

The Statue Bases of Claudius

A Reassessment of *The Portraiture of Claudius*

by Meriwether Stuart¹

Jakob Munk Højte



Meriwether Stuart observed in 1938 in the introduction to his study on the portraits of Claudius: “Problems have arisen in the study of the extant portraits whose solution eludes the evidence they furnish. For supplementary evidence the long neglected record of non-extant portraits must be searched”. His study contained, apart from a traditional catalogue of portraits in marble and bronze, a collection and discussion of all the different types of evidence relevant to the subject: literary sources, coins, papyri, and as a novelty the first systematic compilation of inscriptions pertaining to statue bases and other types of monuments designed to carry sculptural representations of Claudius.² The epigraphic material, being close to three times as numerous as the preserved portraits, was by far the largest body of evidence and the one to yield the most interesting information. They offered for the first time answers to questions about geographical distribution, chronological distribution and occasions and motives for erecting imperial statues, which hitherto had been left largely to guesswork.

Although the results of Stuart’s investigation of the epigraphic material were remarkable, this approach has never received the attention it deserves among scholars of Roman imperial portraiture. The following year, Stuart published a *corpus* of statue bases of the Julio-Claudian emperors,³ and a few years later a study along similar lines concerning the relatives of Augustus appeared.⁴ More recently studies of the portraits of Sabina, the Late Roman emperors, Julia Domna, Caligula and Hadrian have included epigraphic material.⁵ However, Stuart’s work remains the most thorough and consistent attempt at using this type of evidence to address issues related to the erection of imperial statues.

In the intervening 65 years, the study of imperial portraits has advanced immensely and has become a highly specialized field with increasingly more sophisticated typologies and dating schemes based on details in the reproduction of the hair. The first comprehensive treatment of the portraits of Claudius since Stuart still awaits publication,⁶ but Stuart’s catalogue has long been outdated both with regard to the number of entries and to the method of identifying and categorizing the portraits. Similarly, much new




Fig. 1. Marble portrait of Claudius in Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, inv. no. 1423.

epigraphic evidence has been published.⁷ Stuart enumerated 104 inscriptions from statue bases; today they number 156, an increase of 50%. This increase necessitates a reassessment of Stuart's results, and as will be shown, the currently available evidence on central points leads to different conclusions.

Geographical distribution

The geographical distribution of the statue bases in Stuart's study showed that the distribution of imperial portraits was much wider than could be assessed from the extant portraits, which for the most part derive from Italy. Bernoulli's groundbreaking study from 1886⁸ had almost exclusively dealt with portraits found in Italy, and Rome in particular. Even though several portraits had been found outside the Italian peninsula in the fifty years between Bernoulli and Stuart, three quarters of the portraits in Stuart's catalogue originated in Italy. The distribution of the statue bases was exactly the opposite, with three quarters originating in the provinces. As a consequence, production centres outside Rome and Italy with a substantial capacity must

Region	Number of bases	% of total
Italia with Sicilia and Sardinia	39	25.0
Northern frontier provinces	8	5.1
Spain and Gaul	21	13.5
Western North Africa	11	7.1
Greece with Cyrene	31	19.9
Asia Minor	45	28.8
Eastern provinces and Egypt	1	0.6

Fig. 2. The geographical distribution of the statue bases of Claudius.

have existed to supply the local demand for imperial portraits. Today even more portraits from the provinces are known but they still constitute a minority.⁹ At least three factors have contributed to the overrepresentation of Italian material among the extant imperial portraits. First of all, marble, being more durable than bronze, was always more favoured for honorary statues in the Latin West than in the Greek East. Secondly, imperial portraits in private contexts are known primarily in Italy, and marble busts which because of their high durability constitute a considerable portion of the preserved portraits seem to have been the favoured medium for private display.¹⁰ Finally, in Italy there has been a strong tradition for collecting ancient sculpture which goes back at least to the 15th century, whereas marble sculpture in many other parts of the Roman empire until well into the 19th century was likely to end up in the limekilns.

The new material has not significantly changed the list of provinces with statue bases of Claudius.¹¹ The provinces of Alpes Maritimae, Cilicia, Sardinia et Corsica and Tarraconensis have each been included with one inscription.¹² However, the inscriptions from Alpes Maritimae and Tarraconensis had already been noted by Stuart, who listed them as doubtful.

The relative importance of each region has remained largely unchanged since Stuart's study even though the rate of publication of epigraphic material has not been the same everywhere. The material from Asia Minor, which was poorly published at the time Stuart wrote, has in some areas received more attention in recent years, but this has not resulted in a significantly larger percentage of statue bases. It is still, however, the area with the most statue bases, with Italy second and Greece third. These constitute the three major centres. There are almost an equal number of bases east and west of the traditional linguistic dividing line through the Adriatic, but 57% of the inscriptions are in Latin, since sixteen inscriptions in Latin have been found in the eastern half of the empire, and only one in Greek in the western half. Bilingual inscriptions have been found in Ephesos and Sagalassos.¹³



Fig. 3. Statue base for Claudius in the Agora of Athens with cuttings typical for a bronze statue on the top.

A few curiosities concerning the geographical distribution are worth pointing out. In Cyprus an abundance of Julio-Claudian, particularly Tiberian, statue bases have been found, but so far none for Claudius.¹⁴ In Gaul, the Julio-Claudian emperors apparently enjoyed great popularity if we are to judge from the number of statues dedicated. Claudius, a native of Lugdunum, is no exception. Together with Tiberius, statue bases for Claudius are the most frequently encountered of all emperors. After the reign of Claudius, there is a large gap in the series of imperial statue bases in Gaul. In Narbonensis, for example, only one base is known from the hundred years following the base for the Divus Claudius in Arles,¹⁵ and in Belgica a base for Claudius is the last for an emperor in that province until the third century AD. The same tendency can be observed for the preserved portraits, although not quite to the same extent.¹⁶

Stuart did not discuss how the non-extant portraits relate to the extant ones, or to what extent the documentary sources are representative of what was originally set up. It seems that he took for granted that the evidence of the documentary sources was applicable to the portraits as well.¹⁷ Survival of epigraphic evidence, however, requires the presence of a stone suitable for cutting inscriptions, just as the survival of portraits requires the presence of and preference for marble over bronze. In areas where stone suitable for cutting inscriptions was not quarried locally, built-up bases covered with bronze sheets were a good alternative to imported stone, and these natural-

ly have as little chance of surviving as the accompanying bronze statues. This is the case in many regions of the northern part of the empire, where most of the relatively few known bronze bases have been found,¹⁸ including one for Claudius in Augustomagus in Lugdunensis,¹⁹ where our knowledge of imperial statue bases is meager. The use of bronze plaques for inscriptions was however not restricted to areas without stone suitable for inscriptions, as shown by the finds of bronze plaques for statue bases for Claudius in Herculaneum and in Rome.²⁰

Even if the epigraphic material does not tell the complete story of the distribution of imperial portraits in antiquity, its evidence is certainly much more reliable than that offered by the portraits themselves. The relative importance of each region as a market for imperial statues therefore deserves to be taken into account in any discussion of how the production and distribution was organized. The portraits of provincial manufacture, which are often treated parenthetically in studies of imperial portraiture, may have in fact been the norm rather than the exception.

Chronology

The statue bases can, contrary to the portraits, often be dated very precisely because of the titles, offices and epithets frequently found in the imperial name in the dedicatory inscription. 56% of all the inscriptions including pre-accession and posthumous statue bases contain internal criteria for dating. Among the bases set up during the reign of Claudius 52.4% can be dated more precisely. 42% of the inscriptions can be dated to specific years, mostly on the basis of the tribunician count, and another 10.4% can be dated within a limited period within the reign. These are for the most part dateable because the bases have been found together with ones for family members which supply a shorter date range. There is a very clear linguistic difference in the percentage of dateable bases. 75% of the Latin inscriptions and only 30% of the Greek are dateable, since the Greeks generally were not interested in the Roman *cursus*, preferring traditional epithets like *σωτήρ* and *εὐεργέτης* instead.

Stuart's interest in the documentary sources concerning the erection of portraits of Claudius was twofold: 1) to establish the chronological distribution of the dedications throughout the reign independently of the preserved portraits themselves in order to obtain an objective criteria for dating the portraits, and 2) to investigate which occasions caused the erection of portrait statues and what motives the dedicator had. Stuart's primary source was the epigraphic evidence but the literary and papyrological testimony was included in the discussion of the chronology as well. Consequently one document, the London Papyrus 1912, which mentions eight or more statues of Claudius set up in Alexandria in AD 41 or 42, had a considerable impact on the conclusions drawn from the chronological distribution of the docu-




Fig. 4. The chronological distribution of the statue bases of Claudius.²¹

mentary evidence. Stuart calculated that 46.5% of the dateable evidence belonged to the period AD 41-43 and “the significance of this percentage for the extant portraits seems obvious. Approximately half of them should date from the first three years of Claudius reign. And most of the types of Claudius’s portraits should go back to this period”.²² This is stretching the evidence. The present *corpus* of epigraphic material from the statue bases has an overrepresentation for the period AD 41-43 much lower at 28% of the material. With an even distribution throughout the reign, it ought to be 20%, since Claudius ruled for approximately fifteen years. Thus, there is no reason to suppose, as Stuart did, that half the portraits of Claudius should be dated within the period AD 41-43.

Regarding the question of the number of portraits of the young Claudius, no new pre-accession statue bases have come to light. This contradicts the situation for the portraits since many new specimens supposedly have been identified.²³ Although the provenience of the so-called “arch at Pavia” still remains a mystery,²⁴ its inscription at any rate constitutes our only evidence for portrait statues of Claudius during the reign of Augustus. In a senatorial decree of AD 19 concerning the posthumous honours for Germanicus, preserved in the *Tabula Siarensis*, one of the honours is an arch to be erected in the *Circus Flaminius*.²⁵ The document describes the inscription on the front and the statue group on the attic with statues of Germanicus in a triumphal chariot; Drusus, his father; Tiberius, his brother; Antonia, his mother; Agrippina, his wife; Livia [Livilla], his sister, and, just before Germanicus’s children are mentioned (here only referred to as his sons and daughters), his brother Claudius. Although he was the emperor’s nephew and for a long period the closest adult male relative, this is the only evidence

of statues of Claudius during the reign of Tiberius. From the reign of Caligula, we know of two bases: one in Pola and one in Alexandria Troas.²⁶ Considering that the average ratio between extant bases and portraits of approximately two to one,²⁷ we should expect very few pre-accession portraits of Claudius to exist. Even if we allow for a different distribution pattern for portraits of members of the imperial family, since the reason for setting up statues of them may have been somewhat different, portrait statues of Claudius could by no means have been common before his sudden and unexpected elevation to power in AD 41.²⁸ The reasons for erecting a statue of a young or (during the reign of Caligula) middle-aged prince must have been related to his role in the dynastic policies or in anticipation or appreciation of benefactions. On both counts Claudius seems to fall behind other male members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, whose statue bases are encountered much more frequently.²⁹

The number of posthumous dedications, on the other hand, has risen considerably to nine and they now account for 5.8% of the total.³⁰ This brings the evidence for statues of Divus Claudius in accordance with the number of statue bases for the following *Divi*, for whom between ten and thirteen are known.³¹

The extant portraits and the non-extant portraits, represented by the statue bases, constitute two separate excerpts of what was originally set up – the portraits being of marble and deriving predominantly from Italy, whereas the bases have a much wider distribution and often carried images of bronze. Only in two instances do the two excerpts overlap: the bronze statue and base from Herculaneum and the high relief with inscription from the *sebasteion* in Aphrodisias.³² Despite this, the chronological distribution of the bases within the reign most likely applies to the portraits as well. This is rendered probable by the fact that the length of the reign is not a factor in determining the ratio between extant portraits and bases, which for most emperors during the first two centuries AD amounts to approximately two bases for each portrait. If there was a difference in the chronology of the two excerpts – for example a certain form of portraits being produced primarily in the beginning of the reign, we would expect a difference between Nerva who only reigned one year and four months and Antoninus Pius who reigned nearly twenty-three years. Since this is not the case, the chronological distribution of the two excerpts must have been approximately the same. Thus, the evidence of the statue bases can be employed to determine the chronological distribution of the portraits of Claudius.³³

Occasions for erecting statues of Claudius

In his analysis of the occasions for setting up statues of Claudius, Stuart took for granted that there was a close connection between events related to the emperor and the dedication of statues. In many instances, however, this

assumption easily leads to an overinterpretation of the evidence. A statue set up in AD 48/9, for example, could have been inspired by the downfall of Messalina and the marriage to Agrippina, but not necessarily, as is evidently the case with the statue found in Herculaneum set up that year *ex testamento*.³⁴

Stuart noted that there were very few portrait statues of Claudius in existence before AD 41 and, probably as a consequence of this, that "Claudius's accession gave a strong impulse to the erection of his portraits."³⁵ However, it was not the first year of his reign that produced large quantities of statues; it was the second. On these grounds, Stuart concluded that the administration was unconcerned about the speedy or widespread distribution of the imperial portrait, a phenomenon noticeable to all the Julio-Claudian emperors. The administration's active involvement should allegedly only have begun with the rapid succession of emperors in AD 69 without the legitimacy of a Julio-Claudian ancestry.³⁶ The theory rests primarily on Tacitus's references to statues of Galba and Vitellius within a very short period of their accession³⁷ and on third century and later sources.³⁸ Tested against a large body of epigraphic material it proves incorrect. For Vespasian, Domitian and Trajan the accession of the new emperor did not give impetus to a rapid and wide distribution of imperial portraits.

Stuart pointed out the fact that most of the dedications in the first two years of his reign were made by communities rather than by individuals, and considered this as a confirmation of the belief that showing loyalty to the emperor by erecting his image immediately upon accession was a highly motivating factor for communities.³⁹ Stuart enumerated thirteen public dedications and only three by private individuals in the first two years of the reign, but the figures need revision. In the present *corpus* the statue bases of AD 41-42 were dedicated by nine communities, one corporation, and five private individuals with one more private individual and four corporations in AD 43,⁴⁰ and the argument concerning the composition of the dedicators is thus not as strong as believed by Stuart, although there is still an overrepresentation of public dedications among the early bases.

The peak in AD 42 is significant, but there could be an explanation other than the wish or even duty of communities to pay their respects to the new emperor by erecting his image.⁴¹ After Caligula was overthrown there must have been a substantial number of monuments and statues of Caligula available for reworking at a favourably low expense, and furthermore in the cities there must have been a number of public places in every city which looked conspicuously empty after the removal of Caligula's statues. The reason why the dedications took place in AD 42 rather than 41 could be that city magistrates awaited instructions from the new administration in Rome as to how they should treat the images of the previous emperor. The removal and reuse of portraits and inscriptions had many precedents, but none had the

same judicial and religious implications as those of the imperial image.⁴² While the evidence for re-use of inscriptions for Caligula is limited to the arch in Thugga,⁴³ perhaps because new bases were relatively inexpensive, there are several examples of portraits of Caligula remodelled into the likeness of Claudius⁴⁴ and in most instances a mere swapping of heads was necessary to bring portrait statues into current fashion.

Some fifty years later, following the murder of Domitian, the chronological distribution of the statue bases of Nerva show some of the same tendencies as for Claudius: few dedications the first year and then a very large number the following.⁴⁵ It is of course impossible to say how things would have developed had Nerva not died after having reigned for only sixteen months, but judging from the number of dedications to Trajan in the first years of his reign, the high figure for Nerva would not have lasted long.⁴⁶ During the first years of Vespasian's reign, however, there are relatively few dedications of statues even if the bases for Vespasian, Titus and Domitian are added up, although there must have been an abundance of statues of several different emperors ready for re-use. Perhaps communities and individuals had become very cautious; Vespasian was after all the fifth emperor in just over one year.

In most studies of imperial portraits military success figures among the most important occasions for erecting statues, and Claudius, who had no prior military experience and owed his position to the intervention of the praetorian guard during the uncertainty following the murder of Caligula, relied heavily on military support, as seen in several reverse types on the coinage⁴⁷ and in the unsurpassed 27 imperial acclamations. Direct reference to military engagements, however, can only be found in two inscriptions belonging to arches set up in Rome and Kyzikos.⁴⁸ Among the other inscriptions that probably belong to arches of Claudius,⁴⁹ the one set up in Rome may have been associated with the British campaign. It is one of four dedications made in AD 43 by corporations, some of which undoubtedly profited from the military operations in Britain by acting as suppliers for the army.⁵⁰ Furthermore, the two arches in Verona set up in AD 44 may have been inspired by the triumph in AD 43. Possibly Claudius even visited the city on his way back to Rome.⁵¹ In fact, four out of five dateable arches were set up in AD 43/4 and 51/2, the years of the most important victories in Britain. There is a slight increase in the number of dedications in these particular years (Fig. 4), which to a large extent can be explained by these arches. The number of ordinary statue bases, however, does not rise significantly. That the inscriptions referring to military activities belong to arches is hardly surprising. Honorific arches and city gates dedicated to the emperor were more closely connected to victories and imperial visits than ordinary statue bases.⁵²

The importance of military exploits during Claudius's reign does not seem to have encouraged military personnel to erect statues either. None of the bases were dedicated by military units, but these are admittedly rare among the dedicators under the Julio-Claudian emperors.⁵³ Three bases were set up by officers and of these only [...]glitus Barbatus could still be on active duty. Both C. Norbanus Quadratus and [...]essus Seneca's dedications were testamentary and C. Norbanus Quadratus had left his military career for civic office.⁵⁴

Important occasions for erecting statues connected to Claudius's private life occurred in AD 41 with the birth of Britannicus, an heir to the throne, and with the events following the downfall of Messalina in AD 48: the marriage to Agrippina⁵⁵ and the betrothal of Octavia to Nero in AD 49 and finally the adoption of Nero in AD 50. The birth of Britannicus within weeks of Claudius's accession was overshadowed by this event, and the one statue group associated with the birth of Britannicus cannot have been set up before AD 43.⁵⁶ Infants sometimes appear in Julio-Claudian family groups, but with the possible exception of the statue group on Thasos of Julia and Livia holding her granddaughter Julia⁵⁷ nothing suggests that childbirth was an occasion for erecting dynastic statue groups.⁵⁸ London Papyrus 1912 refers to groups of statues to be set up in AD 42 consisting of Claudius and his family, but none of Claudius's children are mentioned by name.

Stuart observed that the period after the downfall of Messalina was "marked by the impetus given the erection of Claudius's portraits by his marriage with Agrippina", but the six inscriptions referred to as results of the new alliance in fact all antedate the marriage which took place early in AD 49.⁵⁹ The adoption of Nero in AD 50 neither aroused enthusiasm for erecting statues of Claudius, as the year has the least bases of any apart from AD 54, which Claudius did not live throughout (Fig. 4). Stuart proposed that this was a result of Claudius's alleged modesty in private affairs,⁶⁰ but perhaps imperial statues generally were not meant to commemorate such occasions.

Strack's identification of a new portrait type on coins of Trajan, supposedly in connection with his *decennalia*,⁶¹ has had a great influence on the study of the portraits in the round, and anniversary types have been proposed not just for Trajan, the "*Dezennalienbildnis*", but for several other emperors who reigned more than ten years. The *decennalia* has so far not been suggested as the reason for the third portrait type of Claudius, the "*Typus Turin*", whose similarity to the portraits of the young Nero could indicate that they were conceived together on the occasion of the adoption.⁶² The *decennalia* has, however, been seen as an obvious occasion for showing loyalty towards the emperor by erecting his portrait. So far no consensus has been reached about the exact moment and duration of an emperor's *decennalia*. One suggestion is that it occurred sometime between the *dies imperii*

nine years after the accession and the end of the tenth year.⁶³ For Claudius this corresponds approximately to the year AD 50 in which only one base can be dated with certainty,⁶⁴ and in this case the anniversary can thus not have been a cause for erecting statues of Claudius. The other possibility, that the *decennalia* started only after the completion of the tenth year,⁶⁵ brings the celebration into the year AD 51 to which three inscriptions can be dated with certainty. However, one of these, the arch spanning the *Via Lata*,⁶⁶ celebrates Claudius's Britannic victory rather than the *decennalia*. Further research must show whether anniversaries can be documented as occasions for erecting statues of other emperors.

Apart from the large number of dedications in the early part of the reign clearly inspired by the accession of the new emperor, there is remarkably little evidence pointing towards a close relation between events related to the emperor and the dedication of his portrait statues. One possible explanation for the rather uniform number of statue bases throughout the reign could be that the occasions were related not to the emperor whose statue was set up, but rather to the dedicator of the statue.

Dedicators

Even though the inscriptions seldom state the motives for erecting the imperial statue directly, the cause can sometimes be inferred from the identity of the dedicator. Of the 156 inscriptions from statue bases for Claudius, thirty-eight are in a state of preservation that does not allow us to determine whether a dedicator was named or not. Of the remaining 118 only sixteen (14%) specify no dedicator, and it is certainly a possibility that the identities of the dedicators of these monuments were obvious in their original context, either because the location dictated it or because the dedicator was mentioned in a separate inscription associated with the statue base. The dedicators of the remaining 102 inscriptions are divided almost evenly between public and private.

Communities or their executive bodies are mentioned in fifty inscriptions or 42%. It is not always clear whether public funds actually paid for the statue, or whether an executive body simply authorized the use of public space for the dedication. The well-known expression *l(ocus) d(atatus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* leaves no doubt as to the private nature of the monument, but the shorter, more common *d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* is more elusive. Generally it indicates a public dedication, but there are examples of statues paid for by individuals.⁶⁷ Four of the seven inscriptions for Claudius set up by decree of the *decuriones* specify that public funds were used, while the remaining three contain no further information.⁶⁸ Similarly, in Greek inscriptions, cities decide to set up statues (twenty-eight examples), but may leave it to one or more *ἐπιμεληταῖο* to carry out the work.⁶⁹ Due to the brevity of the inscriptions the function of the *ἐπιμελητής* is often not entirely clear. Did they, for exam-

ple, sometimes take the initiative themselves or were they appointed, and were they expected to pay for the dedication out of their own pocket or were public funds supplied? Normally the ἐπιμεληταὶ were office holders, which could indicate that office holders were obliged to display munificence, as is well documented in North Africa. An inscription from Tralles is particularly illustrative in this respect.⁷⁰ The city dedicated the statue, but the inscription informs us that it was paid for by Tiberius Claudius Diogenes at the time he was *gymnasiarchos*. Clearly he intended the monument to glorify his own achievement as well.

Only four inscriptions from public dedications offer precise information as to the motive for setting up the statue of Claudius. Two belong to the above-mentioned arches commemorating Claudius's Britannic victories. The other two were set up by the city of Volubilis because Claudius had granted Roman citizenship to its inhabitants. The first could have been set up to commemorate this event, while the other was a posthumous dedication.⁷¹ Sometimes epithets like saviour and benefactor allude to imperial benevolence, but the exact nature of the gifts, if indeed there were any, almost always elude us.⁷² Exceptions are the unusual epithet νεὸς κτίστης in the inscription from Samos, which probably refers to reconstructions paid for by the emperor after the earthquake of AD 47,⁷³ and σωτήρ καὶ εὐεργέτης in an inscription from Kos.⁷⁴ Claudius seems to have had good relations with Kos also prior to the grant of *immunitas* in AD 53,⁷⁵ and the Koans dedicated more statues of Claudius than of any other emperor.⁷⁶ The use of the epithets εὐεργέτης and σωτήρ in inscriptions found in Koroneia and Patara is more curious, since the background for the dedications was far from favorable.⁷⁷ The dedication of the statue in Koroneia by the league of Achaeans, Phoceans, Euboeans, and Boeotians occurred shortly after Claudius had returned the province of Achaea to the senate in AD 44,⁷⁸ an event not likely to have been of benefit to the provincials, and the one in Patara was set up only two years after Claudius had deprived the cities of Lykia their freedom and put the province under the administration of a *pro praetor* because of internal strife.⁷⁹ However, as London Papyrus 1912 clearly illustrates, honorary statues could be used to mitigate the anger of a displeased emperor.

Corporations were responsible for seven statue bases (6%) and individuals for forty-five (38%). Among these the most obvious explanation for the time and occasion for the dedication is offered by the four dedications made *ex testamento*.⁸⁰ Two of them were gifts from soldiers, while the other two inscriptions offer no information about the deceased.

The profession or the public office of the dedicator can give a clue as to the motive for erecting the emperor's portrait. Two points are worth noting in this connection: 1) the dedications seem to take place while the dedicator is holding office, and 2) the most active group consists of priests, particularly priests in the imperial cult, who had a personal interest in promoting the imperial worship.

A curiosity among the statue bases of Claudius is the numerous dedicators, mostly Greeks, who because of their name Tiberius Claudius seem to have received Roman citizenship from Claudius.⁸¹ Newly enfranchised citizens figure among the dedicators of statues of other emperors but never in such numbers. This is probably to be explained by Claudius's generosity in granting citizenship, and we can expect that at least some of these statues were set up as a result of the newly acquired status of the dedicator.

One last monument worth mentioning is the *sebasteion* in Aphrodisias.⁸² On the two porticoes flanking the processional way from the *propylon* to the temple, reliefs were placed between the columns in the two upper stories. On the northern portico personifications of conquered peoples and cosmic figures are depicted, on the southern portico mythological scenes and members of the Julio-Claudian family. Two reliefs show Claudius vanquishing Britannia and Claudius clasping hands with Agrippina. Beneath the reliefs on a panel the names of the depicted are written in the nominative case as a caption for the scene. Although the monument falls outside the definition of a statue base and the portraits are not in the round, I have decided to include the relief with the associated inscription in the catalogue.⁸³ The original dedicators of the southern portico and the temple were two brothers, Diogenes and Attalos, and the latter's wife Attalis, but repairs after an earthquake including the reliefs showing Claudius and his family were carried out by Diogenes' son Tiberios Claudios Diogenes, who had received citizenship from Claudius as the inscription on the architrave on the south portico informs us.⁸⁴

The fact that at least 86% of all the inscriptions specify who donated the statue gives some idea of the importance attached to such monuments by their dedicators. Erecting a statue was a costly affair, and great care was taken to ensure that the publicity such a display afforded was used to its full potential. Although specific references to the occasions for erecting the statues are rare, there are several indications that in many instances the events leading to the dedication related to the dedicator rather than to Claudius.

Conclusion

When Stuart wrote his treatise on the portraits of Claudius, he could only suspect that the chronological distribution of the documentary sources had any bearing on the preserved portraits. With the availability of comparative studies today and evidence of the constant ratio between statue bases and portraits, we can say with great certainty that the chronology of the statue bases applies to the portraits as well. The available data belonging primarily to late first and second century AD emperors point to a ratio of about two statue bases for each preserved portrait.⁸⁵ The ratio for Caligula seems to be an exception to the rule. According to Boschung there are fewer statue bases than preserved portraits of Caligula.⁸⁶ Likewise, the evidence for Augustus




Fig. 5. The chronological distribution of all statue bases for reigning emperors from Augustus to Commodus.⁹⁰

indicates a fairly low ratio,⁸⁷ but the historical background for both these emperors – Augustus’s extraordinary position as founder of the principate and Caligula’s fall from power and the subsequent removal of monuments commemorating him – could very well have distorted the figures. It is interesting, therefore, that the ratio for Claudius corresponds closely to the evidence for the Flavian emperors and the emperors of the second century AD, with ratios close to 2:1. According to A.-K. Massner there are in the vicinity of eighty-five portraits identifiable as Claudius,⁸⁸ which together with the 156 statue bases gives a ratio of approximately 1.8:1.⁸⁹

We learn from the chronological distribution of the statue bases that portrait statues of Claudius were erected continuously throughout the reign. The accession of the new emperor gave some impetus to the erection of his portraits (28% of the bases date to the first three years of his reign), but other occasions traditionally believed to offer motives – military exploits, anniversaries and family-related events – seem to have been of minor importance. On the other hand, a number of inscriptions indicate that the occasions instead were closely related to the dedicator of the statue, whether a city or a private individual.

The frequency at which statues of Claudius were erected is remarkably high compared to other first century AD emperors. 10.3 statue bases of Claudius are preserved for each year of the reign, a level that, apart from the short reign of Nerva, was not reached again until the reign of Hadrian. Naturally, the figures for his immediate predecessor and successor – Caligula and Nero – are unreliable due to the removal of monuments after

their deaths, but the frequency for Caligula at least seems to have been fairly high. From Tiberius, with 5.4 statue bases per year, to Claudius the frequency almost doubled. Since the geographical area in which the statues were set up remained largely unchanged, it is within the same cities that increased pressure or perhaps rather enthusiasm for erecting portraits of the emperor was felt.

The frequency of imperial statue bases during the first two centuries of the principate (Fig. 5) recalls that of the general evolution of the epigraphic habit of the Roman Empire as presented by MacMullen.⁹¹ In this case, however, it concerns not only the epigraphic habit but even more so the sculptural habit, since the inscriptions were after all only of secondary importance to the imperial statues. On the otherwise gently rising curve of the frequencies from the reign of Augustus and into the second century AD, the reign of Claudius stands out as a particularly active period. Perhaps a combination of the stability of the period and the favourable economic situation created an ideal climate for individuals and communities to show munificence and loyalty towards Rome and the emperor by erecting his statue – a climate that was dramatically changed in the late 60s only to return under the adopted emperors.

Notes

1. Stuart 1938.
2. For definition and identification of statue bases see, Stuart 1938, 13-14.
3. Stuart 1939, 601-617.
4. Hanson & Johnson 1946, 389-400.
5. Carandini 1969; Stichel 1982; Fejfer 1985; Boschung 1989; Evers 1994.
6. A.-K. Massner, who is currently working on *Die Bildnisse des Claudius. Das römische Herrscherbild I 5*, has kindly supplied me with information about the number and format of the portraits included in her catalogue.
7. Menichetti (1983-84, 188-192) made a cursory survey of the inscriptions published after 1938 and briefly discussed the chronology of the bases. However, his revised list is far from complete, and a number of the included inscriptions do not belong to statue bases of Claudius.
8. Bernoulli 1886, 327-355.
9. Updated figures will hopefully appear soon in Massner (forthcoming). Until then the most important recent studies are: Balty 1963, 97-134; Fittschen 1973, 55-58, no. 17; Jucker 1981, 236-316; Massner 1982, 135-139, 159-160; Menichetti 1983-1984, 182-226.
10. For display in private contexts, see Neudecker 1988.
11. See the revised catalogue at the end of this article.
12. *CIL* XII, 5; *SEG* XX, 69; *CIL* X, 7515; *CIL* II, 3105.
13. Ephesos: *SEG* XXXIX, 1178. Sagalassos: *CIL* III, 6871.
14. Augustus: *SEG* XX, 241. Tiberius: *IGRR* III, 933, 941-943; *CIL* III, 12140; *JHS* 9 (1888) 260, no. 14; Pouilloux et al. 1987, nos. 132-133. Caligula: *SEG* XXX, 1633. Nero: *IGRR* III, 971; Pouilloux et al. 1987, no. 134, 136.
15. *CIL* XII, 666. The following is a base for Hadrian (*CIL* XII, 1797) presently placed next to the church in St. Jean-de-Muzols.

16. Apart from the imperial portraits from the Chiragan Villa, whose original context is unknown – they could have been secondary imports in the late antique period – the portraits of emperors in Gaul in the hundred years after Claudius are Domitian (re-cut from Nero) in Vaison-la-Romaine; Trajan in Avignon, Musée Calvet; Hadrian in Vaison-la-Romaine; Hadrian in Nevers, Musée Lapidaire no. 84; Antoninus Pius in Toulouse, Musée Saint-Raymond (from Béziers) and Antoninus Pius in Bourges Mus. There exist no fewer than ten portraits of Augustus alone! (Boschung 1993, 206).
17. Stuart 1938, XIV, 41.
18. Driehaus 1969, 424-436; Boon 1980, 98-101. In Vienne, Mus. Beaux-Arts, there is a fine example of a bronze statue of a *privatus* found along with a dedicatory inscription on a bronze plaque (France-Lanord 1960, 93-104).
19. Piganiol 1959, 450-457 (with photo of the inscription); Wuilleumier 1984, 147-148, no. 357.
20. Herculaneum: *CIL* X, 1416. Rome: *CIL* VI, 40307. The inscription on the last-mentioned marble plaque was originally engraved on bronze plaques, as shown by the presence of the duplicate inscription *CIL* VI, 40334.
21. The inscriptions are divided into three categories. 1) inscriptions dateable to specific years. 2) inscriptions dateable within a limited period within the reign. These are distributed evenly within the date range. 3) inscriptions which cannot be dated more precisely within the reign or in the case of posthumous inscriptions any time after AD 54. These are evenly distributed throughout the reign as well. This “conservative” method tends to flatten the curve while distributing them according to the distribution of the dateable inscriptions, will accentuate the differences. It is difficult to determine which is the more correct method to use. Since two thirds of the undated inscriptions are Greek, the dateable Greek inscriptions should perhaps accordingly weigh more. These have a distinct chronological distribution with more bases towards the end of the reign. The eighteen dateable Greek bases are, however, too limited a sample to be statistically significant.
22. Stuart 1938, 40-41.
23. Balty 1963, 97-134.
24. *CIL* V, 6416. Rose 1990, 163-168. For a rejection of Rose’s theory, see *CIL* VI, p. 4301.
25. *Tab. Siar.* I, 1-21. Gonzales 1984, 58-59. Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.83) mentions the arch and the content of the inscription but not the statue group.
26. *CIL* V, 24; *CIL* III, 381.
27. See below and Højte 1999, 228-229.
28. For Tacitus’s personal reflections on the prospects of Claudius becoming emperor, see Tac. *Ann.* 3.18.
29. See Stuart (1938, 42) for statue bases for Britannicus; Stuart (1939, 601-617) for Tiberius, Caligula, and Nero, and Hanson & Johnson (1946, 389-400) for Gaius and Lucius Caesar. The numbers found in the cited works are naturally as outdated as Stuart’s figure for the statue bases of Claudius. Forty pre-accession bases for Tiberius are known to me, eight for Caligula and ten for Nero. The figures derive from a catalogue under preparation of all the statue bases for the emperors between Augustus and Commodus.
30. The posthumous bases are Ephesos: *SEG* XXXIX, 1178; Regium Lepidum: *AE* 1996, 668; Savaria: *AE* 1944, 131; Volubilis: Euzennat & Marion 1982, 235-236, no. 370; Carthago: *CIL* VIII, 1015; Panormus: *CIL* X, 7281; Arelate: *CIL* XII, 641; Larissa: *IG* IX, 2, 605 & 606.

31. Vespasian: 12; Titus: 13; Nerva: 13; Trajan: 10.
32. Herculaneum: Napoli, Museo Nazionale inv. no. 5593 and *CIL* X, 1416. Aphrodisias: Smith 1987, 115-117 (plates XIV; XV, 3). Stuart (1938, 46-47) furthermore combined the semi-nude statue from Lanuvium with the base *CIL* XIV, 2097, but the attribution is unfounded.
33. Højte 1999, 228-229.
34. Stuart 1938, 27, 41.
35. Stuart 1939, 608.
36. Pekáry 1985, 23-25.
37. Tac. *Hist.* 3.7 and 3.13.
38. For a discussion of the evidence, see Swift 1923, 297-300; Pekáry 1985, 24-25. Pekáry draws attention to an inscription mentioning festivities on the day the portrait of the new emperor was brought to Oinoanda by a magistrate (Holleaux and Paris 1886, 226-229, no. 8 = *IGRR* III, 481). The complete lack of evidence for the first and second century AD, however, makes it unlikely that such centralized distribution took place, perhaps with the exception of portraits to be set up in military camps.
39. Stuart 1938, 52-53.
40. AD 41: Veii: *CIL* XI, 3790 (private); Thugga: *CIL* VIII, 26519 (private); Athens: *IG* II², 3268 (public); Athens: *IG* II², 3269 (unknown). AD 42: Rome: *CIL* VI, 40307 (corporation); Lanuvium: *CIL* XIV, 2097 (public); Sestium: *CIL* XI, 5998 (public); Veleia: *CIL* XI, 1169 (public); Augusta Taurinorum: *CIL* V, 7150 (unknown); Burdigala: *CIL* XIII, 590 (private); Hippo Regia: *AE* 1935, 32 (public); Henchir Zian: *CIL* VIII, 1102 (private); Athens: *IG* II², 3271 (public); Athens: *IG* II², 3272 (public); Korinthos: Kent 1966, 40, no. 74 (private); Delphi: *Syll.*³ 801 B (public); Olbasa: *CIL* III, 6889 (public); Sagalassos: *CIL* III, 6871 (unknown). AD 43: Rome: *CIL* VI, 915 (corporation); Moguntiacum: *CIL* XIII, 6797 (corporation); Mediomatrici: *CIL* XIII, 4565 (corporation); Epora: *CIL* II², 7, 142 (private); Serobriga: *CIL* II, 3106 (unknown); Ephesos: *IGSK* 17, 1, 3019 (corporation). AD 41-43: Lepcis Magna: *AE* 1987, 989 (private). In Stuart's collection a number of bases with either uncertain dates or unknown dedicators were included among the public dedications of AD 41/2.
41. Alföldy 1984, 56: "Die Verehrung des Herrschers mit Statuen war für die Gemeinde eine ständige Verpflichtung politischer und zugleich religiöser Natur, ohne daß sie hierfür jeweils einen konkreten Anlaß benötigt hätten. Die Hauptsache war offensichtlich, daß jede Gemeinde jedem Herscher – wohl je früher nach seinem Regierungsantritt, desto besser – mit einer Ehrenstatue huldigte."
42. The after life of imperial images was a precarious matter. The example of the unfortunate Granius Marcellus, *praetor* of Bithynia, is well known (Tac. *Ann.* 1.74), and the letter from Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to Ulpius Eurykles regarding the old imperial portraits in precious metal stored in the *synedrion* of the *gerousia* in Ephesos (*IGSK* 11, 1, 25) illustrates the caution exercised by local magistrates.
43. *CIL* VIII, 26519.
44. Jucker 1981, 254-281. A.-K. Massner has kindly informed me that approximately one out of eight portraits in her catalogue are reworked from Caligula.
45. AD 96: *CIL* XIV, 4341; *CIL* III, 216. AD 97: *CIL* II, 956; *CIL* III, 3006; 8703; 12041; 12103; 12238; VI, 950; 951; XII, 104; *AE* 1940, 186; *AE* 1993, 471; *AE* 1993, 474; Kern 1900, 125-126, nos. 168-169. To these should be added a substantial part of the seventeen statue bases that cannot be dated more accurately within the reign.

46. AD 98: *CIL* III, 3942; 12682; *AE* 1949, 42; *SEG* XXXXI, 1109. AD 98-99: *CIL* III, 14147, 2; *IG* VII, 2236. AD 99: *CIL* IX, 728; XIII, 7285; Gsell 1922, 120, no. 1243. According to Bergmann (1997, 141) all the portraits of the two earliest portrait types of Trajan are reworked from Domitian.
47. Mattingly 1965, clii-clix; Kaenel 1986, 280. Reverse types associated with military exploits: *Constantiae Augusti, De Germanis, Ob cives servatos, Imper(ator) recept(us) - praetor(ianus) recept(us in fidem), Paci Augustae, De Britannis, Victoria Augustae*.
48. *CIL* VI, 40416: [q]uod reges Brit[annorum] XI d[iebus sine] ulla iactur[a devicerit et regna eorum] | gentesque b[arbaras trans oceanum sitas] | primus in dici[onem populi Romani redegerit]. The reconstruction is not beyond dispute. *CIL* III, 7061: Vind(?) lib(?) de vi[ctori regum xi] britanniae. Reconstruction based on the previous inscription, which is far from certain. The identification of the monument in Kyzikos as an arch rests on the restoration of ar[...] in l. 5 as *arcum*. On the arch, together with Claudius, were statues of Divus Augustus and Tiberius. This inclusion can be interpreted as an attempt to make up for the actions which caused the citizens of Kyzikos to be deprived of their freedom first by Augustus in 20 BC and then again in AD 25 by Tiberius.
49. Rome: *CIL* VI, 915. Verona: *AE* 1992, 739 a-c. Verona: *AE* 1992, 740 a-c. Lepcis Magna: *AE* 1987, 989. Thibaris: *CIL* VIII, 26177 a. Thugga: *CIL* VIII, 26519. Perge: *IGSK* 54, 33 (this inscription is no longer associated with the arch at Perge, for which a newly excavated Domitianic inscription has been identified. It does, however, belong to a monument carrying a statue of Claudius, possibly an arch).
50. Stuart 1938, 53-54. The base in Vicus Marosallensis seems to have been voted before Claudius came to Britannia – if the titles of Claudius are correct – but not dedicated until 23 September, the birthday of Augustus, the following year.
51. Halfmann 1986, 172-173.
52. Imperial visits around the empire, for example, were more often commemorated by erecting an arch or a gate than by setting up a statue, see Højte 2000, 221-236 and Halfmann 1986, 129-133.
53. Prior to the reign of Claudius, I only know of *CIL* III, 2908 for Tiberius in Iader and *CIL* III, 14147, 1 for Caligula in Syene.
54. *CIL* V, 6969; *IGSK* 53, 15; *CIL* X, 1416.
55. The wedding was arranged late in AD 48 (*Tac. Ann.* 12.1-9) but did not take place until AD 49.
56. Aezanoi: *IGRR* IV, 559. Britannicus received that name in AD 43.
57. *IGRR* I, 835.
58. For a discussion of the groups, see Rose 1987, 76.
59. Stuart 1938, 41 and n. 208.
60. Suet. *Claud.* 12.
61. Strack 1931, 29.
62. Fittschen & Zanker 1985, 17.
63. Mattingly 1966, lxxvi.
64. *AE* 1989, 138. The inscription almost certainly mentions a statue of silver weighing 300 pounds.
65. Rachet 1980, 200-242; La Roux 1999, 55-65.
66. *CIL* VI, 920.
67. Vespasian: *CIL* VIII, 20857; Antoninus Pius: *CIL* VIII, 23599; Marcus Aurelius: *CIL* VIII, 17864.

68. *CIL* XI, 1169; *CIL* XI, 5999; *AE* 1924, 66; *AE* 1979, 174; *AE* 1992, 740 a-c; *AE* 1996, 668; Kent 1966, 40-41, no. 71.
69. *IG* II², 3268; *IG* II², 3271; *AE* 1888, 39.
70. *IGSK* 36, 1, 37. Ὁ δῆμος καθιέρωσεν ἀναθέντος ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Ἀρτεμιδώρου υἱοῦ Κυρεΐνα Διογένους ἐν τῷι τῆς γυμνασιαρχίας χρόνῳι.
71. *AE* 1924, 66 = Euzennat and Marion 1982, 233-235, no. 369 & 235-236, no. 370.
72. For examples at Athens and Kalymna, see Stuart 1938, 60, n. 337 and 61-63. Inscriptions employing epithets unknown to Stuart have been found at Hydai, Laertes, Patara, Skepsis, Sidyma and Tymnos (see catalogue).
73. *IGRR* IV, 1711; Stuart 1938, 48-49.
74. *IGRR* IV, 1099.
75. *Tac. Ann.* 12.61.
76. During the first two centuries of Roman rule, fifteen imperial statue bases are known. Four belong to statues of Claudius: *IGRR* IV, 1099; *IGRR* IV, 1103; Segre 1993, 237, no. EV 243; Segre 1993, 248, no. EV 248.
77. *IG* VII, 2878; *SEG* XXXIV, 1205.
78. Dio Cass. 60.24.1; Suet. *Claud.* 25.
79. Suet. *Claud.* 25.
80. *CIL* X, 1416; *CIL* XII, 641; *IGSK* 12, 259 b; *IGSK* 53, 15.
81. Tiberii Claudii as dedicators: *IGRR* IV, 559; *IG* IV², 1, 601-602; *SEG* XXXI, 918; *IGSK* 2, 512; *IGSK* 12, 259b; *IGSK* 36, 1, 37; *IGRR* III, 579; *CIL* XIII, 3200. Eight of the nine inscriptions are in Greek, and these comprise almost half of the private dedications in the Greek east.
82. Erim 1982, 277-281; Smith 1987, 88-138.
83. *SEG* XXXI, 918 = Reynolds 1981, 323, no. 8.
84. Reynolds 1981, 317, no. 1.
85. Højte 1999, 229. Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian 1.8:1. Nerva, Trajan, and Antoninus Pius 2.6:1. Hadrian 2.4:1. Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius 1.4:1. Note that the ratios are dependant on the date of the last catalogue of the portraits. Up-dated lists of the portraits in existence result in lower ratios.
86. Boschung 1989, 80-83. Smith (1981, 209-211) remarks on the curiosity of this ratio.
87. Boschung (1993) lists 211 portraits of Augustus in the round including miniature heads. He has also collected part of the epigraphic material (1993, 98-103). There is probably a total of approximately 200 statue bases.
88. Massner (forthcoming).
89. Using the number of statue bases and portraits listed in Stuart's catalogues the ratio would be 2.7:1.
90. Based on a catalogue of all imperial statue bases from Augustus to Commodus in preparation by the author. The peak in the 130s is for the most part caused by the extraordinary number of statue bases for Hadrian found in Athens, particularly in the vicinity of the Olympieion, where multitudes of statues were dedicated at the inauguration of the temple in AD 131-132. In the 160s Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus reigned simultaneously, which seems to have doubled the number of dedications. *Damnatio memoriae* has affected the values for the 30s (Caligula), the 50s and 60s (Nero), the 80s and 90s (Domitian), and the 180s (Commodus).
91. MacMullen 1982, 233-246; pl. 1 and pl. 5.

Revisions to Stuart's catalogue of statue bases of Claudius

Inscriptions from statue bases in Stuart's catalogue:

Roma: CIL VI, 915; CIL VI, 31283; CIL VI, 40412=CIL VI, 31205; CIL VI, 40416=CIL VI, 920. **Regio I:** Herculaneum: CIL X, 1416. Lanuvium: CIL XIV, 2097. **Regio IV:** Napoli: IG XIV, 728. Trebula Mutuesca: CIL IX, 6361. **Regio V:** Urbs Salvia: CIL IX, 5532. **Regio VI:** Forum Sempronii: CIL XI, 6114. Sestinum: CIL XI, 5999. **Regio VII:** Luna: CIL XI, 6954. Unknown: CIL XI, 7793. Veii: CIL XI, 3790-3792. **Regio VIII:** Veleia: CIL XI, 1169. **Regio X:** Acelum: CIL V, 2088. Brixia: CIL V, 4309. Pola: CIL V, 24-25. Verona: CIL V, 3326. **Regio XI:** Augusta Taurinorum: CIL V, 6969. Mediolanum: CIL V, 5804. Ticinum: CIL VI, p. 4301. **Sicilia:** Panormus: CIL X, 7281. **Germania Superior:** Mogontiacum: CIL XIII, 6797. **Belgica:** Vicus Marosallensis: CIL XIII, 4565. **Lugdunensis:** Ebuovices: CIL XIII, 3200. **Aquitania:** Ager Vellavorum: CIL XIII, 1610. Burdigala: CIL XIII, 590. Mediolanum Santonum: CIL XIII, 1037-1038. **Narbonensis:** Arelate: CIL XII, 641. **Baetica:** Cartima: CIL II, 1953. Epora: CIL II², 7, 142=CIL II, 2198. Ipagrum: CIL II², 5, 593=CIL II, 1518; CIL II², 5, 583=CIL II, 1519. Castro del Riò: CIL II², 5, 394=CIL II, 1569. Regina: CIL II², 5, 5978=CIL II, 1027. **Mauretania Tingitana:** Volubilis: AE 1924, 66. **Africa Proconsularis:** Ghardimaou: CIL VIII, 14727. Hippo Regius: AE 1935, 32. Thugga: CIL VIII, 26517 & 26519. Henchir Zian: CIL VIII, 11002. **Pannonia Superior:** Unknown: CIL III, 4591. **Dalmatia:** Salona: CIL III, 1977. **Thracia:** Mesembria: AE 1928, 150. **Macedonia:** Lamia: IG IX, 2, 81. Larissa: IG IX, 2, 605-606. **Achaea:** Athens: IG II², 3268-3274. Delphi, *Syll.*³ 801 A-C. Epidaurus: IG IV², 1, 601-602. Koroneia: IG VII, 2878. Megara: IG VII, 67. Minoa: IG XII, 7, 265. Rhamnous: IG II², 3275. Thebae: IG VII, 2493. Thera: IG XII, 3, 473 & 1395. **Asia:** Aezanoi: IGRR IV, 558-559. Alexandria Troas: CIL III, 381 & CIL III 6060. Antimachia: IGRR IV, 1103. Aphrodisias: CIG 2739. Kyzikos: CIL III, 7061. Ephesos: IGSK 17, 1, 3019=AE 1924, 69. Eresos: IG XII, 2, 541. Golis: IGRR IV, 551. Halasarna IGRR IV, 1099. Kalymnos: IGRR IV, 1023. Klazomenai IGSK 2, 512=IGRR IV, 1550. Kys: BCH 11 (1887) 306-308, no. 11. Magnesia Hermi: TAM V, 2, 1359=BCH 1 (1877) 83, no. 12. Pergamon IGRR IV, 321. Samos: AE 1912, 215. Sardis: IGRR IV, 1502. Tralles: IGSK 36, 1, 37=CIG 2922. **Lycia et Pamphylia:** Arneia: TAM II, 760=IGRR III, 328. Perge IGSK 54, 33=IGRR III, 788. Sagalassos CIL III, 6871. Sidyma: TAM II, 1, 184=IGRR III, 579. Galatia: Jali-jük: CIL III, 288. Olbasa: CIL III, 6889.

Inscriptions from statue bases in Stuart's catalogue which do not belong to portrait statues of Claudius:

Regio VII: Caere: CIL XI, 3593 (statue of the emperor's genius). **Lusitania:** Emerita Augusta: CIL II, 476 (statue of Tiberius). **Pontus et Bithynia:** Amastris: CIL III, 6983 (not a dedication of a statue). **Asia:** Lindos: IG XII, 1, 805 (statue of Nero). Mylasa: IGSK 34, 33=CIG 2697 (personification of Claudius pietas). **Aegyptus:** Tentyra: IGRR I, 1165 (inscription under a relief depicting Claudius in Egyptian style).

Inscriptions listed by Stuart as doubtful, which I think ought to be included:

Regio I: Ostia: NSc (1909) 128, no. 2 (AD 41-54). **Regio XI:** Augusta Taurinorum: CIL V, 7150 (AD 42). **Narbonensis:** Nemausus: CIL XII, 3160 (AD 41-54). **Alpes Maritimae:** Vintium: CIL XII, 5 (AD 41-54). **Tarraconensis:** Segobriga: CIL II, 3105 (AD 43). **Africa Proconsularis:** Carthago: CIL VIII, 1015 (AD 54-?). **Dalmatia:** Iader: CIL III, 2942 (AD 41-54). **Macedonia:** Thessalonika: AE 1888, 39 (AD 44). **Asia:** Apollonia: MAMA IV, 56, no. 144 (AD 41-54).

Inscriptions included in Stuart, How Were Imperial Portraits Distributed Throughout the Empire?:

Achaea: Athens: IG II², 3276 (AD 41-54).

Inscriptions published before 1938 not mentioned by Stuart:

Regio VIII: Caere: *CIL* XI, 3599 (AD 41-54). **Sardinia:** Sulcis: *CIL* X, 7515 (AD 48). **Germania Superior:** Noviodunum: *CIL* XIII, 11468 (AD 41-54). **Narbonensis:** Arelate: *CIL* XII, 666 (AD 41-54). **Africa Proconsularis:** Thibari: *CIL* VIII, 26177a (AD 41-54). **Dalmatia:** Novae: *CIL* III, 13880 (AD 51-52). **Asia:** Ephesos: *IGSK* 12, 259b (AD 41-54). Eresos: *IG* XII, 2, 542 (AD 41-54). Tralles: *IGSK* 36, 1, 38 (AD 41-54). Tymnos: *IGSK* 38, 206 (AD 41-54). **Lycia et Pamphylia:** Attaleia: Lanckoronski 1890, 153, no. 1 (AD 41-54).

Inscriptions published after 1938:

Roma: *CIL* VI, 40307 (AD 42); *CIL* VI, 40414-40415 (AD 45). **Regio I:** Herculaneum: *AE* 1979, 174 (AD 46). Minturnae: *AE* 1989, 138 (AD 50). Puteoli *AE* 1995, 309 (AD 45). **Regio V:** Montegiorgio: *AE* 1985, 341 (AD 41-54). **Regio VIII:** Regium Lepidum: *AE* 1996, 668 (AD 54-?). Regium Lepidum: *AE* 1996, 669 (AD 41-54). **Regio X:** Verona: *AE* 1992, 739 a-c (AD 44). **Lugdunensis:** Augustomagus: *AE* 1960, 149 (AD 48). **Lusitania:** Ammaia: *AE* 1969/70, 238 (AD 44). Emerita Augusta: Vives 1971, no. 1063 (AD 41-54). **Baetica:** Iliturgi: *CIL* II², 7, 30 (AD 44). **Mauretania Tingitana:** Volubilis: Euzennat & Marion 1982, 235-236, no. 370 (AD 54-?). **Africa Proconsularis:** Lepcis Magna: *AE* 1987, 989 (AD 41-43). Lepcis Magna: *AE* 1948, 15 (AD 45). **Pannonia Superior:** Savaria: *AE* 1944, 131 (AD 54-?). **Macedonia:** Beroia: *SEG* XXVII, 263 (AD 41-54). Dyrrachion: *AE* 1966, 390 (AD 44). **Achaea:** Korinthos: Kent 1966, 40, no. 74 (AD 42). Korinthos: Kent 1966, 40-1, no. 77 (AD 47-54). Epidauros: *AE* 1980, 855 (AD 49-54). Lykosoura: *IG* V, 2, 532 (AD 41-54). Thebae: *AE* 1974, 599 (AD 41-54). **Pontus et Bithynia:** Herakleia: *IGSK* 47, 40 (AD 41-54). **Asia:** Aphrodisias: *SEG* XXXI, 918 (AD 50-54). Ephesos: *IGSK* 12, 259a (AD 48). Ephesos: *SEG* XXXIX, 1178 (AD 54-68). Hydai: *IGSK* 38, 256 (AD 41-54). Kos: Segre 1993, 237, no. EV 243 (AD 51). Kos: Segre 1993, 248, no. EV 248 (AD 49-54). Skepsis: *AE* 1973, 508 (AD 41-54). **Lycia et Pamphylia:** Patara: *SEG* XXXIV, 1205 (AD 45). Seleukia Sidera: *AE* 1999, 1642 (41-54 AD). Side: *IGSK* 43, 31 (AD 41-54). Sidyma: *SEG* XXXVII, 1221 (AD 41-54). **Galatia:** Olbasa: *AE* 1998, 1393 (50 AD). Cilicia: Laertes: *SEG* XX, 69 (AD 41-54). **Aegyptus:** Thebae: *AE* 1982, 913 (AD 41-54).

Bibliography

- Alföldy, G. 1984. *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen.* Heidelberg.
- Balty, J.-Ch. 1963. Note d'iconographie julio-claudienne, *Mon Piot* 53, 97-134.
- Bergmann, M. 1997. Zu den Porträts des Trajan und Hadrian, in: Caballos & León (eds.) 1997, 139-148.
- Bernoulli, J.J. 1886. *Römische Ikonographie, Zweiter Teil, I. Das julisch-claudische Kaiserhaus.* Berlin.
- Boon, G.C. 1980. Bronze-mounted Statue-bases at Carmarthen and Silchester, *AntJ* 60, 98-101.

- Boschung, D. 1989. *Die Bildnisse des Caligula. Das römische Herrscherbild I 4*. Berlin.
- Boschung, D. 1993. *Die Bildnisse des Augustus. Das römische Herrscherbild I 2*. Berlin.
- Caballos, A. & P. León (eds.) 1997. *Italica MMCC*. Sevilla.
- Carandini, A. 1969. *Vibia Sabina. Funzione politica, iconografia e il problema del classicismo adrianeo*. Firenze.
- Driehaus, J. 1969. Bronzeverkleidungen römischer Statuenbasen aus Weißenthurm Landkreis Koblenz, *Bjb* 169, 424-436.
- Erim, K.T. 1982. A New Relief Showing Claudius and Britannia from Aphrodisias, *Britannia* 13, 277-281.
- Euzennat, M. & J. Marion. 1982. *Inscriptiones antiquae du Maroc 2. Inscriptiones latines*. Paris.
- Evers, C. 1994. *Les portraits d'Hadrien. Typologie et ateliers*. Bruxelles.
- Fejfer, J. 1985. The Portraits of the Severan Empress Julia Domna. A New Approach, *AnalRom* 14, 129-138.
- Fittschen, K. 1973. *Katalog der antiken Skulpturen in Schloss Erbach*. Berlin.
- Fittschen, K. & P. Zanker 1985. *Katalog der römischen Porträts in der Kapitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom*. Band 1. Mainz am Rhein.
- France-Lanord, A. 1960. La statue de bronze reconstituée, dite de Pacatianus, au Musée de Vienne, *Mon Piot* 51, 93-104.
- Gonzáles, J. 1984. Tabula Siarensis, Fortunales Siarenses et Municipia Civium Romanorum, *ZPE* 55, 55-100.
- Gsell, S. 1922. *Inscriptions latines de l'Algérie I*. Paris.
- Halfmann, H. 1986. *Itinera Principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich*. Stuttgart.
- Hanson, C. & F.P. Johnson 1946. On Certain Portrait Inscriptions, *AJA* 50, 389-400.
- Holleaux, H. & P. Paris 1886. Inscription d'Oenoanda, *BCH* 10, 216-235.
- Højte, J.M. 1999. The Epigraphic Evidence Concerning Portrait Statues of Hadrian's Heir L. Aelius Caesar, *ZPE* 127, 217-238.
- Højte, J.M. 2000. Imperial Visits as Occasion for the Erection of Portrait Statues?, *ZPE* 133, 221-236.
- Jucker, H. 1981. Iulisch-claudische Kaiser- und Prinzenporträts als "Palimpseste", *Jdl* 96, 236-316.
- Kaenel, H.-M. von. 1986. *Münzprägung und Münzbild des Claudius*. Berlin.
- Kent, J.H. 1966. *Corinth VIII, 3. The Inscriptions 1926-1950*. Princeton.
- Kern, O. 1900. *Inchriften vom Magnesia am Mäander*. Berlin.
- Lanckoronski, K. 1890. *Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens*. Wien.
- Le Roux, P. 1999. Sur les puissances tribunicienes de Trajan, in: Schallmayer (ed.) 1999, 55-65.
- MacMullen, R. 1982. The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire, *AJPh* 103, 233-246.

- Massner, A.-K. 1982. *Bildnisangleichung. Untersuchungen zur Entstehungs- und Wirkungsgeschichte der Augustusporträts (43 v.Chr.-68 n.Chr.). Das römische Herrscherbild IV 1*. Berlin.
- Massner, A.-K. 1994. Zum Stilwandel in Kaiserporträt claudischer Zeit, in: Strocka (ed.) 1994, 159-173.
- Massner, A.-K. (forthcoming). *Die Bildnisse des Claudius. Das römische Herrscherbild I 5*. Berlin.
- Mattingly, H. 1929. *A Catalogue of the Roman Coins in the British Museum I. Augustus to Vitellius*. Reprint with alterations 1965. London.
- Mattingly, H. 1936. *A Catalogue of the Roman Coins in the British Museum III. Nerva to Hadrian*. Reprint with alterations 1966. London.
- Menichetti, M. 1983-84. Il ritratto di Claudio, *AnnPerugia* 21, 182-226.
- Neudecker, R. 1988. *Die Skulpturenausstattung römischer Villen in Italien*. Mainz am Rhein.
- Pekáry, T. 1985. *Das römische Kaiserbildnis in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft. Das römische Herrscherbild III 5*. Berlin.
- Piganiol, A. 1959. Une inscription romaine inédite de Senlis sur un socle de bronze, *CRAI* 1959, 450-457.
- Pouilloux, J., P. Roesch & J. Marcillet-Jaubert 1987. *Salamine de Chypre XIII*. Paris.
- Rachet, M. 1980. Decennalia et vicennalia sous la dynastie des Antonins, *REA* 82, 200-242.
- Reynolds, J. 1981. New Evidence for the Imperial Cult at Aphrodisias, *ZPE* 43, 317-327.
- Rose, C.B. 1997. *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*. Cambridge.
- Rose, C.B. 1990. The Supposed Augustan Arch at Pavia (Ticinum) and the Einsiedln 326 Manuscript, *JRA* 3, 163-168.
- Schallmayer, E. (ed.) 1999. *Traian in Germanien. Traian im Reich*. Bad Homburg.
- Segre, M. 1993. *Iscrizioni di Cos*. Rome.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1981. Review of *Die Bildnisse des Caligula. Das römische Herrscherbild I 4*, by D. Boschung, *JRS* 75, 209-211.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1987. The Imperial Reliefs from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias, *JRS* 77, 88-138.
- Stichel, R.H.W. 1982. *Die römische Kaiserstatue am Ausgang der Antike. Untersuchungen zum plastischen Kaiserporträts seit Valentinian I. (365-374 n.Chr.)*. Rome.
- Strack, P.L. 1931. *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des 2. Jahrhunderts I. Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Traian*. Stuttgart.
- Strocka, V.M. (ed.) 1994. *Die Regierungszeit des Kaisers Claudius (41-54 n.Chr.) Umbruch oder Episode?* Mainz am Rhein.
- Stuart, M. 1938. *The Portraiture of Claudius. Preliminary Studies*. Ph.D. diss., Columbia University.

- Stuart, M. 1939. How Were Imperial Portraits Distributed throughout the Empire?, *AJA* 43, 601-617.
- Swift, E.H. 1923. Imagines in Imperial Portraiture, *AJA* 27, 286-301.
- Vives, J. 1971. *Inscriptiones latinas de la España Romana*. Barcelona.
- Wuilleumier, P. 1984. *Inscriptions latines des Trois Gaules*. Paris.

Abbreviations

- CIG* A. Boeckh, *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Berlin 1828-1877.
- IGRR* R. Cagnat, *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res romanas pertinentes*. Paris 1906-1927.
- IGSK* *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*. Bonn 1972-.
- MAMA* *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*. Manchester 1928-.
- Syll.*³ W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* I-IV. Leipzig 1915-1924. 3rd ed.
- TAM* *Tituli Asiae Minoris*. Wien 1901-1989.