

## THE AEDUI, TROY, AND THE *APOCOLOCYNTOSIS*<sup>1</sup>

In his *Galic War* Caesar tells us that the Roman Senate had frequently recognized the Aedui as 'brothers and kinsmen'.<sup>2</sup> This statement, though *prima facie* rather odd, is fully supported by Caesar's contemporaries, Cicero and Diodorus Siculus, and a number of later authorities.<sup>3</sup> Ihm was of the opinion that the Aedui were recognized as 'fratres consanguineosque' because they were the first tribe in Gallia Comata to enter into alliance with Rome.<sup>4</sup> However, no ancient authority supports this view<sup>5</sup> and it is hardly sufficient to explain the notion of blood relationship implied by these titles.

In fact the rationale behind this notion is, I suggest, to be found in a line and a half of Lucan (1.427-8):

Arvernique, ausi Latio se fingere fratres  
sanguine ab Iliaco populi . . .

Since the Arverni are not previously attested as 'fratres', whereas their neighbours the Aedui are recorded as such, it may be argued that Lucan has confused the two tribes;<sup>6</sup> the slight similarity of their names and their geographical propinquity

<sup>1</sup> I am greatly indebted to Joyce Reynolds for her generous and apposite advice. All responsibility for the views expressed is, of course, my own.

<sup>2</sup> 'Aeduos fratres consanguineosque saepe numero a senatu appellatos': *B.G.* 1.33.2. Caesar repeats the fact on several occasions (cf. *B.G.* 1.36.5; 43.6; 44.9). It may well be that he stressed the brotherhood of the Aedui and Romans so as to help justify his campaign against Ariovistus, who was himself a *rex socius et amicus populi Romani* (cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome* (1967), p. 14; M. Gelzer, *Caesar: Politician and Statesman* (transl. 1968), p. 107); this campaign provides the immediate context for Caesar's repetition of their titles.

<sup>3</sup> Cic. *ad Fam.* 7.10.4; *ad Att.* 1.19.2; Diod. 5.25.1; Strabo 4, p. 192; Plut. *Caes.* 26.3; Tac. *Ann.* 11.25.1-2; Eumenius, *pro inst. schol.* 4; *Paneg. Lat.* 8.21.2; 5.2.4; 5.3.1.

<sup>4</sup> *R-E Bd.* I (1894), col. 475.

<sup>5</sup> Strabo 4, p. 192 comes closest: οἱ δὲ Αἰδοῦοι καὶ συγγενεῖς Ῥωμαίων ὠνομάζοντο καὶ πρῶτοι τῶν ταύτη προσήλθον πρὸς τὴν φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν. However, no causal connection may be imputed to these two facts: Strabo simply lists them. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 11.25.1-2.

<sup>6</sup> I find that C. E. Haskins (ed.), *Lucani Pharsalia* (1887), p. 25, and O. Hirschfeld, *Kleine Schriften* (1913), pp. 186-208 (= *SPAW* 9 (1897), pp. 1099-1119) and again in

*CIL* XIII (1899), p. 400, long ago imputed this confusion to Lucan *contra* Th. Birt, *Rb.M.* 51 (1896), p. 523, whom C. Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule*, III (1909), p. 143 n. 7 follows, without argument. The case *contra* Birt is strengthened by Tacitus who tells us that the Aedui were the *only* Gauls called *fratres* (*solii Gallorum: Ann.* 11.25.2), against which Birt urges Lucan's *ausi*: he suggests that the Arverni *claimed* to be Rome's *fratres* but were recognized as such neither by Rome nor by Tacitus. *Paneg. Lat.* 5.2.4-3.1 also stresses the singular nature of the Aeduan relationship with Rome (*primi omnium* in this passage need be no more than a general reference to Aeduan ascendancy). Haskins and Hirschfeld are obliged to argue further that the attribution of a Trojan origin to the Arverni in the writings of Sidonius Apollinaris is to be explained by his reading Lucan and compounding his 'error'; linguistic similarities make it plain that Sidonius was, at the very least, *aware* of Lucan 1.427-8 (*Sid. Ap. Pan.* 7.39-41; *Ep.* 7.7.2), but *Ep.* 2.2.19 suggests that he was perhaps not alone in his belief. There seems to be no evidence of any tribal link between the Aedui and Arverni that might solve this problem: their only relationship seems to have been one of hostility and rivalry (*Caes. B.G.* 1.31.3).

C. Jullian, as we have seen, was familiar with this dispute and assigned the Aedui a Trojan legend *as well as* the Arverni (*op.*

would go some way towards accounting for the error. If this argument can be accepted, we therefore have in Lucan an explicit reference to a link between the notion of the Aedui as 'fratres' of the Romans and the legend of Troy. The Trojans, it seems, could be considered as the common ancestors of the Aedui and the Romans: the notion of blood relationship becomes immediately explicable. If confusion is on the other hand not to be accredited to Lucan—and I am reluctant so to accredit it—the present argument is ultimately little affected: if we believe the Arverni to have been called 'fratres' on account of their supposed Trojan blood, it may reasonably be inferred that the Aedui were given the same title for the same reason.

Further support for the relevance of the Trojan legend to these Aeduan titles may be gleaned from Caesar and Diodorus, both of whom regard the blood relationship as of some antiquity:<sup>7</sup> a Trojan past would be antique enough. A later source may also help:

Nunc [sc. civitas Aeduorum] sibi redditum vetus illud Romanae fraternitatis nomen existimat, cum te [sc. Constantium] rursus habeat conditorem (*Paneg. Lat.* 8.21.2).

The author connects Aeduan 'fraternitas' and Constantius' re-foundation: it may be that we are to understand that Aeduan 'fraternitas' was connected with the other, original foundation recalled by 'rursus'. A Trojan founder may be suggested: 'brotherhood' between states was regularly based upon connected foundation legends.<sup>8</sup>

Ammianus Marcellinus provides further evidence of a legendary connection between Gaul and Troy. He tells us explicitly that when Troy was sacked by the Greeks some Trojans who managed to escape fled to Gaul:

cit., p. 28 n. 2). Even so, later scholars by and large remained in the dark (E. J. Bickermann, *C.Ph.* 47 (1952), 73–6 is a notable exception): most significantly perhaps, T. Rice Holmes, who in his *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (2nd edn., 1911), p. 58, saw the title *fratres* as a reward for fidelity (a view for which there is no ancient authority); the same author's *De Bello Gallico* (1914) shows no advance.

<sup>7</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.43.6: *docebat etiam, quam veteres quamque iustae necessitudinis ipsi cum Aeduis intercederent* . . . Diod. 5.25.1 refers to a *συγγενείαν παλαιάν*.

<sup>8</sup> Compare Lampsacus' claim to *ἀδελφότης* with Massilia through Phocaea (Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 591). Note also the *ἀδελφότης* of Lystra and Pisidian Antioch, both colonies of Augustus (*OGIS* 536). Cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica*, I (1940), pp. 56–9; II (1946), pp. 145–6; *BCH* 101 (1977), pp. 130 n. 219.

A recently discovered treaty between Aphrodisias, Cibyra, and Tabae contains the notion of *ἀδελφότης*: perhaps the result of their being founded by three brothers (I must thank Joyce Reynolds for

making this text available to me; it was excavated by K. T. Erim of New York University with grants from the National Geographic Society; see Joyce Reynolds *Aphrodisias and Rome* (forthcoming)). Compare the idea that the Jews and Spartans were *ἀδελφοί* because of their common descent from Abraham (Jos. *A.J.* 12.226; A. Momigliano, *Prime Linee della Tradizione Maccabaica* (1931, repr. 1968), Ch. 4).

See also F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. II (1967), p. 52, on Pol. 7.9.4, with the references there cited: add D. Musti *Sull'idea di συγγένεια in iscrizioni greche*, *ASNP* series 2. 32 (1963), pp. 224–39. Rather later, cf. *Amm. Marc.* 17.5.3 and 10 with P. de Jonge, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XVII* (1976), pp. 134–5. In general, cf. E. J. Bickermann, *Origines Gentium*, *C.Ph.* 47 (1952), pp. 65–81.

In the West, in Gaul itself, we should note the *fraternitas* between the Suessones and the Remi (Caes. *B.G.* 2.3.5); compare the Cimbri and Teutones (Plut. *Mar.* 24.2–4) and note Massilia's role in Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 591.

Aiunt quidam paucos post excidium Troiae fugitantes Graecos ubique dispersos loca haec [i.e. Gaul] occupasse tunc vacua (Amm. Marc. 15.9.5).

Gardthausen, Mommsen, and Sontheimer are all agreed that Ammianus is here drawing upon Timagenes, whom he has cited by name just above at 15.9.2. According to the Suda, Timagenes was brought to Rome as a prisoner by Pompey and lived on into the reign of Augustus. We can therefore trace a tradition of the arrival of Trojans in Gaul, at an appropriately early stage (N.B. 'tunc vacua'), back into the first century BC.<sup>9</sup> This accords with the arguments presented above: that the notion of 'fraternitas' in the relationship of the Aedui and Rome rests upon and is to be explained by a legendary common descent from the Trojans.

Tacitus, recounting Claudius' introduction of Gauls from Comata into the Senate in AD 48, tells us:

... primi Aedui senatorum in urbe ius<sup>10</sup> adepti sunt. Datum id foederi antiquo et quia soli Gallorum fraternitatis nomen cum populo Romano usurpant (Tac. *Ann.* 11.25.1-2).

Given the suggested common Trojan origin of the Romans and Aedui, which, on the present argument, lies behind this 'fraternitatis nomen', we may propose that the erudite Claudius<sup>11</sup> singled out the Aedui in this way in an attempt to palliate the odium incurred by his introduction of Gauls from Comata into the Senate, for they could be held to be 'fellow-Trojans'. Claudius was certainly alive to Rome's Trojan past and was prepared to act upon it: he granted full immunity to the people of Ilium on the grounds that they were the founders of the 'gens Romana' and 'consanguineos' of the Romans.<sup>12</sup>

Armed with these arguments we may now turn to what is usually known as Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*. At *Apoc.* 6.1 the goddess Febris introduces Claudius to Hercules, who has been sent by the gods to investigate the strange phenomenon that has arrived in heaven; that is, Claudius. She says:

Lugduni natus est, Marci municipem<sup>13</sup> vides. Quod tibi narro, ad sextum decimum lapidem natus est a Vienna, Gallus germanus. Itaque quod Gallum facere oportebat, Romam cepit. Hunc ego te recipio Lugduni natum ubi Licinus<sup>14</sup> multis annis regnavit.

Claudius is depicted as a full-blooded Gaul from Lugdunum (in fact his real birthplace). Lugdunum is suitably degraded by having its position fixed only in relation to its old rival Vienna, thereby implying its inferiority to that town.

<sup>9</sup> On Ammianus' sources for this section and the views of modern scholars see P. de Jonge, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XV 6-13* (1953, repr. 1972), pp. 47-9.

<sup>10</sup> On the so-called *ius honorum* see A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (2nd edn., 1973), pp. 234-6, 239, 265-7. Also R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), I, pp. 459-60.

<sup>11</sup> See A. Momigliano, *Claudius: the Emperor and his Achievement* (repr. 1961), pp. 1-19.

<sup>12</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 12.58.2 with Furneaux ad loc.; Suet. *Claud.* 25.3, on which see M. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies*

*bellenistiques* (1935, repr. 1969), pp. 46 ff.

<sup>13</sup> C. F. Russo, *Divi Claudii 'Αποκολοκύντωσης* (5th edn., repr. 1967) ad loc. plausibly suggests that this refers to Marcus Antonius; for a fuller discussion see A. P. Ball, *The Satire of Seneca on the Apotheosis of Claudius* (1902), p. 181. We are perhaps expected to recall that M. Antonius was Claudius' maternal grandfather and received honours from him (Suet. *Claud.* 11.3). On Claudius and Lugdunum see Syme, *Tacitus*, p. 460 n. 6.

<sup>14</sup> The detail about Licinus cleverly portends Claudius' supposed slavery to his own freedmen when emperor.

Claudius is described as a Gaul again at *Apoc.* 7.3 in another pun: 'gallum in suo sterquilino plurimum posse'. In this satire, therefore, Claudius' position is ambiguous: he is both Roman emperor and Gaul.

The council of the gods before which comes Claudius' case is modelled upon the Senate at Rome, as commentators have seen.<sup>15</sup> It is a Senate composed of gods behaving like Roman senators. Giving the ambiguities full rein, we can therefore see the case of Claudius before the divine Senate, on one level, as the case of a Gaul before the Roman Senate.

Claudius' 'case' is his application to become a god, which seems to entail becoming a divine senator.<sup>16</sup> As we have seen, however, there is a central ambiguity here: not only is Claudius an emperor seeking to leave the ill-defined, half-way status of *divus*; he is a Gaul seeking to become a Roman senator. Moreover, Claudius the Gaul may have an ill-defined, intermediate position parallel to that of Claudius the emperor as a *divus*: he may have Roman citizenship without the opportunity of becoming a Roman senator.<sup>17</sup>

At this point we must return to the recorded actions of Claudius in real life. As we have seen, in AD 48 Claudius introduced Gauls from Comata into the Senate at Rome;<sup>18</sup> Tacitus records senatorial opposition to this move.<sup>19</sup> It might have been a little surprising if this action had not been picked out for ridicule in the *Apocolocyntosis*, a work which ridicules so much that senators might have found objectionable in Claudius' reign. As it is we can now see that his introduction of Gauls into the Senate has indeed been satirized in this work. Claudius the Gaul comes before the Senate seeking admission and is refused thanks to the opposition of Augustus, the model emperor.<sup>20</sup> This is an implicit criticism of the introduction of Gauls into the Senate by the real-life Claudius. The satirist has achieved this effect by putting Claudius in the shoes of the Gauls he had admitted and having *his* request for admission denied on the motion of the imperial paradigm, Augustus himself.

Inversion of this sort is a standard satirical feature in the *Apocolocyntosis*. In real life Claudius was said to have been a slave to his freedmen; after death he in fact becomes a freedman's slave.<sup>21</sup> In life Claudius was said to enjoy gambling; after death it is a means of his punishment.<sup>22</sup> Again, in life Claudius had given judgement with only one side of a case heard; on his own day of judgement his side of the 'case' is not heard.<sup>23</sup> It is entirely apposite that Claudius' admission

<sup>15</sup> Ball, pp. 195–219; Russo, pp. 86–107.

<sup>16</sup> Augustus has clearly become a divine senator as well as a god (*Apoc.* 10). For a useful guide to the literature on deification in the *Apocolocyntosis* and other relevant material down to that date see M. Coffey, *Lustrum* 6 (1961), pp. 239–71. M. Griffin, *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (1976), p. 129 is sensible on this topic. Our author clearly distinguishes the status of one deified from that of a god at *Apoc.* 9.5: 'censeo uti divus Claudius ex hac die deus sit ita uti ante eum quis optimo iure factus sit . . . '.

<sup>17</sup> There is no reason to suppose that such a position would have any legal basis: the present argument can tell us nothing about a *ius honorum*.

<sup>18</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.23–5; cf. *ILS* 212.

<sup>19</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.23.2–7.

<sup>20</sup> So, correctly, Griffin, *Seneca*, p. 130.

<sup>21</sup> Suet. *Claud.* 28–9.1; cf. *Apoc.* 15.2.

That Claudius is termed a *Saturnalicus princeps* is partly to be explained in this connection: at the Saturnalia slaves became masters and masters slaves. The same joke, used in the same connection, is reported by Dio (60.19.3). Claudius is also said to have restored the fifth day to the Saturnalia (Dio 60.25.8).

<sup>22</sup> Suet. *Claud.* 33.2; cf. *Apoc.* 14.4–15.1. Further, the Saturnalia was the only period when dicing was strictly legal: another aspect of *Saturnalicus princeps* (cf. *OCD*<sup>2</sup> s.v. Dicing (Moritz)).

<sup>23</sup> Suet. *Claud.* 15; 29.1; Dio 60.28.6;

of Gauls into the Senate should be ironically turned back upon him in the same way. Indeed, in this case there may be a further dimension to the humour: the satirist may be suggesting that Claudius had introduced Gauls to the Senate because he was himself a Gaul. The capture of Rome laid at his door at *Apoc.* 6.1 can thus be given added meaning: it is Gallic infiltration as well as Gallic sack.

We must now return finally to the Aedui. As we have seen, Claudius is depicted as a Gaul from Lugdunum. Gallia Lugdunensis was the home of the Aedui. Moreover, Lugdunum itself was founded on the land of the Segusiavii, a lesser tribe under Aeduan domination.<sup>24</sup> It may just be, therefore, that when Claudius is said to have come from Lugdunum, the satirist intends us to understand rather specifically that he is a Gaul of that area and, therefore, perhaps, still more specifically, an Aeduan.

On the present argument, the Aedui could claim a common ancestry with Rome through Troy. This may be relevant to the *Apocolocyntosis*. When Claudius tries to introduce himself to Hercules at *Apoc.* 5.4, he rather bombastically quotes two lines of Homer:<sup>25</sup>

'Ιλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσευ  
ἐνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλῳ ἔπραθον ὥλεσα δ' αὐτούς.

If we take the first line at face value it is rather otiose, being no more than an excuse for the second, wherein lies the joke. However, if we take the first line as an erudite allusion on Claudius' part to his birth in an area of Gaul which claimed descent from the Trojans, it gains a great deal. Febris immediately dismisses Claudius' claims as 'mera mendacia' and proceeds to dub him a full-blooded Gaul ('Gallus germanus': note the pun) and to affirm the distance between the Rhône (Lugdunum) and the Xanthus (Troy). This also gains a great deal if we understand the first line as a reference to Claudius' birthplace. On this interpretation Claudius claims a Trojan origin for at least part of Lugdunensis and is mocked by Febris for so doing, for she rejects the claim entirely, calling him a 'Gallus germanus': he is of pure Gallic stock with no Trojan blood at all, she says. Further, if these arguments are accepted, Febris' position may be taken as an implicit criticism of Claudius' admission of Gauls to the Senate, which, as we have seen, may have been justified by an appeal to a common Trojan origin.

Admittedly, a good deal of this interpretation rests upon speculation. We do not know to what extent Gallic claims to Trojan descent were understood in the mid-first century AD, nor do we know how important a factor such claims had proved in AD 48 when Claudius introduced Gauls into the Senate. We do have a number of clues, however, which tend to support the interpretation presented above. Claudius was prepared to justify political action by reference to Rome's Trojan heritage and we are told that he singled out the Aedui in AD 48 partly because of their 'fraternitatis nomen'; a fact which Tacitus seems to have felt required neither elaboration nor explanation. Moreover, we know that Claudius was prepared to delve back into the past to justify his introduction

cf. *Apoc.* 14.2, where Aeacus explicitly makes the point that Claudius is suffering precisely as he had made others suffer.

cf. 1.10.5; 7.64.4; Plin. *N.H.* 4.107.

<sup>25</sup> On Claudius' fondness for citing Homer cf. Suet. *Claud.* 42.1.

<sup>24</sup> Strabo 4, p. 192; Caes. *B.G.* 7.75.2;

of Gauls to the Senate. We may add that our author Seneca's nephew, Lucan, was aware of Gallic claims to 'fraternitas' with Rome, albeit in a slightly garbled form perhaps.<sup>26</sup> It is, therefore, probable that our author might expect his audience to catch allusions which to the modern reader prove subtle and elusive.

*Churchill College, Cambridge*

D. C. BRAUND

<sup>26</sup> Suet. *Claud.* 25.3; Tac. *Ann.* 11.25.  
1-2; *Ann.* 11.24; *ILS* 212; Lucan 1.427-8.