

# THE MENTALITY AND PERSONALITY OF THE JULIO-CLAUDIAN EMPERORS

by

GERALD C. MOSS

καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασις ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερεπέστερον φανεῖται· ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὐθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιοῦτων καὶ παραπλησιῶν ἕσσεσθαι, ὀφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ ἀρμόντως ἔξει.

(*Thucydides* 1, 22).

THE absence of romance in my history will, I fear, detract somewhat from its interest; but if it be judged useful by those inquirers who desire an exact knowledge of the past as an aid to the interpretation of the future, which in the course of human things must resemble if it does not reflect it, I shall be content. (Crawley's translation.)

A HISTORIAN has remarked that the confused data from antiquity and the limitations of the psycho-medical sciences make it difficult to draw a picture of Claudius at once satisfying to the historian, the physician and the psychologist.<sup>1</sup> This could be said of all the Julio-Claudian emperors. Controversy has raged mostly over Tiberius and Claudius. Suetonius saw in Tiberius the archetype of the cruel despot, in Gaius (Caligula) the savage monster, in Claudius the fool and weakling, and in Nero the scoundrel. Tacitus, whose books on Gaius' reign are lost, and Cassius Dio painted them in more or less the same colours. To Tacitus, Tiberius was a hypocrite and criminal; Claudius had a weak mind,<sup>2</sup> Gaius mental disorder.<sup>3</sup> But Dio granted that Claudius, though sick in body so that his head and hands shook slightly, was by no means inferior in mental ability;<sup>4</sup> and Pliny the Elder, a contemporary, had a high opinion of his learning and cited him four times as an authority.<sup>5</sup>

Despite the generally unfavourable picture of the *princeps* drawn by the ancient writers the administrative machinery functioned for the most part efficiently and the empire of Augustus was consolidated; most of its citizens were content; opposition came from a restricted circle. Tacitus had little perception of the general bearings of a situation and could see little but its personal aspects. If Tiberius' early years were marked by good rule and his later ones by bad, his explanation was that Tiberius was always a hypocrite, who finally dropped the mask; to Tacitus character was a static immutable thing.<sup>6</sup> Views of character have continued to colour estimates of skill and ability and vice versa.<sup>7</sup>

In a recent monograph A. Esser, Professor of Medical History at Düsseldorf, has undertaken a biological, medical and psychological study of Caesar, Augustus and the Julio-Claudians.<sup>8</sup> His work is essentially a medical treatise, but he does refer to the fear of assassination felt by Tiberius and Claudius; he attaches importance to the exploitation of Claudius' fear by his freedmen and by Messalina when they wished to have someone removed.<sup>9</sup> He examines in detail the emperors' heredity, illnesses and mental state in the light of what has been handed down. In deciding that Tiberius was schizothymic he is careful

to state that this term, as medical men know, carries no imputation of insanity, but refers only to a biotype; he rejects, as others have rejected, von Hentig's diagnosis of schizophrenia and Thiel's diagnosis of schizoid personality.<sup>10</sup> With reservations, he thinks that Gaius was schizoid if not schizophrenic,<sup>11</sup> and he believes that Claudius, though suffering from an organic cerebral affection, was something between a feeble-minded person and an imbecile.<sup>12</sup> Whatever the justification for the other diagnoses—and it is obvious that any diagnosis can only be tentative—Esser's argument in his judgment of Claudius is weak, and it illustrates the pitfalls of a too clinical approach to the problem.

G. Marañón, the Spanish physician and man of letters who recently died, takes a broader view than the title of his book suggests, and he makes pertinent observations upon life, history and psychology in general. He appears, however, to over-estimate the influence of Tiberius' gradually increasing resentment; for instance, though Tiberius had every reason for becoming resentful and suspicious, the evidence does not support Marañón's contention that the delations were due to the revenge of a resentful man.<sup>13</sup>

It has been pointed out that there is a risk in psychological speculation, which has been carried too far;<sup>14</sup> the result of more than one revision of Tacitus' portrayal of character has been a figure devoid of life and colour.<sup>15</sup> It is held that more attention should be paid to determining the nature of the emperors' contributions to the empire and to history at large. They may then be seen in a different light, especially when edicts, inscriptions, tablets, papyri and coins are studied. Momigliano discusses this type of evidence so far as it concerns Claudius; but it is not needed to show that Esser's diagnosis of his mental state is untenable, for the testimony of the ancient writers themselves excludes it. In the face of this and the later evidence he thinks that laymen, through not knowing how much a mentally defective person can learn and recite parrot-fashion, could have been misled by Claudius' apparent scholarship.<sup>16</sup>

The results of research along the lines mentioned speak for Tacitus' veracity but do not confirm his view, much less more damaging ones, of Claudius' mentality. In confirming that Claudius wrote letters, made speeches, or issued edicts (and many were recorded by Tacitus) in which a distinctive style and mode of thought can be detected they add to our respect for his intellectual capacity. But many passages in the works of Suetonius and Tacitus point not only to the vigorous intellect, but also to the efficiency, public spirit, political sagacity, and, it may seem strange to say, humanity of both Tiberius and Claudius. Even Gaius, according to Suetonius, though sick mentally and physically and an epileptic in his early years, showed remarkable eloquence and quickness of mind.<sup>17</sup> When Suetonius goes on to mention Gaius' floods of words and over-zealous writing of speeches on litigious occasions, we are bound to be reminded, as we are by other passages in Suetonius, of the eloquence and quickness of mania and the misplaced diligence of either mania or paranoia; but the question of Gaius' sanity is still undecided.<sup>18</sup> The possible route of transmission of epilepsy in the Julio-Claudians is discussed in Esser's work.<sup>19</sup>

It is natural that Augustus should confuse physical and mental defects, as he

### *The Mentality and Personality of the Julio-Claudian Emperors*

seems to do when he perplexedly writes of Claudius,<sup>20</sup> but Esser too seems to have done so. Much of his reasoning is unsound. He believes<sup>21</sup> that Claudius' disturbed speech<sup>22, 23</sup> and weak legs and ungainly gait<sup>24</sup> had an organic cause, but that his fits of excessive and inappropriate laughter, his slobbering,<sup>25, 26</sup> and even his tremor,<sup>27, 28, 29</sup> were due to mental deficiency arising from a cerebral lesion. He thinks the lesion was probably caused by meningitis or encephalitis acquired in childhood; but it is as likely that Claudius had congenital cerebral palsy. Although Baring-Gould casually suggested that he was paralysed in infancy, Ruth was the first to record and document a belief that he suffered from one of the forms of infantile spastic paralysis or infantile diplegia.<sup>30</sup> Compatible with such a diagnosis is Suetonius' report that Claudius' mother often referred to him as 'a monster: a man whom Mother Nature had begun to work upon but then flung aside'.<sup>31</sup> More important, however, than precise diagnosis of his lesion is evidence that he had an organic cerebral affection from infancy and that this was responsible for his quite unjustified reputation for imbecility. Ruth has marshalled this evidence with great skill, all the more remarkable because he was not a medical man. He has also fully and fairly assessed the psychological effects which such an illness could have had upon Claudius, effects so familiar to doctors who treat sufferers from it.

Archaeology may or may not do something for Tiberius as it has done for Claudius, although, since his character rather than his intellect and ability has been assailed, it is difficult to see what could now come to light to rehabilitate him. Moreover, epigraphic material, valuable as it is, often raises as many problems as it solves.<sup>32</sup> Syme thinks fairly enough that 'not much . . . will be redeemed if the ostensible lunacy (of Gaius) is toned down'. As for Nero, he observes that no one has been able to impugn Tacitus' credit and veracity, and that what has been transmitted by Suetonius and Cassius Dio shows a remarkable concordance.<sup>33</sup> With respect to archaeological evidence for Claudius, it must suffice to refer to his letter to the Alexandrians, found in 1920 or 1921, and to the Lugdunum (Lyons) tablet, found in 1528.<sup>34</sup> This tablet fully corroborates his speech to the citizens of Gallia Comata;<sup>35</sup> it makes all the more credible Tacitus' version, already credible enough, of another speech, in which Claudius made pithy remarks about mercy, justice, monarchy, glory and peace to a Parthian legation.<sup>36</sup>

Yet much remains unexplained. Why did the princes act with such seeming savage cruelty, often on the flimsiest evidence, towards so many prominent and high-minded citizens? If the research that has brought further redress for Claudius warns us to be cautious before we judge Tiberius, if not the others, and if, excepting psychopaths and psychotics, we do not believe that personality mostly determines action, we are obliged to look further.

Genealogy cannot be expected to offer much help. By Julia and Agrippina, Gaius and Nero had Julian blood. Claudius' strain was preponderantly Claudian, though he had some Julian blood through Antonia Minor. Tiberius united a double Claudian strain, that of the Pulchri as well as that of the Neronēs;<sup>37</sup> but he was an anomalous Claudian. It is impossible to maintain that Nero's depravity arose from his mother's genes. Balsdon, while supposing

that Gaius' imperiousness came from his mother and his aestheticism from his father, thinks that little good is done by seeking after inherited qualities in his character; he concludes that 'in his personal life he simply displayed in an exaggerated form those weaknesses which were characteristic of the age in which he lived: he was prodigal, immoral, pleasure-loving, and cruel'.<sup>38</sup> Much the same could be said of Nero.

Aristotle's dictum that the historian, unlike the poet, tells us only what has happened, but not what might happen,<sup>39</sup> has long since proved to be wrong; Thucydides' earlier warning was only too well founded. When we consider, with the lessons of later chapters of history in mind, the restless and cult-ridden environment in which an emperor moved, we may well suppose that he must have acted as he did. Its importance appears to justify its fresh scrutiny, but it has by no means been neglected by scholars. Attention has been drawn, for example, to the importance of considering not only Claudius' character but also the forces which crowded and clamoured around him. Roman tradition, it has been said, took little notice of this canon of historical construction because of the uncritical methods of the age, partisan bias, and even deliberate misrepresentation.<sup>40</sup>

Tiberius has not lacked apologists since the virtual *odium theologicum* which followed Voltaire's sneer at Tacitus<sup>41</sup> gave way to more sober, if not always more novel argument. The plea, sometimes coupled with allegations of bias against Tacitus more specific and less illogical than those of Voltaire, has been mainly one of self-defence. Marsh, for instance, thinks that Tiberius has been wrongly blamed for the delations:<sup>42</sup> informers were already in existence before him, and he tried to restrain them, as even Tacitus admitted.<sup>43</sup> He was forced to turn to them because of the insecurity of his position and the increasing danger of conspiracy against him. Merivale held the same opinion:<sup>44</sup> since Tiberius' reaction to his dangerous position was a natural one, his character becomes sufficiently transparent. Although Boissier emphasizes that Tiberius was goaded by suspicion, uncertainty and fear ('il n'y a rien qui rende féroce comme la peur'), he unexpectedly accepts Tacitus' opinion that he was inherently wicked and affirms that he was made worse by absolute power. He argues that, since most of the plots existed only in the imagination of the informers, he was all the more culpable.<sup>45</sup> Such an argument cannot be accepted today; for we know how often imagination and persuasion go hand in hand.

It is a commonplace that events of the last few decades have exercised the physician and the psychiatrist as well as the historian. A re-examination of Pavlovian physiology has seemed to yield clues to the understanding of the behaviour of persons subjected to persistent and powerful suggestion in various forms but with one object, the conversion of the subject, who all too often is converted. And since there is no proof that human nature has changed, it follows that neither the sensibility of the subject nor the ardour of the proselytizer would differ in any essential way in ancient and modern times; but that is not to say that differing cultural and religious beliefs do not play an important part. Although the object is clear, the mechanism by which it is so regularly

### *The Mentality and Personality of the Julio-Claudian Emperors*

attained is far from clear. But it is plain that self-defence is rarely a sufficient explanation; it is plain, for instance, that the effect of cults and superstition, of rumours and omens (Tacitus had something to say about these, and it matters little if he himself was sceptical of them) is to increase suggestibility, sometimes to such a degree as to cause a wave of hysteria. It is therefore proposed to examine a Julio-Claudian emperor's situation, one common in many ways to them all, and to draw some conclusions, even if they amount merely to a psycho-medical restatement or extension—and they could scarcely amount to more—of those reached by noted scholars.

Boissier's vivid interpretation<sup>46</sup> of what has been handed down by the ancient writers makes his verdict upon Tiberius all the more surprising. Looming large is dread opposition, no less threatening for coming from a restricted circle; and here is a cardinal point: the opposition was to be found among the senatorial hierarchy; that is, among the oligarchs. In his sympathies Tacitus was an oligarch; his theme was oligarchy, 'the supreme, central, and enduring theme in Roman history'.<sup>47</sup> Throughout the reign of the Julio-Claudian dynasty a pattern is repeated: the new *princeps* or emperor is acclaimed with wild enthusiasm; fulsome flattery is his portion; it seems there is general satisfaction, but it does not last. Among the oligarchs there are still thoughts of a republic, although its passing is known to be inevitable or is an accomplished fact. The empire began at a time of great intellectual activity, and this is not favourable to absolute power. Already in the time of Augustus the voices of critics were heard. Perhaps he at first despised them, but there came a day when he took severe measures against them; and that was the day of the birth of the opposition. The lesson was not lost on his successors.

Whatever republican forms remained—and they did remain—it was a monarchical government in fact. The powers of both the emperor and the Senate were badly defined, and this was a fruitful cause of trouble; mutual suspicion and uncertainty prevailed.

The opposition lurked in the elegant world of Rome. The army, until it was Nero's undoing, was generally satisfied with its lot and showed devotion to the prince. There was little opposition in the provinces, which were better off under the imperial régime; the *municipia* lost nothing from the fall of the republic and accepted the empire; the main concern of the common people was for bread and games. The emperor might have felt more secure if he had known that all opposition was openly ventilated in the Senate; but he knew better. Tacitus makes Tiberius say that he knew where the enemies were: 'I am aware that at dinner parties and social gatherings these things are condemned.'<sup>48</sup> But even there no one could trust another.<sup>49</sup> The *perduellio* of earlier times became *maiestas*;<sup>50</sup> *quadruplatores* became *delatores*. In the more humane days of Cicero men had some scruples about gaining fame from the misfortunes of others, and advocates were unpaid. Legislation actually brought the *quadruplatores* into being; there thus arose a *métier* more advantageous than honourable; but the subtle difference under the empire is apparent: accusers became a terror to honest men; from spying on celibates, an activity brought about by the Papian-Poppaeian law,<sup>51</sup> they turned to gambling for high stakes.

The law of *maiestas* (*lèse-majesté*) was invoked whenever an unscrupulous senator or man of rank saw a chance to raise himself, to ingratiate himself with the emperor, or to pay off old scores. He might forestall a likely accuser by being first with a charge. Any vague formulation of sacrilege, magic, or adultery was twisted to mean *maiestas*. The emperor was now substituted for the people. Add to this his particular nature and the honours, suggesting he was more than human, heaped upon him: with the tribunician power he was inviolable and sacred; if he was not deemed a god in his lifetime he expected or hoped to be one after his death. A political crime was thus complicated by a religious one; the perpetual adoration of the emperor became a cult and, as in other cults, the slightest error or deviation became culpable. Suetonius relates that, in the time of Tiberius, a person could be executed for beating a slave or changing his clothes close to an image of Augustus.<sup>52</sup> He gives other strange examples of the law's severity, and Seneca, in one of his ethical treatises,<sup>53</sup> writes in similar vein of the reign of Tiberius, of whom he was a contemporary.

If a prominent man went in fear of his life, so too did the emperor. In the speech with which Gaius stunned the Senate he declared, according to Cassius Dio, that Tiberius had said to him: 'Therefore show no affection for any of them and spare none of them. For they all hate you and they all pray for your death; and they will murder you if they can.'<sup>54</sup>

The emperor would scarcely seem human if, bearing the strain of repeated suggestion of this kind and breathing an atmosphere charged with superstition, he remained unmoved; indeed, if he did, he could well be mentally ill. The parallels of both medieval and modern cults are obvious enough. But in Rome an accused citizen usually received short shrift; it was the emperor who was subjected to a prolonged and relentless form of suggestion; and despite the unusual though by no means unfamiliar reversal of roles, the phenomenon of the political indoctrination of apparently normal persons comes to mind. The success of the Communists in this activity is well known; but this is to notice only one example, and it would be naïve to believe that sheer brutality has not often caused quick collapse. Yet political conversion by Communists as well as by others has frequently been brought about by more subtle means. Further, as Sargent has shown, the techniques employed in some religious conversions approximate closely to modern political techniques of brain-washing and thought-control;<sup>55</sup> and he gives a number of other examples. There have of course been many unwitting exponents of modern methods, or exponents of something closely akin to them, from the days of the ancients downwards. Sargent's words are, *mutatis mutandis*, applicable to a number of situations:

Granted that the right pressure is applied in the right way and for long enough, ordinary prisoners have little chance of staving off collapse; only the exceptional or the mentally ill person is likely to resist over very long periods. Ordinary people, let me repeat, are the way they are simply because they are sensitive to and influenced by what is going on around them; it is the lunatic who can be so impervious to suggestion.<sup>56</sup>

To say that the emperors were normal would be to go too far, and it is unnecessary to do so; it is hard enough to lay down a standard of normality for our own time, let alone for other times of other cultures and religious beliefs.

*The Mentality and Personality of the Julio-Claudian Emperors*

But perhaps Tiberius was not, as Tacitus thought he was, expressing 'only his own personality—by unrestrained crime and infamy';<sup>57</sup> and perhaps he was not as one of his victims, Arruntius, said he was, and as many have said since, 'with all his experience . . . transformed and deranged by absolute power'.<sup>58</sup> It is not suggested that absolute power does not corrupt; to be at once its possessor and the object of religious awe is, to be sure, unfavourable to psychic equilibrium. But it has not always done so; and there is no evidence that Tiberius was any more corrupted by it than Augustus or, to go much further back, Pisistratus. It is much more likely that the deterioration of his rule was mainly brought about by the uncanny ordeal that he had to endure. His plight conjures up the chorus's grim picture of the transgressor in the *Agamemnon* (and in the eyes of many in the Senate Tiberius had trampled on sacred things), one for whom, compelled by a persistent and relentless Peitho, the over-mastering child of Ate, there is neither cure nor concealment.<sup>59</sup> Such a comparison, despite its highly poetic imagery, will not seem unduly fanciful to those who believe Tiberius was in the grip of that which he could not control.

There have been at least five theories to account for the inevitable change for the worse; some have long since been discarded, and there has been a tendency to arraign the biographer rather than the emperor. But to vindicate the one is not utterly to discredit the other, and a historian has entered a plea for Tacitus which has something in common with that which is here put forward for Tiberius: he was not consciously dishonest.<sup>60</sup> If strong sentiment coloured his narrative it has yet to be shown that it destroyed its general truth. And when Suetonius is accused of accepting loose gossip, pronouncements upon its truth or falsity are largely irrelevant, since it is more than probable that much of it arose from rumours current in the time of which he wrote; to demonstrate, therefore, that he (or Cassius Dio) is untrustworthy is not to deal a fatal blow to a belief that turmoil existed in Rome of such a peculiar nature that it had as its consequence a battle for, and the conquest of, Tiberius' mind. Tiberius was the first to experience the full blast of the gathering storm; of him it could be said, for the word has now been coined, that he was the victim of *menticide*;<sup>61</sup> and his successors, whether they were fully aware of it or not, were ripe for the same process before they came to power. Largely because of this, but also because he has been the most controversial figure of all, more attention has here been paid to him than to them.

Tacitus' judgment may have been distorted by his experiences under Domitian,<sup>62</sup> though he was often as contemptuous of the oligarchs as of the emperors, and the part played by the law of *maiestas* under Tiberius may have been exaggerated.<sup>63</sup> And Claudius may have forbidden complaints of *maiestas* as Dio states he did.<sup>64</sup> Yet it cannot be doubted that opposition existed (and it has already been said that in such a *milieu* it would make little difference how much was actual, supposed, or rumoured), and that denunciation, leading to the death of many innocent men, was rampant.<sup>65</sup> Before Tacitus, well after the events that he recorded, wrote of the evil which for many years corroded public life,<sup>66</sup> Seneca had written of the mania for prosecutions that was rife in his own time.<sup>67</sup>

One reason why Gaius and Nero have been only briefly mentioned has already been given: the battle for their minds was half won before they came to power. It would seem, in fact, that their conduct after their accession was in great part due to ingravescence, under the strain of the *imperium*, of a malady that had been implanted and become firmly rooted during their minority. Gaius' reign was short; neither he nor Nero had a training to fit him in any way for his peculiar position. It is undeniable that men such as Seianus, Macro and Tigellinus had great power and influence; so too did Claudius' freedmen; but the argument that they completely dominated him is not necessarily sound.<sup>68, 69</sup> The schemes and sinister suggestions of Seianus must have done much to break down Tiberius' resistance; small wonder that Tacitus saw in him the cause and beginning of Tiberius' lapse into open tyranny;<sup>70</sup> he has become a byword for his unscrupulousness in serving his own ends. But it has been seen that the scramble for power was a weakness of a ruthless age. Ruthlessness and fear! The one bred the other; it was a vicious cycle.

Although Pavlov's researches may have been put to uses that he never intended, it would be rash to depend upon them to explain those long since dead when their application to the living is imperfectly understood; and although it is actually helpful to think of Claudius, the obvious and most promising subject, as one of the Pavlovian types, to refer any of the emperors to one of them and to deduce all his behaviour from his resemblance to it would be indefensible. No one of course is likely to suggest that this should be done; to the historian it would be both to repeat the Tacitean technique and to engage in the speculation that has been deplored; to the medical man, by removing a part of the theory from its context, it would be to distort the system built with such genius. That expert opinion would be much against unscientific tampering with it, can be gathered from the report of an American psychiatrist's interview with a Russian physiologist who has been described as the most distinguished living pupil of Pavlov.<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, as Sargant explains, it is a modern paradox that rapid scientific progress often results when a field of experimental research is deliberately limited.<sup>72</sup>

Whatever the position of Pavlovian psychiatry, it can be maintained that there has never been any evidence that the basic behaviour patterns of men have changed. To shift the emphasis from where Tacitus laid it in his explanation of human behaviour and to restate, within the limits imposed by the title of the discussion, the interrelationship, nay, interpenetration of history and human nature is not, it is hoped, to air a theory that is over-speculative or destructive of Tacitus' psychology. Little more than such a restatement has been intended.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The indispensable teaching and guidance of Professor M. N. Austin, Mr. P. R. C. Weaver, and Mr. J. R. Jones of the Department of Classics and Ancient History in The University of Western Australia, since classical studies, begun at school many years ago, were resumed in the department only a few years ago, are gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. SCRAMUZZA, V. M., *The Emperor Claudius*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, and London, Oxford University Press, 1940, p. 35.
2. TACTITUS, *Annals* VI, 46: 'imminuta mens'.
3. — *Annals* XIII, 3: 'turbata mens'.
4. CASSIUS DIO LX, 2: 'Ἐγένετο δὲ τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν οὐ φαῦλος.
5. PLINY, *Natural History* I, 5; I, 6; I, 12; I, 13.
6. MARSH, F. B., *The Reign of Tiberius*, Oxford University Press, 1931, pp. 13ff.
7. MARAÑÓN, G., *Tiberius, a Study in Resentment*, trans. from the Spanish by W. B. Wells, London, Hollis & Carter, 1956, p. 7.
8. ESSER, A., *Cäsar und die Julisch-Claudischen Kaiser im Biologisch-Ärztlichen Blickfeld*, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1958.
9. — *op. cit.*, pp. 163ff.
10. — *op. cit.*, pp. 87ff.
11. — *op. cit.*, p. 139.
12. — *op. cit.*, p. 165.
13. MARAÑÓN, G., *op. cit.*, p. 201.
14. MOMIGLIANO, A., *Claudius, the Emperor and his Achievement*, trans. by W. D. Hogarth, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1934, p. xii.
15. SYME, R., *Tacitus*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958, p. 436.
16. ESSER, A., *op. cit.*, p. 165.
17. SUETONIUS, *Gaius Caligula*, 50, 53.
18. CARY, M., *A History of Rome*, London, Macmillan, 1954, p. 539. There are imponderables here; cf. the gloating and ranting of Freisler, the trained lawyer and president of the so-called German People's Court, after the events of 20 July 1944.
19. ESSER, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 201-3.
20. SUETONIUS, *Claudius* 4.
21. ESSER, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 166ff.
22. SUETONIUS, *Claudius* 30.
23. CASSIUS DIO LX, 2.
24. SUETONIUS, *Claudius* 30 and 21.
25. — *Claudius* 30.
26. JUVENAL VI, 623: 'longa manantia labra saliva'.
27. SUETONIUS, *Claudius* 30.
28. CASSIUS DIO LX, 2.
29. JUVENAL VI, 622: 'tremulumque caput'.
30. RUTH, T. DE C., *The Problem of Claudius*, Baltimore, The Lord Baltimore Press, 1916, p. 131. Ruth gives his diagnosis and conclusion in Chapter VII (pp. 113-37) of his work, which was submitted to Johns Hopkins University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Any physician or neurologist acquainted with the sources must be filled with admiration for this summing-up. The dissertation is an altogether admirable one. Ruth states that he has not worked without the guiding hands of several medical men who have given him the benefit of their advice and criticism. Nevertheless it is evident that he himself conceived and carried out the work and that he did so with a perspicacity not revealed by at least one modern medical judge of Claudius. In an introduction he refers briefly to the nineteenth-century theories of a

'manie impériale' or 'Cäsarenwahnsinn', allegedly affecting all the Julio-Claudians and treated evidently, as he says, as a veritable trade psychosis. Perhaps, if 'induced neurosis' were substituted for 'psychosis' there would be a good deal of truth in these ideas; but it has not been possible to examine them; and it was not Ruth's main business to do so. He thinks the 'linguae titubantia' of Suetonius (*Claudius* 30) and the τῷ φωνήματι ἐσφάλλετο of Dio (LX, 2) mean that Claudius was a stutterer. Though Augustus' third letter to Livia in Suetonius *Claudius* 4 creates a slight difficulty, I think that, considered in the light of the whole clinical history presented, which includes the important symptom of sialorrhoea, they are much more suggestive of dysarthria. The terms, with their sense of stumbling over a word or being tripped up in speech, are quite as compatible with this as with stuttering.

Pliny the Elder in *Natural History* XI, 144, gives the following description of Claudius' eyes: [Oculi] 'Claudio Caesari ab angulis candore carnosio sanguineis venis subinde suffusi.' I would translate: 'Claudius Caesar's eyes had a conspicuous white fleshy formation at the corners and were often bloodshot'. I think, *pace* the oculist to whom Ruth submitted the case of Claudius and who thought he probably had chronic conjunctivitis or inflammation of the tear sac, that Pliny's description is sufficiently diagnostic of a pterygium in both eyes. But this is a point of no neurological importance.

31. SUETONIUS, *Claudius* 3: 'Mater Antonia portentum eum hominis dictitabat, nec absolutum a natura, sed tantum incohatum.'
32. CHARLESWORTH, M. P., *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Cambridge University Press, 1952, vol. x, p. 674.
33. SYME, R., *op. cit.*, pp. 436-7.
34. CHARLESWORTH, M. P., ed., *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Claudius and Nero*, Cambridge University Press, 1951, docs. nos. 2 and 5.
35. TACITUS, *Annals*, XI, 24.
36. — *Annals* XII, 11.
37. SUETONIUS, *Tiberius* 3.
38. BALSDON, J. P. V. D., *The Emperor Gaius (Caligula)*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1934, p. 208.
39. ARISTOTLE, *Poetics* 1451 b: ἀλλὰ τούτω διαφέρει, τῷ τὸν μὲν τὰ γινόμενα λέγειν, τὸν δὲ οἷα ἄν γένοιτο.
40. SGRAMUZZA, V. M., *op. cit.*, p. 4.
41. VOLTAIRE, *Essai sur les mœurs et l'esprit des nations*, Oeuvres Complètes de Voltaire, Paris, Au Bureau de la Société des Publications Illustrées, 1846, Tome III, p. 73. It has been said that Voltaire's short note on 'Défloration' in his *Dictionnaire Philosophique* is an attack on Tacitus because of what he wrote in *Annals* V, 6. It is difficult to see why this has been said; rather is the attack on those who have not taken the trouble to interpret Tacitus correctly.
42. MARSH, F. B., *op. cit.*, pp. 108ff.
43. TACITUS, *Annals* II, 50; III, 56.
44. MERIVALE, C., *History of the Romans under the Empire*, London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1890, vol. v, p. 405.
45. BOISSIER, G., *L'Opposition Sous Les Césars*, Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1892, pp. 64, 173ff.
46. — G., *op. cit.*, *passim*.
47. SYME, R., *op. cit.*, p. v.
48. TACITUS, *Annals* III, 54.

*The Mentality and Personality of the Julio-Claudian Emperors*

49. TACITUS, *Annals* IV, 69; VI, 7.  
50. BALSDON, J. P. V. D., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 1949, p. 907. The distinction between the two is not explicit in Tacitus.  
51. TACITUS, *Annals* III, 28.  
52. SUETONIUS, *Tiberius* 58.  
53. SENECA, *De Beneficiis* III, 26.  
54. CASSIUS DIO LIX, 16.  
55. SARGANT, W., *Battle for the Mind*, London, Pan Books Ltd., 1959, p. 80.  
56. — *op. cit.*, p. 168.  
57. TACITUS, *Annals* VI, 51.  
58. — *Annals* VI, 48.  
59. AESCHYLUS, *Agamemnon*, 385–7:  

βιᾶται δ' ἄ τάλαινα Πειθῶ,  
προβοῦλον παῖς ἄφερτος Ἄτας  
ἄκος δὲ πᾶν μάταιον' οὐκ ἐκρύφθη, . . .

  
60. PIPPIDI, D. M., *Autour de Tibère*, Bucaresti, Institutul de Istorie universală 'N. Iorga', 1944. Quoted by BALSDON, J. P. V. D., in a discussion and review in *J. Roman Studies*, Lond., 1946, 36, pp. 168 ff.  
61. MEERLOO, J. A. M., The crime of menticide, *Amer. J. Psychiat.*, 1951, 107, p. 594.  
62. TACITUS, *Agricola* 1–3: 'Nerva Caesar res olim dissociabiles miscuerit, principatum ac libertatem.' Suetonius (Domitian 20) states that Domitian assiduously read Tiberius' notebooks and memoirs. This would have been known to Tacitus.  
63. MARSH, F. B., *op. cit.*, pp. 289–95.  
64. CASSIUS DIO LX, 3; LX, 17.  
65. ROGERS, R. S., *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius*, Connecticut, American Philological Association, 1935, pp. 195 ff.  
66. TACITUS, *Annals* II, 27: 'quae per tot annos rem publicam exedere'.  
67. SENECA, *De Beneficiis* III, 26: 'Sub Tib. Caesare fuit accusandi frequens et paene publica rabies.'  
68. SCRAMUZZA, V. M., *op. cit.*, pp. 87 ff.  
69. MOMIGLIANO, A., *op. cit.*, p. 43.  
70. TACITUS, *Annals* IV, 1: 'initium et causa penes Aelium Seianum cohortibus praetorii praefectum'.  
71. WORTIS, J., A psychiatric study tour of the U.S.S.R., *J. ment. Sci.*, 1961, 107, p. 138.  
72. SARGANT, W., *op. cit.*, pp. 212 ff.

Parts of translations quoted are by R. Graves, of Suetonius, *Claudius* 3 (Penguin Books); E. Cary, of Cassius Dio LIX, 16 (Loeb Classical Library); M. Grant, of Tacitus, *Annals* VI, 51; VI, 48; II, 27 (Penguin Books).