a temple of the gods, then, when they first came across a bone, after the corpse had been incinerated, to declare that the deceased was now a god.[24] The significance of cremating the body is emphasized by the late first-century account in Diodorus Siculus of how Hercules achieved apotheosis by ascending from the burning pyre at Oeta (D.S. 4.38.3–5).[25] Similarly in the case of Caesar the crowd rioted and incinerated his body in the forum, some having tried to cremate it in the temple of Jupiter, others in the *curia* of Pompey (Suet. *Iul.* 84). An obvious point of difference is that in the myth of Hercules not a single bone was to be found, whereas the remains of both Caesar and Augustus were naturally left behind. It follows that in its technical sense *consecratio* means incineration of the corpse on the funeral pyre, the *rogus consecrationis*.

Is it possible, then, to reconcile the accounts of Claudius' deification in the literary sources in the light of either the general or the specific sense of *consecratio*?

First the evidence of Tacitus. Kierdorf proposes that *censorium funus et mox consecratio* should be taken as a coherent phrase expressing two aspects of the same measure.[26] While not excluding the technical sense of *consecratio*, he prefers the sense of *Kultbegründung* as more in line with ideas of the mid-first century. But the main point at issue is the implication of *et mox*, which Kierdorf takes to be used attributively as frequently in Tacitus.[27] The meaning would then be that the decision taken by the Senate before the funeral was to give Claudius a *censorium funus* followed—*et mox*—by the institution of his cult: 'ein Staatsbegräbnis und die anschliessende Vergöttlichung'. The decree might have been implemented, it is suggested, by erecting and venerating a cult image.[28]

Significant difficulties stand in the way of this analysis. For one thing, the Senate had already created the *flamonium Claudiale* before the funeral itself took place,

[22] On the background and development of apotheosis, see Price (n. 2), 71–82.

[23] Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.5–6, Suet. *Aug.* 100.2–4, C.D. 56.34.42. See the helpful summary of Barrett (n. 4), 147. For an overview of imperial funerals see Price (n. 2), 59–70.

[24] H. J. Rose, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch* (Oxford, 1924), 125, 174–5. On the procedure, see R. Turcan, 'Culte impérial et tradition romaine', *Histria Antiqua* 4 (1998), 99–106 at 103 with nn. 87–8, and refs.

[25] Price (n. 2), 74–5.

[26] Kierdorf (n. 14), 53–5.

[27] On the attributive use of the adverb with a noun see Kierdorf (n. 14), 54 with bibliog., n. 51, citing Tac. *Ann.* 6.31.2: *insigni familia ac perinde opibus*; cf. Livy 22.7.11: *postero ac deinceps aliquot diebus*.

[28] Kierdorf (n. 14), 52–5, 63, 68.

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

inferentially on 18 October.[29] For another it is clear from Seneca's account, noted specifically by Kierdorf, that Claudius is already *divus* on 13 October, immediately following his death,[30] that is, several days before his funeral and apotheosis by incineration. If the deceased emperor has a priest and is officially Divus Claudius, his cult is surely in existence by virtue of the decree of *consecratio*. All that the sources fail to mention explicitly in this regard is his temple and invocation. In this perspective it is difficult to see why a later *Kultbegründung* in some form should be needed at all. These objections apply *a fortiori* to Furneaux's view that the Senate did not decree deification until after the funeral.If, on the other hand, one understands the technical sense of *consecratio*, which Kierdorf would not exclude, then the formal act of deification, the burning of the pyre, seems separated by *et mox* from the funeral of which it was in fact the final act. To refer specifically to this concluding rite seems in any case out of line with Tacitus' reference to *caelestes honores* in *Ann.* 12.69.4.

In view of these difficulties it may be suggested that *simul* and *et mox* are not elements of a coherent phrase but rather mark distinct, consecutive measures. On this interpretation the Senate would have decreed a censorial funeral at the same time as the lictors (of Agrippina) and the priesthood of Claudius (to be held be Agrippina), then after an interval—*et mox*—decreed *at the same session* the consecration of Claudius. This accords with creation of his priesthood on 13 October, and also with his heavenly status later on the same day, as reported by Seneca. Presumably the priesthood was irregularly decreed first in order to keep Agrippina quiet. There is a further point. The background to the decrees of 13 October is the attempt of Seneca and Burrus to restrain Agrippina, who is nevertheless openly given *omnes honores* (*Ann.* 13.2.5). On the suggested interpretation the interval before the Senate decreed the consecration of Claudius must have been occupied by discussion of arrangements for his cult, in particular the whereabouts of the temple of Divus Claudius. As it now appears, a location on the Mons Caelius was deliberately chosen in order to make a laughing-stock of the ridiculous new god, in which case its location would have indirectly undercut the priesthood held by Agrippina.[31]

The ambiguous implications of the site have recently been brought out by Turcan,[32] who points out in the first place that the temple was clearly relegated to the perimeter of the historical and political centre of Rome in preference to areas that in A.D. 53 were still available near, say, the Capitol or the Palatine. This suggests that Divus Claudius has been deliberately sidelined, put *hors circuit*. More obviously, the Caelian hill had

[29] See n. 8.

[30] Cf. the parallel procedure with Marciana, the sister of Hadrian, who was named *diva* immediately on her death: below, n. 44.

[31] The choice of site would have been the prerogative of the Senate without reference to Agrippina. Turcan (n. 9), 164–5 suggests that, as Suetonius attributes the beginning of construction to her initiative (Suet. *Vesp.* 9.1), she may nevertheless have suggested the site on the pretext of respecting the Etruscan connections of Claudius but in reality to spite the man whom she had just murdered—or who had opportunely died a natural death, whatever the facts may have been: see Barrett (n. 4), 140–2. In any event the Senate seized the opportunity to locate the temple where it would in fact ridicule Divus Claudius. Most of Agrippina's building is lost, but it seems clear that the original temple, while rebuilt by Vespasian, was on a scale that matched the magnificence with which she had celebrated Claudius' funeral in emulation of Livia's extravagant obsequies of Augustus (Tac. *Ann.* 12.69.4). Energetic promotion of the cult of Divus Claudius suited Agrippina's political purposes, of course. On the remains of the temple of Divus Claudius, see Barrett (n. 4), 148–50.

[32] Turcan (n. 9), 161–7. For the point that temples of the *divi* were positioned as a rule on prominent sites, see Price (n. 2), 77–8.

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

ambiguous Etruscan associations. According to Tacitus, the place had been occupied by an Etruscan chief, Caeles Vibenna (*Ann.* 4.65.1), whom Claudius transforms in the Lyons tablet into a comrade-in-arms of Servius Tullius. On this version of the tradition the hill was named *a duce suo* by Servius Tullius, a stranger who as king of Rome instituted the census and included other strangers in the city. Turcan suggests that in establishing an Etruscologist, apparently himself of Etruscan descent,[33] on a hill that had been the stronghold of an Etruscan bandit, the Senate would in practice have been mocking Claudius, who as censor extended citizenship wholesale (cf. *Apoc.* 3.3). On a more vicious level the Mons Caelius was notorious for its meat market and brothels,[34] establishments suited to Claudius' low tastes, so the new god will have been well lodged to indulge his vices. Quite clearly the choice of location was intended to perpetuate the bad image of the deceased emperor which his enemies were anxious to parade, and the malicious humour of the site can hardly have been lost on those in the know. 'Dans l'Antiquité, cette espèce de relégation du "dieu Claude" sur une butte étrusque, non loin d'un marché aux victuailles et en compagnie des filles de joie, avait de quoi susciter l'hilarité.'[35]

If, then, the evidence of Tacitus can be explained in terms of a decision, taken before the funeral, to institute the cult of Divus Claudius, how is one to understand the two references in Suetonius? One of these refers to *consecratio* on the conclusion of burial rites so plainly employs the term in a technical sense (*Nero* 9). We know from the account of Tacitus that in performing the obsequies of her deceased husband Agrippina emulated her great-grandmother Livia by copying the form followed at the funeral of Augustus. In that case the eulogy, delivered by Nero in a polished address written by Seneca, will have preceded the departure of the cortège for the Campus Martius. But Suetonius records that, when Claudius had been carried out in a magnificent funeral, Nero praised *and consecrated* him (*Nero* 9): the *laudatio* and *consecratio* seem to belong together in the context of the funeral ceremonies, an impression reinforced by the apparent absence of any conjunction in the earliest manuscripts.[36] Everything indicates, then, that Nero carried out the rite as a result of which Claudius was enrolled among the gods (*Claud.* 45). What exactly he did is not recorded but analogy with later practice suggests that he might have set fire to the *rogus* of consecration, and conceivably also declared Claudius a god as Varro describes (above, p. 344).

In support of this proposal it may be noted that, in reporting the funeral of Septimius Severus, Herodian states that at the ceremony of apotheosis the heir to the principate takes a torch and lights the pyre. Once the structure catches fire an eagle is released, taking the soul of the dead emperor from earth to heaven, after which he is

[33] Turcan (n. 9), 163–4 with refs.

[34] Turcan (n. 9), 165–6, citing R. Valentini and G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della Città di Roma* 1 (Rome, 1940), 92–3 with n. 1. *Curiosum Urbis Romae Regionum XIII cum brebiariis* [*sic*] *suis, Regio II Caelemontium*, lines 12–14: *Claudium* | *Macellum Magnum* | *Lupanarios* [for Luparios]; 166. *Notitia Urbis Regionum XIIII cum breviariis suis, Regio II Caelemontium*, lines 6–8: *Templum Claudii* | *Macellum Magnum* | *Lupanarios* [for Luparios]; 209 with n. 1. Regional Catalogue of Pomponius Laetus (see 193–9), *Regio II Caelemontium*, lines 2–5: *Templum Claudii* | *Macellum Magnum* | [*Campus Martialis*: misplaced] | *Lupariae*.

[35] Turcan (n. 9), esp. 165ff. with references, arguing that the market opened by Nero would in all probability have been a project of Claudius.

[36] The Teubner edition of M. Ihm, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli de Vita Caesarum Libri VIII* (Leipzig, 1907), 236 reads *laudavit <et> consecravit*, noting that Roth supplied *et* from ς, whereas the Roman *editiones principes* of 1470 (*praefatio* lxi) read *consecravitque*.

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

worshipped with the rest of the gods (4.2.10–11). The account seems to describe standard procedure, though our two other descriptions of imperial funerals are divergent on this point. In the case of Pertinax, Dio reports that the consuls set the pyre ablaze (74.5.5), but here of course the circumstances were different. Pertinax, deserted by the army, had been assassinated several months earlier and his successor, Julianus, overthrown by Septimius Severus, so in this instance there was no heir to play the part. The appointment of consuls may have been a conciliatory gesture designed to restore some normality after the confusion of recent events.[37] The more interesting case is that of Augustus, whose *rogus* was kindled by centurions of the Praetorian Guard. As Augustus had left a book of instructions on how his funeral was to be celebrated, this looks like an attempt to keep the troops loyal. Tiberius was, of course, a stepson reluctantly adopted for the sake of the empire. In contrast, Nero was a direct descendant of Augustus as well as the adopted son of Claudius, and therefore better qualified to play the role that Varro ascribes to sons in ancient practice. To have consecrated Claudius by firing his pyre would have been entirely consistent with Nero's reported display of filial piety.[38]

As for the other passage in Suetonius, while the formula *in deorum numerum relatus* can certainly refer to a senatorial decree on occasion,[39] the phrase can be used in a wider context without reference to the Senate. Of particular interest are Suet. *Iul.* 88: . . . *atque in deorum numerum relatus est* . . . *et persuasione volgi*; Cic. *De Nat. Deor.* 1.29: *Quid Democritus, qui tum imagines eorumque circumitus in deorum numero refert* . . . ? See further, for example, *CIL* I^2.189: . . . *appel[atus]q(ue) est indigens* | *[pa]ter et in deo[rum n]umero relatus* (re Aeneas). In the light of these texts there seems to be no difficulty in taking Suetonius' reference in *Claud.* 45 as a loose, general reference to the deification of Claudius at the conclusion of his burial rites.[40]

II

If this analysis is correct, it follows that Tacitus and Suetonius report different steps of the same procedure. Whereas the evidence of Tacitus refers to the vote of *consecratio* by the Senate, the account of Suetonius relates rather to the rite that completed the process of deification. Far from being inconsistent, therefore, the two main authorities are complementary in recording successive stages of Claudius' deification.

An important consequence of this conclusion is that the current picture of how the deification process evolved is in need of adjustment. As presently understood, in the first century A.D. the vote of the Senate succeeded cremation as the sources document in the case of Augustus, later too of Drusilla,[41] and required the services of a witness.

[37] Price (n. 2), 61; C. R. Whittaker, *Herodian* 1. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA, 1969), 382, n. 1.

[38] For the piety of Tiberius towards Augustus, see Price (n. 2), 81 with n. 52 on Velleius Paterculus 2.126.1. On the roots of deification in traditional Roman *religio*, see Turcan's survey (n. 24), 102–4.

[39] See, for example, Suet. *Iul.* 88: *periit sexto et quinquagensimo aetatis anno atque in deorum numerum relatus, non ore modo decernentium, sed et persuasione volgi*; *CIL* 9.2628 = *ILS* 72 (Aesernia): *genio deivi* [*sic*] *Iuli* | *parentis patriae* | *quem senatus* | *populusque* | *Romanus in* | *deorum numerum* | *rettulit*; *SHA, Pertinax* 14.10: *sed cum ipse a militibus desertus iam esset, per senatum et populum Pertinax in deos relatus est.*

[40] Kierdorf (n. 14), 55 with n. 54. See further Clauss (n. 5, 1999), 520–1.

[41] On the death (10 June) and consecration (23 September) of Drusilla in A.D. 38, see P. Hertz, '*Diva Drusilla*', *Historia* 30 (1981), 324–36. See further Kierdorf (n. 14), 58–9, 62, 68.

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

In later times, however, a senatorial decree conferring apotheosis (*consecratio*) looks to have come first,[42] *before* the *funus imperatorium*.[43] This was certainly the case with Marciana, the sister of Trajan, who according to an entry in the Fasti Ostienses was granted the title of *diva* immediately after her death on 29 August, A.D. 112, five(?) days prior to her funeral.[44] Presumably this became regular procedure now that practically all emperors with many of their wives and offspring were deified.[45] The decree of the Senate had become constitutive and from now on there is no mention of a witness in the principal sources.[46]

The apotheosis of Pertinax is different. In the first place he was not deified at death since he was removed by the usurper Didius Julianus. According to Dio, the Senate bestowed divine honours on Pertinax at the time Julianus was sentenced to death and Severus named emperor (74.17.4). Similarly the *Vita* of Pertinax states that, when Julianus himself was deserted by the soldiers, a decree of the Senate and the people placed Pertinax among the gods. As for the funeral, this was held under Septimius Severus at a time when Pertinax had been accorded the 'full approval' of the Senate,[47] so it is clear from both accounts that the decision of the Senate would have preceded the funeral in this instance also. In contrast, the *Vita* of Severus makes no mention of the senatorial decree but states that, after a censorial funeral was given to the effigy of Pertinax, Severus elevated him to a place among the *divi* and gave him besides a *flamen* and *sodales Helviani*.[48] Dio, too, mentions various cult honours to Pertinax that

[42] Kierdorf (n. 14), 49–53, 64–9; Clauss (n. 5, 1999), 363–8.

[43] The funeral rites also changed with the evolution of the pyre into a truncated pyramid in several stages like that of Hephaistion, the companion of Alexander (D.S. 17, 115). Descriptions in Dio (75.4.2–5, 5) and Herodian (4.2) give essentially the same account of the funerals of Pertinax and Septimius Severus, when events culminated in the lighting of the pyre and release of an eagle from its summit to symbolize the ascent of the deceased's soul. With this feature added there was no longer any need for a witness, who in fact is not heard of after the funeral of Drusilla. A different point at issue is whether the symbolic cremation of the emperor's waxen image was preceded by the burial of his body in line with what had become common practice by the second century. For discussion, see Price (n. 2), 96–7; Kierdorf (n. 14), 43–5 with numerous references. For present purposes the more important feature is that incineration remained the key to deification as before. Just as Hercules had ascended from the burning pyre, so on Dio's testimony cremation made Pertinax immortal (C.D. 75.5.5). Similarly in regard to the ceremony of apotheosis Herodian reports the belief that the emperor's soul, symbolized by the soaring eagle, ascended to heaven from the blazing pyre, even though what was incinerated in this instance was an effigy (4.2.11).

[44] *IIII k. Septembr.* | [*Marciana Aug*]*usta excessit divaq(ue) cognominata.* | [*Eodem die Matī*]*dia Augusta cognominata. III* | [*non. Sept. Mar*]*ciana Augusta funere censorio* | [*elata est . . .*]. See further Kierdorf (n. 14), 50, 66–7.

[45] Price (n. 2), 87. A senatorial decree evidently preceded the funeral of Marcus Aurelius, who was acclaimed a propitious deity by the senate and the people, acting not in separate places but meeting together. See above, n. 17.

[46] Price (n. 2), 92 with n. 70; Kierdorf (n. 14), 59, 62–3, noting the absence of a witness already in the case of Livia.

[47] *Sed cum ipse quoque a militibus desertus iam esset, per senatum et populum Pertinax in deos relatus est. Sub Severo autem imperatore cum senatus ingens testimonium habuisset Pertinax, funus imaginarium ei et censorium ductum est, et ab ipso Severo funebri laudatione ornatus est* (*SHA, Pertinax* 14.10). The phrase *ingens testimonium* seems exaggerated if referring simply to a decision to grant a censorial funeral but would be appropriate to a decision resulting from the 'trial' of the deceased on whether he merited apotheosis. See *OLD* 1932, s.v. *testimonium* (3).

[48] *Funus deinde censorium Pertinacis imagini duxit eumque inter divos sacravit, addito flamine et sodalibus Helvianis . . .* (*SHA, Sev.* 7.8). Presumably the meaning is that Severus consecrated Pertinax by having the consuls light the pyre, then made appointments to the priesthood and sodality created by the prior decree of the Senate. *Contra* Price (n. 2), 82–3, placing the decree of the Senate after the funeral.

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Severus brought in after he was established in power; these are mentioned before the funeral, though it is not clear that they preceded the funeral (C.D. 75.4.1). In any event it would appear that by the third century what counted was the emperor's decision (cf. *SHA*, *Geta* 2.8–9). Similarly after Severus himself died at Eboracum his sons demanded that the Senate include him among the *divi*. Whether this was done before or after the funeral is not made clear by the sources.[49]

What the above analysis now reveals is that the procedure had already changed by the deification of Claudius in A.D. 54.[50] In the first place there is no mention of a public witness to Claudius' ascension.[51] Part of the snide humour of Seneca's skit is that he claims to have heard of the business transacted in heaven from Livius Geminius (Geminus?). Livius could not help seeing everything that went on in heaven since he was curator of the Appian Way, along which Divus Augustus and Tiberius had gone to join the gods, but he had made such a fool of himself by swearing to Drusilla's ascension that he would not even report in public a murder in the middle of the forum (*Apoc.* 1.2–3). Quite clearly, then, neither he nor anyone else, if one may judge from the silence of the sources, testified to Claudius' apotheosis. Secondly, Seneca's opening sentence in the *Apocolocyntosis* clearly states that the heavenly debate took place on 13 October, the day of Claudius' death; as analysis of the text makes clear, this was following the Senate's vote of deification, and therefore well before the funeral, a point corroborated by Tacitus as interpreted above. It would appear, then, that Drusilla was the last public figure who is known to have been deified after her funeral (C.D. 59.11.2–4) and that the practice of voting celestial honours immediately upon death, before the funeral of the deceased, was already operative in A.D. 54. Whether there was ever a return to the earlier practice on some later occasion is not directly in evidence.[52] Thin though it is, the evidence that we have points decidedly in the opposite direction.

University of Alberta DUNCAN FISHWICK

[49] *Ipse a senatu agentibus liberis, qui ei funus amplissimum exhibuerant, inter divos est relatus* (SHA, Severus 19.4). Herodian's account of the deification of Septimius Severus mentions neither the senatorial decree nor the demand of his sons (4.2).

[50] Kierdorf (n. 14), 56–61. [51] *Contra* Bickerman (n. 21), 16.

[52] The case of Pertinax is not entirely certain. See above, pp. 348–9.

This content downloaded from 194.80.178.246 on Tue, 7 May 2013 08:41:18 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions