

How Romans Became “Roman”: Creating Identity in an Expanding World

by

Claudia I. Arno

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor  
of Philosophy  
(Greek and Roman History)  
in The University of Michigan  
2012

Doctoral Committee:

Professor David S. Potter, Co-Chair  
Professor Nicola Terrenato, Co-Chair  
Professor Bruce W. Frier  
Professor Raymond H. Van Dam

© Claudia I. Arno  
2012

To my family and friends,  
whose support is invaluable.

## Acknowledgements

I owe a great many individuals and institutions thanks for their support and assistance during the years I have been researching and writing this dissertation. I would first like to thank the University of Michigan Interdepartment Program in Greek and Roman History, which promotes the interdisciplinary study of Classics and History, and with which I am very proud to be associated. I am also grateful to the University of Michigan History and Classics Departments, whose cooperation makes IPGRH possible. I would especially like to thank my graduate colleagues in IPGRH, Classics, and History, who have made my graduate experience so enjoyable and rewarding.

The staffs at the University of Michigan and UCLA libraries, as well as the UCLA History Department, and in particular Professor David Phillips, were critical in helping me obtain access to research materials while I was living in Michigan, Los Angeles, and Boston. I would also like to express my deep admiration for Dr. Susan Lipshutz, who I unfortunately never had the opportunity to meet, but whose devotion to the success of women in academia inspired the creation of an award fund from which I received valuable support. The staff of the Michigan Classics Department, and especially Michelle Biggs, was incredibly helpful as I negotiated the logistics of completing my dissertation from California and Massachusetts.

I wish to add some personal acknowledgments as well. My parents, Andrew Arno and Letitia Hickson, both of the University of Hawai'i, have consistently provided encouragement, support, and scholarly feedback, as have my in-laws, Charles and Elaine Brenner. Donna and Jim Wessel Walker, whose valued friendship we have enjoyed for many years, graciously opened their home during my final semester, while I was living in Boston and commuting each week to teach and work in Ann Arbor. Ruth Scodel kindly offered me the use of her car for that same semester. Together, their generosity made my life immeasurably easier. My husband, Samuel Brenner, who is also a historian and legal scholar, has provided a decade of support, encouragement, companionship, intellectual stimulation, and editing services.

I am indebted to my committee members: David Potter, Nic Terrenato, Bruce Frier, and Ray Van Dam. I am especially grateful to David Potter, who has always provided invaluable guidance and encouragement, and whose scholarship sets an ongoing standard to which I aspire. I am also especially grateful to Bruce Frier, who is not only a valuable teacher and advisor, but who, through his fund, has provided ongoing and welcome financial support for the graduate students in IPGRH. Deborah Boedeker at Brown University, Maud Gleason at Stanford University, and Sara Forsdyke at Michigan have provided welcome advice and guidance. I would also like to thank the faculty members at the University of Michigan, including H.D. Cameron, Sara Forsdyke, Ruth Scodel, Mira Seo, and Ray Van Dam, whom I have been privileged to work for and learn from as an instructor.

# Table of Contents

Dedication .....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Abstract .....	vii
Chapter	
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Cicero’s Citizenship: <i>sanguis coniunctus existimandus est</i> .....	9
Ethnicity .....	12
Ethnicity in Modern Scholarship .....	13
Cicero and the Ethnicity Debate .....	16
Cicero and the Question of Romanness .....	18
Roman Behavior and Roman Values .....	20
Roman Behavior: the Ancestors of the “Best” .....	20
Roman Behavior: the Modern Roman .....	23
Un-Roman Behavior: Verres the Pirate .....	27
Interactions: Romanness outside Rome .....	32
Geography: Italy beyond Rome .....	39
Geography: Beyond Italy .....	43
Treatment of Allies and Becoming “Roman” .....	46
Conclusion .....	55
3. Necessary but Not Sufficient: Latin and Romanness under the Republic .....	58
Quality of Speech.....	67
Performing Roman Identity by Using Latin .....	78
Accommodation.....	84
Case Studies .....	90
Julius Caesar .....	90

Cicero and Atticus.....	97
Archias and Balbus .....	106
Conclusion .....	120
4. So You Want to Be a Roman: Rome’s Cultural, Political, and Territorial Expansion within Italy.....	122
Citizenship Status: Terminology and Concepts .....	129
Problems in Studying Roman Colonization.....	135
The Remodeling of Italy: Case Studies .....	138
Cosa.....	142
Paestum .....	145
Pompeii .....	147
General Traits of the Three Civic Centers .....	152
The Extension of Roman Citizenship to Groups and Individuals	157
Conclusion .....	169
5. Romanness Abroad: Roman Identities beyond Italy .....	172
The Significance of Urbanization .....	175
Romans in Iberia .....	177
The Rhine Frontier .....	191
Julius Caesar on the Frontier.....	194
Conclusion .....	203
6. Conclusion .....	207
Bibliography .....	210

# Abstract

How Romans Became “Roman”: Creating Identity in an Expanding World

by

Claudia I. Arno

Co-Chairs: David S. Potter and Nicola Terrenato

In this dissertation, I examine the ways in which the concept of what it meant to be “Roman” changed over the fourth through first centuries BCE in the minds of both Romans and non-Romans. I use literary evidence from the second and first centuries, especially Cicero’s speeches and treatises, as a window into the perceptions of the Roman elite, and the material culture (especially architectural, before Augustus) of Italian cities from the fourth to the first century as evidence of the official adoption of Roman practices by Italians. While Rome granted citizenship or partial citizen rights to individuals and towns over several centuries on a case-by-case basis, which suggests that Romans harbored a certain amount of flexibility in their ideas about what constituted their group identity, Rome’s transformation from a regional power to an imperial one necessitated a redefinition of what it meant to be Roman by birth or to acquire Roman citizenship. My conclusion is that, with the extension of Roman citizenship to most of the Italian peninsula in 90/89 BCE, the Roman citizenship became a characteristic that could be held in *addition* to a local identity. Meanwhile, for the original Romans (who



lived in Rome and whose ancestors had been Romans), being a Roman was no longer simply a matter of citizenship status. They had two options: they could either surrender their uniqueness and sense of Roman identity, or develop a sub-definition of Romanness based on birth and on behaving in a particular way. This placed “new men” like Cicero in the position of having to manufacture a Romanness as close as possible to that of the hereditary Romans and distinct from that of the newly-Roman Italians. Following the Social War, therefore, there were three distinct ways of understanding Roman citizenship: hereditary Romans understood Romanness to be a combination of ancestry and social and political participation; new men understood it to consist entirely of behavior that conformed to Roman traditions of virtue and service to the state; and the new, Italian, Romans saw it as a legal status to be acknowledged and enhanced by certain public behaviors.

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

My point of departure . . . is that nationality . . . is a cultural artefact of a particular kind . . . I will be trying to argue that the creation of these artefacts towards the end of the eighteenth century was the spontaneous distillation of a complex “crossing” of discrete historical forces, but that, once created, they became “modular,” capable of being transplanted, with varying degrees of self-consciousness, to a greater variety of social terrains, to merge and be merged with a correspondingly wide variety of political and ideological constellations.<sup>1</sup>

Writing in the early 1980s, Benedict Anderson famously argued that nations are in some sense “imagined communities,” created as much in the minds of individuals as in the lines on a map. Of course, nationality as described by Anderson does not really fit the model of the Roman world. While it thus might seem that Anderson’s work has little relevance to the study of perceptions of *identity* in the Roman world, in fact Anderson’s central point – that “nationality” can be created by belief in the existence in a group identity not solely defined by geography, language, or ethnicity – is critically important to understanding developments between the fourth and first centuries BCE in the ways Romans and non-Romans understood what it meant to be “Roman.” These years saw a shift, facilitated or necessitated by Rome’s expansion into Italy, and then expansion beyond Italy, in the ways in which identity was understood in the western Mediterranean.

---

<sup>1</sup> Anderson 1991, 4. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, [1983] 1991).

The term “Roman,” which at the beginning of this period had been a meaningful concept only to those living in the city of Rome, evolved from a geographical identifier into a set of criteria for evaluating individual or group behavior and then into a fusion of those criteria which was able to encompass other identities and give meaning to the process of Rome’s imperialism.

Over the past twenty years, scholars of the ancient world have accepted that the spread of Roman culture through Italy did not necessarily mean that the local identities of the communities of Italy were superseded by a “Roman” identity. At the same time, it is clear that the imposition and the acceptance of Roman practices throughout Italy signified an important change in the way Romans and Italians understood the concept of “being Roman.” Louise Revell, among others, has argued that “the issue of creating identity needs to be taken beyond the level of an ethnic Roman/native dichotomy, and reframed in terms of creation of many different identities;” I would add that in scholarship dealing with identity in the Roman world, we should be wary of the concept of a single “Roman identity,” and instead frame Roman social and cultural history in terms of multiple “Roman identities.”<sup>2</sup> In chapters 2 and 3, I focus my discussion of Roman identities primarily on what the Romans themselves, at least as represented by the urban elite, thought constituted “Romanness.” As important as I believe it to be for scholars to think about Roman *identities* rather than *identity*, the Romans did not think in those terms. The Romans of the late Republic who gave thought to this issue, however (notably including Cicero, the great statesman and orator of the mid-first century BCE), did recognize that

---

<sup>2</sup> Revell 1999, 57. Louise Revell, “Constructing Romanitas: Roman Public Architecture and the Archaeology of Practice” in Patricia Baker, Colin Forcey, Sophia Jundi, and Robert Witcher (eds.), *TRAC 98: Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeological Conference* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1999), pp.52-8.

there were multiple ways of expressing what they thought of as Roman identity in the singular: that is, different ways of being Roman. Given that the preponderance of the literary evidence for elite Roman attitudes before the Augustan era comes from Cicero, I have focused on that time period, although with the understanding that this is far from a comprehensive picture of contemporary thought.

I begin with the literary/oratorical evidence, drawing primarily on Cicero's forensic speeches for examples of a self-made Roman's interpretation of what Romanness meant; chapter 2, my first substantive chapter, is entitled "Cicero's Citizenship: *sanguis coniunctus existimandus est*" ("a common kinship must be recognized"). Cicero is particularly interesting in this context because he was a "new man" (that is, he came from the Italian town of Arpinum rather than from Rome itself and was the first in his family to hold a consulship), and thus put a great deal of time and energy into considering what it meant to be an ideal Roman citizen and then presenting himself as that man. I examine Cicero's descriptions of his own behavior, the behaviors of the blue-blooded Roman aristocrats by whom he often felt excluded, and the behaviors of non-Romans, in order to determine what qualities Cicero associated with Romanness and whether or how he felt Romanness could be acquired. Citizenship was one element of Roman identity, but it was possible to be a Roman who did not act Roman, and to be a foreigner who displayed Roman characteristics. Thus it is clear that Cicero and his fellow Romans recognized at least two ways of being Roman, through legal status and through behavior, and it is equally clear that neither of these components of identity was by itself always enough to make an individual indisputably Roman.

The fact that Cicero's writings so heavily dominate the surviving evidence from the Republic, and thus that our view of the concept of Romanness is colored by one individual's opinions, could be seen as a drawback for a study of this kind, but Cicero's opinions, as expressed through his work, are significant on several levels. Cicero's work communicates his experience over a number of years. In many ways, his career was the ideal for new men: he achieved high office at a relatively young age, acquired powerful friends, and was renowned as a speaker and as a writer. The fact that he still felt himself to be an outsider is telling, and the fact that he publicly expressed this feeling demonstrates that he expected his audience to recognize and understand it. Furthermore, Cicero was a politician and very interested in his social and intellectual legacy. This meant that when he published anything it was intended at least partly to shape his public image, but also to shape public opinion on other issues, notably including Romanness. Part of Cicero's self-image was his contribution to making the Roman state and the Roman people as secure and as noble in their conduct as possible. When he wrote about Romanness, he was promoting an understanding of identity that he believed in. In order to satisfy Cicero's requirements of self-promotion and public interest, this conceptualization of Roman identity had to apply to and appeal to a significant number of people in addition to Cicero himself.

It is important to note that I do not deal with freedmen as a class of individuals who acquired Roman citizenship during this period. The legal and philosophical issue surrounding manumission and the status of former slaves in Republican Rome are complex, and they are distinct from the more generalized questions of how free Romans and non-Romans viewed the concept of belonging to, and identifying as part of, Rome or

another Italian city or tribe. The Roman practice of granting citizenship to former slaves was notable in antiquity, but freedmen constituted a separate class under Roman law, and they were certainly seen as a distinct social class. Also, unlike the other groups under discussion, freedmen had been forcibly separated from their identities while being held at arm's length from the identity of Romanness. If and when they did achieve freedom and citizen status, therefore, these individuals tended to adopt ways of demonstrating their Romanness that were distinct from those practiced by other Romans.<sup>3</sup>

In chapter 3, entitled “Necessary, but Not Sufficient: Latin and Romanness under the Republic,” I focus on the role of the Latin language in determining and shaping Roman identity. I look at two components of Latin usage by Romans and non-Romans: the ability to speak Latin understandably and correctly, and the ability to deploy Latin effectively in the form of Roman oratory. Cicero is an excellent source of evidence for how Latin and Roman oratory were seen in the first century, while Julius Caesar provides information on the ways in which Latin was used outside Rome. Caesar's understanding of the implications of language use for defining identity are of particular interest because he, unlike Cicero or any of the grammarians who were their contemporaries, actually had a hand in determining the composition of the Roman people by engineering large-scale interactions between Romans and non-Romans and by extending the Roman citizenship (or at least the political participation that led to citizenship) to individuals and communities for whom Latin was a second language. In this chapter, I use concepts borrowed from linguistic anthropology, including language ideology and accommodation, to talk about the interrelation of language and identity.

---

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Lauren Hackworth Petersen, *The Roman Freedman in Art and Art History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

The purpose of chapter 4, the next substantive chapter, is to contextualize what I have identified as the Ciceronian concept of Romanness. By the mid-first century, Romans had arrived at a point at which Cicero could present himself as the quintessential Roman while advocating a fluid understanding of Romanness and an infinitely expandable citizen body, but such a definition would not always have been acceptable or comprehensible to Romans. I argue that, although the concept of Romanness had been growing more flexible over the fourth, third, and second centuries, it was the change in policy necessitated by the Social War and the implementation of the *lex Iulia* of 90/89 BCE that caused a radical shift in the Romans' understanding of Romanness. As the nature of Rome's interactions with Italian communities changed, and specifically as Rome began to extend Roman and Latin rights to groups of people who in many cases had never seen Rome, a different definition of Roman citizenship had to evolve. The Social War made it official: since the Italian communities did not give up their original identities but were now legally "Roman," Romanness was an identity that existed over and above local identities. The new definition was largely based on legal status, although behavior demonstrating the desire to be "Roman" was also an important component. The traditional definition was still valid, and the Roman elites in particular tended to hold to it, but the new definition existed simultaneously and stretched beyond it. Rome was now simply another state under the umbrella of Romanness, which was a supra-state, almost national, identity, although Romans had the distinction of having invented and given their name to this new identity.

In my fifth chapter, I examine the ways in which the evolution of the supra-state Roman identity related to Rome's expansion into two areas beyond Italy: the coastal

cities of southern Spain, members of whose elite families were to become the first non-Italian senators in Rome, and the Rhine frontier, which began to be developed under Augustus. This area of Spain had a long history of urbanization and positive connections with Rome, while the Rhine frontier had a non-urban, tribal socio-political structure and a tradition of hostility toward Rome. Southern Spain, in other words, resembled urban Italy in many ways, but had a different set of cultural influences; the Rhine, meanwhile, was dramatically different on the social, cultural, and political levels. Through a comparison between the ways in which these two areas developed in the first decades following their formal inclusion into Roman territory, and specifically the ways in which their adoptions of Roman culture resembled and differed from those of the Italian cities, another aspect of the Roman supra-state identity is perceptible. I argue that the infusion of Roman material culture into the extra-Italian territories was not a defined program of cultural imperialism, due to a combination of practical considerations (such as the need for military bases and mechanisms for tax collection), the agency of the local elite who were ready to take advantage of a new source of security and commercial opportunities, and the Roman need to act out Romanness, which included standards of conduct in interactions with non-Romans.

The Romans liked to think of themselves as a people defined by inclusiveness. The origin myth of Romulus in particular was tied to the concept of a voluntary association of groups and individuals who came together on an equal footing to form a powerful whole.<sup>4</sup> During the the fourth century BCE, however, many elite Romans viewed Roman identity as an immutable characteristic, something that they possessed by

---

<sup>4</sup> See especially Emma Dench, *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).



virtue of birth, rather than by virtue of attitude or activity. Between the fourth and the first centuries BCE, this concept of what it meant to be “Roman” shifted dramatically, in part because Romanness became an increasingly valuable commodity as Rome expanded throughout Italy and beyond. Ultimately, Romanness came to be seen as both an attribute of civilized individuals and a tool of Roman expansionism. Although Romans understood the myth of Romulus in the context of an archaic Rome that had long ceased to exist, the Romans of the middle and late Republic had a keen sense of their own exceptionalism and the desirability of belonging to the community of Romans; for Romans, both elites and non-elites, citizenship was thus both a means of evaluating and controlling the behavior of members of the group and a reward for behaving appropriately. As the citizen body expanded, the elite class of Romans reevaluated the nature of the control and the reward, until, by the end of the Republic, Romanness essentially fractured, such that, in the years following the Social War, there were three distinct ways of understanding Roman citizenship: hereditary Romans understood Romanness to be a combination of ancestry and social and political participation; new men, such as Cicero, understood it to consist entirely of behavior that conformed to Roman traditions of virtue and service to the state; and the new, Italian Romans saw it as a legal status to be acknowledged and enhanced by certain public behaviors.

## Chapter 2

### Cicero's Citizenship: *sanguis coniunctus existimandus est*

In his 70 BCE prosecution of Gaius Verres, the former Roman governor of Sicily, for oppression of the Sicilians, Marcus Tullius Cicero spoke often of the Sicilians' virtues and their friendship for the Roman people. Near the end of the final speech in his *Verrine Orations* (2.5.172), Cicero went so far as to state: "*nam civium Romanorum omnium sanguis coniunctus existimandus est, quoniam et salutis omnium ratio et veritas postulat.*" In other words, in Cicero's eyes, the prosecution of Verres on behalf of the Sicilians was necessary, "for we must hold that there is common blood among all Roman citizens, since both consideration of the common safety and the truth demand it." But what exactly was this *sanguis coniunctus* to which Cicero referred?<sup>1</sup> Clearly by "common blood" Cicero was not referring to literal blood kinship, as there was no historical tradition of such kinship between Romans and the Sicilians as a whole. Instead, Cicero was describing the *idea* of blood kinship, a kinship that comes into being between and among peoples and communities when the individuals in those communities

---

<sup>1</sup> As Sue Elwyn has explained,

We know of fewer than twenty occasions on which the Romans advanced or recognized a claim of kinship with another state, using such specific terms as *fraternitas*, *cognatio*, or *consanguinitas* in Latin [between the mid-third century BCE and the first century CE].

Elwyn 1993, 261. Sue Elwyn, "Interstate Kinship and Roman Foreign Policy," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123 (1993): 261-86.

believe in the existence of that kinship. This notion, that Romans shared “common blood” in a metaphorical sense by sharing a belief in something like a cultural kinship, hits directly upon Cicero’s understanding of what it meant to belong to the ethnic group known as “Roman,” and reflects the ways in which Cicero, indisputably one of the great Roman statesmen of his time, spoke and even thought about what it was to be “Roman”.

In his capacity as legal orator, Cicero spoke for and against some of the most colorful characters of the period from the 70s to the 40s BCE and some of the most important actors in shaping the transition from Republic to Empire. In this chapter, I focus on how Cicero described these men in terms of their characteristics, their actions, and the world in which they operated. The language Cicero used to present certain individuals and groups in a positive or negative light reveals much about Cicero’s own views, though it is of course necessary to bear in mind that in each case he was pursuing a specific goal (usually winning a lawsuit) and thus speaking to, and subsequently writing for, a very specific audience, such as a jury.<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of examining the changes in the way elites viewed the concept of “Romanness,” or what it meant to be a Roman, Cicero’s most significant rhetoric was that with which, whether implicitly or explicitly, he invoked the concepts of Roman identity or Roman character. To Cicero, Roman characteristics of individuals or of groups were generally good, while non-Roman characteristics and behaviors were generally bad. The reverses of these two propositions also held true (good characteristics are Roman, bad ones are foreign), making it possible,

---

<sup>2</sup> As Catherine Steel states,

Cicero does *not* always argue as we might expect him to do on any crude and simplistic picture of his aims and methods as a public speaker, and that the unexpected twists and turns of his arguments spring from a much more complex and nuanced response to the problems which Rome faced as it extended as an imperial power than is often allowed.

Steel 2001, 17. C. E. W. Steel, *Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

in Cicero's view, for Roman elites to act "barbarously" and for provincials to act "Roman." Cicero's words and speeches, and especially his selection of what characteristics to present as Roman and what characteristics to present as non-Roman in those words and speeches, suggest that Cicero was attempting – seemingly more consciously than unconsciously – to shape the very definition of Roman identity for his politically elite contemporaries.<sup>3</sup> In order to accomplish this shaping, he relied on various contemporary paradigms; in other words, Cicero was able to get his point across by tapping into the perceptions his fellow Romans had of themselves, of him, and of individuals and groups they defined primarily as "other."

In this chapter, I argue that Cicero's attempts to formulate a concept of Romanness over the course of his oratorical career, which reflected the ongoing discourse about Romanness being carried out at the time, fall into three rough categories: (1) his engagement with what scholars today would recognize as the debate between so-called primordialist and modernist thinkers about whether heredity or culture should define Roman ethnicity; (2) his expression of his views on the nature of Roman identity – in other words, by which characteristics an individual could be identified as Roman and what it meant to act in a Roman or an un-Roman fashion; and (3) his addressing of the role of geographical origins in the definition of identity while dealing with the impact of Roman imperialism (in the sense of increasing geographical dispersion of Romans and

---

<sup>3</sup> As Ann Vasaly points out in her 2009 article on the *Verrine Orations*, the forensic speeches offered Cicero the opportunity to carve out a place for himself in Roman political life:

Through the trial he injected himself forcefully, and for the first time, into a contemporary political debate and thereby created for himself a new space from which to operate within the political landscape.

(2009, 101.) I argue that, as part of this process, Cicero sought to base his position among the Roman elite on his stance as a self-appointed arbiter of Romanness. Ann Vasaly, "Cicero, Domestic Politics, and the First Action of the Verrines," *Classical Antiquity* Vol. 28, Issue 1 (2009): 101–137.

Roman power) on definitions of Romanness. In the speeches in which Cicero dealt with issues of Roman identity, the tension between hereditary membership in the Roman ethnic group and the idea of Romanness being defined by behavior was omnipresent. Ultimately, Cicero's formulation of Roman ethnicity, Roman identity, and Roman behavior came to depend more on what an individual believed and did than on blood-lines – hardly surprising for a man who was himself an example of a “true Roman” by dint of conscious choice rather than of lineage.<sup>4</sup>

## Ethnicity

Ethnicity is at once an extremely useful concept and term for talking about the ways in which individuals and groups perceive themselves and others, and a difficult one for scholars to use. As a recently-developed term and one that has been used across multiple disciplines, “ethnicity” has been interpreted in various different ways according to the nature of those disciplines and in particular the types of evidence – whether textual, archaeological or ethnographical – that those disciplines privilege.<sup>5</sup> At the most basic level, a good definition of ethnicity is probably: “the sum of the actions and characteristics whereby a group becomes a group.” (A “group,” for these purposes, is a collection of individuals whose members see themselves – and are seen – as being

---

<sup>4</sup> Cicero made this point of view explicit in the case of the citizens of Segesta and Centuripa (*Verr.* 2.5.83), “*quae cum officiis, fide, vestustate, tum etiam cognatione populi Romani nomen attingunt*” (who, by their actions, their loyalty, their antiquity, and even blood-kinship, attain to the name of the Roman people).

<sup>5</sup> For an excellent analysis of how ethnicity has been understood and used in archaeology in recent decades, see Sam Lucy, “Ethnic and Cultural Identities,” in *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion*, ed. Margarita Diaz-Andreu, Sam Lucy, Stasa Babic, and David N. Edwards (Oxon: Routledge, 2005). For an example of the ways in which literary texts have been used to approach questions of ethnicity in the ancient world, see J. H. C. Williams, *Beyond the Rubicon: Romans and Gauls in Republican Italy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); see also Emma Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

distinct from any other collection of individuals).<sup>6</sup> I am studying the development of the ethnicity we recognize as “Roman”; more importantly, it is about how Romans defined themselves and how they actually perceived the development of the concept of “Romanness” in the ancient Roman world. The issue of belonging to a group, which in this case can be conveniently defined as the Roman ethnic group, was both implicitly and explicitly central to Cicero’s definition of what it meant to be Roman. Thus, in this chapter, I focus on what scholars can learn about the development of Roman identity in Cicero’s time by studying his oratorical works: in other words, I explore the question of what Cicero, a prominent Roman citizen and politician who was nonetheless an “outsider” to the hereditary Roman aristocracy, thought about what characteristics constituted Romanness and about the nature of the relationship between Romans in the city of Rome itself and individuals (even “Romans”) in the Roman territories.

### **Ethnicity in Modern Scholarship**

Speaking very broadly, there are two traditional schools of thought when it comes to defining ethnic identity: (1) the perennialist, or primordialist, school; and (2) the modernist, or instrumentalist, school.<sup>7</sup> This dichotomy was articulated most famously by the anthropologist Fredrik Barth in his seminal introduction to *Ethnic Groups and*

---

<sup>6</sup> The concept of ethnicity, especially as defined in this way, is clearly closely related to the equally-fraught concepts of race and nationality. (See, for example, Benjamin Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004).) As Benedict Anderson famously observed, nations are in some sense “imagined communities,” created as much in the minds of individuals as in the lines on a map. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, [1983] 1991). In much the same way, ethnicity is largely, but not entirely, created in the minds of individuals, who self-identify as part of one ethnicity or another and who categorize others similarly. (See, for example, Cornel West, *Race Matters* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993).)

<sup>7</sup> Hyun Jin Kim, *Ethnicity and Foreigners in Ancient Greece and China* (London: Duckworth, 2009). Kim’s introduction provides an excellent summary of the history of writing about ethnicity.

*Boundaries: the Social Organization of Culture Difference*.<sup>8</sup> As formulated by Barth, the dichotomy expresses remarkably well the varying ways in which Romans of the first century BCE thought about Roman identity.<sup>9</sup> The primordialist school of thought, for example, places primary emphasis on common descent – or a tradition of common descent – in the definition of an ethnic group. This means that for primordialists, ethnicity is largely determined by something akin to genetics: an individual is of the same ethnicity as his or her mother and father.<sup>10</sup> Obviously, there are serious problems with the extreme form of this theory: it fails to account for adoption and for mixing of ethnicities, assumes that particular ethnicities are sharply distinguished, and ignores entirely the concept of cultural ethnicity. The modernist school of thought, in contrast, emphasizes the ability of individuals to define themselves consciously and actively as belonging to an ethnic group by participating in shared social and political institutions. The modernist school is clearly the more favorable for anyone wishing to understand an ethnic group as a fluid entity (and, in particular, one capable of expanding its membership). Like the primordialist school, however, it has some problems when taken to an extreme: it ignores obvious physiological connections between people with similar

---

<sup>8</sup> Barth essentially invented the instrumentalist school of thought.

<sup>9</sup> Fredrik Barth, ed., *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969).

<sup>10</sup> We must bear in mind, however, that even the primordialist understanding of ethnicity does not depend on actual, genetic heredity but rather on the belief in shared ancestry. Max Weber made this clear as early as 1922:

We shall call ‘ethnic groups’ those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization and migration; this belief must be important for the propagation of group formation; conversely, it does not matter whether or not an objective blood relationship exists.

*Economy and Society*, ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, trans. Ephraim Fischhof (vol. 2), (Berkeley: University of California Press, [1922] 1978), 389.

genetic backgrounds, and fails to account for the fact that much of ethnicity is, in the minds of the individuals belonging to various groups, tied to common descent.

Obviously, despite the fact that Barth was correct in identifying the dichotomy between primordialism and modernism, any true understanding of the development and identity of a particular ethnicity must include reasoning from both schools of thought.<sup>11</sup>

Gary Farney presents a different dichotomy in his study of Roman ethnicity:

Farney argues that Roman politicians thought about and used “otherness” in their careers by defining themselves (and being defined) by that part of their identities which was “other.” This means, logically, that what was “other” (from Cicero’s hometown of Arpinum, for example) could not be Roman.<sup>12</sup> The concept of the “other” as opposed to the self has long been essential to understandings of how ethnicity is defined and maintained. Barth stated:

category ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of mobility, contact and information, but do entail social processes of exclusion and incorporation whereby discrete categories are maintained despite changing participation and membership in the course of individual life histories... [V]itally important social relations... are maintained across such boundaries, and are frequently based precisely on the dichotomized ethnic statuses.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> In recent decades another movement has arisen in the study of ethnicity: the “constructivist” school of thought holds that both primordialist and instrumentalist approaches are inherently flawed and focuses instead on the intentional development of “ethnicities” by various groups specifically in order to promote the power or status of these groups, especially in the context of 19<sup>th</sup>- and 20<sup>th</sup>-century state formation. (See Thomas Hylland Eriksen, “Ethnic Identity, National Identity, and Intergroup Conflict: The Significance of Personal Experiences,” in *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*, ed. Richard D. Ashmore, Lee Jussim, and David Wilder (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 44-7.)

<sup>12</sup> Gary D. Farney, *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007). Though Farney and I both deal with questions of identity within Italy and the ways in which identity was interpreted, Farney focuses heavily on (1) what the Romans exported culturally as opposed to what they imported and (2) how elite individuals translated perceptions of identity into political power. Farney also looks at the Republic explicitly through the lens of the Empire; his work begins and ends with the imperial myth of a Rome that was and had always been ethnically inclusive. In Farney’s interpretation, this is indeed myth rather than reality.

<sup>13</sup> Barth 1969, 9-10.



Although ethnic groups certainly define themselves in part on the basis of their relationship to “others”, however, it is entirely possible for an individual’s identity to include some elements of what is “other” without threatening the identity of the group. The modernist idea of continual construction and reconstruction of identity allows for the inclusion, at various points, of elements from other groups into the identity of individuals or of the ethnic group as a whole. During the last century of the Republic, Roman identity came to encompass not only those who were “primordially” Roman but those who became Roman, bringing with them the experience of belonging to non-Roman groups; this ultimately broadened the very definition of Romanness to include individuals who in some sense belonged to other ethnic groups but chose to see themselves and be seen primarily as Roman.

### **Cicero and the Ethnicity Debate**

Cicero clearly thought about Romanness in both primordialist and modernist terms. Cicero’s speeches, for example, show a clearly instrumentalist or modernist bent: people can become Roman, and deserve to become Roman, if they have performed conspicuous service to Rome.<sup>14</sup> The quintessential Romans of Rome’s past – who were also the ancestors of some of Cicero’s noble colleagues and audience members – were important to Cicero’s definition of Romanness not because they had sired the Roman people, but because they provided examples for future Romans (notably including Cicero) to follow.<sup>15</sup> Cicero did not, however, by any means dismiss the importance of

---

<sup>14</sup> See especially the *Pro Balbo* and *Pro Archia*; for a detailed discussion of these two cases, see Steel 2001, chap. 2 (pp.75-112).

<sup>15</sup> See Cicero’s definition of *optimates*, literally the best possible Romans, in *Pro Sestio* 96-9. He goes on, in *Pro Sestio* 143, to exhort his fellow Romans:

*Qua re imitemur nostros Brutos, Camillos, Ahalas, Decios, Curios, Fabricios, Maximos, Scipiones, Lentulos, Aemilios, innumerabilis alios qui hanc rem publicam stabiliverunt...*

blood kinship and its influence on the character of individual Romans; to do so would, paradoxically, be un-Roman in itself. Instead, he made frequent appeals to his noble contemporaries to live up to the greatness of their forefathers. This was a particularly effective rhetorical technique because it played into the primordialist way in which these men from great families defined *themselves* as Romans.

Cicero was, in effect, forced to walk a narrow line between those whom we would now call “primordialists” and “modernists.” In his own life, and therefore in many of his court cases, Cicero had to confront the problem of being a “new man,” one without ancestral political connections to invoke or to fall back on, among men whose definition of themselves as Romans rested to a significant extent upon their hereditary places in Rome’s governing class.<sup>16</sup> In interacting with these men, however, Cicero also had to account for the fact that the post-Sullan aristocrats were not themselves entirely primordialist in their understanding of Romanness. In other words, in the eyes of Romans of impeccable Roman lineage, it was certainly possible for Romans to behave in such un-Roman ways as to make it appropriate for other Romans to eject the miscreants

---

*Amemus patriam, pareamus senatui, consulamus bonis; praesentis fructus neglegamus, posteritatis gloriae serviamus; id esse optimum putemus quod erit rectissimum; speremus quae volumus, sed quod acciderit feramus . . .*

And so let us imitate our Bruti, Camilli, Ahalae, Decii, Curii, Fabricii, Maximi, Scipiones, Lentuli, Aemilii, and countless others who made the Republic unshakeable... Let us love our fatherland, obey the senate, take thought for the good; let us disregard immediate reward, and act for the glory of future generations; let us consider what is for the best and what will be most correct; let us hope for whatever we like, but bear whatever may befall us . . .

<sup>16</sup> As Treggiari (2003) states: “In deploying the arguments about socio-political and moral ancestry, Cicero shows that most of his fellow Romans would identify with such ideas. He is tapping into belief and emotion.” Susan Treggiari, “Ancestral Virtues and Vices: Cicero on Nature, Nurture and Presentation,” in *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome*, ed. David Braund and Christopher Gill (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2003), 163. See also Steel (2001, 20):

Cicero’s rhetoric of empire illustrates both his strengths and weaknesses as an orator; his capacity to be persuasive is breathtaking, but his lack of alternative political capital – military success, distinguished ancestry, exceptional wealth, unscrupulousness – places firm limits on what he can and cannot say.

from the community and from the privileges of citizenship. In interacting with these men, Cicero was forced to engage in a truly intricate balancing act.

### **Cicero and the Question of Romanness**

From Cicero's speeches, we can glean his view of the contemporary shaping of Romanness as both an insider (one of Rome's social and political elite) and as an outsider (a new man among the post-Sullan aristocracy). Cicero was continually dealing with the question of how to be both a new man and one of the *optimates* (best men). As part of his efforts to do so, he frequently invoked what he saw as "Roman" characteristics in his speeches; *fides* (loyalty), *moderatio* (self-control), *dignitas* (dignity), *integritas* (trustworthiness), and *iustitia* (justice) are a few of the more common adjectives he sprinkled liberally throughout his arguments when speaking of the virtues of the men he was representing.<sup>17</sup> These traits were not meant simply to describe the uprightness of Cicero's clients. Instead, Cicero used these particular terms to connect those of his contemporaries whom he wanted to praise with the great Romans of earlier times. Cicero had no interest in revolutionizing Roman society. His views on how the Republic should function were, in fact, fairly conservative for the first-century period of political flux in which he operated.<sup>18</sup> In setting himself in opposition to the post-Sullan aristocracy, he was essentially – like many other individuals and especially politicians – trying to

---

<sup>17</sup> Cicero also invoked the *liberalitas* (generosity), *constantia* (firmness), *pudor* (modesty), *temperantia* (restraint), *gravitas* (seriousness), *industria* (hard work), *comitas* (friendliness) and *honestas* (honesty) of his fellow Romans; in addition, he described both individuals and the Roman people as a whole as *fortissimi* (bravest), *optimi viri* (the best men), *sani* (reasonable), *continentissimi* (having the most self-control), *clarissimi* (most noteworthy), and *magni animi* (of the greatest mind or spirit).

<sup>18</sup> As Elizabeth Asmis states in her article on Cicero's *De republica*, "Cicero... does not merely impute the best type of constitution to the Romans. He elevates the Roman constitution above all other mixed constitutions as the single best constitution" (2005, 377). At *De republica* 1.34, Cicero claims to be quoting Scipio Aemilianus when he claims that Rome's ancestral constitution is by far the best of any in existence. Elizabeth Asmis, "A New Kind of Model: Cicero's Roman Constitution in 'De republica,'" *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 126, No. 3 (Autumn, 2005): 377-416.

promote himself and his position in opposition to people with whom he did not get along. Thus, he was entirely in favor of retaining the cultural tradition of placing a high value on ancestral exempla. Ancestry was vitally important to Cicero because he saw the great men of Rome's past as the cultural, rather than biological, ancestors of Romans (including himself) who were true to Roman values.<sup>19</sup> As crucial as this dichotomy is to understanding Cicero's take on the political situations of the first century BCE and the issues of Roman ethnic identity, however, it does not offer a clear explanation for what Cicero believed defined Roman ethnicity.

Definitions of and questions about identity were particularly rife in the late second and first centuries BCE. Rome itself experienced numerous political and social stresses; at the beginning of Cicero's career, for example, the earliest provincial territories were still fairly young, the Social War was fresh in Roman and Italian minds, and Sulla's dictatorship lingered in Rome in the guise of the Sullan political reforms. By the end of Cicero's career, moreover, the Republic was (as it turned out) on its last legs. Over about the same period, the shape of Rome's territory and the numbers of Roman citizens and Roman subjects changed dramatically. While Cicero's was perhaps not the most important or influential voice at the time, it was certainly one of the loudest; Cicero directly addressed the problems of defining Romanness and determining who was and was not Roman, and he did it in a very public fashion. His speeches, in fact, depict Cicero's attempt to forge an identity for himself both as someone special – a great orator and statesman, not just *a* Roman, but *the* Roman – and as a member of the group.

---

<sup>19</sup> For the background of the broad definition of ancestry that enabled Cicero, among others, to claim descent from other men's biological ancestors, see Henriette Van Der Blom, *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010): 13f.

In his speeches and writings, Cicero attempted to promulgate his understanding of Roman identity, which is to say, the way in which he thought Romans should behave in order to be the best Romans possible. He did this by praising ideal Roman behavior and criticizing its opposite, and, perhaps less consciously, by invoking Roman elite perceptions of Italy, the provinces, and provincials. In other words, Cicero attempted to define what it was to be “Roman” by focusing both on actions and identity, by identifying both what he believed was “Roman” individual behavior and what he believed was somehow “Roman” territory. Ultimately, however, neither individual behavior nor physical geography could fully and accurately differentiate those whom Cicero viewed as Roman from those he thought were un-Roman; in part, he moved toward a more complete understanding by considering, under the general category of treatment of allies, how certain peoples not truly “Roman” by dint of geography or behavior could somehow be culturally transformed.

## Roman Behavior and Roman Values

Cicero’s remarks concerning the characteristics and behavior exhibited by Romans that constituted Romanness and un-Romanness fall into two rough categories: (1) those that refer to Roman ancestors and ancestry; and (2) those that refer to the behavior of modern Romans, including “new men” like himself.

### **Roman Behavior: the Ancestors and the “Best”**

Cicero praised two groups of people unquestioningly: the men whom he was defending and the great Romans of the past on whom all proper Roman behavior was modeled. Whenever Cicero invoked the name of a specific Roman ancestor or referred

more generally to the actions of “our ancestors”, it was to praise these men and to encourage his listeners to imitate their example.<sup>20</sup> Cicero praised good men as being like earlier Romans, condemned those who behaved badly as comparing unfavorably to earlier Romans, encouraged individuals who were present at the trials to live up to the reputation of their own ancestors, and supported points that he wanted to emphasize by setting himself up as being in agreement with ancestral tradition. Cicero himself also came in for a great deal of praise in his own speeches, given his penchant for portraying his clients as the noble victims of unseemly plots and himself as a man capable of seeing through such treachery and bringing enlightenment to the jury and the Roman people, but it was always the ancestors who occupied the highest moral ground. The *mos maiorum*, or ancestral way of doing things, constituted the highest standard of Roman behavior. In the *Pro Sestio*,<sup>21</sup> Cicero straightforwardly exhorted his listeners to join him in imitating the examples of the Bruti, Camilli, Ahalae, Decii, Curii, Fabricii, Maximi, Scipiones, Lentuli, Aemilii, and “*innumerabilis alios qui hanc rem publicam stabiliverunt*” (“countless others who made the Republic unshakeable”):

*amemus patriam, pareamus senatui, consulamus bonis; praesentis fructus neglegamus, posteritatis gloriae serviamus; id esse optimum putemus quod erit rectissimum; speremus quae volumus, sed quod acciderit feramus.*

---

<sup>20</sup> “It is appropriate to remind sections of the Roman people of the *virtus* of their ancestors (e.g. *Sest.* 81) and to represent the electorate as thinking of the examples set by their ancestors (*Planc.* 12).” (Treggiari 2003, 144.)

<sup>21</sup> In 56 BCE, Cicero defended Publius Sestius on a charge of violence during his tribunate. Cicero focused a great deal of his speech on establishing his client as a man of impeccable ancestry and an upholder of the *mos maiorum* who was under attack by a group of men who would overthrow the state if given the opportunity. Cicero also took the opportunity to elaborate on the nature of Roman character, describing the development of civilization from the time when savage bands of men wandered in the wilderness until his own time, when there were cities and laws (*Pro Sestio* 91-2), and going on to define the term “*optimates*” (*Pro Sestio* 97-8) and what constituted *bonam famam bonorum* (“the good reputation of good men”) (*Pro Sestio* 138-9). Sestius was acquitted.

let us love our fatherland, obey the senate, take thought for the good; let us disregard immediate reward, and act for the glory of future generations; let us consider what is for the best and what will be most correct; let us hope for whatever we like, but bear whatever may befall us.<sup>22</sup>

Marcus Porcius Cato (“Cato the Elder”) was one of Cicero’s favorite ancestral exemplars.

Not only was the Elder Cato known as “*fortissimum virum et illis temporibus doctissimum*” (“the most excellent and learned man of his time”), but his descendant, Marcus Porcius Cato Uticensis (“Cato the Younger”), was a participant in several of Cicero’s trials on the opposing side; this meant that Cicero could reproach the Younger Cato with not living up to the reputation of his illustrious great-grandfather, and that this rhetorical device would be fully appreciated everyone else present.<sup>23</sup>

Although Cicero was able to extol several of his clients by reminding his listeners that the men came from ancient and respectable families, he was not able to make use of the same device for his own benefit – at least not directly. He did make several references to “our ancestors” (for example, at *Pro Fonteio* 23, *Pro Murena* 77, *Pro Archia* 22, and *Pro Balbo* 55), usually in order to recommend that the court look to precedent or not overturn traditional practices. He also referenced the great events of Roman history associated with his hometown, Arpinum, noting that Gaius Marius, the great general and new man of the late second century, was one of his compatriots.<sup>24</sup> Most

---

<sup>22</sup> *Pro Sestio* 143.

<sup>23</sup> *Pro Archia* 15-6.

<sup>24</sup> *Pro Sestio* 48:

*Praesertim cum eius essem civitatis ex qua C. Mucius solus in castra Porsennae venisset eumque interficere proposita sibi morte conatus esset; ex qua P. Decius primum pater, post aliquot annos patria virtute praeditus filius se ac vitam suam instructa acie pro salute populi Romani victoriaque devovisset; ex qua innumerabiles alii partim adipiscendae laudis, partim vitandae turpitudinis causa mortem in variis bellis aequissimis animis oppetissent; in qua civitate ipse meminisset patrem huius M. Crassi, fortissimum virum, ne videret victorem vivus inimicum, eadem sibi manu vitam exhausisse qua mortem saepe hostibus obtulisset.*

striking, however, is Cicero's statement that while the Younger Cato had the Elder Cato as an example of virtue in his own family, Cicero himself, as a good Roman, had just as much responsibility to emulate the great man.<sup>25</sup> On the one hand, Cicero was establishing a hereditary place for himself with ancestors of his own choosing; on the other, he was making the point that it was not necessary for him – or, presumably, for other new men – to claim literal blood kinship with any famous Roman. Instead, for Cicero, something like cultural ancestry stood in for the ties of blood; the fact of their common Romanness was enough.

### **Roman Behavior: The Modern Roman**

In the *Pro Sestio*, Cicero spoke at some length on the nature of the *optimates*.<sup>26</sup> Given the importance of ancestry, whether biological or metaphorical, one would expect ancestral examples as illustrations of how to be “the best.” In this passage, however, Cicero called upon the everyday examples that people could see around them: “*sunt principes consili publici... sunt municipales rustique Romani, sunt negoti gerentes, sunt*

---

Especially since I was of that same city from which Gaius Mucius had gone alone into Porsenna's camp and attempted to kill him, putting his own life on the line; from which first Publius Decius the father, and after some years the son, endowed with the strength of his father, when the battle-lines were drawn up devoted themselves and their lives for the safety and success of the Roman people; from which countless others, some to obtain glory and some to avoid shame, had sought death in various wars with equanimity; in which same city I remembered the father of this Marcus Crassus, a most excellent man, lest he should live to see the enemy's victory, ending his life with the very hand with which he had often dealt death to enemy forces.

*Pro Sestio* 50.

<sup>25</sup> *Pro Murena* 66:

*Est illud quidem exemplum tibi propositum domi, sed tamen naturae similitudo illius ad te magis qui ab illo ortus es quam ad unum quemque nostrum pervenire potuit, ad imitandum vero tam mihi propositum exemplar illud est quam tibi.*

He is indeed an example available to you within your own family, but although the similarity to his nature is greater in you who are descended from him than could be the case for any one of us, indeed he is available to me as an example to be imitated as much as he is to you.

<sup>26</sup> *Pro Sestio* 96-9.



*etiam libertini optimates*” (“the best men are the first men of the public council... they are Romans who live in municipal towns and in the countryside, they are businessmen, some are even freedmen”). The *optimates* exemplified the traditional values of *honestas* (truthfulness), *religio* (piety), and *iudicia* (justice), as well as *virtus* and *dignitas*; these are all qualities that appeared in Cicero’s descriptions of ancestors worthy of emulation. Cicero also emphasized these men’s service to the Republic in the form of *auctoritas* (influence), *fides* (loyalty), *constantia* (firmness), and *magnitudo animi* (greatness of spirit).<sup>27</sup> All of these qualities appeared elsewhere in Cicero’s work, describing ancestors and contemporary Romans; and indeed Cicero also stated that the *optimates* were defenders of the *mos maiorum*, which implied that the values of the *optimates* were the values of the ancestors. The passage describing the *optimates* represented a departure, but not a dramatic departure, from the significance of ancestors as models of Romanness. From Cicero’s inclusion of this description of those individuals who represented the best of Roman society, it is possible to see that Cicero was experimenting with moving beyond the linear connections of individual Romans to individual ancestors into a world in which he could reference broad archetypes of Roman tradition.

The role of the individual citizen was crucial to Cicero’s understanding of Rome and Romanness; the fact that this was a core element of his worldview clashed with most Romans’ and some modern scholars’ understanding of Rome as a traditionalist society in which the “best form of citizen participation was to accept and pass on in as good a condition as possible what had been handed down from the immemorial past.”<sup>28</sup> As

---

<sup>27</sup> *Pro Sestio* 138; 139.

<sup>28</sup> James E.G. Zetzel, “Citizen and Commonwealth in *De Re Publica* Book 4” in *Cicero’s Republic*, J.G.F. Powell and J.A. North, eds. (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2001), 86.

J.E.G. Zetzel points out, “[Cicero’s] own life confirmed in him the strong belief in the power of individuals to preserve and even to improve the *res publica*; and the [*De Re Publica*] itself is described, in his letter to Quintus, as *de optimo statu civitatis et de optimo cive*. Hence the difficulty and complexity of Cicero’s construction: the problem of explaining a society based in principle on unchanging tradition in terms which allow a continuing and significant role for the *optimus civis*.”<sup>29</sup> Cicero dealt with this difficulty by creating a definition of Romanness based on the behavior of the individual; in other words, being Roman was an opt-in system, in which each individual could make the decision to follow the traditions and morality of Rome. Anyone who wanted to be a member of the group was expected to attempt to be the *optimus civis*, which he would demonstrate by displaying certain quintessentially Roman qualities, and the standards were set by the ancestral *optimates*.<sup>30</sup>

When praising his clients to the courts, Cicero tended to focus on a particular set of key moral characteristics. He mentioned *dignitas*, *liberalitas*, and *moderatio* in the case of Publius Sulla, and *liberalitas* and *abstinentia* in the case of Publius Sestius.<sup>31</sup> In a particularly grand rhetorical flourish, Cicero referred to Lucius Flaccus as *modestissimus*, *sanctissimus*, *fortissimus*, *diligentissimus*, *temperatissimus*, and *constantissimus*.<sup>32</sup> In

---

<sup>29</sup> Zetzel 2001, 86-7.

<sup>30</sup> Zetzel (2001, 95-6) also argues that, paradoxically, anyone acting as a *censor* or *moderator* (and so acting for the protection of Cicero’s Rome)

must break with tradition in order to preserve it, he must revise the *instituta* in order to maintain them. Any theory of republicanism must take account of the fact that virtue is not universal... [Cicero] recognized the need for reformation and reconstitution, the continuing role of the statesman in maintaining and restoring the social fabric.

<sup>31</sup> *Pro Sulla* 73; *Pro Sestio* 7.

<sup>32</sup> *Pro Flacco* 8:

*Tmolites ille vicanus, homo non modo nobis sed ne inter suos quidem notus, vos docebit qualis sit L. Flaccus? Quem vos modestissimum adolescentem, provinciae*

Cicero's view, Verres' son-in-law showed regard for his own *dignitas*, *aetas* (proper behavior for his age), and *nobilitas* by renouncing Verres; the implication was that Verres himself scorned these things.<sup>33</sup> In the *Pro Sulla* Cicero described himself as being naturally possessed of *misericordia* (compassion) and having cultivated *severitas* (sternness) for the good of the state, but never having needed to employ *crudelitas* (cruelty) on a personal or professional level.<sup>34</sup> In the *Verrine Orations*, Cicero stated that he (unlike Verres) valued *fides* (faith), *pudor* and *pudicitia* (modesty and chastity), *religio* (piety), and *ius aequum* (fairness under the law).<sup>35</sup> Cicero then went on to accuse his noble audience of lacking the proper appreciation for certain values exemplified by new

---

*maximae sanctissimum virum, vestri exercitus fortissimum militem, diligentissimum ducem, temperatissimum legatum quaestoremque cognoverunt, quem vos praesentes constantissimum senatorem, iustissimum praetorem atque amantissimum rei publicae civem iudicastis.*

Shall that Tmolian villager, a man not only unknown to us but not even known to his own people, tell you what sort of man Lucius Flaccus is? A man whom you know to have been a thoroughly modest youth, whom the greatest provinces knew as a supremely virtuous man, whom your army knew to be the bravest soldier, the most conscientious general, the most moderate legate and quaestor, whom you who are present have judged to be the most reliable senator, the fairest praetor, and the citizen most devoted to his country.

L. Valerius Flaccus was accused by Publius Lucius of oppression in the province of Asia, where he was propraetor in 62-1 BCE. One of the most notorious charges against Flaccus was that he had seized the gold that the Jews collected annually and sent to Jerusalem and instead sent it to Rome. Flaccus was defended by Cicero and by Cicero's sometime rival Q. Hortensius Hortalus, and was acquitted.

<sup>33</sup> *In Verrem* 2.2.48.

<sup>34</sup> *Pro Sulla* 8. P. Cornelius Sulla was elected consul in 66 BCE but was impeached and convicted of bribery. In 62 he was accused by Lucius Torquatus of involvement in the Catilinarian conspiracy of 63-2. In the course of the trial, Torquatus called Cicero the third foreign king to reign in Rome (after Numa and Tarquin). Cicero introduced his speech by acting hurt at this accusation, and went on to emphasize moderation and generosity as typical Roman virtues unable to coexist in the same person with the evils of the Catilinarians. Sulla was acquitted.

<sup>35</sup> *In Verrem* 2.3.6. Cicero is able to contrast himself with Verres in these speeches on the basis of their shared status as men who had recently held magistracies. As Steel points out, "[t]he particulars of the aedileship are very different from those of a propraetorship; but they are both magistracies, whose holders should be bound by the *religio omnium officiorum*, the scrupulous care to perform all duties." (2001, 29.)

men such as himself: *virtus* (virtue, the essential quality of Roman manhood), *integritas* (trustworthiness), *industria* (hard work), *frugalitas* (frugality), and *pudor* (modesty).<sup>36</sup>

### **Un-Roman Behavior: Verres the Pirate**

Descriptions of positive behaviors are not as striking as they would otherwise be without descriptions of negative behaviors to which to compare them. In his speeches, Cicero repeatedly addressed notable examples of Romans behaving exactly contrary to Roman values. Gaius Verres was an especially rich source of examples of what not to do; the *Verrine Orations* thus offer some of the best evidence regarding what Cicero thought it meant to act in Roman fashion. Whether we see Verres as a diabolical criminal mastermind or as the venal victim of Cicero's eloquence, Verres has entered the canon of Roman oratory as the quintessential example of what a Roman governor – or even a Roman citizen abroad – should not do or be.<sup>37</sup> The Verres of Cicero's *Verrine Orations* abused hospitality, despoiled temples, falsified records, harassed women and children, shrugged off his military duties, tortured Roman citizens, bribed witnesses, and even, from time to time, wore perfume.<sup>38</sup> Happily for Cicero, the late Republic possessed an idiom that was particularly apt for expressing Verres' dastardliness: by referring to

---

<sup>36</sup> *In Verrem* 2.3.7.

<sup>37</sup> Although the speeches *In Verrem* are notable for Cicero's deployment of every weapon in his rhetorical arsenal that could possibly pertain to reprehensible behavior in the provinces, several of the shorter forensic speeches, which were not attacking provincial governors per se, display comparable strategies. In the *Pro Flacco*, for example, Cicero had two opponents: Decimus Laelius was a young man making a name for himself as Cicero had done with in the case of Verres, and Gaius Appuleius Decianus was a middle-aged man living in Flaccus' province, Asia Minor. Neither were *imperium*-holders, but Cicero used the same tactics that he had previously used to discredit Verres, Piso, and Gabinius (the latter two in the *de provinciis consularibus*), "which suggests that codes of appropriate behavior in the provinces were not limited to figures in authority, but could be extended, by comparison, to any Roman who had dealings overseas." (Steel 2001, 22.)

<sup>38</sup> See Thomas D. Frazel, *The Rhetoric of Cicero's "In Verrem"* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009) for a full, contextualized analysis of Cicero's rhetorical strategies in the *In Verrem*, especially his focuses on the themes of Verres' tyranny, effeminacy (*mollitia*), and greed (*avaritia*).

Verres throughout the speeches as a “pirate,” Cicero evoked the image of a stereotypically un-Roman, even anti-Roman, individual.

In this era of Roman expansionism and overseas development, pirates were seen as the opposite of Romans because, while both groups initially gained access to land and goods through their military power, and while this military power shaped their initial interactions with other people, pirates did not maintain their power over areas such as Sicily in the “Roman” way. In other words: pirates never settled down, they stole and destroyed without being productive, and they did not establish long-term or positive relationships with the local communities. Romans, with some notable exceptions, preferred to make use of the land they had subdued by force by settling down there, making it as productive as possible (which in the case of Sicily meant that many Romans had estates on the island which they either farmed themselves or maintained as absentee landlords), and forming ties of friendship and patronage with the local elites. It was this plan for the long-term improvement and stability of the province that Verres violated by his actions as governor: he stole from communities and individuals, overburdened Sicily economically, and tormented the Sicilian elites under the color of Roman authority.<sup>39</sup>

The importance of piracy for Cicero’s rhetoric, however, lies not in the direct threat that pirates posed to Romans and their possessions (or, in Brent D. Shaw’s words, to “the social and moral order of the state”), but in the fact that a “pirate” was defined by his behavior, not by any hereditary or national identity; one could become a pirate (and

---

<sup>39</sup> See Brent D. Shaw, “Bandits in the Roman Empire,” in *Studies in Ancient Greek and Roman Society*, Robin Osborne, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) for the role of provincial governors in the Late Republic and Empire in keeping down banditry (*latrocinium*) in the provinces (though Shaw does not, for the purposes of his article, include piracy under the heading of banditry).

hence an anti-Roman) by inverting normal Roman behavior.<sup>40</sup> The Roman elite regarded their relationship with the province as one regulated by moral obligation: early in the first speech of the *Verrines*, and elsewhere, Cicero describes Verres as having harassed and *betrayed* (*vexavit ac perdidit*) the province under his protection.<sup>41</sup>

Cicero used two techniques to paint Verres as un-Roman and piratical, and so to set Verres apart from the senatorial jurors: the positive examples of what Romanness was, and the negative examples of what Verres was and Romanness was not.<sup>42</sup> Cicero made his point about just how bad Verres, that “*homo audacissimus atque amentissimus*” (“superlatively bold and untrustworthy man”) was by detailing his offenses against provincials, Romans, and Rome’s international reputation.<sup>43</sup> Early in the first speech, Cicero called Verres a *depeculator*, *vexator*, *praedo*, *labes* and *pernicius*: plunderer of treasuries, molester of Asia and Pamphylia, robber of his urban praetorship, and the ruin and destruction of the province of Sicily.<sup>44</sup> Shortly thereafter, Cicero promised to make plain “*istius insidiae nefariae, quas uno tempore mihi, vobis, M’. Glabrioni praetori, populo Romano, sociis, exteris nationibus, ordini, nomini denique senatorio facere conatur,*” the nefarious plots Cicero maintained Verres had hatched against Cicero

---

<sup>40</sup> Shaw 2004, 326-7.

<sup>41</sup> *In Verrem* 1.1.12.

<sup>42</sup> See Vasaly (2009) on the Senate’s implied culpability in Verres’ crimes and Cicero’s distancing of Verres from the jury of his senatorial peers. Cicero managed this in part by creating a community of those harmed by Verres, which included the Senate, because its reputation had been harmed by Verres’ behavior.

Throughout the *Verrines*... Cicero transforms his prosecution of Verres into a defense: of provincials and Roman citizens harmed by Verres, of Roman financial interests, and of the stability and reputation of Roman *imperium*, which was being undermined not just by Verres, but by all such rapacious governors.

(Vasaly 2009, 118.)

<sup>43</sup> *In Verrem* 1.1.7.

<sup>44</sup> *In Verrem* 1.1.3.

himself, the jury judging Verres, Manius Glabio the praetor, the Roman people, the allies, foreign states, the elite class, and the reputation of the senate, all at the same time.<sup>45</sup>

Cicero went on to allude specifically to the plight of the citizens *and* allies, *cives atque socios*, against whom Verres committed *insignes iniurias*, conspicuous offenses.<sup>46</sup> Steel points out that “the theft of religious statuary raises the possibility that Verres is endangering the Roman state’s favored position with the gods by his impiety; his military failure strikes a direct blow at Roman interests.”<sup>47</sup> In the first speech of the second *actio*, Cicero pointed out that Verres had defiled the reputation (*fama*) of the Roman imperium; he had acted as “*non legatum... sed tyrannum libidinosum crudelemque*,” not a magistrate but a cruel and lustful tyrant. Cicero also took this opportunity to point out that trust in Roman law is what keeps the peace in the provinces.<sup>48</sup> As Frazel states, “Cicero portrays a Verres who did away with the *ius imperi* itself, thus directly negating the very claims of Rome to govern the world.”<sup>49</sup>

Meanwhile, throughout the speeches, Cicero dropped hints of Verres’ piratical behavior. In the first speech, during the standard discussion of why he had taken the case in the first place and the work he had done to make it airtight, Cicero stated that Verres had laid numerous ambushes for him *terra marique*, by land and by sea.<sup>50</sup> In the fourth speech of the second *actio*, he accused Verres directly of acting *ut praedones solent*, as

---

<sup>45</sup> *In Verrem* 1.1.4.

<sup>46</sup> *In Verrem* 1.1.7.

<sup>47</sup> Steel 2001, 24.

<sup>48</sup> *In Verrem* 2.1.82.

<sup>49</sup> Frazel 2009, 166-7.

<sup>50</sup> *In Verrem* 1.1.3.

pirates are accustomed to do.<sup>51</sup> In the same speech, Cicero described the city of Syracuse as looking as if it had been attacked “*non...ab hoste aliquo...sed...a barbaris praedonibus,*” that is, not by an actual army (because armies have some discipline and religious scruples) but by savage pirates.<sup>52</sup> In the first speech of the second *actio*, in describing Verres’ actions before arriving in Sicily as governor, Cicero stated that the town of Miletus lost one of the ships that Lucius Murena had ordered it to maintain against piracy “*non praedonum repentino adventu sed legati latrocinio,*” not to the sudden appearance of pirates but to the banditry of a magistrate, adding that the Milesians, as witnesses, “*ostendent C. Verrem, in ea classe quae contra piratas aedificata sit, piratam ipsum consceleratum fuisse,*” would show that Gaius Verres had himself acted as a depraved pirate against the fleet which had been built to oppose piracy.<sup>53</sup>

Indeed, Verres apparently did a terrible job of keeping pirates out of Sicily. The Sicilian fleet, though seriously undermanned as a result of false economy on Verres’ part, once managed to capture a pirate vessel and bring it to Syracuse, where Verres acted “*quasi praeda sibi advecta, non praedonibus captis,*” as though the spoils had been delivered to him, and not to the captured pirates.<sup>54</sup> Verres divided up the booty among his supporters and allowed the pirate captain to disappear.

Through his description of individual characteristics – his analysis of how a true Roman should act and of how a criminal such as Verres could bring shame upon the

---

<sup>51</sup> *In Verrem* 2.4.12.

<sup>52</sup> *In Verrem* 2.4.122.

<sup>53</sup> *In Verrem* 2.1.89-90.

<sup>54</sup> *In Verrem* 2.5.64.



name of Rome – Cicero effectively laid out a rough definition of what it meant to be “Roman.” This definition was not complete: Cicero did not believe that all those who acted correctly were necessarily Roman, and he did not believe that those, including Verres, who acted incorrectly were no longer Roman. By identifying positive characteristics with Roman identity, however, Cicero took at least the first step towards explaining his view of a “national” identity. The development of an idea of criminality at the time of the *Verrines*, and especially criminality of the sort practiced by corrupt Roman officials, was inextricably linked to the concept of what it meant to be Roman. Being a good Roman, in turn, was to a great extent dependent on interaction with and treatment of non-Romans.

### Interactions: Romanness outside Rome

Although Cicero’s take on the interactions between Romans and non-Roman provincials varied predictably according to the objects of his speeches, in that he tended to praise those non-Romans who agreed with him and censure those who did not, he was not always so predictable, and it is possible to discern some broad trends in Cicero’s world-view from the types of behavior and relationships that he appears to have been advocating.<sup>55</sup> Cicero was firm and outspoken in his belief that it was necessary for Rome and its representatives in the provinces (especially its provincial governors) to show

---

<sup>55</sup> The variations occurred almost entirely in the way in which he described the character of provincials; non-Romans who were on Cicero’s side were honest and innocent of wrongdoing, while those who appeared as witnesses for the opposition were congenitally shady characters. Absent any special motive on Cicero’s part for making an individual or a group look particularly good or bad, Cicero tended to present Roman citizens in a positive light, while tending to use examples of provincials to illustrate the sort of qualities not desirable in a Roman. It was undeniably possible for individual Romans to be bad people – indeed, Cicero’s legal arguments depended on this being the case – but such individuals were, by definition, acting contrary to Roman values.

generosity, justice, and respect (or at least common politeness) in their dealings with the provincial populations. He valued Rome's reputation as a merciful and pious entity and blamed the provincial administrators for disregarding their responsibility to uphold this reputation. It is important to recognize that Cicero nowhere questioned the policy of having an empire (that is, of holding and administering provinces outside Italy).<sup>56</sup> In his speeches, the problems with the way the provinces were administered were always caused by individual, not systemic, failures.<sup>57</sup> In fact, he made remarks explicitly supporting the idea of empire as a common good for Romans and provincials. In several cases, Cicero cited individual Romans, including the Scipiones, the Marcelli in Sicily, and his own municipal compatriot Gaius Marius, as role models.<sup>58</sup> These men were noted for their military successes and, more importantly, for their pious, generous, merciful, and forward-looking behavior in the aftermaths of their victories.<sup>59</sup> In *In*

---

<sup>56</sup> Not, that is, until the *de Officiis*, written in 44 BCE, when it was becoming clear that the death of Caesar had not sufficed to restore the Republic; in the *de Officiis*, Cicero suggested that imperial possessions constituted one cause of the glory-seeking that led to the Republic's collapse. Note that even this criticism of the policy of holding imperial provinces is based on the weakness of character of those men sent to conquer and govern the provinces.

<sup>57</sup> This trend may have been related not only to Cicero's personal estimation of what the role of Rome should be in the Mediterranean world, but to his reluctance to alienate an audience composed of the very men from whose ranks provincial governors were drawn. As Steel points out,

[i]f the only thing wrong with the empire is the misbehavior of individuals, then there is no need to feel concern about the system of imperial administration more generally; no need to consider whether the relationship between Senate and individual magistrate involves a satisfactory distribution of power, or whether governors are under irreconcilable pressures from provincials and Roman citizens in their provinces.

(2001, 73).

<sup>58</sup> See especially *In Verrem* 2.5.25 and *In Catilinam* 4.20-4. Cicero's "description of senatorial misuse of power [in the *Verrine Orations*]... is expressed not in an exposé of the inherent structural flaws that led to abuse of provincial peoples, but in a demand that the Roman elite live up to its birthright." (Vasaly 2009, 130.)

<sup>59</sup> Clemency at the moment of conquest did not simply spare the fabric of a city; it helped to guarantee that that city's inhabitants, even in future generations, would not rebel against Roman rule. In other words, sparing use of force could both increase and preserve Rome's *imperium*. Midway through the *Verrine orations* (2.2.50-1), Cicero noted that Marcus Marcellus, unlike the rapacious Verres, when he had conquered the city of Syracuse, *conservavit ac redidit* ("preserved it and returned it") to its inhabitants, and

*Verrem* 2.5.25, Cicero actually provided a list of Rome's most famous generals and their identifying virtues in order to emphasize that Verres had none of these qualities:

the wisdom (*sapientia*) of Q. Fabius Maximus, the swiftness (*celeritas*) of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus, the resourcefulness (*consilium*) of P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus, the intelligence and discipline (*ratio et disciplina*) of L. Aemilius Paullus, and the strength and courage (*vis atque virtus*) of C. Marius.<sup>60</sup>

Cicero's litmus test for good Roman behavior in any instance was the good of the Republic. Good Roman behavior was behavior that actively protected the Republic or helped to maintain order and harmony within the city. Likewise, good behavior for administrators in the provinces was to protect the Republic and its imperium, which included all Roman-controlled territory and its inhabitants, not only from physical strife but from economic damage and the moral outrage caused by oppression.

In *Ad Quintum fratrem* 1.1, Cicero wrote to his brother Quintus at the beginning of Quintus' third year as propraetor of the province of Asia, offering a great deal of advice on the correct way to govern a province.<sup>61</sup> While Cicero freely admitted that, at this point in their careers, his brother was actually the more experienced of the two, he was apparently unable to resist the opportunity to enumerate the qualities of the optimal

---

that these actions had ensured the future cooperation of the Syracusans out of gratitude to Rome. As Cicero stated in the *de Officiis* (2.26 ff), an empire built on fear cannot last. (Imperialism was so thoroughly integrated into Rome's government and economy by the time Cicero entered the political stage that Cicero could talk about the good of the Republic and the good of the *imperium* in the same breath.)

<sup>60</sup> Frazel 2009, 151. Steel describes the men mentioned by Cicero here and elsewhere as "a historical continuum of good Romans serving the state (which Verres has broken)"; she also points out that "[c]omparison with exemplary figures of the past suggests a further way in which Verres is a bad Roman: he has not taken full account of the actions of the *maiores* (unlike Cicero, whose citation of these figures is proof that he has)." (2001, 17, 35).

<sup>61</sup> In this letter, written in 60 BCE, Cicero expressed his regret that Quintus had been called upon to serve in Asia for a third year; he went on make his recommendations as to how Quintus should conduct himself, while maintaining that Quintus had already been behaving exactly as he should.

Roman governor.<sup>62</sup> These qualities included self-control (*moderatio*), the maintenance of proper discipline among the administrative staff and the slaves attached to the governor's household, and an attitude of dignified reserve when dealing with provincials (especially Greeks) who might be attempting to insinuate themselves into the governor's circle of intimates.<sup>63</sup> More importantly, he several times revisited one particular theme: the responsibility of the governor to uphold Roman standards of morality by constantly communicating his concern for the well-being of the people under his care.<sup>64</sup> In this letter, as in his forensic speeches, Cicero clearly demonstrated his understanding of the Roman administration as necessarily a positive and productive force in the provinces. Once Rome had acquired new territory, its custom and its responsibility were to improve living conditions in the territory for the original inhabitants as well as for Roman immigrants, by ensuring peace and security in the region, improving the infrastructure, supplying or encouraging good government, and establishing stable economic links with

---

<sup>62</sup>*Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.18:

*Quid enim ei praecipiam quem ego in hoc praesertim genere intellegam prudentia non esse inferiorem quam me, usu vero etiam superiorem?*

For why indeed should I lecture one whom I know, in this sort of thing especially, to be not inferior to myself in judgment, and even superior in experience?

<sup>63</sup>*Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.7-9; 1.1.15-17.

<sup>64</sup>*Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.13:

*Toti denique sit provinciae cognitum tibi omnium quibus praesidis salutem, liberos, famam, fortunas esse carissimas.*

Finally, let it be known to the whole province that the safety, children, reputation, and prosperity of all over whom you preside are exceedingly dear to you.

*Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.24-5:

*Ac mihi quidem videntur huc omnia esse referenda iis qui praesunt aliis, ut ii qui erunt in eorum imperio sint quam beatissimi...*

Indeed, all those things appear to me to be the responsibility of those who govern others, such that those who are under their power should be as happy as possible...

Rome. The governor was the embodiment of this benevolent rule; as such, his function was to serve the state by living up to the expectations of the provincials and ensuring the rights guaranteed to them by their status as Roman subjects. It was the responsibility of the man, as of the state, to show mercy and generosity, and not to betray the trust (*fides*) established with its allies.

At the same time, some of Cicero's comments to his brother hint at the rarity of such attitudes and behavior in the provincial administration. Cicero went so far as to claim that, if Quintus followed his advice, the Greeks would see him as a hero or a demigod:

for it is a splendid thing to have lived in Asia for three years with supreme power, in such a way that no statue, no painting, no dish, no clothing, no slave, no one's beauty, no agreement concerning money (in all of which things your province is very rich) has lured you away from the pinnacle of integrity and moderation.<sup>65</sup>

He went on to ask what could be more desirable than this:

That the inhabitants are not terrified by your progresses, nor drained by your excess, nor shaken by your approach? That wherever you go there is the greatest delight both in public and in private, when the city seems to receive you as a protector and not a tyrant, the house as a guest and not a plunderer?<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.7-8:

*...praeclarum est enim summo cum imperio fuisse in Asia triennium sic ut nullum te signum, nulla pictura, nullum vas, nulla vestis, nullum mancipium, nulla forma cuiusquam, nulla condicio pecuniae, quibus rebus abundat ista provincia, ab summa integritate continentiaque deduxerit.*

<sup>66</sup> *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.9:

*Non itineribus tuis perterreris homines, non sumptu exhauriri, non adventu commoveri? Esse quocumque veneris et publice et privatim maximam laetitiam, cum urbs custodem non tyrannum, domus hospitem non expilatorem recepisse videatur?*

It is at this point that the striking rhetorical similarity between *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1 and the *Verrine Orations* becomes most apparent; the former is in many ways almost the mirror image of the latter. Frazel (2009, 138) mentions this in passing in his analysis of the *Verrines* and draws a connection between these two examples and expressions in the letters between Cicero and Atticus regarding Cicero's term as proconsul in Cilicia ten years after Quintus' praetorship.

Quintus was to accomplish this, first of all, by avoiding not only actual oppression of the provincials (through extortion and judicial misconduct) but even the appearance of oppression, and secondly, by overseeing tangible improvements in the quality of life in his province. Cicero flattered his brother (perhaps in an attempt to sweeten the remarks to follow, which concerned Quintus' obvious struggles to control his temper) with a list of his accomplishments in Asia thus far, which include the restoration of famous cities, the suppression of banditry (*latrocinia*) in the countryside and the towns, helping the cities out of debt, and discouraging slander (*calumnia*) and bribery while remaining available to all petitioners and showing mercy and compassion.<sup>67</sup> These practices are all part of maintaining the bond of *fides* with Rome's allies.

At the root of all the behaviors that Cicero identified as being most detrimental to Rome's reputation for *fides* is a lack of self-control (*moderatio, temperantia, or abstinentia*). Cicero stated the connection most explicitly and succinctly in *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.7, with a rhetorical question to Quintus: "what trouble is it to govern those over whom you preside, if you can govern yourself?"<sup>68</sup> He had already explained in his congratulations (or consolation) to Quintus for receiving a third year of provincial administrative duties that, since the province in question was not at war, "indeed, the lot assigned to you by the state is one in which fortune has little or no part and which seems to me to rely entirely on your *virtus* and *moderatio*."<sup>69</sup> In other words, the management of the province in peace was seen as totally dependent on the good judgment and conduct

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.24-5.

<sup>68</sup> *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.7: *Quid est enim negoti continere eos quibus praesis, si te ipse contineas?*

<sup>69</sup> *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.5: *Nunc vero ea pars tibi rei publicae commissa est in qua aut nullam aut perexiguam partem fortuna tenet et quae mihi tota in tua virtute ac moderatione animi posita esse videatur.*

of the governor; while Cicero did not have to fear for his brother's personal safety, there would also be no excuse for inappropriate behavior. Cicero was especially careful to caution his brother about the danger of succumbing to the luxuries of his province, implying that superhuman qualities were necessary to resist such temptations:

*Tu cum pecuniae, cum voluptati, cum omnium rerum cupiditati resistes, ut facis, erit, credo, periculum ne improbum negotiatorem, paulo cupidiores publicanum comprimere non possis nam Graeci quidem sic te ita viventem intuebuntur ut quendam ex annalium memoria aut etiam de caelo divinum hominem esse in provinciam delapsum putent. Atque haec nunc non ut facias, sed ut te facere et fecisse gaudeas scribe...*

While you resist the money, the pleasures, all the trappings of desire, as you are doing, there may, I believe, be a danger that you might not be able to suppress a shameless businessman or a slightly too-eager tax-collector. For the Greeks, when they see you living in this way, will think that someone from their histories, or even a demigod from heaven, has descended upon the province. And I do not write this so that you will act in this way, but so that you will be pleased to do so and to have done so...<sup>70</sup>

Financial management as an aspect of *moderatio* was a concern for Cicero not only in his advice to Quintus and the prosecution of Verres, but in his other writings on morality and *instituta*. In fragments attributed to the beginning of Book 4 of his *De Re Publica* (4.7a,b,d,e), in what appears to be a discussion of the behavior of adult male citizens, he emphasizes self-control and stresses appropriate financial management as a manifestation of this quality.<sup>71</sup> In the *de Officiis*, Cicero's three books of explicit instructions (ostensibly written to his son, Marcus) on how a good man should behave, self-control assumes an even greater importance; in the first half of the first book Cicero described the four most important principles of good behavior, of which *decorum*, or

---

<sup>70</sup> *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.7-8.

<sup>71</sup> Zetzel 2001, 88.

“propriety” (with its associated virtues of *temperantia*, *modestia*, and *verecundia*) is the fourth.<sup>72</sup> In the introduction to this lengthy exposition, Cicero explained that morality originated, in the fourth place, “in order and moderation in everything that it done or said, in which modesty and self-control reside.”<sup>73</sup> He went on to provide detailed examples of ways in which self-control, along with courage and justice, could be applied to a number of different situations in a man’s public or private life, and emphasizing at many different points the importance of refraining from excess, whether in personal pleasures or in the punishment of enemies after capturing a city.<sup>74</sup>

### **Geography: Italy beyond Rome**

Just as Cicero sought, whether consciously or unconsciously, to define and describe what it meant to be Roman through the examination of individual behavior, he simultaneously addressed the concept of what it meant to be Roman by focusing on geography. The Romans had been using the sphere to symbolize Roman dominance; Cicero seemed to view Roman identity through a system of concentric circles. The city of Rome was also the center of Romanness. Italy, too, was somehow “Roman” – which meant that it was somehow special. The provinces, on the other hand, which were far from the city of Rome, were almost always, in Cicero’s view, to some degree less Roman than was Italy itself. The way in which Cicero saw some of these provinces and their

---

<sup>72</sup> *De Officiis* 1.93ff. The other three principles are wisdom, or knowledge of the truth (*veri cognitio*), justice (*iustitia*), and courage (*fortitudo*).

<sup>73</sup> *De Officiis* 1.15: ...*in omnium, quae fiunt quaeque dicuntur, ordine et modo, in quo inest modestia et temperantia.*

<sup>74</sup> The various terms related to the concept of self-control, including *moderatio*, *abstinentia*, *temperantia*, *decorum*, *modestia*, *continentia*, and *verecundia*, appear more often in the *de Officiis* than in all of Cicero’s other published works combined. The noun *decorum*, for example, occurs 28 times in the *de Officiis* and never in any of Cicero’s other works cited in this chapter, while *temperantia* appears 16 times compared with 10 in the other works. Only in the *de Oratore* does one of these terms, *moderatio*, appear more frequently than in the *de Officiis* (11 and 10 times, respectively).



inhabitants as less Roman than others suggests that geography was indeed part of the puzzle of Roman identity.

Italy figured in Cicero's speeches in two ways: he made occasional references to the municipal towns, including his own birthplace of Arpinum; and he used the name "Italy," more as a concept than as a literal geographical reference. The municipal towns were notable for being the birthplaces of great men, rather than for any distinct qualities of their own. In the course of the *Pro Sulla*, Cicero's opponent apparently called Cicero a foreigner (*peregrinus*).<sup>75</sup> This must, Cicero reasoned, have been a reference to the fact that he came from a municipal town; his response was: "*Fateor et addo etiam: ex eo municipio unde iterum iam salus huic urbi imperioque missa est*" ("I admit it, and I add: I am from a town from which salvation has repeatedly come to this city and this empire").<sup>76</sup> Similarly, in the *Pro Sestio*, Cicero described Gaius Marius as "*divinum illum virum atque ex isdem quibus nos radicibus natum ad salutem huius imperi*" ("that godlike man who sprang from the very same roots as I did for the preservation of this empire").<sup>77</sup> In the *Pro Fonteio*, Cicero referred to the fact that his client's family came from Tusculum, a most illustrious (*clarissimum*) town.<sup>78</sup> For Cicero, presumably on account of his origins, the alliance of Rome and the municipal towns was closely tied to

---

<sup>75</sup> As is frequently the case in the published versions of Cicero's speeches, the arguments or interjections of an interlocutor are implied in Cicero's "responses" to them.

<sup>76</sup> *Pro Sulla* 22-3. He went on to point out that, ironically, his opponent, Torquatus, was a citizen of a municipal town on his mother's side: "*honestissimi ac nobilissimi generis, sed tamen Asculani*" (a man from a most upright and noble family, but still from Asculum) (*Pro Sulla* 25).

<sup>77</sup> *Pro Sestio* 50.

<sup>78</sup> *Pro Fonteio* 41.

the alliance of the aristocracy and the *equites*, which he certainly saw as crucial to the health of the Republic.<sup>79</sup>

In the forensic speeches as a whole, Cicero did not refer to Italy itself at all frequently. When he did so, it was most commonly in order to emphasize a point, either that someone or something posed a threat to everything that was important to Rome, or that someone or something was very widely recognized. In the *Pro Sestio*, for example, Cicero declared first that Sestius was defending “*causam senatus, causam Italiae, causam rei publicae*” (“the cause of the senate, the cause of Italy, the cause of the Republic”) when he acted on Cicero’s behalf, and later that “*omnes ordines, tota in illa contione Italia constitit*” (“all the orders, the whole of Italy was present at the assembly”) concerning Cicero’s affairs.<sup>80</sup> Similarly, in his indictment of Publius Clodius in the *Pro Milone*, Cicero stated that “*capere eius amentiam civitas, Italia, provinciae, regna non poterant*” (“neither the city, nor Italy, nor the provinces, nor the foreign kingdoms could contain [Clodius’] madness”).<sup>81</sup> In other words, Italy represented the stepping-stone between the level of the individual and the level that included the Roman *imperium* in its entirety. When Cicero wanted to communicate that someone or something was important to “all of us Romans,” he invoked the name of Italy. As Kathryn Lomas has noted, however, while Cicero called upon Italy to support his clients, he typically did not emphasize the Italian origins either of his clients or of his audience. The client’s origins

---

<sup>79</sup> As John Taylor notes,

[Cicero] frequently speaks of the *concordia ordinum* along with the *consensus Italiae* or *consensus bonorum* [see *Att.*, I, 14.4 and 16.6], showing that he looked to a union of all the ‘loyal’ elements in Italy to preserve constitutional government.

John H. Taylor, “Political Motives in Cicero’s Defense of Archias,” *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 73, No. 1 (1952): 62-70, p.66.

<sup>80</sup> *Pro Sestio* 83; 107.

<sup>81</sup> *Pro Milone* 87.

may appear in a speech when they have some bearing on a question of fact, or when Cicero wished to link the client to a particular famous Italian (see above), but Lomas correctly states that

[w]here the Italians are invoked, it is usually as an anonymous mass who appear in support of their local notable and whose presence acts as a form of moral validation, both for the defendant and – in some cases – for Cicero himself.<sup>82</sup>

In the *de Officiis* Cicero made the distinction between Italy and the provinces very clear. One reference to Italy came, for example, when he discussed the appropriate way of waging war and the appropriate conduct following a war's conclusion. A just war, according to Cicero, was one motivated by the need to live peacefully and followed up by mercy to any opponents "*qui non crudeles in bello, non immanes fuerunt*" ("who have not been cruel or inhuman in war"). Cicero's illustration of diplomatic best practices is "*ut maiores nostri Tusculanos, Aequos, Volscos, Sabinos, Hernicos in civitatem etiam acceperunt, at Carthaginem et Numantiam funditus sustulerunt*" ("that our ancestors actually gave the citizenship to the Tusculans, the Aequi, the Volsci, the Sabines, and the Hernici, but they razed Carthage and Numantia to the ground").<sup>83</sup> In other words, Italians who were the Romans' allies and citizens were so because they always had that innate decency that the Romans, as Romans, had to respect. Clearly, even Cicero, who had suggested in *Pro Balbo* that provincials could earn or be deserving of Roman citizenship, believed, in jingoistic fashion, that the men of the Italian peninsula were somehow different and better than the men living elsewhere. The way in which provincials could earn the citizenship was not through assimilation of Roman behaviors or material culture;

---

<sup>82</sup> Kathryn Lomas, "A Volscian Mafia? Cicero and his Italian Clients in the Forensic Speeches" in *Cicero the Advocate*, Jonathan Powell and Jeremy Paterson, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004), 115.

<sup>83</sup> *De Officiis* 1.35.

it was by lending exceptional military or cultural support to great Romans (as is demonstrated in the Cicero's speeches for Balbus and Archias, respectively).<sup>84</sup> In fact, as Steel argues, it was an essential component of Cicero's presentations of Balbus and Archias as desirable recipients of the citizenship that they should continue to seem as exotic as possible; the fact of their foreignness enabled the Romans to continue to look down on these exceptional individuals, or at least to feel that the grant of citizenship was an act of generosity rather than fulfillment of an obligation, and it alleviated the fear that it would be possible for any provincial to claim Romanness (including political rights as well as a stake in defining Roman culture) simply by changing his clothes and speaking Latin.<sup>85</sup> Even if provincials could earn Roman citizenship, then, and even act in Roman fashion, they might never, on account of their births and cultures, truly be Roman.

### **Geography: Beyond Italy**

Cicero's representations of Gauls, Germans, Spaniards, Sicilians, Sardinians, and Greeks depended entirely on which characterizations would best serve his purposes. Scholars should not dismiss his remarks entirely on this account, however; they are still valuable evidence for the ways in which Cicero's contemporaries thought about other

---

<sup>84</sup> As Steel mentions, "Cicero's failure to use arguments based on assimilation can be seen as a sign that his jury, and readers, felt uneasy at the prospect of non-Romans becoming Roman" (2001, 75).

<sup>85</sup> In *Pro Balbo* 56-7, Cicero described the aspersions cast on Balbus in the course of the prosecution, all of which concerned his social prominence at Rome (including great wealth and a Tusculan villa formerly owned by (probably) Q. Metellus Pius, consul 80 BCE, and L. Licinius Crassus, consul 95 BCE), and all of which he ascribed to envy (*invidia*). One of the matters held against Balbus (or Lucius Cornelius, as Cicero refers to him throughout) was his membership in the *tribus Clustumina*, the highly aristocratic rustic tribe to which Pompeius also belonged. R. Gardner, *Cicero XIII*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 704-6.) The post-Sullan aristocrats could very easily have seen this combination of real and manufactured aristocratic connections as a threat to their own delicately-negotiated power structure, quite apart from the fact that Balbus was closely connected to both Pompeius and Caesar, such that an attack on him was an indirect attack on those two controversial figures. In fact, Balbus's presence and prominence at Rome (offensive enough in itself) was an example of the innovations and the manipulations of the imperial system that made Caesar and Pompeius so unnerving to the more conservative Roman elite.

peoples, because, as a litigator, Cicero would not have used expressions which his listeners could not accept or to which they could not relate. In order to show provincials in a positive light, Cicero attributed typical Roman values to them; the Sicilians whom he represented in the case against Verres were “*antiquissimi socii et fidelissimi, Siculi, coloni populi Romani atque aratores*” (“the Sicilians, our oldest and most faithful allies, colonists and farmers of the Roman people”) as well as *honestissimi*.<sup>86</sup> The Sicilians appear again in the *Pro Scauro*, in which Cicero accused the prosecutor of not doing his job in Sardinia as well as Cicero had done his in Sicily. The Sicilians, Cicero argued, being “*homines prudentes natura, callidi usu, doctrina erudite*” (“prudent by nature, clever by experience, and learned by education”), had presented Cicero with all the evidence he needed, whereas the Sardinians were a people “*cuius tanta vanitas est ut libertatem a servitute nulla re alia nisi mentiendi licentia distinguendam putent*” (“whose worthlessness is such that they consider freedom to be in no way different from slavery except for the opportunity to lie”).<sup>87</sup> Cicero also described the Sardinians as the “*amandati et repudiati coloni*” (shunted off and rejected colonists) of the Poeni, who were themselves descendants of the Phoenicians, the greatest liars (*fallacissimi*) of all time.<sup>88</sup> He did, however, allow that “*fortasse aliqui suis moribus et humanitate stirpis ipsius et gentis vitia vicerunt*” (“there may, perhaps, be some who by their morality and humanity have conquered the vices of their families and their people”).<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> *In Verrem* 2.3.228; 2.1.10.

<sup>87</sup> *Pro Scauro* 24; 38.

<sup>88</sup> *Pro Scauro* 42.

<sup>89</sup> *Pro Scauro* 44.

The Gauls who found themselves in opposition to Cicero in the *Pro Fonteio* fared no better in Cicero's rhetoric than had the Sardinians. Cicero disparaged the Gauls primarily by criticizing their religiosity, or lack thereof. At several points in the speech he asserted that the judges should not give much credence to the Gauls' testimony, since such people surely could not experience the proper religious awe when taking the oath, and so would not hesitate to lie.<sup>90</sup> To prove his point, he explained that

*ceterae pro religionibus suis bella suscipiunt, istae contra omnium religiones; illae in bellis gerendis ab dis immortalibus pacem ac veniam petunt, istae cum ipsis dis immortalibus bella gesserunt.*

other peoples take up arms on behalf of their religious practices, these men fight against the religion of everyone else; others, when waging war, seek peace and pardon from the immortal gods, while these men wage war against the gods themselves.<sup>91</sup>

Cicero also invoked the Romans' visceral fear of war with the Gauls by describing the witnesses who had come to Rome as stalking around the forum in their trousers, muttering threats in their incomprehensible language. Casting subtlety aside, he proclaimed:

*infestis prope signis inferuntur Galli in M. Fonteium et instant atque urgent summo cum studio, summa cum audacia... sed multis et firmis praesidiis vobis adiutoribus isti immani atque intolerandae barbariae resistemus.*

the Gauls are advancing against Fonteius with hostile standards, as it were; they pursue him and press him with the greatest zeal, with the greatest audacity... but with many and strong defenses and with you as our helpers, we will stand against that inhuman and unbearable band of barbarians).<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> *Pro Fonteio* 21, 27.

<sup>91</sup> *Pro Fonteio* 30.

<sup>92</sup> *Pro Fonteio* 44.

Even more strikingly, in an appeal to both piety and fear, Cicero played his trump card: “*Quis enim ignorat eos usque ad hanc diem retinere illam immanem ac barbaram consuetudinem hominum immolatorum?*” (“Who does not know that, to this very day, they cling to the inhuman and savage practice of sacrificing men?”).<sup>93</sup> Even allowing for the hyperbole of the court, it is difficult to imagine Cicero ever agreeing that these men were Roman enough to participate in the empire at the same level as citizens; yet their neighbors, and even peoples further away from Rome itself, were, in Cicero’s admittedly complicated view, deserving of that august status.

### **Treatment of Allies and Becoming “Roman”**

Roman identity – or what it meant to be Roman – was thus, for Cicero, in part a function of individual behavior and in part a function of geographic proximity to the city of Rome. However, neither in his analysis of individual behavior nor in his references to the geography of the Roman world did Cicero fully articulate how it was that some people, places, or things were “Roman” and some were not. Perhaps a fuller explanation is offered by Cicero’s discussion of the appropriate way to treat allies. For Cicero, there was something laudatory – or even quintessentially Roman – in treating allies well. It was in working with those allies, however, and especially in working to bring Roman law and culture to those allies, that Cicero saw a true transformation of allied peoples into something approaching “Roman.”

In his work on personal enmity in Roman politics, David Epstein pointed out that a breach of *fides* was a well-understood source of *inimicitia* (that is, dislike or hatred

---

<sup>93</sup> *Pro Fonteio* 31.

accompanied by an open show of hostility in actions or words) in Roman political life.<sup>94</sup> Epstein was referring to the rules governing relationships between Romans of equal social standing, but it seems reasonable to infer that the same understanding applies to a breach of *fides* in the case of a governor and his subjects. In other words, a Roman who violated the *fides* between Rome and one of its allies *had* to be taken to task by his peers, for example, by means of a trial under the *lex de repetundis*. This social code may even have been a consideration in the development of the courts *de rebus repetundis*, along with the need to make concessions to the safety of provincials and to check the power of individual Romans in the provinces. In several of Cicero's defense speeches, in fact, it is clear that he felt it necessary to address the question of *fides* on his clients' behalf. In *Pro Fonteio* 15, for example, he made the argument that *fides* was not owed to untrustworthy men such as the Gauls who are witnesses against Fonteius, while in *Pro Flacco* 9, a particularly vitriolic passage on Greek character, he asserted that Greek witnesses could not be trusted because Greeks had no concept of *fides* in the courtroom.<sup>95</sup> In *Pro Ligario*

---

<sup>94</sup> David F. Epstein, *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics 218-43 BC* (London, New York, Sydney: Croom Helm, 1987).

<sup>95</sup> *Pro Fonteio* 15:

*Statuite nunc quid vestra aequitas, quid populi Romani dignitas postulet, utrum colonis vestris, negotiatoribus vestris, amicissimis atque antiquissimis sociis et credere et consulere malitis, an eis quibus neque propter iracundiam fidem neque propter infidelitatem honorem habere debetis.*

Decide now what your sense of fairness and the dignity of the Roman people requires, whether you prefer to believe and take counsel of your own colonists, your own businessmen, your friendliest and oldest allies, or of those men for whom you ought to have no trust on account of their irascibility and no honor on account of their untrustworthiness.

*Pro Flacco* 9:

*Verum tamen hoc dico de toto genere Graecorum: tribuo illis litteras, do multarum artium disciplinam, non adimo sermonis leporem, ingeniorum acumen, dicendi copiam, denique etiam, si qua sibi alia sumunt, non repugno; testimoniorum religionem et fidem numquam ista natio coluit, totiusque huiusce rei quae sit vis, quae auctoritas, quod pondus, ignorant.*



2, Cicero states that Ligarius “governed [Africa] in peace in such a way that his integrity and loyalty (*fides*) were entirely acceptable to both citizens and allies.”<sup>96</sup> And in *Pro Scauro* 39, when there seems to have been nothing positive to say about Scaurus’ tenure in Sardinia, he took the opportunity to mention that Quintus had recently served as a legate there and, on account of his *fides* and *humanitas* toward the Sardinians, had actually made himself *percarus et iucundus* to them.<sup>97</sup>

The Roman treatment of non-Romans whom the Romans had conquered had one overarching goal: to preserve the security (both military and economic) of the Republic. Cicero very frequently referred to the relationship between Romans and provincials (meaning those people in the provinces who came from families conquered by the Romans, not Roman citizens who had moved to the provinces); for the most part, these references dealt with the economic interactions between Romans and provincials and the subjugation and subsequent protection of provincials by Rome. This strongly implies that, in evaluating what it meant to be “Roman,” Cicero valued the concrete (that is, how

---

But I say this about the whole Greek people: I attribute literary learning to them, I will give them skill in many arts, I will not take away elegance in speeches, keenness of abilities, an fullness of speaking, and even, at last, if they claim anything else for themselves, I won’t deny it; that nation never cultivated scrupulosity and trustworthiness in giving testimony, and they are entirely ignorant of the power of this quality, its authority, or its weight.

<sup>96</sup> *Pro Ligario* 2: ...*cui sic praefuit in pace ut et civibus et sociis gratissima esset eius integritas et fides.*

<sup>97</sup> *Pro Scauro* 39:

*Neque ego Sardorum querelis moveri nos numquam dico oportere. Non sum aut tam inhumanus aut tam alienus a Sardis, praesertim cum frater meus nuper ab eis decesserit, cum rei frumentariae Cn. Pompei missu praefuisset, qui et ipse illis pro sua fide et humanitate consuluit et eis vicissim percarus et iucundus fuit.*

Nor am I saying that it is right for us never to be moved by the complaints of the Sardinians. I am not so inhuman or so hostile to the Sardinians, especially since my brother has recently left them, where by order of Cnaeus Pompeius he was in charge of the corn supply, and he himself [Quintus] consulted their interests because of his loyalty and humanity and was in turn very dear and agreeable to them.

people were living from day to day), and not simply an intellectual or emotional identification with “Romanness” as an identity.

In the *de Provinciis Consularibus*, Cicero described the current state of the areas of Gaul which Caesar was in the process of subduing. As part of his argument that Caesar should be allowed to retain the two Gallic provinces for another year, Cicero pointed out what needed to be done in order for the task of acquiring Gaul to be complete: “*Bellum in Gallia maximum gestum est domitae sunt a Caesare maximae nationes, sed nondum legibus, nondum iure certo, nondum satis firma pace devinctae*” (“a great war has been waged in Gaul; the greatest nations have been subdued by Caesar, but they have not yet been bound by regulations, by defined law, by a firm enough peace”).<sup>98</sup> Further on in the speech, Cicero reminded his audience more explicitly that another season of campaigning was required “*vel metu vel spe vel poena vel praemiis vel armis vel legibus potest totam Galliam sempiternis vinculis adstringere*” (“in order to bind the whole of Gaul fast, whether by fear, hope, punishment, reward, arms, or laws”), lest the Gauls at some point “*ad renovandum bellum revirescent*” (“revive themselves in order to renew hostilities”).<sup>99</sup> In other words, it could not be enough to defeat the people of a region in battle; in order to make the Republic secure, generals and their administrators had to establish the rule of law.<sup>100</sup> (Roman law, that is; Cicero had

---

<sup>98</sup> *De Prov. Cons.* 19.

<sup>99</sup> *De Prov. Cons.* 34.

<sup>100</sup> Caesar himself, meanwhile, differentiated between the people in the Gallic territory who had been pacified, and those who had not; in the *Bellum Gallicum* 1.33, for example, he stated that the Germans led by Ariovistus were fierce barbarians (*homines feros ac barbaros*) who would not stop at conquering part or all of Gaul, but would go on to invade Italy, while their opponents, the Aedui, had often been called brothers and kinsmen by the senate (*fratres consanguineosque saepe numero a senatu appellatos*).

nothing to say about the laws that were presumably in effect before the arrival of the Romans.)

Cicero made references to several other areas outside Italy which were at a more advanced state of interaction with Rome than was Gaul. Also in the *de Provinciis*, Cicero described Macedonia as a region “*quae multis victoriis erat iam diu triumphisque pacata*” (“which had long been pacified by many victories and triumphs [of Roman generals]”).<sup>101</sup> In the *Pro Fonteio*, Cicero mentions in passing that Romans are inextricably tied into the economy of Gallia Narbonensis: “*Nemo Gallorum sine cive Romano quicquam negoti gerit, nummus in Gallia nullus sine civium Romanorum tabulis commovetur*” (“not one of the Gauls carries out any business without a Roman citizen, no money in Gaul is moved about outside of the account-books of Roman citizens”).<sup>102</sup> In neither of these remarks does Cicero consider the opinion of the provincials on these situations; clearly, however, he thinks that the situations are beneficial for both parties. Cicero very clearly recognized that peaceful and prosperous conditions were desirable for both Romans and provincials, and believed (with good reason) that these conditions would obtain increasingly over time. Time, however, was not the only element necessary to create a harmonious and “Roman” atmosphere in a province. It was essential that the provincials cooperate, adapt to their new circumstances, and, most importantly, recognize the dominance of Rome.

One excellent example of how Cicero viewed the appropriate relationship between Romans and provincials, and thus indirectly how far provincials could go in becoming Roman, is the *Pro Balbo*, which is largely based on ideas of what this

---

<sup>101</sup> *De Prov. Cons.* 4.

<sup>102</sup> *Pro Fonteio* 11.

relationship should be. L. Cornelius Balbus had been awarded citizenship by Pompeius in return for service to the Roman military and the provincial administration in his native Spain (he was born in Gades), in particular during the Sertorian revolt. Pompeius' political enemies questioned the legitimacy of Balbus' citizenship by arguing that the town of Gades had never been given the privilege of having its citizens be eligible for the Roman citizenship. Cicero argued that Balbus was a good person and ideal Roman citizen material, and that it was a necessary thing for Rome to be able to take full advantage of having such excellent subjects by holding out the reward of citizenship to those who helped Rome the most. When describing Balbus' military service, Cicero noted his "*labor, adsiduitas, dimicatio, virtus digna summo imperatore*" (industry, determination, fighting spirit, and valor worthy of a general); later, Cicero called on his audience to recognize that Balbus had never been lacking in *pudor, integritas, religio*, or *diligentia*, and that Balbus' *castitas, sanctitas, and moderatio* were known to all.<sup>103</sup> These terms echo those used by Cicero to describe himself and other paragons of Romanness. Elsewhere, Cicero broadened the picture to include all the citizens of Gades, "*quorum moenia, delubra, agros ut Hercules itinerum ac laborum suorum, sic maiores nostri imperi ac nominis populi Romani terminos esse voluerunt*" ("whose walls, shrines, and fields our ancestors wished to be the boundaries of the *imperium* and name of the Roman people just as Hercules wished them to be the end of his journeys and labors").<sup>104</sup> Ancestral tradition played a large part in Cicero's presentation of the nature of Roman citizenship, as when he stated that "*princeps ille creator huius urbis, Romulus, foedere Sabino docuit etiam hostibus recipiendis augeri hanc civitatem oportere*" ("the first

---

<sup>103</sup> *Pro Balbo* 6; 9.

<sup>104</sup> *Pro Balbo* 39.

citizen and founder of this city, Romulus, taught us by his treaty with the Sabines that it is right for the citizen body to be augmented even by the acceptance of enemies”).<sup>105</sup> Even non-Roman ancestral tradition, or at least ancestry, could be significant; Cicero was called on his audience to recognize that “*hunc enim in ea civitate in qua sit natus honestissimo loco natum esse*” (“[Balbus] was born to the highest rank in the city in which he was born”).<sup>106</sup> At the same time, Cicero managed to include a dig at the those in his audience who represented the old Roman families:

*Cuius civitatis sit, id habent hodie leve et semper habuerunt, itaque et civis undique fortis viros adsciverunt et hominum ignobilium virtutem persaepe nobilitatis inertiae praetulerunt.*

Men today make light of, and have always made light of, the question of what a person’s citizenship is, and so they have enrolled brave men from anywhere as citizens and very often preferred the virtue of unknown men to the idleness of the nobility).<sup>107</sup>

Such ventures into egalitarianism, however, were sporadic at best. Despite his ability to appreciate the good qualities of individual non-Romans, Cicero was by no means above making generalizations, whether laudatory or offensive, about the character of peoples outside Italy. Perhaps he can be forgiven for some confusion; after all, L. Cornelius Balbus, an individual who (while indubitably Spanish) possessed characteristics that corresponded to those of the Roman nobility, had earned his recognition and status as a Roman citizen by helping the Romans to subdue his own rebellious countrymen.

It was, however, a vitally important feature of the Roman citizenship that it could only be *given*, not taken. Balbus, Archias, and their countrymen could cooperate with Rome, appropriate Roman culture, and visit or even reside in the city itself, but they

---

<sup>105</sup> *Pro Balbo* 31.

<sup>106</sup> *Pro Balbo* 6.

<sup>107</sup> *Pro Balbo* 51.

could never make themselves Roman. Until and unless some individual acting in the name of the Republic chose to bestow the citizenship on them, they were non-Romans. In the late Republic, Rome chose to present the citizenship as something that an individual had to be worthy of, either by birth or by service to the state, but if the citizenship was a commodity that could be earned, the ball was in the provincials' court; they could take action that would lead to the acquisition of the citizenship, which in turn would detract from an important aspect of Rome's power (the arbitrary conferral of favors). In *Pro Balbo* 9, Cicero allayed his audience's fears concerning just this possibility through his use of language in his defense of the idea of granting citizenship to non-Romans: he stated that, by offering the citizenship as a reward (*praemiis*), the Senate, the people, and the generals were able to entice (*elicere*) the provincials into cooperation with Roman initiatives.<sup>108</sup> Meanwhile, Cicero used biting irony to condemn the actions and attitude of the Gaditan prosecutor. In *Pro Balbo* 20, he exclaimed, “*O praeclarum interpretem iuris, auctorem antiquitatis, correctorem atque emendatorem*

---

<sup>108</sup> *Pro Balbo* 9:

*Atqui si imperatoribus nostris, si senatui, si populo Romano non licebit propositis praemiis elicere ex civitatibus sociorum atque amicorum fortissimum atque optimum quemque ad subeunda pro salute nostra pericula, summa utilitate ac maximo saepe praesidio periculosis atque asperis temporibus carendum nobis erit.*

And yet, if it is not permitted for our commanders, for the senate, for the Roman people to entice, with the offer of rewards, the bravest and best men from the cities of our allies and friends to encounter dangers for the sake of our safety, we will be without the greatest advantage and what is often the best guard in dangerous and harsh times.

Steel explains,

*Elicere* is to get something from someone who might not otherwise give it by means of particular tactics; it is often used in cases where the giver is deceived, and there is never a suggestion that the giver is acting in his or her own advantage. In this passage, it contains not only the realistic acknowledgement that provincials are not going to work for the Roman state without some reward, but also the implication that the Romans are pulling an advantageous fast one, getting provincials to risk their necks on behalf of the Roman state, *pro salute nostra*.

(Steel 2001, 105).

*nostrae civitatis...*” (“What an excellent interpreter of law, patron of tradition, reformer and improver of our city...”); the term *praeclarum*, normally used to describe the best and most powerful men in the Roman state, would have immediately registered with the audience as ironic, while “*auctor antiquitatis*” was an even more edged insult. *Auctor* with the dependent genitive can mean “patron” or “sponsor,” and the idea that a foreigner, the receiver of Roman patronage, would take on this role in relation to Roman tradition was offensively absurd. Cicero returned to this tactic in *Pro Balbo* 25, addressing the prosecutor as “*patrone foederum ac foederatorum*” (“patron of treaties and allies”).<sup>109</sup> Cicero’s message is clear: the prosecutor was an arrogant and presumptuous provincial whose only connection to Rome was on Balbus’ coattails and who had no real understanding of what it meant to behave as a Roman.

---

<sup>109</sup> *Pro Balbo* 25:

*Hanc tu igitur, patrone foederum ac foederatorum, condicionem status Gaditanis, tuis civibus, ut, quod iis quos magnis adiutoribus tuis <usi civibus> armis subegimus atque in dicionem nostram redegimus liceat, si populus Romanus permiserit, ut ab senatu, etiam per imperatores nostros civitate donentur, id ne liceat ipsis?*

So are you saying, you patron of treaties and allies, about the treaty-status of your Gaditan citizens, that, while it is permissible for those people whom we have subdued and brought under our sovereignty with a great deal of help from you, if the Roman people allow it, to be given citizenship by the senate or by our generals, it is not permissible for you yourselves?

As Kimberly Barber noted,

The term *patronus* was generally applied to men of a certain importance, who were able to protect their clients... [T]he prosecutor is actually attempting to deny his fellow citizens rights they ought to enjoy; and therefore even as a mock patron, he is not acting in his clients’ best interests (since they would self-evidently prefer to have Roman citizenship).

Kimberly Anne Barber, *Rhetoric in Cicero’s Pro Balbo* (New York and London: Routledge, 2004), 12.

## Conclusion

In the legal orations, Cicero mentioned Italy almost exclusively in a single context: when emphasizing the extent of a particular thing (the *amentia* of P. Clodius, for example, in *Pro Milone* 87) by listing concentric geographical and cultural circles of Roman identity. He mentioned the Italian municipalities only occasionally, in the context of an individual's origins (most often his own, as at *Pro Sestio* 48 and 50). He often mentioned the Roman character, both in negative and in positive terms; in other words, he both enumerated the qualities to be found in the ideal Roman (especially in *Pro Sestio* 96-99, in which he provided a definition of *optimates*) and listed the evils of those he wished to condemn, which constituted the opposite of good Roman behavior. Cicero's references to Roman behavior and Roman influence in the provinces focused almost entirely either on things for which the provincials might justifiably be grateful or on Roman military successes. The tone in which Cicero talked about the provincials themselves varied from the complimentary, though frequently condescending (*In Verrem*), to the downright vitriolic (*Pro Scauro*), entirely according to what Cicero was seeking to accomplish in each speech. His interests lay with those of the Sicilians, so the people of Sicily were *honestissimi* and *fidelissimi* (*In Verrem*); the Sardinians who were opposed to him were "*sine fide, sine societate*," without loyalty or community, while the Gauls, against whom he was also arrayed, practiced the "*immanem ac barbaram consuetudinem*" (horrible and savage custom) of human sacrifice.<sup>110</sup>

The themes of Romanness and un-Romanness appear in many of Cicero's writings. There were several possible reasons for Cicero to wish to communicate his

---

<sup>110</sup> *Pro Scauro* 44; *Pro Fonteio* 31.



views on these subjects to his audience. Cicero was in a complex position as both a member of the elite class and a “new man.” As such, he spent a great deal of time thinking about his relationship to the old Roman elite, and so consciously participated in the process of “defining Romanness.”<sup>111</sup> He was also perceptibly uneasy, in spite of his own outsider status, with the way his society was changing, and so wanted to communicate his own understanding of what standards the Republic and the elites running it should be held to. Court cases in the Greek and Roman styles were expected to be somewhat hyperbolic, featuring sweeping statements and moral judgments; Cicero thus had a ready-made platform from which to express what, in his opinion, his fellow elites needed to hear.

In the end, Cicero was unable to formulate a single, clear definition of what it meant to be Roman. At best, he was able to formulate multiple definitions, often paradoxical and conflicting. In order for Cicero to consider himself fully Roman, it was necessary for him to place primary importance on culture (observance of Roman traditions and maintenance of Roman values) in his definition of Romanness. One of the most important cultural traditions of Rome, however, was the use of ancestry and ancestral exempla to define Romanness. Thus Cicero had to find a way to redefine noble Roman ancestry as something in which he and other new men, and later provincials, could participate. Cicero was aided in this project by the fact that he *could* formulate a clear definition of what it meant to be “not Roman.” He used stereotypes of non-Roman groups to illustrate un-Roman behavior, and by drawing a line from behavior to being Roman or not, he was able to argue that individuals (such as Verres) who were Roman by

---

<sup>111</sup> Epstein 1987, 55.

birth were not Roman by character. Thus Cicero's speeches demonstrated clearly that while ancestry was an important component of Roman tradition, Roman tradition itself was the key to Roman ethnicity.

## Chapter 3:

### Necessary but Not Sufficient: Latin and Romanness under the Republic

[N]on enim tam praeclarum est scire Latine quam turpe nescire, neque tam id mihi oratoris boni quam civis Romani proprium videtur.

For it is not so amazing a thing to know proper Latin as it is shameful not to know it, and it does not seem to me to belong more to a good orator than to any Roman citizen.  
(Cicero, *Brutus* 140)

Language is not, by itself, an indicator of ethnicity or of group identity. An individual or group may obviously acquire a second language without surrendering the first, or the identity that goes with it. While language by itself may not conclusively indicate ethnicity, however, command of *multiple* languages probably indicates that an individual or group possesses or interacts with multiple ethnicities or identities. As J.N. Adams and Simon Swain point out, “[b]ilingualism by definition acknowledges the existence of ethnic differences. But it does not necessarily reveal a lack of integration between the ethnic groups who use different languages.”<sup>1</sup> With the acquisition of a

---

<sup>1</sup> J. N. Adams and Simon Swain, “Introduction” in *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, J.N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 11.

second language come both the ability to make choices about which language to use and the ability to employ language to manipulate one's image.<sup>2</sup> As Frédérique Biville states,

There can be no discussion of bilingualism [or, indeed, of language itself] without raising the question of what being Roman involved. Choice of language was one aspect of what might be termed the “nationality code”. The *civis Romanus* saw himself as one who belonged to a nation (*patria*), a race (*genus*), and a people whose language commanded respect (*sermo patrius*, “the national language”), and with whom he shared certain institutions and customs (*mores, usus, consuetudo*) and a way of dressing (*habitus*).<sup>3</sup>

It is commonly accepted that bilingualism was widespread in the ancient Mediterranean world; by the period of the mid-to-late Republic, Latin was frequently one of the languages spoken by bilingual individuals.

The importance of Latin in the ancient Mediterranean, along with the fact that Latin was one of the multiple languages spoken by many polyglots, has generated numerous historical theories regarding what effect the use and nature of Latin itself had upon Roman culture and the cultures of the non-Roman peoples ultimately dominated by the Roman world. Many scholars, for example, have argued for what might be called the “instrument of imperialism” theory: that Latin, as the language of the Roman state (*sermo patrius*) was used by Romans as a tool in that domination and assimilation of non-Roman

---

<sup>2</sup> Ludwig Wittgenstein pointed out in his *Philosophical Investigations* (1953) that the use of spoken language is part of a “form of life” (*Lebensform*), or a set of behaviors common to the members of a particular group; he went on to suggest that there is a form of life common to all humans, which allows us to interpret unfamiliar languages. According to Wittgenstein's theory, then, learning to use a language is a way of entering into a specific community bound together by cultural practices. L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* (4<sup>th</sup> edition), translated by G.E. Anscombe. (Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> Frédérique Biville, “The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: A Terminological Framework for Cases of Bilingualism” in *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, J.N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 87-8.

peoples.<sup>4</sup> Certainly, as the power and influence of Rome grew, Latin acquired a symbolic significance (as Greek had earlier) even beyond its importance as a lingua franca along the increasingly intricate and far-flung Mediterranean trade routes. At various times, Latin was a vital tool for spreading knowledge of Roman culture or impressing Roman ways of life upon conquered peoples, especially through the introduction of Latin into local government. While this was certainly true during the imperial period, however, it was less true in Republican Italy and in the early years of imperial expansion beyond the Italian peninsula. Another popular theory (which might be called the “massive inferiority complex” theory) is that Romans in the late Republic felt the need to repudiate Greek language and culture – to the extent that they were able to do so – in order to promote Latin and Roman culture instead. The implication is that Roman elites, motivated by frustration at their own belief in Greek superiority and fear that philhellenism would undermine Rome’s power in the Mediterranean, engaged in a concerted effort to impose their language on the world.<sup>5</sup> This inferiority complex theory, however, does not fully account for the various ways in which Romans understood and embraced Greek culture, Roman culture, and their individual roles as representatives of the Roman state. In fact, the linguistic interactions between Romans and non-Romans during the second and first centuries BCE were more flexible than advocates of the “instrument of imperialism”

---

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g.: Biville (2002); Erich S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992); M. Dubuisson, “Y a-t-il une politique linguistique romaine?” *Ktéma* 7(1982): 178-210.

See Farrell (2001) for a slightly different view of Roman linguistic imperialism: “It is as if not power, but anxiety about its ability to resist the forces of linguistic ‘debasement’, drove Latin culture to marginalize the linguistic Other and to claim an overweening potency and value for itself.” Joseph Farrell, *Latin Language and Latin Culture from Ancient to Modern Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 6.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Biville (2002, 87): “Indeed, language, culture, and national identity were all implicated in a single drive by Rome to assert its individuality and its supremacy in the face of the cultural imperialism of the Greek world.”

theory allow, and far more individualized than the “massive inferiority complex” theory implies. These interactions were shaped by the need on the part of individual Romans to establish and confirm a specific Roman identity for themselves, and the need of non-Romans to explore their relationship to Rome, Romans, and Roman culture.

In this chapter, I argue in part that using Latin (in speech or writing), and *using it well*, was a crucial element of any individual’s self-presentation as a Roman.<sup>6</sup> I also argue that, in order to be a “Roman,” it was not enough for an individual simply to demonstrate his or her Romanness at one particular time: true Roman identity could only be established through continuous or repeated performance of Roman behavior, preferably over the course of one’s life. The use of fluent and stylistically correct Latin as one’s primary language was an obvious way in which to participate continually and publicly in Roman culture.<sup>7</sup> In other words, a Roman individual was one who universally acted as a Roman or did Roman things; a single instance of allegiance to Rome – or, for the purposes of this chapter, a single instance or period during which an individual used Latin correctly and effectively – could not be sufficient to establish an individual as a “true” Roman. (A “true” Roman, in this context, is one who is fully accepted by the most

---

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., Cic. *Ver.* 2.5.167: *cives... Romanos qui et sermonis et iuris et multarum rerum societate iuncti sunt.* ([Romans can feel secure not only among] Roman citizens who are joined together by a community of language, of laws, and of many other things [but among other people, because they are Roman citizens]).

<sup>7</sup> Simon Swain (2002) notes the performative aspect of language use over time in the context of bilingualism:

One of the most important results of the sociolinguistic research of recent decades is the demonstration that a speaker’s movement from one language to another, both over prolonged stretches of discourse and in single words or phrases, constitutes a continuous, unitary communicative performance... it seems incredible that individuals’ ability to vary languages should once have been taken primarily as evidence of inadequate linguistic control.

Simon Swain, “Bilingualism in Cicero? The Evidence of Code-Switching” in *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, J.N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 128.

established Roman families and who is permitted to participate fully in the highest levels of Roman politics.) Put another way, “Romanness” as a category erred on the side of exclusion rather than inclusion of new members. Romans were those who possessed an essential quality of Romanness – not individuals who simply donned ideals, customs, or appearances as convenient for a finite amount of time. A corollary of this attitude on the part of the Roman elites (perhaps conscious, perhaps not) was that they were only required to treat as equal participants in Roman society those new Romans who had the resources and ability to learn a second language (Latin) fluently and to develop the skills to deploy it as did the Roman elites themselves.

Of course, not everyone aspired to participate in the daily life of Roman high society or to become a “true Roman.” For the leaders of the Italian municipalities, for example (as demonstrated by Livy’s famous story of the Campanian town of Cumae, which, he tells us, asked the Roman Senate in 180 BCE for permission to use Latin in their public affairs), the desired result could be recognition by Rome’s leaders of the citizen body’s loyalty to and respect for Rome.<sup>8</sup> The public show of Latin usage in official contexts, such as political activity and public inscriptions, was a popular way to demonstrate these qualities. For many individuals who lived around the Mediterranean and had occasional interactions with Rome and Romans, it was enough to use Latin (whatever the fluency level of the speaker) during these interactions in order to demonstrate some affinity with Rome, even in the absence of Roman identity. In the field of linguistics, this behavior is called “accommodation.” The phenomenon of accommodation has been extremely well-studied, notably in the context of ancient Latin-

---

<sup>8</sup> Livy 40.42.13.

Greek and Greek-Latin bilingualism.<sup>9</sup> As Adams and Swain explain in their introduction to *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*, “[l]inguistic accommodation is a form of deference or politeness which stands in a polar opposition to what might be called ‘aggressive’ language use adopted as a means of exclusion.”<sup>10</sup> In non-Roman speakers, accommodation was almost always seen as a good thing; in the case of Romans accommodating non-Latin speakers, however, such deference could be seen by other Romans as weakness. The decision to use a particular language (that is, Latin, Greek, or one of the Italian languages) was a decision about what kind of identity one wished to present to one’s interlocutors and to the world. In other words, using Latin could be a crucial element of any (Roman or non-Roman) individual’s self-presentation to Romans and non-Romans.

The decision of whether and to what extent to use one’s second language (whether that language was Latin or something else) was influenced by a variety of factors, not least of which was the level of an individual’s fluency in his second language. We have little evidence regarding how Latin fluency was judged and received; some evidence comes instead from the analogous decisions by Romans who had learned Greek to use that language in daily life or in formal settings. Greek fluency was a sign of education and sophistication. There were multiple ways to look at the use of Greek by Romans, however: use of Greek to Greeks constituted accommodation either in a positive or a negative sense. Too much use of Greek could mean a rejection of Romanness, but this was certainly not always (and perhaps very rarely) the case.<sup>11</sup> Inappropriate or

---

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, Adams, Janse, and Swain’s edited volume, cited above (notes 1, 3, and 7).

<sup>10</sup> Adams and Swain 2002, 7-8.

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g. Cic. *Fin.* 1.8.



affected use of Greek words or phrases was considered ridiculous and to be avoided;<sup>12</sup> this implies that there were standards of fluency – presumably informal ones – below which it was not appropriate to attempt to use a second language.<sup>13</sup> We know of some, though not many, instances of individuals whose first language was not Latin being mocked for their lack of fluency.<sup>14</sup>

One critical measure of an individual’s skill in Latin use was, of course, oratory. The political significance of speechmaking in the Roman state was unsurpassed; it also presented an opportunity for Romans to compete with one another (implicitly or explicitly) for preeminence in the field of language use. As a fundamental part of elite education and a crucial tool for a Roman career, oratory was essential to the definition of what it meant to be Roman, whether in terms of the skills and personal qualities needed to speak well, or of the fact that oratory was, by definition, a form of public participation in Roman society (and so a performance of Romanness).

To summarize: in this chapter I argue that effective, regular, and even cultured use of Latin was necessary but not sufficient to become a “true” Roman (one with full political and social participation in the life of the Roman state), that the decision by acknowledged Romans to use other languages could even cast some doubt on the authenticity or “purity” of the speakers’ ethnic identity, but that true Romans could retain their ethnic and civic identity even while embracing other languages and other cultures – a luxury not afforded to their newly-Roman brethren. I first examine three broad themes

---

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., Cic. *Off.* 1.111.

<sup>13</sup> The use of more than one language in a single speech or sentence is known to sociolinguists as “code-switching.” Adams and Swain (2002, 2) raise the question of whether or not we can truly describe the use of more than one language in a written document (and thus in all of our ancient sources) as code-switching, but this is certainly a useful and widely accepted use of the term.

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., Quint. 1.4.14.

supporting this “necessary but not sufficient” argument: first, the concept that the quality of Romans’ and non-Romans’ Latin usage was a relevant and important indicator of the extent of an individual’s Roman identity; second, the concept that individuals were “performing” Roman identity by using Latin; and third, the concept of accommodation – that in some contexts individuals used their second languages not to adopt Roman (or any other) cultural identity, but rather as a pragmatic tool so that they could move easily through the multicultural world of the Mediterranean *without* seeking to change their identities.

After discussing these themes, I present three case studies which illustrate the significance of Latin use in individuals’ self-presentation as Romans, as well as the concept of identity as a continuing performance. In the first case study, I examine Gaius Julius Caesar and the importance of his *De Analogia*, the fragmentary work on how to speak Latin correctly (*de ratione Latine loquendi*) that he composed while crossing the Alps.<sup>15</sup> Caesar’s thoughts on correctness of language are especially significant because they were expressed at a time (the 40s BCE) when the question of extending Roman identity to non-Roman speakers of Latin was particularly fraught, and because Caesar himself played a major role in bringing the question to the fore. During his Gallic campaigns and afterward, Caesar brought Romans and Gauls together, not only as opponents in battle, but also as partners in negotiation, and ultimately as joint participants in the heart of Roman politics; these activities are vividly illustrated in his *Bellum Gallicum*. In the second case study I examine what Cicero said about himself alongside what we know, primarily through Cicero, about his close friend, Titus Pomponius

---

<sup>15</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 253.

Atticus. Cicero was a “new man,” the Roman orator *par excellence*, and one of the few Romans whose opinions on language use survive from the Republican period. Cicero’s lifelong goal was to present himself as the quintessential Roman statesman, and he accomplished this goal primarily through the use of spoken and written language. In contrast, his friend and confidant Atticus stands as an example of a different way of being Roman. Atticus had no reason to fear that anyone would question his Romanness; descended from an ancient Roman family and moving in the highest circles of Roman society, he was secure enough in his identity to be able to live in Greece, speak and write Greek, participate in Athenian society, and accept a cognomen that expressed all this – while remaining indubitably Roman. In the third case study, I examine, again through the lens of Cicero’s speeches, the perceptions by Romans of two of Cicero’s clients, Cornelius Balbus and the poet Archias. These two men, one Iberian and the other Greek, were prosecuted under the *lex Papia* for possessing illegal grants of citizenship; Cicero defended both successfully, essentially by explaining in each case why the defendant was desirable as a member of Roman society and so was deserving of Roman citizenship and, in fact, of being a Roman. While Cicero’s own concerns that the slightest deviation from the Roman ideal might brand *him* as un-Roman were probably unfounded, new citizens like Balbus and Archias actually faced the danger of disfranchisement if they did not demonstrably live up to Rome’s expectations of Romanness. Both men, Cicero argued, possessed the sterling qualities that made Romans Roman, and had repeatedly demonstrated their commitment to Rome above and at the expense of other commitments. Balbus’ Romanness was shown by his military service, while Archias’ appeared through his contributions to Roman culture in the form of poetry – as well as

the indirect contributions he made to Roman political life by training Cicero, who in turn used his highly-refined oratory to defend Archias' identity as a Roman.

## Quality of Speech

Once an individual had learned the basics of speaking Latin, there were two ways in which he or she could sound like a Roman: by correctly applying the mechanics of Latin (grammar, vocabulary, and accent) and by exhibiting linguistic sophistication (specifically by producing persuasive, effective and even stirring rhetoric and oratory). In this section, focusing primarily on the mechanics of "Roman-sounding" and "foreign-sounding" speech, I argue that first-century Romans viewed "mechanical" Latin skill as an indicator of identity, and at least occasionally remarked (as people do in a different context in the modern world when comparing accents from the southern United States and upper mid-west, or when comparing the accents of English speakers born in the United States with the accents of English speakers born in other countries or on other continents) on the differences in accent between the Latin spoken by Romans and that of people from other parts of Italy and beyond. Cicero, by far the most prolific source for what Romans in the late Republic thought constituted good Latin speech, certainly thought that being able to speak well was an integral part of Roman identity; we know this both because he wrote two treatises specifically on sophisticated speaking (the *Orator* and *De Oratore*) and because it was the deployment of Latin fluency in the form of oratory that enabled him to rise through the ranks of Roman society. While most of the evidence in these two treatises and elsewhere concerns Cicero's interest in the theory and practice of Roman oratory rather than his views on the accents of other Latin

speakers, he, along with other authors, did note some of the variations in the way that people of different backgrounds spoke Latin (that is, the mechanics). In *Brutus* 258, in fact, he claimed that a faultless (*emendatus*) grasp of the mechanics of Latin speech was a prerequisite for oratorical success.<sup>16</sup> Cicero seems to have had particularly high standards, possibly as a result of his outsider status; he was on the alert for non-urban accents, and he felt strongly that the Latin spoken in the city of Rome was the best. Cicero clearly saw himself as one of the people who spoke in the correct, urban manner, even though he had not been born in the city. Although his references to his own speech all related to his rhetorical skill rather than to any discernable accent he might have had, or avoided, his ability to place himself in the urban-speech category, which I will call the “standard,” and to set himself up as a critic of both urban and non-urban speakers depended on the fact that it was possible for people born elsewhere to assimilate to Roman speech patterns.

Kees Versteegh points out that, in sociolinguistics, “the term ‘standard language’ stands for at least two different notions. Sometimes it is used as a synonym for ‘the codified norm of the language’ ... At other times the standard indicates the target of the speakers in a speech community, the linguistic aim of all speakers who aim at a cultivated language.”<sup>17</sup> This is indeed an important distinction, and it is difficult in many cases to determine whether and in which sense a particular text represents the “standard.”

---

<sup>16</sup> “*Solum quidem, inquit ille, et quasi fundamentum oratoris vides, locutionem emendatam et Latinam...*” (“‘You see,’ said [Atticus], ‘the basis or, so to speak, the foundation, of oratory is faultless Latin speech...’”)

<sup>17</sup> Kees Versteegh, “Dead or Alive? The Status of the Standard Language” in *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, J.N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain (eds), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 55.

Clackson and Horrocks appear to conflate the two senses of the term when they argue that:

[t]he story of Latin in the centuries following its earliest attestations provides one of the first, and certainly one of the most important, examples of how the prestige of a “standard language” and the benefits deriving from its use in the context of a rapidly expanding imperialist state can not only put great pressure on other varieties..., but also hasten the wholesale abandonment of other languages spoken by minorities within a larger political structure.<sup>18</sup>

I believe, however, that their statement accurately reflects the understanding that Cicero and Caesar had of “standard” Latin; both Caesar and Cicero were clearly representatives of the Latin-speaking elite, and although they disagreed about the emphasis that should be placed on certain rules of rhetoric and grammar, they agreed on the overall importance of general linguistic codification.<sup>19</sup> For the purposes of this chapter, then, I am using the term “standard” to refer to what Caesar, Cicero, and their contemporaries would have recognized as “Roman” Latin (that is, Latin that was not noticeably foreign in accent or vocabulary).

One of the difficulties involved in identifying “standard” Latin is the fact that many of the Republican sources on the subject of language use are tendentious; it is very difficult to find a reference to a particular accent, Roman or non-Roman, in which the person making the observation had no axe to grind. We know, most importantly from Cicero’s *De Oratore*, that there was a Roman accent that the Romans believed to be superior to the accents of non-Roman Italians.<sup>20</sup> If Romans (or the Roman elite) were really snobbish about the correct use of their language, however, one would expect to

---

<sup>18</sup> James Clackson and Geoffrey Horrocks, *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 77.

<sup>19</sup> See below, “Case Studies: Julius Caesar.”

<sup>20</sup> *De Oratore* 3.43-4.

find numerous examples of derisive comments about non-Romans' attempts at Latin. This is not the case. For example, there is only one recorded instance of Cicero mocking a non-Roman's speech in a forensic context, and it survived indirectly, through Quintilian (1.4.14). In *Brutus* 171, Cicero told his friend not to expect the polish of urban speech during his term as propraetor in Gaul: "*Id tu, Brute, iam intelleges, cum in Galliam veneris; audies tum quidem etiam verba quaedam non trita Romae, sed haec mutari dediscique possunt*" ("You will understand, Brutus, when you arrive in Gaul; you will indeed hear certain words that are not common in Rome, but these can be changed or unlearned"). In other words, Latin speakers beyond the city limits used language in an unusual way, but such variations could easily be modified to fit the standard of Roman speech. As J.N. Adams points out, however, "[a]n attempt to construct an idealized Romanness of city speech can indeed be discerned in the second and first centuries BC, but not all linguistic observers were so naïve as to talk of the superiority of this Roman construct."<sup>21</sup> The first-century grammarian and antiquarian Marcus Terentius Varro, for example, in his *De Lingua Latina*, made an effort to be objective in his discussion of regional speech variations; furthermore, not everyone was in complete agreement about what the best possible Roman speech sounded like. Ultimately, however, it is clear that first-century Romans and non-Romans recognized the importance of speech as a component of group identity, and that many took advantage of this knowledge to manipulate or attempt to manipulate their social status.

Among Latin-speaking natives of Rome, whose first language actually was the standard, there were those who attempted to use linguistic affectations to further assert or

---

<sup>21</sup> Adams 2003, 191.

refine their identities. Cicero was highly critical of this practice; in *De Oratore* 3.42, he referred (with contempt) to Romans who affected a rustic accent (*rustica vox et agrestis*) because they thought that it was old-fashioned and therefore desirable.<sup>22</sup> In *De Oratore* 3.43-4, Cicero stated explicitly that the sound of standard speech in the city of Rome was automatically superior to all other forms of Latin speech:

*Nostris minus student litteris quam Latini; tamen ex istis quos nostris urbanis, in quibus minimum est litterarum, nemo est quin litteratissimum togatorum omnium Q. Valerium Soranum lenitate vocis atque ipso oris pressu et sono facile vincat. Quare cum sit quaedam certa vox Romani generis urbis propria, in qua nihil offendi, nihil displicere, nihil animadverti possit, nihil sonare aut olere peregrinum, hanc sequamur, neque solum rusticam asperitatem sed etiam peregrinam insolentiam fugere discamus.*

Our people study literature less than do the Latins; however of those who live in our city, among whom there is no scholarship whatsoever, there is no one who would not easily defeat Quintus Valerius of Sora, the most scholarly of all Roman citizens, in smoothness of voice, in pronunciation, and in tone.<sup>23</sup> And so since there is a particular accent specific to the city of the Roman people, in which there is nothing to offend, nothing to displease, nothing to cause revulsion, nothing to sound like or smack of provincialism, let us follow that example, let us learn to avoid not only rustic harshness but foreign oddity.

Unfortunately, he did not go so far as to give examples of the “harshness” (*asperitas*) and “oddity” (*insolentia*) that he had in mind. “Softness” (*mollitia*), which was presumably

---

<sup>22</sup> *De Oratore* 3.42:

*Est autem vitium quod nonnulli de industria consecretantur: rustica vox et agrestis quosdam delectat, quo magis antiquitatem, si ita sonet, eorum sermo retinere videatur: ut tuus, Catule, sodalis L. Cotta gaudere mihi videtur gravitate linguae sonoque vocis agrestis, et illud quod loquitur priscum visum iri putat si plane fuerit rusticum. Me autem tuus sonus et subtilitas ista delectat...*

There is, however, a fault that a number of people seek out on purpose: these people prefer a rustic and countrified accent, [thinking that], if their speech sounds this way, it will seem to preserve a greater antiquity: just as your friend L. Cotta, Catulus, appears to me to rejoice in a heaviness of tone and in the sound of a rustic voice, and to think that what he says will seem old if it is simply countrified. I, on the other hand, prefer your tone and delicacy...

<sup>23</sup> Sora was a Latin town about 60 miles east of Rome, not far from Arpinum.



the opposite of *asperitas*, was also objectionable to Cicero; in *De Oratore* 3.41, he stated that opinions about the best pronunciation might vary, but that everyone agreed that “*mollis vox aut muliebris aut quasi extra modum absona atque absurda*” (“a soft or feminine voice or one that is, so to speak, discordant and out of tune”) was to be avoided.<sup>24</sup> In *De Oratore* 3.39, moreover, Cicero had Crassus admonish those who aspire to oratorical excellence against using archaisms except to make a specific point, even though it was worth imitating the earlier authors (such as Plautus, Naevius, and Ennius) in all other respects.<sup>25</sup> Cicero went on to make a fascinating point about affectation as opposed to “natural” speech: in this dialogue, he portrayed Crassus as claiming that the aesthetically pleasing Latin spoken by his mother-in-law, Laelia, was the closest possible Latin to that spoken by the ancestors whose speech Cicero felt that modern Romans should imitate, because women from aristocratic families were unlikely to be exposed to linguistic influences outside their own families. He concluded that, since the unusual pronunciations affected by other Romans in Crassus’ circle were unlike Laelia’s natural accent, they could not be authentically antique.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> In *De Officiis* 1.133, Cicero stated that the voice should have two properties: it should be clear and musical (*clara et suavis*). He also argued, using the example of the Catulus brothers, that the best speakers were those who avoided both indistinctness and affectation (*ne aut obscurum esset aut putidum*) and whose voices were neither strained, faint, nor shrill (*sine contentione vox nec languens nec canora*).

<sup>25</sup> *De Oratore* 3.39:

*Sunt enim illi veteres, qui ornare nondum poterant ea quae dicebant, omnes propter praeclare locuti: quorum sermone assuefacti qui erunt, ne cupientes quidem poterunt loqui nisi Latine. Neque tamen erit utendum verbis eis quibus iam consuetudo nostra non utitur, nisi quando ornandi causa, parce...*

For those old authors, who were not yet able to ornament the things they said, almost all spoke excellently: [readers] who have become accustomed to their language could speak nothing but [proper] Latin even if they wanted to. But [modern speakers] should not use words which are no longer in use according to our modern custom, except for the sake of decoration, sparingly...

<sup>26</sup> *De Oratore* 3.45:

Cicero seems to be arguing against any habits of speech that deliberately vary from the Roman standard. As J. N. Adams notes, it is possible that Cicero, as an outsider, was more dedicated than was the average Roman to the establishment of “Roman Latin” as superior to other forms.<sup>27</sup> It is hard to determine from the sources we have whether Cicero’s concerns were widespread; while Cicero is undoubtedly our best source for perceptions of late Republican Latin, occasional references by other authors have survived, and those authors do tend to be from outside the city of Rome. The late second-century satirist Lucilius, for example, was born at Suessa Aurunca, a Latin colony founded in 313 in Campania.<sup>28</sup> One surviving line of his satires, for which there is unfortunately no context, reads: “*primum Pacilius tesorophylax pater abzet*” (“first, Pacilius, treasurer and father, is dead”).<sup>29</sup> Since Pacilius is an Oscan name (the Latinized form of *Paakul*), Adams reads the unusual form of the final word as a condescending reference to the way the Pacilius whom Lucilius was satirizing would have pronounced

---

*sono ipso vocis ita recto et simplici et ut nihil ostentationis aut imitationis afferre videatur; ex quo sic locutum esse eius patrem iudico, sic maiores, non aspere, ut ille quem dixi, non vaste, non rustice, non hiulce, sed presse et aequabilitater et leniter. Quare Cotta noster, cuius tu illa lata, Sulpici, nonnunquam imitaris ut iota litteram tollas et E plenissimum dicas, non mihi oratores antiquos sed messoros videtur imitari.*

The tone of her voice is simple and direct and seems to bring in no showiness or affectation; therefore I believe that her father and her ancestors spoke in this way, not harshly, like the man I mentioned before [Cotta], nor coarsely, nor in a rustic way, nor using the hiatus, but crisply and evenly and smoothly. Which is why our friend Cotta, whose broad speech you, Sulpicius, often imitate when you lengthen the letter *i* and pronounce it as a long *e*, seems to me to imitate not the ancient orators, but the ancient field workers.

<sup>27</sup> J. N. Adams, “‘Romanitas’ and the Latin Language,” *Classical Quarterly* 53.1 (2003): 184-205 = Adams 2003b.

<sup>28</sup> “The town itself will not have been primarily Oscan-speaking, but it is in just such a provincial, Latin-speaking, environment that Lucilius might have acquired a condescending attitude to the Oscan spoken in neighboring areas.” J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 121 = Adams 2003a.

<sup>29</sup> Lucilius 623, W. Loeb Classical Library, *Remains of Old Latin III: Lucilius, Twelve Tables*, E.H. Warmington (trans), (Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk: St. Edmundsbury Press, Ltd., 1938).

*abiit*.<sup>30</sup> In another fragment, Lucilius teased his friend Scipio Aemilianus for affecting an accent to make himself sound smarter; apparently Scipio thought that shortening certain vowels would have this effect.<sup>31</sup> Cicero twice had Crassus in *De Oratore* refer to Lucilius as “*doctus et perurbanus*,” (“a learned man and one completely at home in the city”);<sup>32</sup> nevertheless, as Gruen points out, Lucilius’s relationship with members of the Roman elite and his Campanian origins may have meant that he “could enjoy the combination of internal connections and external detachment – a useful mix for satire.”<sup>33</sup>

One of the largest and most influential groups of foreign Latin-speakers consisted of individuals from various regions whose first language was Greek. So extensive was this linguistic involvement that there were specific Latin words to describe different forms of Greek-Roman interaction. The late third-century playwright Titus Maccius Plautus used the verb *graecisso* (“to act Greek” or “to Greek-ify”) in the prologue to his *Menaechmi* to refer to the imitation of a Greek plot and the use of a Greek setting for the action of the play, both common features of Roman comedy. Varro used *Graecanicus* (“Greek-style”) as an adjective and an adverb in *De Lingua Latina* to describe various Greek elements in Latin.<sup>34</sup> There is some evidence that the term *semigraeci* (“half-

---

<sup>30</sup> Adams 2003a, 120-1; Adams 2003b, 189. I am not convinced that this particular fragment actually represents a negative attitude on Lucilius’ part toward his Oscan-speaking compatriots, especially since edged comments on all sorts of behavior were Lucilius’ stock in trade as a satirist, but it is an interesting hypothesis.

<sup>31</sup> Lucilius 963-964, M = 983-984, W = 971-972, K: “*quo facetior videare et scire plus quam ceteri, ‘pertisum’ hominem, non ‘pertaesum’ dicere humanum genus*” (“whereby you may seem to be cleverer and to know more than others, people say ‘a man was tired of’ with an *i* instead of an *ae*”). Cf. Cicero’s criticism of Cotta and Sulpicius (*De Oratore* 3.45).

<sup>32</sup> *De Oratore* 1.72, 2.25.

<sup>33</sup> Gruen 1992, 280.

<sup>34</sup> Plaut. *Men.* 11-2: “*atque adeo hoc argumentum graecissat, tamen/ non atticissat, verum sicilicissat*” (“I put it to you that this subject matter is Greek-like, moreover that it’s not Attic-type, but Sicilian-ish”); Varro *LL* 10.70: *dicimus... Graece Graecaniceve* (“we say... in Greek or in the Greek way”); id. 9.89: *Quod adventicia pleraque habemus Graeca, secutum ut de nothis Graecanicos quoque nominatus plurimos*

Greek”) was used of Roman individuals who were educated enough in Greek language and culture to act as intermediaries between other Romans and Greeks.<sup>35</sup> Other terms, such as *Graeculus* (“little Greek”), were used to refer to Romans who sought to imitate Greeks but succeeded only in making themselves look ridiculous; Cicero, for example, used the term *Graeculus* numerous times. The existence of this specialized vocabulary indicates that Romans were very interested in the influence of Greek language and culture on their own, and intently observed the mannerisms, language, and customs of individual Romans who got particularly close to Greek culture.

Cicero made numerous comments in his writings about the varying degrees of Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek bilingualism that he observed in professional and social settings. Sometimes he took advantage of Roman attitudes toward speakers with foreign accents; Quintilian, for example, reported that, when Cicero was defending Fundanius in court, Cicero mocked a Greek witness for mispronouncing the letter “F”.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, in *Pro Archia* 26, Cicero mentioned that poetry from Corduba had a coarse (*pingue*) and foreign (*peregrinum*) sound to Roman ears.<sup>37</sup> Ramage argues convincingly that Cicero was referring to poetry written in Latin, because Corduba was a mixed community of Romans and people native to the area.<sup>38</sup> The sounds Cicero was criticizing, therefore,

---

*haberemus* (“Since most of the foreign words that we have are Greek, it follows that most of the borrowed nouns that we have are also Greek in origin”).

<sup>35</sup> Biville 2002, 90-1.

<sup>36</sup> Quint. 1.4.14: “*Graeci aspirare f ut φ solent, ut pro Fundanio Cicero testem qui primam eius litteram dicere non possit irridet*” (“The Greeks aspirate their f’s as they would their letter phi, so in the *pro Fundanio* Cicero makes fun of the witness who is unable to pronounce the first letter of the name”).

<sup>37</sup> Cic. *Arch.* 26: “*Qui praesertim usque eo de suis rebus scribi cuperet ut etiam Cordubae natis poetis pingue quiddam sonantibus atque peregrinum tamen auris suas dederet*” (“Especially since [Quintus Metellus Pius] was so eager to have his deeds written up that he even paid attention to poets born at Corduba, who have something coarse and foreign about their tones”).

<sup>38</sup> Strabo 3.141.1; Ramage 1961, 490. Edwin S. Ramage, “Cicero on Extra-Roman Speech,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 92 (1961): 481-94.

were probably those of a Latin modified by extensive contact with local languages. On the other hand, in *De Oratore*, Cicero portrayed Antonius as praising his fellow Roman aristocrat Catulus for achieving such a high degree of bilingualism that even Greeks had to admit that his speech was elegant and sophisticated.<sup>39</sup> Cicero was aware that not everyone agreed with him about the desirability of complete familiarity with the Greek language; in *De Finibus* 1.9 he quoted a poem by Lucilius that demonstrated how bilingualism could become part of a reproach for over-acculturation, and in a letter to Atticus he spoke scornfully of their mutual friend Lucullus' decision to introduce errors into the history he had written in Greek in order to indicate that it was written by a Roman.<sup>40</sup> Cicero declared that *he* would never do such a thing; to the best of his knowledge, his writings were entirely correct. This comment illustrates what seems to have been Cicero's attitude toward speech in general and bilingualism in particular: no matter what the language, accuracy and elegance should be the goal. In *De Officiis* 1.111, in fact, Cicero used inadequate bilingualism as an example to illustrate a general rule of behavior: "*Ut enim sermone eo debemus uti, qui innatus est nobis, ne, ut quidam, Graeca verba inculcantes iure optimo rideamur, sic in actiones omnemque vitam nullam discrepantiam conferre debemus*" ("Just as we ought to use the language which is natural to us, lest, as some people do, we should make ourselves ridiculous to [people of] good judgment by cramming in Greek words, so in terms of action we ought not to introduce inconsistency into our lives"). The premise on which he based this statement was that

---

<sup>39</sup> *De Oratore* 2.28: Antonius: "*Catulus auditor accessit, cui non solum nos Latini sermonis, sed etiam Graeci ipsi solent suae linguae subtilitatem elegantiam concedere*" ("Catulus has come into the conversation, whose subtlety and elegance in their language not only we Latin-speakers, but even the Greeks themselves are accustomed to acknowledge").

<sup>40</sup> *Att.* 1.19.10: "*uo facilius illas probaret Romani hominis esse, idcirco barbara quaedam et soloeca dispersisse*" ("so as to prove more easily that his work was that of a Roman, he sprinkled a number of barbarisms and solecisms throughout").

using Greek words unnecessarily or inappropriately was, at best, gauche. In other words, bilingualism was acceptable and even desirable, but overestimating one's linguistic ability was a terrible mistake.

In a letter to his friend L. Papirius Paetus in 46 BCE (*Ad familiares* 9.15.2), Cicero complained about the invasion of *peregrinitas* ("foreignness") into Rome; he was particularly upset about the non-Italian foreigners' lack of urbane wit.<sup>41</sup> Ramage claims that, in this passage, *peregrinitas* "includes everything foreign that is contrary to anything Roman, whether the contrast be in manners or speech."<sup>42</sup> Ramage is probably incorrect in arguing that Cicero's comment stemmed from indiscriminate xenophobia; when Cicero made xenophobic comments, they tended to have a rhetorical purpose. Instead, the reference to *peregrinitas* more likely reflects Cicero's specific interest in establishing and maintaining standards of correct Latin speech in Rome. In *Orator* 160, Cicero wrote resignedly of the fact that, over time, incorrect forms and usages of words creep into common parlance and become established as correct, at which point they are very difficult to uproot and one must decide whether to use the correct word and be thought incorrect or eccentric, or to reinforce the popular error.<sup>43</sup> His friend Varro had similar linguistic theories; in Book 9 of *De Lingua Latina*, Varro argued for the regularization of

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. *Brutus* 258.

<sup>42</sup> Ramage 1961, 489.

<sup>43</sup> *Orator* 160:

*Quin ego ipse, cum scirem ita maiores locutos ut nusquam nisi in vocali aspiratione uterentur, loquebar sic ut pulchros, Cetegos, triumphos, Carthaginem dicerem; aliquando, idque sero, convicio aurium cum extorta mihi veritas esset, usum loquendi populo concessi, scientiam mihi reservari.*

I myself, since I knew that our ancestors never used the aspirate except with a vowel, would say *pulchros*, *Cethegos*, *triumphos*, and *Carthaginem* without the *h*; at some point, after a long while, when correctness had been wrested away from me by the reproach of the ear, I gave in to the people on the point of speech and kept my knowledge to myself.

Latin. He believed that “regularity” (*analogia*), was a natural and desirable feature of language, and that therefore the most correct forms of words were those that followed regular patterns within the declensions and conjugations. Irregular forms were incorrect, and should be changed. His plan for slowly weaning Latin-speakers off of incorrect words was for poets, especially dramatists, to use only the correct forms in their works, “*quod poetae multum possunt in hoc: propter eos quaedam verba in declinatione melius, quaedam deterius dicuntur*” (“since poets have great power in this matter: because of them some words are spoken with a better inflection, some with a worse”).<sup>44</sup> This is yet another example of the prevailing belief that the mechanics of standard Roman Latin were influenced by fashion and by the desire to belong to a particular group; the Romans of the late Republic clearly saw technical linguistic skill as something that was acquired and manipulated for the purpose of self-presentation.

### “Performing” Roman Identity by Using Latin

In this section, I focus on the ways in which the choice of Latin over Greek and the acquisition of a level of sophistication over and above “standard” Latin, as demonstrated through oratory, allowed individuals to display their Roman identities publicly. Adams states that Roman authors do not seem to have given much thought to the problem of language barriers, but that there was “some sense that possession of the

---

<sup>44</sup> Varro *LL* 9.17. As Andrew Wallace-Hadrill notes, however, Varro did admit

that considerable variety of usage is possible within patterns of consistency, that it is offensive to the majority of users to insist on changing standard usage in favor of consistency, and that language is subject to continuous and legitimate innovation.

Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 67.

Roman citizenship carried with it an obligation to know the Latin language.”<sup>45</sup> The evidence that there was any such obligation, especially during the late Republic, is indeed relatively thin; from this period, Adams himself mentions only Cicero’s comment about language unifying Roman citizens (*Verr.* 2.5.167) and Livy’s story of the Cumaeans’ request to the Senate (40.42.13).<sup>46</sup> The importance of oratory in Roman life, however, is unquestionable, and we know for a fact that it was a part of the performance of Romanness; in other words, a “great orator” was often synonymous with a “great Roman.” My argument is that, while there may have been an expectation that new Romans would learn Latin, there was certainly an expectation that all Romans would display a certain level of appreciation for the language and pride in using it.

As James M. May and Jakob Wisse point out in their edition of *De Oratore*, it never seems to have crossed Cicero’s mind that any Roman would not accept the profound significance of Roman oratory:

It is sometimes held that Cicero provides a philosophical basis for the importance of eloquence in politics (Conley 1990, 37), but that is incorrect. This importance was a given, as is illustrated by Cicero’s own career as a politician and statesman, which was for the most part built on his enormous powers as an orator. Accordingly, in *De oratore* the fundamental role of oratory in politics is nowhere argued for; it is, on the contrary, often used as a premise for other arguments (e.g., 3.63-66).<sup>47</sup>

In the *Pro Quinctio*, in fact, Cicero explicitly stated that influence (*gratia*) and eloquence (*eloquentia*) were the two most powerful forces in the state (*quae res in civitate duae plurimum possunt*), and that both were arrayed against him and his client, Publius

---

<sup>45</sup> Adams 2003b, 185.

<sup>46</sup> “The Latin language is here placed on a par with Roman law as a shared attribute of Roman citizens.” (Adams 2003b, 185.)

<sup>47</sup> James M. May and Jakob Wisse, *Cicero: On the Ideal Orator* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 4.



Quinctius; the influence of Sextus Naevius (the plaintiff in the case) threatened Quinctius, and the famous advocate Quintus Hortensius' eloquence threatened Cicero.<sup>48</sup> In the context of a trial, it was only natural for Cicero to recognize the threat of his opponent's persuasive oratory, and he showed appropriate modesty as a young advocate by acknowledging the skill and superior experience of Hortensius; in spite of Cicero's reputation for hyperbole in his forensic speeches, however, his ranking of eloquence in the hierarchy of Roman political tactics seems hardly exaggerated.

Cicero believed strongly that correct and elegant Latin was never out of place, even in a merely conversational setting. His advice for his son (and for the wider audience of *De Officiis*) was to treat casual speech as one would a public performance:

*Contentionis praecepta rhetorum sunt, nulla sermonis, quamquam haud scio an possint haec quoque esse... quae verborum sententiarumque praecepta sunt, eadem ad sermonem pertinebunt.*

There are instructions composed by rhetoricians for formal speech, not for conversation, though I hardly know why there could not be [rhetorical instructions] for the latter as well... the rules that exist for the words and concepts [of oratory] will apply to conversation as well.<sup>49</sup>

Moreover, it was not enough for accomplished Romans to speak Latin; they had to recognize its effectiveness as a literary language. In his introduction to *De Finibus* (1.1-10), Cicero defended his decision to write about philosophy in Latin rather than in Greek, apparently anticipating an attack on this score from at least part of his intended audience. Many learned Romans were of the (professed) opinion that Latin was less suited than was Greek to academic or abstract writing. Joseph Farrell notes evidence of this attitude (which he calls "the poverty topos") in the writings of the Elder Cato, Valerius, and

---

<sup>48</sup> Cic. *Quinct.* 1.

<sup>49</sup> Cic. *Off.* 1.132.

Quintilian, who “are clearly playing on the idea that the resources of Latin are more restricted than those of Greek. The idea was evidently a commonplace, probably even in Cato’s day.”<sup>50</sup> Farrell goes on to point out that this apparent denigration of the Latin language was somewhat disingenuous; the supposed simplicity of Latin was actually seen by these same men as an example of Roman *virtus*, a rejection of the luxury and pretentiousness of Greece.

Although Cicero likewise praised straightforwardness in language and believed in the purity and salutary example of traditional, ancestral Latin (see, for example, *Orator* 80, 160, 161, and 169), he was determined to demonstrate that Latin was more than equal to the task of describing philosophical concepts. At the beginning of *De Finibus*, Cicero defended his decision to write in Latin about the quintessentially Greek topic of philosophy (defining and discussing Stoicism, Epicureanism, and other systems of thought and behavior). He declared that there were several classes of people who would disapprove of his current project, including those who thought that philosophy was an inappropriate study for a statesman and those who thought that if something had already been written in Greek it was unnecessary or low-class to render it into Latin. At 1.10, Cicero summarized his goal in writing the study in Latin as “*iis servire qui vel utrisque litteris uti velint vel, si suas habent, illas non magno opere desiderent*” (“to serve those who either wish to use one or the other of the two languages, or, if they have works in their own language, feel no great desire for works in the other”). He had just speculated

---

<sup>50</sup> Farrell 2001, 32.

on how anyone could possess such “remarkable laziness or overly refined sensibility” as not to want to read works written in his native language, no matter what the genre:<sup>51</sup>

*Sed ex credo quibusdam usu venire ut abhorreant a Latinis, quo inciderint in inculta quaedam et horrida, de malis Graecis Latine scripta deterius. Quibus ego assentior, dum modo de iisdem rebus ne Graecos quidem legendos putent. Res vero bonas verbis electis graviter ornateque dictas quis non legat? Nisi qui se plane Graecum dici velit, ut a Scaevola est praetore salutatus Athenis Albucius.*

But I believe that some people have gotten into the habit of dismissing works in Latin because they have come across certain rough and unpolished ones, translated from bad Greek into worse Latin. I will agree with them, so long as they do not consider the same works readable in Greek. But who would not read good subject matter written in words chosen with seriousness and distinction?<sup>52</sup> Unless he wishes to be called a Greek straight out, like that Albucius who was greeted by Scaevola when he (Scaevola) was a praetor in Athens.<sup>53</sup>

Cicero was referring to an anecdote immortalized in a poem by Lucilius, in which Scaevola, on official assignment to Athens, displayed his scorn for a Roman, Titus Albucius, who had become overly assimilated, by addressing him in Greek rather than in Latin. While a certain level of Greek usage was appropriate in the name of accommodation (see below), Albucius had carried it too far: he had crossed the line from the dignified politeness of a Roman expatriate into subordination of Latin to Greek. Scaevola and Lucilius (whose poem Cicero quotes in *De Finibus* 1.9) saw this as

---

<sup>51</sup> Cic. *Fin.* 1.5:

*Rudem enim esse omnino in nostris poetis aut inertissimae segnitiae est aut fastidi delicatissimi. Mihi quidem nulli satis eruditi videntur quibus nostra ignota sunt.*

For being entirely uneducated with regard to our poets is a result either of remarkable laziness or of overly-refined sensibility. Indeed, those people to whom our authors are unknown seem to me to be not at all sufficiently educated.

<sup>52</sup> I follow the example of May and Wisse in their translation of *De Oratore* by translating *ornatus* as “distinctive” rather than “elaborate,” since, as the authors point out, *ornatus* was one of the core qualities of serious oratory, and “elaborate” suggests elements that are added frivolously (May and Wisse 2001, 326).

<sup>53</sup> Cic. *Fin.* 1.8.

Albucius' rejection of his Roman identity, and so they verbally stripped him of it.<sup>54</sup> The implication, of course, is that Albucius would never *actually* give up his Romanness; in spite of his Greek pretensions, he was heartily offended.

In the study of Greek and familiarity with Greek literature, there was a fine line between being an educated Roman and turning into an Albucius. The Elder Cato is often cited, on account of his famous comments on the perfidy of Greeks and his conspiracy theory about Greek doctors, as an example of the contradiction inherent in Roman statesmen's necessary connection with Greek culture and the apparent need for the same statesmen to distance themselves from Hellenism.<sup>55</sup> Erich Gruen has an explanation for Cato's claim that he studied Greek literature only in his old age, which seems to be contradicted by his obvious familiarity with Greek culture and history:

Cato's posture here was deliberate, calculating, and of central importance. He let it be known that, even in the course of an active political and military life at the center of public affairs, he had the *otium* to profit, so far

---

<sup>54</sup> Cic. *Fin.* 1.9:

*Graecum te, Albuci, quam Romanum atque Sabinum,  
municipem Ponti, Tritani, centurionum,  
praeclarorum hominum ac primorum signiferumque,  
maluisti dici. Graece ergo praetor Athenis,  
id quod maluisti, te, cum ad me accedis, saluto:  
'chaere,' inquam, "Tite!" lictores, turma omnis chorusque:  
'chaere, Tite!' hinc hostis mi Albucius, hinc inimicus.*

You wanted to be called a Greek, Albucius, rather than a Roman and a Sabine, a fellow-townsmen of the centurions Pontius and Tritannus, most excellent men and standard-bearers. Therefore when I was praetor at Athens I greeted you as a Greek, as you preferred, when you called on me: "Chaire, Titus!" I said, and the lictors and the whole crowd like a chorus said, "Chaire, Titus!" And so Albucius is my sworn enemy.

<sup>55</sup> Cato's allegation, based on Hippocrates' refusal to work for the Persian king, was that Greek doctors had a conspiracy to poison all *barbari*, which included Romans; it appeared in his *ad filium*, a work which seems to have consisted of advice for his son on a variety of topics. While many Romans (and later scholars) took Cato's caution to his son not to patronize Greek doctors as an example of Cato's anti-Hellenism, authors as early as the Elder Pliny pointed out that Cato condemned the need to pay for medical treatment rather than the treatment itself. For a full discussion of the evidence for and against anti-Hellenism on Cato's part, see Gruen 1992, chap. 2.

as was useful, from the Hellenic experience. But concentrated study of Greek letters should await the fulfillment of national duties... As ever, the obligations of the Roman statesman take priority.<sup>56</sup>

This attitude is remarkably similar to that expressed by Cicero in his discussions of the role of philosophy in Roman life.<sup>57</sup>

## Accommodation

The use of language to project an identity to others did not occur solely within one's own language group; the use of a second language to a native speaker of that language, or the decision not to do so, was an equally strong assertion of identity. It is common in studies of bilingualism to view a speaker's use of his auditor's language as a form of politeness, or "accommodation." This is not the only possible interpretation of such behavior, however; in many cases, accommodation (or the refusal to accommodate) was a public demonstration of identity through conforming to or defying the expectations of the interlocutor or audience. Cato the Elder, for example, famously insisted on speaking Latin to the Athenians during his 191 BCE embassy to Athens; this refusal to compromise by speaking a language other than his own was a clear demonstration of his power and that of Rome. As Gruen argues, however, Cato made it clear at the same time that he could have given his speech in Greek had he wished to.<sup>58</sup> Knowledge was power – Cato's knowledge of Greek as well as Latin tipped the balance of power in his direction

---

<sup>56</sup>Gruen 1992, 68.

<sup>57</sup> See also Cicero's prioritization of the needs of the state above other aspects of his life in *De Legibus* 2.2-5, where he explained the concept of the two fatherlands (one's birthplace, in his case Arpinum, and the city of Rome), but emphasized that Rome, as the fatherland in which everyone shared, was the one "*pro qua mori et cui nos totos dedere et in qua nostra omnia ponere et quasi consecrare debemus*" ("for which we must give our lives and every part of ourselves, and to which we donate and almost consecrate everything we possess").

<sup>58</sup> Gruen 1992, 64-5.

in his dealings with the (presumably) monoglot Athenians. Cato not only declined to make the gesture of “accommodation” by speaking Latin; he made it clear that the gesture was deliberately withheld. This example is an illustration of Cato’s self-presentation and attitude toward language use (at least at that point in his life and in Greco-Roman relations). It also demonstrates, however, that accommodation was a concept that Romans understood – Cato knew what it would mean for him to speak Greek, and avoided doing so in order to send a message.

We know that Romans did sometimes act as Cato did at Athens (that is, using Latin aggressively in Greek-speaking contexts), but this was certainly not universally the case.<sup>59</sup> The extent to which accommodation or its opposite occurred probably had much to do with the circumstances in which the speaker found himself at any given time; the variables which may have influenced the level of accommodation include the social status of the speaker vis à vis his interlocutor, the extent of Rome’s presence in the area (both in terms of political or military influence and in terms of the proportion of Romans resident in the community), and the type of communication, which ranged from casual conversation, to public decrees, to dedicatory inscriptions. Second- and first-century Delos, for example, was a setting in which Roman groups and individuals negotiated continuously with non-Romans for power instead of being able to dictate the terms on which they interacted.

As Adams points out in reference to the story of Cato’s behavior at Athens, “such forms of linguistic nationalism and aggression are simply not to be seen at Delos, where Romans (and Italians) apparently had none of the insecurity that could lead to such

---

<sup>59</sup> For example, Valerius Maximus (2.2.2) described Roman magistrates who insisted on answering Greek petitioners only in Latin.

linguistic assertiveness.”<sup>60</sup> The population of Delos from the early second to early first century consisted of about equal numbers of Romans and Greeks, which was an unusual situation, and the relative social status of the two groups collectively was likewise approximately equal. A large number of the surviving inscriptions from Delos include both Greek and Latin features (whether in the use of both languages, in features of one language carried over into the other, or in the appearance of a name from one group in an inscription in the other group’s language). Adams argues convincingly that the public use of Latin by Roman citizens abroad was a statement of identity both to the non-Romans with whom they interacted daily and, more importantly, to visiting Romans, including Roman officials.<sup>61</sup> The implication is that visiting Romans and those in positions of power would have expected to see a certain amount of resistance to accommodation among Romans who lived abroad full-time. This theory dovetails neatly with the interpretation of Cato’s behavior and that of other Republican ambassadors and magistrates as a display of power; such official interactions often followed on the heels of military conquest, and during the mid-to-late Republican period much of the de facto power to negotiate with and to confer rewards and punishments upon the peoples of the Mediterranean rested with the individual Romans on the spot rather than with the Senate at home, although the possibility of judgment once the magistrate or commander returned to Rome was very real. It was thus in the interests of Roman officials abroad to present as uncompromising a front as possible, whereas businessmen and others who interacted

---

<sup>60</sup> J. N. Adams, “Bilingualism at Delos” in *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, J. N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 106; on p.124, Adams reiterates: “The conventional view of Roman linguistic arrogance simply is not applicable to the situation at Delos.”

<sup>61</sup> “One of the main functions of a bilingual inscription was not so much to convey information to the maximum number of readers, but to project some sort of identity.” (Adams 2002, 126.)

with non-Romans on an individual rather than a state level were more interested in projecting an image of approachability.

Adams also points out that there were distinctions between the uses of Latin by Romans and Italians on Delos. People who were from Italy but not from Rome itself (*Italici*) appear to have made a special point of using Latin in cases involving Roman officials, in particular Roman officials who were not part of the Delian community.<sup>62</sup> Based on the epigraphic evidence, there was enough overlap in language usage between the Roman/Italian and Greek-speaking elements of Delian society for each group to shape its inscriptions so that they would be best understood by the other (by using multiple languages in the same inscription, but also by mixing Greek and Latin spellings and constructions). Adams argues persuasively that this epigraphic behavior indicates that *negotiatores* (businessmen) from Italy as opposed to Rome, while secure enough in their Roman expatriate identity in their dealings with Greeks and other residents of Delos, felt the need to present themselves to other Latin-speakers outside their community as part of Roman, Latin-speaking society. “It is possible that Romans as Romans felt no need to use Latin publicly in formal inscriptions because the identity of Rome was clear, whereas the Italici did sometimes feel that need, perhaps because their composition was complex and their identity there to be established.”<sup>63</sup> In fact, a significant portion of the Italians at Delos came from the Greek-speaking communities of southern Italy, and the majority of

---

<sup>62</sup> As Adams wrote (Adams 2002, 111),

[I]n every single inscription by the Italians containing a Latin version the dedication is to a Roman official who was an *outsider* to Delos. It is also the case that the four dedications in Latin by *Italici* ([in the] nom[initive case]) found in places other than Delos... all honor Roman officials. It may be suggested, then, that within Delian society itself the Italici were usually happy to be seen as Greek-speaking, but that when their dealings were with outside Roman officialdom, they were careful to project a Latin-speaking, or at least bilingual, identity.

<sup>63</sup> Adams 2002, 110.



the inscriptions that we have showing bilingual features can be dated to before the Social War and the extension of full Roman citizenship to all Italians south of the Po river in 90 BCE.<sup>64</sup> Some of the *negotiatores* came from Italian towns that had obtained Latin rights (which essentially consisted of the private but not the public rights of a Roman citizen, such as intermarriage with and inheritance from Romans), but others, while they had lived and were still living in areas in which Rome was the dominant socio-political power, were not technically Romans at all. They seemed “Roman” to the non-Roman non-Italians of Delos, however, and it was entirely apparent to Italians both in Italy and living abroad (the Social War notwithstanding) that their best interest almost always lay in associating themselves with Rome.

Livy’s story of the Cumaeans’ request to be allowed to use Latin in their public affairs is a vivid, though brief, illustration of the late Republican perception of Italian linguistic accommodation: “*Cumanis eo anno petentibus permissum, ut publice Latine loquerentur et praeconibus Latine vendendi ius esset*” (“Permission was granted in that year to the people of Cumae, who were seeking it, to make use of Latin publicly, and to their auctioneers to use Latin in their sales”).<sup>65</sup> This sentence appears in a description of the notable events that took place in the year 180, with a focus on the deaths and elections to office of famous Romans. There was certainly no legal requirement that such a request be made, and had it been standard procedure Livy would hardly have commented on it.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> The Social War (91-87 BCE) was fought between Rome and many of its Italian allies (*socii*); its causes were complex, but it ended with Italy firmly under Rome’s control. Given that one of the results of the war was the blanket extension of Roman citizenship to Italians, scholars have debated and continue to debate the extent to which the conflict was inspired by the Italian allies’ desire for increased political participation at Rome, as opposed to a desire to free themselves from Rome’s influence entirely.

<sup>65</sup> Liv. 40.42.13.

<sup>66</sup> P. A. Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 104 n.25.

If we take the story at face value, it is an example of Italians not merely practicing accommodation towards the Romans, but insisting on public acknowledgment of the fact that they were doing so.<sup>67</sup>

In the case of Delos, then, and probably in those of many “border communities” (that is, those in which neither Romans nor Italians were in the majority), we can expand our understanding of “accommodation” to include any language use that is out of the ordinary for an individual or community, not just the use of a second language. In other words, a Roman or Italian expatriate’s use of Latin is as much accommodation as a Greek’s use of Latin, if the Roman or Italian would normally be using another language. Having Latin as a first language was a component of Roman identity, and in cases where the other components of that identity were not readily apparent (for example, when Romans lived abroad and assimilated to the local communities), Latin was available as a tool for publicly asserting identity. A non-Roman who had *become* a Latin speaker, however, was equally capable of putting up a Latin inscription and so of projecting the identity of a Roman or of someone closely tied to Rome; in this case, knowledge of Latin was a tool for entering the wider Roman community.

## Case Studies:

### **Julius Caesar**

Caesar discussed language in two works: implicitly in the *Bellum Gallicum*, in which he described his interactions with many people who did not speak Latin (at least as

---

<sup>67</sup> Livy wrote his history (*Ab Urbe Condita*, “From the Foundation of the City (Rome)”) during the reign of Augustus, when Italy was completely unified, having grown up with the civil wars of the 40s BCE. He belonged to a generation that had no memory of Italy not being an extension of Rome and welcomed the peace that Augustus’ reign brought to the entire region, though some individuals had philosophical objections to the concept of a Roman emperor. All of these factors influenced the way in which Livy combined the facts that he collected in the course of his historical research into narrative form.

a first language), and explicitly in the *De Analogia*, in which he provided instructions for speaking correct Latin.<sup>68</sup> Caesar's understanding of the significance of correct Latin is especially important for a study of the role of Latin in the first century BCE because he was an imperialist who spent a great deal of time with non-Latin speakers and believed that they should be assimilated into Roman society. For example, he was a friend and supporter of Lucius Cornelius Balbus, and several Romanized Gauls and Spaniards (including, among others, C. Valerius Procillus, Quintus Junius, and Piso Aquitanus) were his assistants during the Gallic campaigns.<sup>69</sup> Caesar was also criticized both before and after his death as being too eager to hand out grants of citizenship to the communities of northern Italy and Gaul; his policy appears to have been to expand Rome's territory, along with his own personal influence and reputation, first by a combination of diplomacy and military intimidation and then by encouraging the non-Roman inhabitants of the provinces to throw in their lot with Rome in exchange for safety and some political participation. The *Bellum Gallicum* dealt with the first part of Caesar's expansionist policy, while the *De Analogia* may have been looking forward to the second.

In spite of the fact that interpreters, or at least the act of translation, must have been ubiquitous during his campaigns, Caesar only used the term "*interpres*" (interpreter) twice in the *Bellum Gallicum*: in 1.19 and 5.36. He reported the speeches of the Gauls using indirect speech (which would seem to make sense for speeches which he was not even affecting to recall word for word) except in four instances: the advice of one of the

---

<sup>68</sup> Elaine Fantham defines the concept of *analogia* as the "regularization" of language; more specifically, Caesar's choice of title reflects his endorsement of the idea that Latin was a simple and straightforward language in which each word stood for one discrete thing. Elaine Fantham, *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

<sup>69</sup> For a discussion of Balbus and his position in late Republican Rome, see the case study on "Archias and Balbus" below.

Eburones to his German captors in 6.35, Vercingetorix's speech to the assembled Gauls in 7.20, Litavicus' speech to his Gallic troops in 7.38, and Critognatus the Arvernian's speech to the Gallic commanders in 7.77. There are, however, only five other instances of direct speech in all of the *Bellum Gallicum*: the exhortations of the Tenth Legion's eagle-bearer and the centurions Titus Pullo and Marcus Petronius to other Romans in battle (4.25, 5.44, and 7.50); Quintus Titurius Sabinus the lieutenant-general speaking in council in 5.30; and Titus Labienus, Caesar's second in command, exhorting his troops in 6.8. The use of indirect speech to describe the majority of spoken interactions, therefore, appears to have been a stylistic choice for the entire work, rather than a reflection of the fact that Caesar's words were not those actually spoken by the subjects of his commentary.

In 1.19, Caesar described sending away *cotidianis interpretibus* ("the usual interpreters") and having C. Valerius Procillus, "*principem Galliae provinciae, familiarem suum*" ("a leader in the province of Gaul and [Caesar's] own close friend"), translate so that he could speak with the Aeduan chieftain Diviciacus privately. Caesar did not call Procillus an interpreter, instead describing himself as speaking to Diviciacus through the agency of Procillus: "*per C. Valerium Procillum... cum eo [Diviciacus] colloquitur.*" This is the only mention of the need for translation in Caesar's frequent interactions with Diviciacus, who was one of the few Gallic chieftains to remain consistently loyal to Caesar and Rome. Diviciacus responded to Caesar's initial remarks by embracing him tearfully; similarly, in 1.27, the *legatos* ("ambassadors" or "delegates") the Helvetii sent to surrender to Caesar fell at his feet and, "*suppliciterque locuti flentes pacem petissent*" ("speaking humbly and weeping, begged for peace"). Presumably it

would have slowed down the action and lessened the impact of the scene if Caesar mentioned that he had to ask someone else what they were actually saying. On the other hand, it is also true that the tone and suppliant posture of the Helvetii, and of Diviciacus, were more important than the actual words, so the fact that an interpreter was needed for the details may have been considered irrelevant. In 1.47, Caesar explained more about Procillus' background and suitability as an interpreter:

*Commodissimum visum est Gaium Valerium Procillum, C. Valeri Caburi filium, summa virtute et humanitate adulescentem, cuius pater a Gaio Valerio Flacco civitate donatus erat, et propter fidem et propter linguae Gallicae scientiam, qua multa iam Ariovistus longinqua consuetudine utebatur, et quod in eo peccandi Germanis causa non esset, ad eum mittere...*

It seemed best [to Caesar] to send C. Valerius Procillus, the son of C. Valerius Caburus, a young man of great courage and refinement, whose father had received the citizenship from C. Valerius Flaccus, both on account of his loyalty and his knowledge of the Gallic language, with which Ariovistus was by that time acquainted through long experience, and because there was no excuse for the Germans to act against him, to [negotiate with Ariovistus].

Procillus had no opportunity to display these qualities to the Germans, however; he was taken prisoner on sight and narrowly escaped being burned alive as a spy.<sup>70</sup>

Caesar's second use of "*interpres*" appears in 5.36. One legion with five cohorts, under the command of Quintus Titurius Sabinus and Lucius Aurunculeius Cotta, was surrounded by the Gauls under Ambiorix; when the Roman position became desperate, Sabinus sent "*interpretem suum Gnaeum Pompeium*" ("Gnaeus Pompeius, his interpreter") to Ambiorix to ask for mercy. In 5.27, however, Sabinus had sent his friend Quintus Junius the Spaniard to negotiate with Ambiorix, as he was in the habit of doing. Junius appears to have held a position in Caesar's army similar to that of Procillus: he

---

<sup>70</sup> BG 1.53.

was bilingual, trustworthy, and capable of handling negotiations with non-Romans, but he was not called an “interpreter.” Taken together, these two instances suggest that interpreters and Romanized nobles attached to the army had skill sets that overlapped somewhat, but were not identical; it is possible that the Romanized nobles were sent into particularly delicate negotiations, but there are not enough examples in the *Bellum Gallicum* to make such a generalization.

There were, of course, less formal ways for the Romans and their allies and opponents to communicate. In 5.51, Caesar said that the Gauls sent out heralds (*praecones*) to stand outside a besieged Roman fort and invite any Romans or Gauls inside to surrender and go free. It is not clear whether the heralds called to the Romans in Latin or relied on the Gauls who had joined the Romans to translate. Caesar also referred several times to the role that traders or merchants (*mercatores*) played in disseminating information throughout Gaul. As a group, the *mercatores* had the ability to communicate fluently with Romans, Gauls, Germans, and Britons.<sup>71</sup> Caesar seems to have taken the presence and abilities of all of these people for granted, however; aside from his comments about Procillus and Ariovistus at 1.47, at no point in the *Bellum Gallicum* did he mention anyone’s linguistic skills.

Caesar wrote the *De Analogia* in the 50s BCE, probably while administering the assizes in Gallia Cisalpina – though Marcus Cornelius Fronto later drew an inspiring picture of Caesar scribbling away amid flying javelins and blaring trumpets.<sup>72</sup> He

---

<sup>71</sup> See *BG* 1.39; 2.15; 4.2-3; 4.5; 4.20-1; 6.24.

<sup>72</sup> Fronto was a second-century CE grammarian and rhetorician; he advised one of his correspondents to bear in mind the image of Caesar:

in the horrible Gallic war, surrounded by vast forces, at the same time writing the two exceedingly precise books of his *De Analogia*, detailing noun declensions amid flying missiles and the pronunciation and logic of words amid the signals and trumpets.

dedicated it to Cicero, and several scholars (most notably G.L. Hendrickson) have theorized that the *De Analogia* was intended in part as a response to the views expressed in Cicero's *De Oratore*.<sup>73</sup> Caesar and Cicero differed in their estimations of the importance of the rules laid down by rhetoricians over time for correct, effective, *Roman* oratory. Cicero believed that it was less important to follow all grammatical and rhetorical rules (for example, the order in which the prescribed elements of a persuasive argument should be presented) to the letter than for the orator to be able to communicate his point to the audience, for which creativity and the ability to be flexible in structuring one's argument were sometimes necessary. Caesar, on the other hand, leaned toward the position espoused by the Atticists, which was that following the established rules of how to construct an argument was an indispensable element of excellent oratory. He also appears to have had very strong views on the details of Latin grammar and spelling; the majority of the fragments of the *De Analogia* that we have are about spelling and the correct uses of the singular and plural and the cases of nouns. The second-century CE author Aulus Gellius, for example, quoted the *De Analogia* five times in his *Noctes Atticae* (*Attic Nights*), citing Caesar as an authority on the use of particular words.<sup>74</sup> The

---

*atrocissimo bello Gallico cum alia multa militaria, tum etiam duos de analogia libros scrupulosissimos scripsisse, inter tela volantia de nominibus declinandis, de verborum aspirationibus et rationibus inter classica et tubas.*

(Fronto p.221 N). Wallace-Hadrill (2008, 69) suggests the purpose of Fronto's description was to point out a parallelism "between conquests that reduced the barbarous Gaul to Roman order, and a treatise designed to keep Latin pure of barbarism, and to reduce it to an order that would enable it to become the language of Gaul itself."

<sup>73</sup> G.L. Hendrickson, "The *De Analogia* of Julius Caesar; Its Occasion, Nature, and Date, with Additional Fragments," *Classical Philology*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Apr., 1906): 97-120.

<sup>74</sup> See, e.g., Gell. 19.8.3:

*Gaius enim Caesar... vir ingenii praecellentis, sermonis praeter alios suae aetatis castissimi, in libris quos ad M. Ciceronem de analogia conscripsit harenas vitiose dici existimat, quod harena numquam multitudinis numero appellanda sit, sicuti neque caelum neque triticum; contra autem quadrigas, etiamsi currus unus, equorum quattuor*

proportion of *De Analogia* fragments that deal with grammar and orthography (29 out of 33) may not be entirely representative; twenty-four of them were actually preserved in a compendium of grammatical writings.<sup>75</sup> Probably the most famous quotation from the *De Analogia*, in fact, is about diction:

*Vive ergo moribus praeteritis, loquere verbis praesentibus atque id quod C. Caesare excellentis ingenii ac prudentiae viro in primo de analogia libro scriptum est, habe semper in memoria atque in pectore ut tamquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum.*

Live therefore by ancient principles, speak with modern words, and attend to that which was written by Gaius Caesar, that man remarkable for his talent and good sense, in the first book of his *De Analogia*, bear always in mind in your heart that “you should flee an odd and unusual word as you would a precipice.”<sup>76</sup>

All of Caesar’s advice to his readers, however, does lead to one conclusion: his goal was to simplify and regularize the Latin language. This would have had the effect of making correct Latin more accessible, especially to people who were learning it as a second language.

In *Brutus* 253, Cicero had Atticus quote Caesar’s extremely flattering dedication of the *De Analogia* to Cicero himself, in which Caesar called Cicero “*paene principem copiae atque inventorem*” (“almost the founder and inventor of eloquence”) and stated that on this account “*bene de nomine ac dignitate populi Romani meritum esse existimare*

---

*iunctorum agmen unum sit, plurativo semper numero dicendas putat sicut arma et moenia et comitia et inimicitias.*

For Gaius Caesar... that man of exceptional talent and of speech purer than that of all his contemporaries, wrote in his books *De Analogia* to Marcus Cicero that he thought it incorrect to say ‘*harenas*,’ since ‘*harena*’ should never be used in the plural, just as *caelum* and *triticum* should not. He thought that *quadrigas*, on the other hand, even though it is a single vehicle (that is, the action of four horses yoked together), should always be used in the plural, just like *arma*, *moenia*, *comitia*, and *inimicitias*.

<sup>75</sup> The fourth-century CE grammarian Flavius Sospater Charisius collected earlier works on grammar and compiled them into the *Artis Grammaticae Libri*.

<sup>76</sup> Gell. 1.10.4.



*debemus*” (“we ought to recognize that you have deserved well of the name and reputation of the Roman people”). The second part of the compliment was particularly astute; Caesar must have been familiar with Cicero’s tendency to emphasize the importance to the state of eloquence – an importance above even that of the contributions made by military commanders, and so presented him with a validation of this obviously self-serving stance. Cicero returned the compliment by portraying Atticus as calling Caesar the “most discriminating of all speakers of the Latin language.”<sup>77</sup> Caesar went on, however, to ask Cicero whether the abilities of a few spectacularly eloquent individuals meant that the essential simplicity of the Latin language should be abandoned. Thus the dedication neatly summed up Caesar’s purpose in writing the *De Analogia*. It was not simply a response to Cicero’s philosophizing; it was a way of advocating for making Roman language, culture and citizenship (three important parts of Roman identity) available not just to the skilled and privileged inhabitants of Rome but to those for whom the primary purpose of Latin was to communicate with their new (Roman) compatriots.

### **Cicero and Atticus**

As a man whose political and social success resulted directly from his linguistic ability, Cicero is an excellent example of a Roman whose used language performance to build a public persona; as a citizen from outside the city who frequently argued that the *sermo patrius* (“native language”) was part of the Roman identity, he is an excellent

---

<sup>77</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 252: “*de Caesare ... iudico ... illum omnium fere oratorum Latine loqui elegantissime.*”

example of the manipulation of the mechanics of language to shape identity.<sup>78</sup> That he thought that language was an integral part of group identity is clear, for example, from his comment in the *Verrines* about what unites Romans – laws, language, and “many other things.”<sup>79</sup> He also felt that the proper use of language was particularly Roman. On the other hand, he admitted that the Latin language as used by the man in the street had degraded somewhat from its pure form (that used by the ancestors). Of course, Cicero was depending in part or in whole on written rather than spoken language for his rules of spelling and grammar (for example, the fact that the Roman ancestors used the aspirant only with a vowel).<sup>80</sup> Thus it is entirely possible that the specific rules Cicero referred to, rather than having lapsed in his own day, had existed all along primarily in the language of the elite. It is also the case, however, that Cicero’s interest lay partly in presenting himself as the champion of standard Latin (not only more correct than foreigners such as Greeks, but more correct than most people born in Rome). In other words, Cicero saw

---

<sup>78</sup> While the concept appears throughout many of his writings, Cicero only used the actual term “*sermo patrius*” once, in *De Finibus* 1.4:

*Iis igitur est difficilius satisfacere qui se Latina scripta dicunt contemnere. In quibus hoc primum est in quo admirer, cur in gravissimis rebus non delectet eos sermo patrius, cum iisdem fabellas Latinas ad verbum e Graecis expressas non inviti legant. Quis enim tam inimicus paene nomini Romano est, qui Enni Medeam aut Antiopam Pacuvi spernat aut reiciat quod se iisdem Euripidi fabulis delectari dicat, Latinas litteras oderit?*

Then, it is harder to satisfy those who claim to scorn works in Latin. What I wonder at about these people first of all is why their own language should not please them in serious matters, when these same men willingly read Latin fiction translated from the Greek. For who is so nearly an enemy to the name “Roman,” who says that he scorns or rejects the *Medea* of Ennius or the *Antiope* of Pacuvius because he prefers the same stories by Euripides, and hates Latin literature?

Cicero went on to state that he, in contrast to the subjects of this passage, made a point of reading the Latin translation of Sophocles in spite of its low quality.

<sup>79</sup> Cic. *Ver.* 2.5.167: *cives ... Romanos qui et sermonis et iuris et multarum rerum societate iuncti sunt* (“[Romans can feel secure not only among] Roman citizens who are joined together by a community of language, of laws, and of many other things [but among other people, because they are Roman citizens]”).

<sup>80</sup> Cic. *Orator* 160.

the use of language in the same way that he saw moral qualities and behaviors associated with Romanness: as tools to demonstrate his own Romanness.

One of the ways in which Cicero connected language with Romanness was the assertion that effective use of language could be a service to the state, equal to or even surpassing military valor. Perhaps the most important victory that Cicero achieved through public speaking, and one to which he often referred, was the exposure and condemnation of the Catilinarian conspirators of 63-62 BCE. In *De Officiis* 1.77, Cicero quoted a verse that he felt to be a particularly apt description of his consulship, from a poem that he himself had written on the subject: “*Cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi*” (“Let the arms yield to the toga, let the laurel give way to [civic] praise”); he went on to boast that Pompeius Magnus himself had said that, had Cicero not preserved the Republic with his verbal skills during the Catilinarian crisis, Pompeius would have had no Republic to defend by force of arms.<sup>81</sup> Cicero acknowledged the importance of military preparedness and of going to war in certain circumstances, but he personally elevated the skills of the diplomat above those of the soldier.<sup>82</sup> He also knew from personal experience that the Roman legal system provided a platform from which a speaker could address the concerns of a large and varied audience, thus enhancing his

---

<sup>81</sup> Cic. *De Off.* 1.78:

*Mihi quidem certe vir abundans bellicis laudibus, Cn. Pompeius, multis audientibus hoc tribuit, ut diceret frustra se triumphum tertium deportatum fuisse, nisi meo in rem publicam beneficio, ubi triumpharet, esset habiturus.*

Indeed, that man loaded with military honors, Cnaeus Pompeius, paid me this tribute in the hearing of many, when he said that his third triumph would have been won in vain if he had not, thanks to my service to the state, had a place in which to celebrate it.

<sup>82</sup> *De Off.* 1.80: *Quare expetenda quidem magis est discernendi ratio quam decertandi fortitudo, sed cavendum, ne id bellandi magis fuga quam utilitatis ratione faciamus.* (“And so indeed the art of negotiation is more desirable than courage in battle, but we must beware, lest we place more emphasis on the flight from waging war than on the path of expediency.”)

public image.<sup>83</sup> Cicero frequently took the opportunity in his own forensic speeches to clarify his position on current political struggles or social issues by constructing his own persona and those of his clients in particular ways. In his speech for Balbus, for example, “[t]o rebut arguments that he is caving in to the ‘triumvirate,’ Cicero employs his own ethos to present an example of how the wise Roman, who wants to place the state before his own personal interests, should behave toward Caesar and Pompey.”<sup>84</sup> Cicero was showing how important it was to behave in a certain way when speaking publicly; that is, he was demonstrating that good Roman speakers had the ability to behave correctly toward those in power through their use of language.

Cicero also felt that the correct use of Latin was connected to Romanness, and in fact to the city of Rome. In the *Brutus* 258, Cicero talked about the fact that Greek and Latin each had become diluted by the influx of foreigners into Athens and Rome, the respective seats of their pure forms.<sup>85</sup> In the time of Rome’s great second-century statesmen, Cicero claimed, “*omnes tum fere, qui nec extra urbem hanc vixerant neque eos aliqua barbaries domestica infuscaverat, recte loquebantur*” (“almost everyone, except for people who lived outside the city or whom some foreignness at home had

---

<sup>83</sup> *De Off.* 2.49:

*Sed cum sint plura causarum genera, quae eloquentiam desiderent, multique in nostra re publica adulescentes et apud iudices et apud populum et apud senatum dicendo laudem assecuti sint, maxima est admiratio in iudiciis.*

But while there are many types of situations that demand eloquent speech, and there are in our state many young men who have pursued honor in speaking before the judges, the people, and the senate, the greatest admiration is to be found in the courts.

<sup>84</sup> Barber 2004, xvi.

<sup>85</sup> For the same sentiment, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 1.89.

confused, spoke correctly”).<sup>86</sup> G. L. Hendrickson believed that *Brutus* 258 was a paraphrase of something Caesar might have said, because it held that there was one unchanging touchstone of correct language against which all Latin could and should be measured, and this seems contrary to Cicero’s opinion (expressed elsewhere) that the orator needed to have flexibility in his diction and the shape of his periods so that he could say what seemed best to him at the time of the speech.<sup>87</sup> In the *Orator* 157, moreover, Cicero stated: “*nec vero reprehenderim ‘scripsere alii rem,’ et ‘scripserunt’ esse verius sentio, sed consuetudini auribus indulgenti libenter obsequor*” (“I would not criticize [the form ‘scripsere’ in] ‘scripsere alii rem’ [a phrase from a fragment of an unidentified tragedy], and I feel that ‘scripserunt’ is more correct, but I happily bow to the habit which accommodates the ears”). It seems clear that Cicero had different standards for different types of Latin speech, not just between Roman and non-Roman individuals, but within the category of Roman speakers; for orators and statesmen (and, not least, for himself), his standards were very high, while poets and persons who had not received the rigorous rhetorical training of the Roman elite were allowed some leeway in the rules of grammar so long as they expressed themselves eloquently.<sup>88</sup>

Titus Pomponius Atticus belonged firmly in the group of elite Romans whom Cicero expected to use impeccable Latin, in spite of the fact that Atticus was neither a politician nor a general. Atticus owed his place in Roman society to an older and

---

<sup>86</sup> Cicero referred specifically to Gaius Laelius (cos. 140), L. Furius Philus (cos. 136), and P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (cos. 147 and 134), as well as the comic poet Caecilius Statius and the tragic poet Pacuvius; the latter two were examples of imperfect Latinity.

<sup>87</sup> See, for example, *De Orat.* 3.150; Hendrickson 1906, 117.

<sup>88</sup> Cicero had different standards again for people who did not come from Rome; see above, “Quality of Speech,” for his views on the Latin spoken by Italians and *peregrini*.

unassailable credential: he belonged to an ancient Roman family.<sup>89</sup> Atticus was unusual among the Romans with whose lives we are especially familiar, in that he intentionally avoided a military or political career, and although he was an author, his writings have not survived.<sup>90</sup> N. Horsfall has described Atticus as “knight, neutral, banker, fixer, survivor, and also a scholar of exceptional care and accuracy;” his modern fame comes from his associations with Cicero, Caesar, Brutus, and the antiquarian and biographer Cornelius Nepos, among others.<sup>91</sup> He enjoyed an impeccable reputation for loyalty, intelligence, and overall morality, in part because he was able to behave in a way that differed widely from those of his famous friends, but that they recognized as unquestionably Roman.<sup>92</sup>

We do not have much direct evidence of the level of Atticus’ Latinity, but we can infer that it was very high. In his biography of Atticus, Cornelius Nepos remarked in the same sentence on Atticus’ Greek fluency and on his easy eloquence in Latin. Nepos used strikingly similar terms to praise Atticus’ Greek and Atticus’ Latin: Atticus, Nepos wrote, spoke Greek as though he had been born in Athens, and Latin as naturally as though he had received no training (in other words, his mastery of both languages appeared

---

<sup>89</sup> Nepos *Att.* 1.1: “*ab origine ultima stirpis Romanae generatus*” (born from the oldest Roman stock).

<sup>90</sup> Nepos (*Att.* 18.1-6) reported that, because Atticus “[*m*]oris etiam maiorum summus imitator fuit antiquitatisque amator” (was a great follower of ancestral custom and a lover of antiquity), he had written a volume listing the holders of Roman magistracies (probably consuls and censors) along with the contemporary laws, treaties, and major events (cf. Cic. *Sen.* 10, 14, *Am.* 96, *Brut.* 60). He also wrote histories (in the form of serious prosopography) of various ancient families, including the Junii, Marcelli, Fabii, and Aemilii, dabbled fashionably in poetry, and produced a short account of Cicero’s consulship, written in Greek (cf. Cic. *Ad Att.* 2.1.1).

<sup>91</sup> Nicholas Horsfall, *Cornelius Nepos: A selection, including the lives of Cato and Atticus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 7.

<sup>92</sup> Nepos *Att.* 6.1: “*In re publica ita est versatus, ut semper optimarum partium et esset et existimaretur*” (He lived in the republic in such a way that he always was, and was seen to be, one of the *optimates*).

effortless).<sup>93</sup> Nepos appears to have seen Greek and Latin eloquence as coming from the same skill set; certainly he did not indicate that Atticus was in any way behaving in an un-Roman fashion by using his natural gifts to master another language. Nepos did not compare Atticus' fluency in Greek and Latin directly (that is, he did not say, "Atticus was just as fluent in Greek as he was in Latin"), but his comment did create an intriguing parallelism. He actually went so far as to say that Atticus appeared, through his ability to speak Greek, to *be* an Athenian (*ut Athenis natus videretur*), although he had just finished explaining how Atticus refused the Athenians' offer of citizenship and attempted to prevent them from erecting statues to him.<sup>94</sup> Obviously it would have been ridiculous to say that Atticus spoke Latin like a Roman; instead, Nepos described Atticus' speech as appearing inborn rather than taught, which may be an indication that Nepos agreed with Cicero about the importance of a naturalistic rhetorical style above the strict observance of rules. Nepos did not present the quality of Atticus' Latin as the defining characteristic of his Romanness. Even in describing Atticus' writings, he focused on the motivation behind the work (Atticus' respect for ancestral tradition and amenability to his friends' requests) rather than on the actual language. It is possible, then, that the comment about Atticus' Latin was merely intended to balance out the comment about his Greek, in response to the feeling among many Romans that too great a familiarity with Greek was somehow suspect.

---

<sup>93</sup> Nepos *Att.* 4.1:

*Sic enim Graece loquebatur, ut Athenis natus videretur; tanta autem suavitas erat sermonis Latini, ut appareret in eo nativum quendam leporem esse, non ascitum.*

He spoke Greek in such a way that he seemed to have been born in Athens; and such was the smoothness of his Latin speech, that it seemed to be an inborn sort of charm, rather than a learned one.

<sup>94</sup> Nepos *Att.* 3.1: "*civemque facere studerent: quo beneficio ille uti noluit*" (they even wanted to make him a citizen: an honor refused to accept).

Cicero certainly appears to have admired Atticus' bilingualism; it is one of the qualities that he mentions in *De Officiis* to describe the ideal that he wanted for his son: “*ut par sis in utriusque orationis facultate*” (“that you should be equally fluent in both [Latin and Greek] oratory”).<sup>95</sup> He also thought highly enough of Atticus' Latinity and reputation for Latinity that he made Atticus a character in the *Brutus* and gave him the role of evaluating the speech of others. As Swain points out, “[i]t was evidently a little joke between Cicero and Atticus to refer to Atticus as a native Athenian (e.g. *Ad Atticum* 1.19.10 *homini Attico*; 1.20.6 *Graecum*; 2.9.4 [*Titon Athenaiion*]; 4.4a.1 *vos Graeci*; 13.35.1 *O rem indignam! gentilis tuus urbem auget*), safe in the knowledge that he ‘traced his origins to the oldest Roman stock’ (Nepos, *Atticus* 1.1).”<sup>96</sup> Swain goes on to argue that “Atticus' assumption of a Greek identity is simply a claim to intellectual respect from fellow Romans.” This makes a great deal of sense; I would go further, and say that this claim to respect was one not available to all Romans. Atticus' social status made it possible for it to be a compliment for other Romans to call him a Greek.

Atticus was certainly not the only Roman expatriate to speak Greek and participate in Greek culture, but he is the one who most famously got it right. Albucius, the subject of the poem that Cicero quoted in *De Finibus* 1.9, was a very bad example of this behavior; he took it too far in some way.<sup>97</sup> We may speculate that he did not show adequate respect for Roman customs, or that he was one of those Romans who continually used Greek speech in an affected and ridiculous way, but there is no real evidence as to what made him so offensive. Cicero seems to have thought of Albucius as

---

<sup>95</sup> *De Off.* 1.1.

<sup>96</sup> Swain 2002, 148.

<sup>97</sup> *Cic. Fin.* 1.9; see above, “Performing Identity by Using Latin.”



someone who was ashamed of his Roman roots, and to have used Albius to demonstrate his own scorn for those who crossed the line from philhellenism (a word which survives, in Latin literature, only in one of Cicero's letters to Atticus) into rejection of their own Romanness.<sup>98</sup> The Roman and Latin-speaking Italian population at Delos, which comprised individuals belonging to a range of social and economic classes, made extensive use of Greek language and culture; they were very successful, but the interactions for which we have evidence took place primarily on the group level (that is, they were intended as messages from the Latin-speakers to their fellow residents of Delos or to Latin-speaking visitors).<sup>99</sup> Atticus was wealthy and influential enough to dictate the terms on which he interacted with his neighbors, whether in Rome or in Athens; he did not need to rely on group identity for economic security, and he had nothing to prove to his fellow Romans.

Biville gives examples of Romans who changed their names to appear more Greek, and vice versa, as well as Roman citizens in southern Italy who chose to retain elements of their Greek heritage, and concludes that “[a]long with bilingualism, such transfers of allegiance were part of a wider process of acculturation (*imitatio, similitudo*). This involved the attempt to imitate in word and deed a social and cultural model deemed to be superior.”<sup>100</sup> Biville uses Atticus as a prime example of such behavior, but it is not clear that Atticus' attitude toward Greek culture was as Biville describes; that is, we do not know that Atticus' love of Greece and Greek culture came from the conviction that they were superior to Rome and Roman culture. While

---

<sup>98</sup> *Ad Att.* 1.15.1; see Swain (2002:163).

<sup>99</sup> Adams (2002); see above, “Accommodation.”

<sup>100</sup> Biville 2002, 89.

familiarity with Greek culture was certainly the mark of an educated and sophisticated Roman, the acceptable level of acculturation varied from person to person. It is also the case that Atticus studiously avoided taking extreme positions that would bring him into conflict with any particular faction; therefore he is unlikely to have seen his cognomen as a radical restatement of his identity. Because of his lineage, social status, and personality, Atticus was able to avoid the negative connotations of a “transferal of allegiance.” In other words, Atticus was so Roman that he was able to take on a secondary, Greek, identity. Cicero, another Roman who undoubtedly appreciated many aspects of Greek culture, was never sufficiently confident in his Roman *bona fides* to be able to take on a second identity; he felt that he had to roundly reject his only other possible identity (as a native of Arpinum). The fact that (according to Sallust) Catiline could respond to Cicero’s famous speeches against him in the Senate by calling on the senators to value his own statements, as the scion of a noble Roman house, over those of Cicero, who was merely an “*inquilinus civis urbis Romae*” (“tenant of the city of Rome”), indicates that he had grounds for concern.<sup>101</sup> Catiline was using Cicero’s lack of historical roots in the city itself to impugn his loyalty to the state, a quality Cicero had gone to great trouble to build into his public identity. Even in his explanation of his attachment to his birthplace in *De Legibus* 2.2-5 (which was, perhaps significantly, placed in the context of a conversation with Atticus), Cicero was careful to reassure the

---

<sup>101</sup> Sallust, *Catilinae Coniuratio* 31:

*[N]e existumarent sibi, patricio homini, cuius ipsius atque maiorum plurima beneficia in plebem Romanam essent, perdita re publica opus esse, cum eam servaret M. Tullius, inquilinus civis urbis Romae.*

[He said that] they should not think that his goal, as a patrician from whom and from whose ancestors the Roman people had obtained so many benefits, was the destruction of the state, when Marcus Tullius, a[ mere] tenant of the city of Rome, was working to preserve it.

reader that his responsibilities to Rome would always come first. Atticus was never in danger of losing his Romanness and becoming a Greek: he was a *Roman* who loved Greece.

### **Archias and Balbus**

For some of Rome's inhabitants, citizenship was a much more tenuous thing. When Aulus Licinius Archias and Lucius Cornelius Balbus found their identities as Romans in jeopardy for political reasons (in 62 and 56 BCE, respectively), it was Cicero's task to demonstrate both that they were legally entitled to Roman citizenship and that they were dedicated to behaving as Romans. The two men were very different in character and in their abilities, but by using his own skill in persuasive speech Cicero successfully claimed that they had assimilated to Roman culture and proved their loyalty to the Roman state, and so deserved the gratitude of the Roman people – even though Archias' linguistic reputation was as a Greek poet and Balbus had no reputation for speaking at all.

Much of what we know about Archias' career is speculative. Thirty-seven epigrams in the *Greek Anthology* are attributed to "Archias," but there are six different descriptors attached to the name at various points (including "Archias of Mytilene," "of Byzantium," and "of Macedon"), so there could have been as many as six other poets by the name of Archias at roughly the same time. In other words, it is not entirely possible to say which, if any, of these poems were written by the Archias who tutored Cicero and was later defended by him.<sup>102</sup> Cicero's Archias, who was born in Antioch, arrived at Rome in 102 BCE, when C. Marius and Q. Lutatius Catulus were consuls. As a client of

---

<sup>102</sup> D.H. Berry, "Literature and Persuasion in Cicero's *Pro Archia*" in *Cicero the Advocate*, Jonathan Powell and Jeremy Paterson (eds), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 292-3.

the Lucullus family, he quickly established a reputation among the aristocracy; he is credited with having introduced the Greek epigram into Roman literary circles, for example, and the consul Catulus, a famous philhellene, composed at least two such epigrams.<sup>103</sup> Prior to his arrival in Rome, Archias had been travelling through southern Italy, possibly making the rounds of local festivals. Several of the cities he visited offered him honorary citizenship.

When he moved to Rome, Archias lived with the Luculli; he would later take his official Roman name (Aulus Licinius Archias) from the head of the family, Lucius Licinius Lucullus. He probably participated in the education of that Lucullus' two sons, Lucius and Marcus; it was also around this time that he taught Cicero. Archias traveled with Marcus to Sicily, after which the family arranged for him to become an honorary citizen of the town of Heraclea in Lucania, a Roman ally since 278.<sup>104</sup> He accompanied Lucius first to the East in the 80s and then during Lucius' command in the Third Mithridatic War from 73 to 67. Archias would later write a poem chronicling the war, in which he presumably gave special attention to Lucius' role and downplayed the actions of Pompey, who took over the command from 67 to 63. This may, in fact, have been the cause of Archias' eventual prosecution – his accuser, the otherwise-unknown Grattius, is

---

<sup>103</sup> Cicero made a point of commenting on Archias' popularity among Rome's cultural elite (*Pro Archia* 6): “*quod eum non solum colebant qui aliquid percipere atque audire studebant verum etiam si qui forte simulabant*” (“for not only those people who truly wished to hear and learn from him cultivated him, but so did those who were perhaps only pretending”).

<sup>104</sup> *Pro Archia* 6:

*Quae cum esset civitas aequissimo iure ac foedere, ascribi se in eam civitatem voluit idque, cum ipse per se dignus putaretur, tum auctoritate et gratia Luculli ab Heracliensibus impetravit.*

Since [Heraclea] possessed the right of citizenship with equality [with Rome] under law and treaty, he wished to become enrolled as a citizen there, and since he was thought worthy in himself, with the authority and influence of Lucullus he obtained [the privilege].

presumed to have been a supporter of Pompey attempting to even the score against the Luculli, Pompey's rivals.<sup>105</sup>

Archias had become a citizen under the *lex Plautia Papiria de civitate sociis danda* of 89 BCE, which made it possible for a citizen of an Italian town who was not residing in that town to claim Roman citizenship, as long as he could prove that he maintained a residence somewhere in Italy at the time of the law and reported to a praetor at Rome within sixty days. Archias qualified because he resided in Rome and because, as a result of the Luculli's patronage, he was already a citizen of Heraclea, and he accordingly registered with the praetor. In 62 BCE, however, he was prosecuted under the law the *lex Papia de peregrinis* of 65, which expelled from Rome any non-citizen who could not demonstrate that he had a permanent residence in Italy. Anyone prosecuted under this law, in other words, had to produce proof either of such a residence or of Roman citizenship. Cicero dealt with the legal issues in sections 1-11 of the *Pro Archia* by pointing out that it was common knowledge that Archias had been living in Rome for many years, that the college of praetors had documentary proof of his having registered as a citizen, and that while the records from Heraclea had been destroyed in a fire, witnesses had arrived from the town to attest to Archias' citizenship there; the prosecution's only argument seems to have been that Archias' name did not appear in the censor's returns, but Cicero pointed out that this was not a requirement for citizenship, and that during the most recent census Archias had been with Lucius Lucullus in the East. He proceeded to devote the remaining two-thirds of his speech (sections 12-32) to Archias' place in Roman literary culture and the role of literature in Roman society.

---

<sup>105</sup> See Erich S. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1974), 267-8.

While this might seem like an extraneous and unnecessary step in light of the rock-solid legal argument Cicero made on Archias' behalf, it served both Archias' case and Cicero's continuing effort to define Romanness.

At the time of the trial Cicero found himself, not unusually, in a difficult political position. His old tutor Archias was a dependent of Lucullus, and Lucullus was the enemy of Pompey. Cicero could not afford to alienate the powerful and conservative Luculli, but he very much wanted to remain on Pompey's good side. Although Pompey was in the East at the time of the trial, he had friends in Rome who were already hostile to Cicero and would happily have reported on the events.<sup>106</sup> Ultimately, of course, Cicero chose to do this favor for the Luculli; as Taylor, Dugan, and Berry argue convincingly, Cicero was also strongly motivated to defend his teacher out of gratitude, and he hoped that Archias might, in turn, celebrate Cicero's career in verse.<sup>107</sup>

As he would do in the case of Balbus six years later, in addressing the court Cicero did not confine himself to the clarification of the statutes, dates, and documents that would prove his client's innocence; in addition, Cicero argued at length that Archias deserved to be a Roman citizen because of specific actions that he had performed and Roman virtues that he embodied. In particular, Cicero foreshadowed his defense of Balbus by stating that the people of Rome should grant Archias the right to be a Roman *"praesertim cum omne olim studium atque omne ingenium contulerit Archias ad populi Romani gloriam laudemque celebrandam"* ("especially since Archias has at all times

---

<sup>106</sup> Taylor 1952, 63: "[Pompey] had his agents at Rome, one of whom, Metellus Nepos, had tried to secure a dictatorship for Pompey in the Catilinarian crisis and had prevented Cicero from addressing the people at the end of his consulate."

<sup>107</sup> Taylor 1952; John Dugan, "How to Make (And Break) a Cicero: 'Epideixis,' Textuality, and Self-Fashioning in the 'Pro Archia' and 'In Pisonem,'" *Classical Antiquity* Vol. 20, No. 1 (Apr., 2001), 35-77; Berry 2004. In a letter to Atticus in 61 (*Att.* 1.16.15), Cicero complained about that fact that Archias had not yet written anything about him; as far as we know, Archias never did complete such a work.

brought his whole energy and talent to the task of celebrating the glory and fame of the Roman people”).<sup>108</sup> In the *Pro Archia* more than in the *Pro Balbo*, however, Cicero focused more on his own experiences in order to demonstrate the direct and indirect influence that Archias had on Roman culture and its arbiters. In section 1, for example, Cicero set the stage for one of the most important themes in his speech by arguing that Archias had helped him to be the best possible statesman and orator, and hence to be as useful as he could be to the state as a whole. In other words, Cicero claimed that he was defending Archias because it was only fair that the man who had given him his voice, which he used to defend people, should, in turn, be defended by it.<sup>109</sup> Throughout the speech, Cicero went on to generalize his experience to include all Romans who were exposed to the exempla that poets, including Archias, presented for their entertainment and instruction.

In section 14, Cicero brought together the strands of several different arguments:

*Quam multa nobis imagines non solum ad intuendam verum etiam ad imitandum fortissimorum virorum expressas scriptores et Graeci et Latini reliquerunt! Quas ego mihi semper in administranda re publica proponens animum et mentem meam ipsa cogitatione hominum excellentium conformabam.*

---

<sup>108</sup> *Pro Archia* 19.

<sup>109</sup> *Pro Archia* 1:

*Quod si haec vox huius hortatu praeceptisque conformata non nullis aliquando saluti fuit, a quo id accepimus quo ceteris opitulari et alio servare possemus, huic profecto ipsi, quantum est situm in nobis, et opem et salutem ferre debemus.*

For if this voice shaped by his encouragement and tutelage has ever been a source of safety for anyone, we certainly ought to give help and safety, as far as we are able, to the man himself from whom we received that with which we were able to help some people and to save others.”

The implication was that Archias had taught Cicero how to be an orator, which was something of an exaggeration; Archias would have taught the skill of recitation and vocal development, which was, of course, only a small part of rhetorical education.

How many portraits describing the greatest men the Greek and Latin writers have left to us, not only for our consideration but also for imitation! While I was governing the republic, setting these portraits continually before my eyes I shaped my mind and spirit with the very thinking of outstanding men.

He placed Archias within the canon of authors who served Rome by producing accounts of exemplary men. Cicero's allusion to his own service to Rome during his consulship served both as an indirect character reference for his client and as a practical illustration of how literature contributed to public safety. Shortly thereafter, Cicero laid out the value of a literary education even more explicitly, stating that although natural talent was an essential part of a great man's character, and although it was possible to achieve excellence without a formal education (as indeed was the case for many of the men whose lives Cicero's contemporaries read about and wished to imitate), nonetheless "*cum ad naturam eximiam et inlustrem accesserit ratio quaedam conformatioque doctrinae, tum illud nescio quid praeclarum ac singulare solere existere*" ("when the care and regulation of learning combines with an exceptional and noble character, it follows that something rare and splendid should result").<sup>110</sup> Education, and in particular the study of historical exempla, Cicero added, enabled a naturally talented man to become truly great. As Cicero had already mentioned, poets were not the only figures to provide exempla to the Roman people; the orators who had received literary educations played an essential role in passing on the benefit of their education to the public.<sup>111</sup>

In addition to demonstrating that Archias was protecting the state by helping to shape generations of Roman statesmen, Cicero had to make sure that Archias was a

---

<sup>110</sup> *Pro Archia* 15.

<sup>111</sup> Cicero mentioned the role of the orator in preserving history again in *De oratore* 2.36 (composed in 55 BCE), when he had Antonius ask, "*qua voce alia, nisi oratoris, immortalitati commendatur?*" ("in what voice but that of the orator can [history] be entrusted to posterity?")



sympathetic figure to the court. Not all the jurors would have belonged to the hyper-educated aristocracy, and Cicero adopted a different tack to engage the imagination of the average Roman by presenting Archias as a humble petitioner for the jury's generosity. Steel notes that "Cicero's defense of Archias depends to a large extent on cutting out the individual patron, through whom the citizenship was originally granted, and making Archias a client of the whole Roman state."<sup>112</sup> The tone of Cicero's speech, which was much more erudite and stylized than was usual for a forensic speech, served to make the jurors feel as though they were attending a literary gathering.<sup>113</sup> Cicero flattered the jurors by addressing them as part of a select and educated group, with enough power to act as patrons, and with the natural superiority that came with belonging to the state that had conquered Archias' homeland. The very fact of Archias' foreignness made him a valuable asset; in a sense, he can be seen as a member of Rome's cultural entourage. A Greek who so clearly appreciated the strength and virtue of Rome and Roman commanders was an excellent example to other Greeks, and since he wrote his poetry in Greek, it could serve as Roman propaganda throughout the Mediterranean.<sup>114</sup> Paradoxically, therefore, by remaining in some ways unassimilated to Roman culture, Archias retained a special quality that made him desirable as an object of Roman

---

<sup>112</sup> Steel 2001, 98.

<sup>113</sup> Cicero had used the same technique in *Pro Murena* 61 (63 BCE), when he told the jurors that, as he found himself in a gathering of cultured men, he would venture to discuss intellectual pursuits. See Dugan (2001) for an in-depth analysis of Cicero's rhetorical choices in the *Pro Archia* and the way in which it would have been interpreted. Dugan believes that Cicero's use of the epideictic style in this unusual context was a message to Archias as well as to the jury; the *Pro Archia* was "an item of exchange in a negotiation with Archias that seeks to obligate the poet to write a laudatory poem on Cicero's behalf whose content and tone the speech subtly prescribes." (2001, 36-7.)

<sup>114</sup> *Pro Archia* 23: *Graeca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus exiguis sane continentur.* ("Greek verses are read among nearly all peoples, while Latin ones are discreetly contained within their own narrow borders.")

patronage. Roman jurors of all classes could share in the glory of their heroes as related in his poetry, and so could afford to be generous.

While it is impossible to know what exactly made Cicero decide to spend one third of the speech on law and two-thirds on literature, there are at least four distinct possibilities: first, Cicero could have feared political fallout from the case and concluded that he could paint the proceedings as less political by disposing of the actual charges as quickly as possible and instead focusing primarily on the nature of literature. Second, as Dugan suggests, Cicero could have planned the speech in such a way as to place Archias in his debt and at the same time suggest a form (namely, elaborate literary composition) in which that debt could be repaid – in which case the speech must be considered a failure. Third, he could have actually been concerned that the jury would, for political or xenophobic reasons, be inclined to ignore the facts and deny his foreign-born client citizenship, regardless of the merits of Archias' case. According to this interpretation, Cicero engaged in a long discourse on literature and focused on the equities of the case because he wanted to draw his listeners' attention *away* from Archias' foreignness and, instead, demonstrate that Archias was, and had been for a long time, a "true Roman." Finally, Cicero might have seen this as an opportunity to promulgate his understanding of what it meant to be a Roman citizen. In reality, Cicero was probably influenced to a greater or lesser extent by all four of these considerations. It seems likely, however, that the opportunity to define his interpretation of Romanness in terms of participation in elite Roman culture was a particularly important one for him.

The defense of Archias supported Cicero's assertion that he himself served the state best through language use, because he said that literature – both Greek and Latin –

provided exempla (for him especially, during his greatest political and pseudo-military triumph, the Catilinarian crisis), and that *natura* and *doctrina* (talent and learnedness) combined to produce the best men. In Cicero's view, in other words, the best servants of the state were men of natural talent who had excellent educations. Archias was a man who provided such educations: witness his defender, Cicero, who was able to become a great servant and protector of the state because Archias taught him to appreciate literature, both Greek and Latin.<sup>115</sup> Unlike Balbus, Archias did not achieve military greatness, but he facilitated military greatness in others. Essentially, Archias helped Romans to be as Roman as possible.

Lucius Cornelius Balbus was born in Gades (modern Cadiz, on the southwestern coast of Spain). He served under Pompey during the Sertorian rebellion of 80-72 BCE, and in 72, in recognition of his services, Pompey granted Balbus and his family Roman citizenship under the *lex Gellia Cornelia*.<sup>116</sup> Balbus went on to become a close advisor to Caesar, holding the post of *praefectus fabrum* (chief engineer) when Caesar was propraetor in Hispania Ulterior (61 BCE). In 56, however, one of his fellow Gaditans brought a suit against him under the *lex Papia* of 65 for illegal possession of citizenship.<sup>117</sup> It is presumed that the prosecutor was put up to it by Romans who wanted

---

<sup>115</sup> "In defending Archias' citizenship in way that blended himself with his client, Cicero could justify his own claim to be authentically Roman and, by extension, to have conducted himself as consul in accordance with the *mos maiorum*." (Dugan 2001, 45.)

<sup>116</sup> The *lex Gellia Cornelia* of 72 allowed Pompey to bestow citizenship on individuals at his discretion; the legal question in Balbus' trial was whether or not the type of treaty that the town of Gades had with Rome precluded individual, unilateral grants of citizenship.

<sup>117</sup> Cicero indicates (in *Pro Balbo* 32) that the prosecutor had held the citizenship and lost it. As Barber writes,

Under the *lex Papia*, procedures were established to determine the legality of citizenship grants, and foreigners could be expelled from Rome. If the prosecutor won this case against Balbus, he would regain his Roman citizenship.

(Barber 2004, xviii-xix).

to strike at Pompey and Caesar, were jealous of Balbus' influence at the highest level of Roman politics, or both. Cicero, who was on good terms with Pompey and Caesar at the time, effectively demolished the opposition, and in 40 BCE Balbus became the first non-Italian consul.<sup>118</sup>

Cicero's task in his speech for the defense was, in part, to prove that the charges under the *lex Papia* were unfounded, but it was also (and more importantly) to convince the jurors that Balbus was a man whom they wished to possess the citizenship. In other words, Cicero had to demonstrate that Balbus was a Roman, and he very clearly did so by presenting Balbus as a man who had continually performed acts of Romanness over his lifetime. Balbus' military career in the service of Rome was an obvious source of evidence for this claim, but language use also played a role in Cicero's depiction of Balbus the Roman.

As Barber observes, "Balbus' military record reads like that of a young Roman noble, and is indeed one any Roman would be proud of..."<sup>119</sup> Cicero laid out the Romanness of Balbus' military career in *Pro Balbo* 6:

*Hunc enim in ea civitate in qua sit natus honestissimo loco natum esse concedis, et ab ineunte aetate relictis rebus suis omnibus in nostris bellis nostris cum imperatoribus esse versatum, nullius laboris, nullius obsessionis, nullius proeli expertem fuisse.*

For you admit that this man was born to a most distinguished family in the city of his birth, and from the earliest age, having abandoned his own affairs, he was acquainted with all our wars and our generals, and in no action, in no blockade, in no battle did he fail to participate.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> See P. A. Brunt, "The Legal Issue in Cicero, Pro Balbo," *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 32, No. 1 (1982), 136-147 for an analysis of the strength of the prosecution's argument, first that the town of Gades had a sacrosanct treaty with Rome, and secondly that Pompey's grant of citizenship to Balbus was therefore invalid without the consent of the Gaditan people.

<sup>119</sup> Barber 2004, 15.

<sup>120</sup> "*Rebus suis*, although perhaps intentionally vague, probably refers to political interests that Balbus had in Gades, as well as property and possessions." (Barber 2004, 16.)

There can be no clearer statement of Balbus' priorities: before citizenship was offered to him, and with his own business to attend to at home, he made the decision to support the Roman military efforts in Spain. Following the theme of being Roman – or “practicing” Romanness – over time, Cicero emphasized that there was no defense of the Roman state (and not even any type of military action) in which Balbus did not participate, from the moment of his earliest youth. Balbus, Cicero argued, put the security of Rome before his own interest at the expense of his personal safety and of his family life and the affairs of his town (to which, as the scion of a local elite family, he would have normally have devoted his energy). A few lines earlier, in fact, Cicero praised Balbus for his “*pietas in rem publicam nostram*,” “devotion to our republic.”<sup>121</sup> The word *pietas* here is significant: it connotes religious or even filial devotion and, as one of the qualities of the quintessential Roman character, Romanness itself. Lest the jurors condemn Balbus for a lack of loyalty to his hometown, however, Cicero made the point that Balbus had done more for Gades and had more support from the townspeople than the prosecutor had. He quoted the prosecutor's protests against the legitimacy of Balbus' citizenship twice (*Pro Balbo* 25, 32) over the course of a lengthy discussion of the desirability of Roman citizenship, in which he also pointed out that the Gaditans in particular were deserving of reciprocity with Rome, and that they, in fact, openly supported Balbus:

*Nunc vero quid ego contra Gaditanos loquar, cum id quod defendo voluntate eorum, auctoritate, legatione ipsa comprobetur? ...quorum moenia, delubra, agros ut Hercules itinerum ac laborum suorum, sic maiores nostri imperi ac nominis populi Romani terminos esse voluerunt.*

Why, indeed, should I speak against the Gaditans, when my argument is supported by their will, their authority, and even a delegation? ... [The

---

<sup>121</sup> Cic. *Pro Balbo* 6.

Gaditans,] who, along with our ancestors, wished their walls, shrines, and fields to be the boundaries of the name and *imperium* of the Roman people, as Hercules wished them to be of his travels and labors.<sup>122</sup>

Descriptions of Balbus' military career also served to link him closely with Pompey in the mind of the jurors. Because he had not, in fact, been a lifelong participant in the life of the city of Rome (having spent much of his time in the provinces and in interactions with the fairly small social circle that included Pompey, Caesar, and Cicero),<sup>123</sup> Balbus was known to the Roman people primarily as a foreigner who had achieved a position of great influence.<sup>124</sup> Cicero attempted to make up this deficiency by associating Balbus with characters from Rome's recent history (most notably Pompey, but also Marius) in order to have some emotion – specifically, patriotism and nostalgia – to draw upon.<sup>125</sup> Balbus' association with Pompey was particularly important to Cicero's defense, as it also offered Cicero a golden opportunity to connect Balbus with great Roman oratory – a skill that Balbus himself apparently did not possess. By associating

---

<sup>122</sup> Cic. *Pro Balbo* 39. While praising the Gaditans (whose support was helpful to Balbus because of their long history of loyalty to Rome), Cicero made use of scare tactics: if the Romans stop offering citizenship to their allies as a reward for cooperation, will they have any allies left to call upon in war?

<sup>123</sup> In fact, Cicero himself stated unequivocally in *De Officiis* 1.125:

*Peregrini autem atque incolae officium est nihil praeter suum negotium agere, nihil de alio anquirere minimeque esse in aliena re publica curiosum.*

The duty of the foreigner or resident alien, moreover, is not to meddle in business not his own, not to inquire into the affairs of others, and least of all to involve himself in the business of a state foreign to him.

While Cicero obviously had no difficulty making exceptions to this rule in individual cases, this standard would have made establishing a Roman identity and especially delicate process for a foreigner.

<sup>124</sup> See Barber (2004) for extensive analysis of the way Cicero dealt with the popular *invidia* against Balbus. In particular, "Cicero... avoids regenerating ill will against the defendant by universalizing and generalizing his praise of brave men who help Rome, rather than specifically praising Balbus too often." (Barber 2004, xvi.)

<sup>125</sup> As Barber notes (Barber 2004, xvi-xvii),

Often pathos is aroused through the use of character [in other words, pathos and ethos are intertwined], as in the digressions on Pompey and Marius. Here intense feelings of admiration, and in the [sic] Marius' case, longing, are stirred in the audience and mingled with strong feelings of patriotism.

Balbus with *Pompey's* oratory, however, Cicero was able to suggest that Balbus's Romanness in part flowed from the extraordinary "Roman" nature of Balbus's patrons. In *Pro Balbo* 2, Cicero described Pompey's speech of the previous day using almost every positive term typical of discussions of rhetoric: *gravitas* (seriousness), *facultas* (talent), *copia* (abundance, or richness), *subtilitas* (acuity), *memoria* (memory, or mindfulness), *peritia* (practical experience), *auctoritas* (authority), and *modestia* (modesty).<sup>126</sup> He went so far, in section 3, as to compare Pompey's speech to the speeches of Lucius Crassus, one of Rome's greatest orators, about whom Cicero was then in the process of composing the *De Oratore*:

*Quae enim in L. Crasso potuit, homine nato ad dicendi singularem quandam facultatem, si hanc causam ageret, maior esse ubertas, varietas, copia quam fuit in eo qui tantum potuit impertire huic studio temporis quantum ipse a pueritia usque ad hanc aetatem a continuis bellis et victoriis conquievit?*

---

<sup>126</sup> *Pro Balbo* 2:

*Quae fuerit hesterno die Cn. Pompei gravitas in dicendo, iudices, quae facultas, quae copia, non opinione tacita vestrorum animorum, sed perspicua admiratione declarari videbatur. Nihil enim unquam audivi quod mihi de iure subtilius dici videretur, nihil memoria maiore de exemplis, nihil peritius de foederibus, nihil inlustriore auctoritate de bellis, nihil de re publica gravius, nihil de ipso modestius, nihil de causa et crimine ornatus.*

What seriousness Gnaeus Pompeius displayed in speaking yesterday, members of the jury, what talent, what richness of speech, seemed to be evident not only in the silent opinion of your minds, but in [your] open admiration. For I have never heard anything that seemed to me to be spoken with greater acuity about the law, nothing with a greater memory for precedents, nothing with more experience of treaties, nothing with nobler authority concerning wars, nothing more seriously about the republic, nothing more modestly about the speaker himself, nothing more distinctively about the case and the charge.

Barber explains (Barber 2004, 5):

Cicero praises [Pompey's] speech, in which Pompey showed *gravitas*, a word which indicates weight of words, but also carries connotations of intellectual and moral influence; *gravitas* indicates that what he said was said seriously and should be taken seriously; *facultas*, which translates both as fluency and the ability to do anything easily; and *copia*, an important rhetorical concept, which translates as abundance and sometimes signifies *eloquentia* in general.

For how could there have been – even in Lucius Crassus, a man born with the most astonishing natural talent for oratory, if he had argued this case – greater richness, variety, and abundance than appeared in this man, who was able to dedicate just as much time to the study [of oratory] as he reserved, from his youth to the present day, from continual wars and victories?

Cicero was very clearly going out of his way to hold a picture of Pompey the great orator before the jury's eyes. It is possible that Cicero was playing on the jurors' affection for Pompey, or simply buttering Pompey up in general, but given the central role of oratory in Roman public life and the abundant examples of Pompey's military and political prowess that Cicero had at his disposal if he wanted to praise something, it is more likely that Cicero had a specific reason for choosing this particular skill of Pompey's. As Barber notes, "[t]he use of the superlative adjective suggests that Pompey and Crassus have tremendous expertise in the law courts. This is not true of Pompey, and in regard to Crassus, Cicero gives a different picture of his talents elsewhere (*Brutus* 233)."<sup>127</sup> That being the case, it is even more noteworthy that Cicero depicted Pompey, one of Balbus' patrons and representatives before the court, as a master of oratory as well as of action. Balbus himself had only military achievements to his credit, rather than cultural ones, and verbal ability was a prerequisite of full participation in the political life of the city; therefore it was up to Cicero to indicate that Balbus was a Roman in word as well as in deed.

Balbus and Archias are excellent examples of the performance of identity over time; in both cases Cicero emphasized their service to Rome at the expense of other desirable things, such as their loyalties to their native lands. As Steel points out, the fact that Cicero emphasized service to Rome as the deciding factor in the Romanness of these

---

<sup>127</sup> Barber 2004, 5.



two immigrants reflects the way in which Roman citizens wished to see their subject peoples; the model that Cicero established with the *Pro Balbo* and *Pro Archia*, “of foreigners serving the Roman state with enthusiasm, confirms Rome’s dominance over its subjects.”<sup>128</sup> The two defenses, moreover, also served to bolster Cicero’s interpretation of what it meant to be a Roman by placing actions over origins. Several different factors may have influenced Cicero’s decision to defend Archias in the first place, but in turning the defense into a monologue on the role of literature in society, he was able to emphasize the point that literary expressions of Romanness played a crucial part in shaping Roman behavior. Balbus, meanwhile, was an example of an individual who had not had the benefit of training such as that provided by Archias, but his lack of literary and oratorical prowess could be compensated for by the educated Romans like Pompey who appreciated his physical bravery and dedication to Roman military dominance.

## Conclusion

In considering what it was that, in the eyes of both elites and the common people, made a Roman “Roman,” it seems clear that language, specifically Latin, played a crucial and necessary – while not sufficient – role. A Roman spoke Latin, and spoke it well, often, and effectively; he took pride in the Latin of the Roman ancestors, even if his own ancestors were not from Rome itself. The linguistic elite, represented by Caesar, Cicero, Atticus, Varro, and others, believed that getting the mechanics of Latin right should be a goal for all Romans, and they sometimes attempted to promulgate such correctness. Aulus Gellius, the author who quoted Caesar’s *De Analogia*, wrote that the early third- to

---

<sup>128</sup> Steel 2001, 75.

late second-century poet Quintus Ennius, who came from Rudiae but was widely regarded as one of the models of antique Roman speech, “used to say that he had three hearts, because he knew how to speak in Greek and Oscan and Latin.”<sup>129</sup> As Andrew Wallace-Hadrill points out, “[w]hat is so striking is not his trilingual skill, but the fact that he felt that these languages represented *hearts*: what should be unique was triple. It went to the core of his identity.”<sup>130</sup> By the time of Cicero and Caesar the number of immigrants in Rome had expanded enormously, but native Romans and new Romans alike were still expected to cultivate a Roman “heart.”

---

<sup>129</sup> Gell. 17.17.1: “*Quintus Ennius tria corda habere sese dicebat, quod loqui Graece et Osce et Latine sciret.*”

<sup>130</sup> Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 3.

## Chapter 4:

### So You Want to Be a Roman: Rome's Cultural, Political, and Territorial Expansion within Italy

As I mention in my Introduction, scholars have come to accept that the spread and eventual dominance of Roman culture in Italy did not necessarily mean that the local identities of the Italian communities gave way to a “Roman” identity – indeed, it makes little sense to speak of a single Roman identity in the last two centuries BCE.<sup>1</sup> Despite the scholarly consensus that Italians continued to enact local identities, it is nonetheless clear that the imposition and the acceptance of Roman practices throughout Italy signified important changes in the ways both Romans and Italians understood the concept of “being Roman.” In discussing Roman identity, I have focused in the previous chapters primarily on what the Romans themselves, at least as represented by the urban elite, thought constituted Romanness. Cicero provides an invaluable picture of the conceptualization of Roman identity in Rome itself during his lifetime, illustrating the different ways in which Roman identity was enacted as well as what he thought the ideal Roman should be like; an analysis of the middle of the first century BCE, however, does

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g.: Kathryn Lomas, *Rome and the Western Greeks, 300 BC-AD 200: Conquest and Acculturation in Southern Italy* (London: Routledge, 1993); Guy Bradley, “Tribes, states and cities in central Italy” in *The Emergence of State Identities in Italy in the First Millennium BC*, Edward Herring and Kathryn Lomas (eds), (London: Accordia Research Institute, University of London, 2000); and Wallace-Hadrill (2008).

not and cannot paint a comprehensive picture of Roman thought during the Republic. This chapter, therefore, contextualizes the Ciceronian concept of Romanness, and describes how Roman society arrived at a point at which Cicero could present himself as the quintessential Roman while nonetheless advocating a fluid understanding of Romanness and an infinitely expandable citizen body. Such a fluid conceptualization would not always have been acceptable or comprehensible to Romans. I argue that, although the concept of Romanness had been growing more flexible over the fourth, third, and second centuries, it was ultimately the change in policy necessitated by the Social War and the implementation of the *lex Iulia* of 90 BCE that caused a radical shift in the Romans' understanding of Romanness and allowed Cicero to develop and promulgate his own fairly meritocratic and politically and socially useful understanding.

During the fourth, third, and second centuries, Rome had developed close political and economic relationships with other cities, especially within Italy. These relationships were sometimes formalized through the extension of Latin status or *civitas sine suffragio* (citizenship without voting rights) to existing cities, or through the establishment of a Roman colony. The decision to award citizen rights (or some subset thereof) to these communities, however, was entirely up to Rome; the people in the local communities had no real power or even moral authority to argue that they *themselves* should be recognized as “Roman.” Instead, it was entirely up to the Roman elites to decide who was and who was not a Roman, in this case by awarding citizenship rights – and so offering the imprimatur of Romanness – to individuals or entire cities, frequently in recognition of service to the state or of special, “Roman” qualities. (This was the sort of recognition awarded to L. Cornelius Balbus, who is discussed in chapters 2 and 3). As Rome became

increasingly powerful, the prestige of Roman citizenship and the significance of its uniqueness correspondingly increased; this had the effect of giving even more power to the Roman elites and the popular assembly, because they were now the arbiters of a far more valuable commodity.

While Rome might choose to associate individuals or groups with itself by making these people into Romans or making them similar to Romans, the Roman elites were emphatically opposed to the concept of creating *other* Romes, which would lead to competition rather than dependence; in effect, the Roman elites believed in cooption, rather than competition. Conferring any sort of Roman rights on an individual or group established Rome's proprietary stake in the individual or community's welfare and actions. This meant that Roman citizenship was a tool that could be used to integrate people and groups into Rome's sphere of influence. It also meant that citizenship entailed some loss of autonomy on the part of "adopted" communities. While the Romans may have granted citizenship during the fourth, third, and second centuries with this in mind, however, they also – at least during the first century, when accounts of these extensions of citizenship were composed – felt that citizenship was a valuable commodity on which they held a monopoly. This was certainly true in the case of individual grants; in such cases, the Romans were offering something concrete (membership in the community of Rome itself), sometimes accompanied by other rewards, in direct response to service to the state. In the eyes of the Roman elites, there was something special about the city of Rome and its people. With the Social War, however, the decision of who was to possess Roman citizenship was taken out of Roman hands; although Rome emerged from the military and political struggle with its leadership of Italy intact, the loss of

control over decisions that had formerly belonged exclusively to the Roman people could not fail to be an embarrassment. Peter Brunt in his *Italian Manpower* suggested that the number of Roman citizens after the Social War was nearly triple what it had been previously.<sup>2</sup> The question for the Roman elites became how to define Roman citizenship in such a way as to account for the change without, so to speak, debasing the currency of citizenship.

The answer for the Roman elites was not so much to redefine Romanness as to subdivide it. Although there had always been tensions, as in every society, between the elite and non-elite segments of the Roman community, following the Social War and with the rise of men such as Cicero who wanted to compete with the Roman aristocrats on their own terms, the qualifications for being accepted as one of the Roman elites were more clearly articulated. Cicero vociferously (if predictably) complained that simply having the proper ancestry would allow a man – however otherwise unworthy – to be welcomed into the houses of fellow-aristocrats, while men like himself, of unimpeachable character and extra-urban birth, were left to beg for admittance into the inner circle.<sup>3</sup> Cicero himself, however, while necessarily taking a broader geographical view of who could be Roman, was similarly strict in his definition of what a Roman should be in terms of personal qualities. As discussed in chapter 2, Cicero used the concept of Romanness extensively in his forensic speeches as a way of garnering sympathy or admiration for his clients and himself and generating opprobrium against his opponents; he invoked Roman identity largely by talking about supposedly “Roman” characteristics such as *virtus* and *fides*. The frequency with which his arguments were

---

<sup>2</sup> P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower, 225 BC–AD 14* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971).

<sup>3</sup> *In Verrem* 2.3.7-8.

successful can be attributed in part to his skillful assessment of what interpretation of Romanness would be acceptable to his audience. As I argue in chapter 3, the adept use of Latin was likewise an important element of Roman identity, for Cicero as well as for his contemporaries. While Cicero was certainly protective of the concept of Roman identity, in the sense that he felt that it was something special and not to be shared indiscriminately, the crucial way in which Cicero differed from the Roman hereditary aristocracy was that he believed that Romanness was something that could be acquired through actions. Romanness still had to be conferred by Romans, but non-Romans could take action toward acquiring a Roman identity, and could at least present a moral argument for deserving the imprimatur of Romanness.

Cicero's conscious and comprehensive adoption of Roman traits is easily explained by his lifelong desire to belong to the upper echelons of Rome's political and social elite. The "Romanization" of Italian communities, by which I mean the appearance in these communities of aspects of Roman culture including the Latin language, Roman architectural influences, Roman magistracies, and Roman laws and legal formulae, is more difficult to understand. This is partly a result of the futility of any attempt to generalize across the various regions of Italy (such as Latium, Umbria, Etruria, and Magna Graecia), and even within those regions. The political systems and non-Roman cultural influences, as well as the amount and type of contact with Rome, varied widely from group to group, as did the degree of urbanization and the level of intra-regional unification.<sup>4</sup> Even if it is possible to identify the motivations of specific communities to adopt Roman characteristics, therefore, it is usually impossible to say

---

<sup>4</sup> The towns of Umbria, for example, were famously more competitive than cooperative, while their Etruscan neighbors possessed a high level of urbanization and intra-city organization (see Bradley 2000, 2010).

with certainty how widespread these motivations were in Italy. The existing evidence, however, does seem to point to one particular way in which Roman and Italian understandings of identity changed over the fourth through first centuries. Once Rome began to achieve dominance over the peninsula, “Roman” identity became something separate from, but coexisting with, the identity that came with being from any particular city or community – even Rome itself.

One of the few sweeping statements that it is possible to make about non-Roman Italians is that, even in the face of Rome’s political and social dominance, they manifestly did not choose to give up all facets of their own cultures, but continued to assert their various identities by using local languages (often alongside Latin), minting their own coins, and declining to do very extensive architectural remodeling of their cities (even when some modifications were made to municipal complexes). Following the Social War, “Romanization” of the non-Roman Italian cities increased, but local identities still persisted, even in areas where Rome placed colonies of its own citizens among the original inhabitants. One explanation for the appearance of aspects of Roman culture in Italian cities is that the changes were mandated by the Roman government following the conquest of those cities. This is certainly true in some cases, to some extent; for example, there is evidence that after Rome’s defeat of Paestum in 273 the plan of the city was significantly modified, resulting (among other changes) in the construction of a forum, *comitium* and *curia* buildings, and a temple in the style of Rome’s great temple to Jupiter Capitolinus.<sup>5</sup> In other cases, however, change was introduced without violence or the (immediate) threat of violence; for example, in 180 BCE, without there having been a

---

<sup>5</sup> Lomas 1993, 89.



war or conflict, the Cumaeans asked the Roman Senate for permission to conduct public business in Latin.<sup>6</sup> While it is possible that, in these situations, the adoption of Roman practices was intended as a statement to neighbors and visitors that the city in question had a strong connection to Rome, the most powerful city of the peninsula, a better interpretation is that these efforts constituted a message from the city *to* Rome, expressing loyalty through a shared, though manufactured, cultural and political milieu. If true, this would mean that the Italian cities that took such actions anticipated the Ciceronian understanding of how identity works – that shared standards of behavior constitute, or at least can lead to the development of, a shared identity.

The traditional definition of Roman identity (that is, the one understood by people from the city of Rome, especially those with significant ancestral ties to the city, at least through the period of the Social War) was based primarily on heredity. Romans were people who were born and lived in Rome, with the exception of certain notable individuals (including the Tarquinii, Rome’s sixth-century Etruscan kings, and the early second-century poet Ennius, who came from Rudiae in southern Italy) and the inhabitants of colonies founded by Rome. As the nature of Rome’s interactions with Italian communities changed, however, and specifically as Rome began to extend Roman and Latin rights to groups of people who in many cases had never seen Rome, a different definition of Roman citizenship had to evolve. The Social War made it official: since the Italian communities did not give up their original identities but were now legally “Roman,” Romanness was an identity that existed over and above local identities. In this it resembled the “ethnic groups” such as “Umbrian” and “Etruscan,” which had been the

---

<sup>6</sup> Livy 40.42.13; see chapter 2.

shared identities of people in their regions who lived in separate cities or rural areas, but it overshadowed these identities as well.<sup>7</sup> The new definition was largely based on legal status, although behavior demonstrating the desire to be “Roman” was also an important component. The traditional definition was still valid, and the Roman elites in particular tended to hold to it, but the new definition existed simultaneously and stretched beyond it. Rome was now simply another state under the umbrella of Romanness, a supra-state, almost “national,” identity, although Romans had the distinction of having invented and given their name to this new identity.<sup>8</sup>

### Citizenship Status: Terminology and Concepts

Roman expansion and colonization was a complex and multi-layered process, and a brief introduction to the terminology used by Romans to refer to different levels of participation in Roman public life is in order. The second-century CE author Aulus Gellius tells us that, at least in his day, Romans themselves were confused as to the distinction between *municipia* and *coloniae*, two types of settlement with very different origins, rights, and responsibilities. The term *municipia*, Gellius tells us, comes from the fact that the inhabitants of *municipia* share Roman citizenship and certain privileges (*munus*) with the Roman people while retaining their own laws and rights (*legibus suis et suo iure utentes*).<sup>9</sup> *Coloniae*, or colonies, on the other hand, were essentially miniature copies of Rome (*quasi effigies parvae simulacraque*), in which the inhabitants had Roman citizenship and were subject to Roman laws. Gellius goes on to explain that

---

<sup>7</sup> As Bradley (2000, 240) points out, after the Social War there was no need for the Umbrians to unite as an ethnic group anymore, because there was no one to fight.

<sup>8</sup> This idea owes much to Benedict Anderson’s premise in *Imagined Communities*.

<sup>9</sup> Gell. *NA* 16.13.6.

people in general found the status of *colonia* to be preferable to that of *municipium*, although there was less choice involved, because of the greatness of the Roman people and because the laws of Rome were current, whereas those of a *municipium* became antiquated.<sup>10</sup> The reality of Republican colonization, however, was more complicated.

At the moment of foundation, a colony consisted of people who were moving to a new geographical location while retaining their original citizenship status. The process of moving the group to its new home was called a *deductio* and led by a *deductor*. The land on which the colonies were founded consisted of carefully delineated sections of *ager publicus* (public land), sometimes called *ager captivus* (captured land); the *ager publicus* that was not allotted to colonies or to individual settlers was made available to any Roman for purchase, with the proviso that the state could take it back at any time. Thus the use of *ager publicus* for colonization was a serious political concern, especially since the unallotted land tended to accumulate in the hands of the wealthy elites who had the disposable income to purchase it. The resultant disparity in landownership between

---

<sup>10</sup> Gell. NA 16.13.8:

*Sed "coloniarum" alia necessitudo est; non enim veniunt extrinsecus in civitatem nec suis radicibus nituntur, sed ex civitate quasi propagatae sunt et iura institutaque omnia populi Romani, non sui arbitrii, habent. Quae tamen condicio, cum sit magis obnoxia et minus libera, potior tamen et praestabilior existimatur propter amplitudinem maiestatemque populi Romani, cuius istae coloniae quasi effigies parvae simulacraque esse quaedam videntur, et simul quia obscura oblitterataque sunt municipiorum iura, quibus uti iam per ignotitiam non queunt.*

But the relationship [of Rome] with 'colonies' is different; for they do not achieve citizenship from without nor develop from their own roots, but are, as it were, transplanted from the state and have all the laws and institutions of the Roman people, not of their own devising. This condition, moreover, although it is more submissive and less free [than that of a *municipium*], is thought preferable and more advantageous, on account of the greatness and power of the Roman people, of which colonies seem to be, as it were, imitations and likenesses, and also because the laws of *municipia* are obscured and lost [over time], such that now, through ignorance, they are unusable.

the elite and the lower classes periodically became a major controversy;<sup>11</sup> in the late second century BCE in particular, under the influence of Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus, it was understood that one way to resolve the issue was through the reclamation of *ager publicus* and redistribution in the form of new colonial foundations.<sup>12</sup> The most important reason for a state to found a colony, however, was to gain a foothold in territory that had recently come under its control; it was an alternative to maintaining a garrison in an existing city. For example, as E. T. Salmon points out, the fourteen colonies known to have been founded before 338 BCE<sup>13</sup> were all located at strategic points along the borders of Latium and Etrurian or Volscian territory.<sup>14</sup> The reason for individuals to participate in the foundation of a colony, sometimes even to the point of giving up their Roman citizenship, if they were originally from Rome and the colony was a Latin one (that is, without Roman citizenship), was to acquire land, along with the opportunity for improved social status.<sup>15</sup> Mario Torelli and Martin Söderlind, in

---

<sup>11</sup> For example, in the mid-fourth century a law proposed by the tribunes C. Licinius Stolo and L. Sextius Lateranus was passed limiting the amount of *ager publicus* that one person was able to possess to 500 *iugera*, or over 300 acres (Jonkers 1963, 3). By way of comparison, the amount of land typically allotted to founding members of a colony was two *iugera*. E. J. Jonkers, *Social and Economic Commentary on Cicero's De Lege Agraria Orationes Tres* (Leiden: Brill, 1963).

<sup>12</sup> Saskia Roselaar argues, with Lo Cascio and De Ligt, that the Gracchan programs of 133 and 123-2 were intended to relieve the pressure caused by population growth in the second century; the allies who had previously held the land, however, had in many cases continued to use it. This became a source of tension between Rome and the allies, which contributed to the conflict leading to the Social War. Saskia T. Roselaar, *Public Land in the Roman Republic: A Social and Economic History of Ager Publicus in Italy, 398-89 BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 6.

<sup>13</sup> The year in which Rome successfully concluded its war against the Latins; this brought an end to the Latin League, an arrangement possibly established by a treaty made with the Latin cities by Spurius Cassius in 493. For the Latin League, see Alföldi 1965, 391-414. A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965).

<sup>14</sup> Salmon 1970, 42; the colonies are Fidenae, Cora, Signia, Velitrae (494), Norba (492), Antium (467), Ardea (442), Labici (418), Vitellia (395), Circeii (393), Satricum (385), Setia (383), Sutrium, and Nepes. E. T. Salmon, *Roman Colonization under the Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970.

<sup>15</sup> Although, as Bradley (2006, 175) points out, the colonies “were founded as hierarchical societies, not egalitarian communities.” Guy Bradley, “Colonization and Identity in Republican Italy” in Guy Bradley

particular, argue for the large-scale participation of freedmen and even slaves in colonization.<sup>16</sup>

There were two types of colonies: Roman and Latin. In a Roman colony, the founding members were Roman citizens. The term “Latin” (*Latinus*) originally referred to the inhabitants of the plain called Latium (modern Lazio), and included the Romans. At some point during the fourth through second centuries, it came to be used by the Romans to refer not just to their neighbors in Latium, but to a set of rights that had been shared by the geographically Latin communities, but could now be granted to other Italians. Unsurprisingly, there has been a great deal of academic debate about the exact nature of Roman and Latin colonies. E. T. Salmon argued in his 1970 book on colonization that the earliest colonies that the Romans were involved in founding were not Roman, but Latin.<sup>17</sup> Anyone who joined one of these colonies, in other words, instead of having Roman citizenship, had the citizenship of whichever colony he joined, as well as the rights common to all Latin communities. Citizenship authorities such as Salmon, Theodor Mommsen, and A. N. Sherwin-White have based more than a century’s worth of analysis on the understanding that the Latin rights included *commercium* and *conubium*, the rights to economic relationships and legal marriage, with the rest of the Latin cities (which, once again, included Rome), as well as the right, almost invisible in the sources, of changing one’s citizenship. The latter, the *ius migrationis* (also called the

---

and John-Paul Wilson (eds.), *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2006).

<sup>16</sup> Torelli 1999, 73-6; Söderlind 2001, 94, 96. Mario Torelli, *Tota Italia: Essays in the Cultural Formation of Roman Italy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999); Martin Söderlind, “Romanization and the Use of Votive Offerings in the Eastern Ager Vulcentis,” *Opuscula Romana* 25-26 (2000-2001), pp. 89-102.

<sup>17</sup> Salmon 1970, 41-2. Salmon points out, reasonably enough, that there is no reason for Rome to have had the right to make independent and unilateral decisions about including communities in the category of Latin cities. See also E. T. Salmon, “Rome and the Latins: I,” *Phoenix*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Autumn, 1953), pp. 93-104.

*ius migrandi* or *ius mutandae civitatis*), supposedly made it possible for a Latin to leave his hometown, move to a different Latin town, and become a citizen there; this included the acquisition of Roman citizenship by moving to Rome or to a Roman colony.<sup>18</sup> As Deryck Piper points out, however, individuals who moved to such a colony, while gaining citizenship, would not have the automatic claim to a specific amount of land that the founding colonists were given; citizenship was not the only commodity at issue in the process of colonization.<sup>19</sup> R. E. Smith suggested that Latins from allied cities were in fact able to become Roman citizens by enrolling as founding members of a Roman colony, but Piper has argued conclusively that this was not the case.<sup>20</sup>

M. P. Guidobaldi and F. Pesando point out in their work on Minturnae that Roman and Latin colonies received different treatment from one another; in 174 BCE, for example, when the censors Q. Fulvius Flaccus and A. Postumius Albinus were undertaking numerous public works in Rome and elsewhere, they confined their efforts to Roman rather than Latin colonies. Guidobaldi and Pesando see this as evidence that the Romans colonies were seen as extensions of the state and the Latin colonies as autonomous entities, tied to the capital only by military obligations.<sup>21</sup> The presence of

---

<sup>18</sup> Sherwin-White 1973, 34-5. A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973). Broadhead (2001), however, makes a persuasive argument against the existence of a formal *ius migrationis* at any time. William Broadhead, "Rome's Migration Policy and the So-Called *Ius Migrandi*," *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 12 (2001), pp.69-89.

<sup>19</sup> Piper 1987, 48. Deryck Piper, "Latins and the Roman Citizenship in Roman Colonies: Livy 34, 42.5-6: Revisited," *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 36, H. 1 (1<sup>st</sup> Qtr., 1987), pp. 38-50.

<sup>20</sup> R. E. Smith, "Latins and the Roman Citizenship in Roman Colonies: Livy 34, 42.5-6," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 44 (1954), pp. 18-20.

<sup>21</sup> Guidobaldi and Pesando 1989, 41:

È significativo che nessun intervento riguardi le colonie latine, ciò che costituisce una conferma che se la colonia romana continua ad essere sentita come una diretta emanazione di Roma, la colonia di diritto latino è uno stato autonomo, legato alla capitale solo dagli obblighi di carattere militare.

Roman-style *forum-curia-comitium* complexes<sup>22</sup> in the colonies of the Republic and not elsewhere, however, clearly demonstrates that, as Henrik Mouritsen argues, the colonies had a relationship with Rome distinct from that of the other communities of Italy.<sup>23</sup>

*Municipia*, which were first constituted in the fourth century BCE, were cities that had existed independently prior to coming under Roman domination. Such communities may be thought of as the urban centers of politically autonomous allies.<sup>24</sup> They were created, like colonies, by the process the Romans called *constitutio*, which usually resulted in the formulation of a “law” (*lex*), or set of regulations. We know that statutes issued from Rome to *municipia* and *coloniae* were taken from templates and adapted to fit the particular communities; as M. H. Crawford explains, “it is clear both that different communities had different *leges* and that they went on being brought up to date, by mechanisms which remain obscure, until the third century AD.”<sup>25</sup> Overall, however, colonial and municipal statutes grew to resemble each other more closely during the first century. Prior to the Social War the *municipes* (inhabitants of *municipia*) seem, for the most part, to have held *civitas sine suffragio* (citizenship without voting rights).<sup>26</sup> After the Social War, most of the communities of Italy became *municipia*; the inhabitants of these *municipia* held full Roman citizenship (*civitas optimo iure*), which meant that they would vote and be counted in the census. Thus, as Bispham argues, the growing number

---

Maria Paola Guidobaldi and Fabrizio Pesando, “La Colonia *Civium Romanorum*,” Filippo Coarelli (ed.), *Minturnae*, (Rome: Nuova Editrice Romana, 1989), pp. 35-66.

<sup>22</sup> See below, “The Remodeling of Italy: Case Studies.”

<sup>23</sup> Mouritsen 2004, 38. Henrik Mouritsen, “Pits and Politics: Interpreting Colonial Fora in Republican Italy,” *Papers of the British School at Rome*, Vol. 72 (2004), pp.37-67.

<sup>24</sup> Bispham 2007, 9-16. Edward Bispham, *From Asculum to Actium: The Municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>25</sup> Crawford 1998, 31. M. H. Crawford, “How to Create a *Municipium*: Rome and Italy after the Social War,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* Vol. 42, Suppl. 71 (1998), pp.31-46.

<sup>26</sup> Bispham 2007, 13.

of *municipia* in Italy necessitated a certain level of decentralization in the administration of Roman territory.<sup>27</sup> Sherwin-White went so far as to state that the existence of *cives sine suffragio* enabled the Romans to come to terms with the idea of individuals being citizens of Rome while retaining elements of their own cultures, a concept which would be all-important during the transition from Republic to Empire.<sup>28</sup>

Virital settlements (*assignatio viritalana*) constituted yet another type of Roman territorial expansion, different from either *coloniae* or *municipia*, in which land was parceled out on an individual basis (*viritalim*), instead of being allotted to a group. Since the individuals in question would be scattered instead of forming a unified geographical and administrative base, this type of settlement could only occur in the case of lands that were already felt to be militarily secure (which usually meant that they had been under Roman domination for some time). The land allotments under Tiberius Gracchus' 133 BCE plan to redistribute the *ager publicus* were virital settlements of Roman citizens alone, and this may have contributed to the aggravation felt by the Latin allies, who wanted the opportunity to participate in the settlement program.<sup>29</sup>

## Problems in Studying Roman Colonization

The study of Roman colonization of Italy, especially in the earliest period (prior to 338 BCE) is complicated by many factors. The literary sources, most notably the

---

<sup>27</sup> Bispham 2007, 11:

They [*municipia*] changed the shape of the Roman body politic, and in such a way that a municipal system was developed which could without much difficulty be transplanted to the provinces, and which possessed the flexibility to adapt and prosper. Without the slow municipalization of Italy, the stability and endurance of the Roman empire would not have been possible.

<sup>28</sup> Sherwin-White 1973, 57-8.

<sup>29</sup> Piper 1987, 41.



works of Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus, and Plutarch (although other authors such as Cicero and Appian also mentioned colonization), were all written during the late Republic or thereafter. This means, obviously, that they partake in all the usual problems of sources composed centuries after the events described, including anachronism and inconsistency. The authors whose works survive depended heavily on the earlier historical works of the annalists (authors who recorded past events succinctly and by year); similarities between the works of later authors often demonstrate or suggest that they were working from the same annalistic sources. As F. Càssola points out, the annalists whose works had the most influence on the writing of late Republican historians were usually the most recent; thus, the problem of the authors writing long after the events occurred was compounded.<sup>30</sup> The authors were also Roman or heavily influenced by Rome, so their descriptions of Rome's development and early foreign policy were undoubtedly influenced by a variety of contemporary social and probably political considerations. Salmon noted the assumption in the works of Roman historians that the earliest colonies, which he terms *priscae latinae coloniae*, were initiated, led by, and entirely composed of Romans; Salmon, and later Sherwin-White, pointed out that this was clearly not the case.<sup>31</sup> W. V. Harris, discussing the colonization of Etruria and Umbria, also mentioned the diverse origins of the colonists, noting in particular Livy's statement (33.24.8-9) that, of the colonists to be sent to Cosa in 197, the Senate decreed that none were to be people who had taken up arms against the state after 218 (the first

---

<sup>30</sup> Càssola 1988, 5. Filippo Càssola, "Aspetti Sociali e Politici della Colonizzazione," *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 6.2 (1988): 5-17.

<sup>31</sup> Salmon 1970, 41-2; Sherwin-White 1973, 36.

year of the Second Punic War).<sup>32</sup> This restriction would have made no sense if the only people eligible for participation in a colonial settlement were themselves Romans.

Another potential pitfall in the study of Roman history more generally, as Sherwin-White noted in 1973 and other scholars have since, is the danger of assuming that a term used in the late Republic or the Empire meant the same thing as it had several centuries earlier. Sherwin-White discussed this problem with regard to the fourth century in particular, when Rome's power in Italy was undergoing a dramatic change and terms such as *civitas sine suffragio* might well mean something completely different when used only decades apart.<sup>33</sup> In some cases, there is debate over whether concepts that have been taken for granted by modern scholars existed at all. One such question is whether, or at what period, it was possible for Latins to become Roman citizens *per magistratum*, that is, by serving as magistrates in their colonies. Mommsen believed that this right appeared in 268, replacing the *ius migrationis*.<sup>34</sup> Donald W. Bradeen, however, argued that if the right existed at all before the imperial period, it was not until 89 BCE at the earliest. Sherwin-White points out that in the early centuries of colonization the idea of a Roman citizen "domiciled in *agro peregrino*, neither performing *munera* nor holding

---

<sup>32</sup> W. V. Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p.158-60. Livy 33.24.8-9:

*Cosanis eo tempore postulantibus, ut sibi colonorum numerus augetur, mille adscribi iussi, dum ne quis in eo numero esset, qui post P. Cornelium et Ti. Sempronium consules hostis fuisset.*

At that time the Cosans were asking for additional colonists, and one thousand colonists were enrolled, but no one who had been an enemy of the state after the consulship of Publius Cornelius and Titus Sempronius could be one of them.

<sup>33</sup> Bispham 2007, 13:

The origins of the familiar *municipium* of the post-Social War period, which are probably to be sought in the fourth century, are inescapably tangled up in the origins of the *municeps* and his relation to the *civitas sine suffragio*, a question in itself still debated, and likely to remain so.

<sup>34</sup> Bradeen 1959, 221. Donald W. Bradeen, "Roman Citizenship *per magistratum*," *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 54, No. 5 (Feb., 1959), pp.221-28.

*honores*, is absurd;” in other words, one could not be a Roman citizen without accepting the rights or performing the duties of a Roman citizen, and ex-magistrates from the colonies would have been in this position unless they all moved to Rome after serving their terms in office.<sup>35</sup> P. A. Brunt argued that this right was granted to the Latins after the revolt and destruction of Fregellae (a Latin colony) in 125.<sup>36</sup>

Even given these serious problems in studying Roman colonization of Italy, it is nonetheless possible to examine the existing sources, and to use those sources – while acknowledging the uncertainty of any conclusions – to determine how the subjugation of Italy to Rome led to a variety of new Roman identities.

### The Remodeling of Italy: Case Studies

The archaeological sources for the expansion of Roman influence in Italy are both vitally important and difficult to interpret. Remains of some colonies founded by the Romans have been discovered and studied, but the accessibility and preservation of the sites varies widely, especially in the case of sites where inhabitation has been continuous. Viewing the architecture of Roman settlements and of cities under Roman influence in terms of the spread of Romanization is also problematic because it invites the assumption of a direct correlation between the construction of Roman-style buildings in a particular place and the adoption of other aspects of Romanness by the inhabitants. While the correlation is not direct, however, the existence of Roman-style buildings in Republican

---

<sup>35</sup> Sherwin-White 1973, 36.

<sup>36</sup> Brunt 1965, 90-1, following G. Tibiletti (*Rend. Istit. Lomb.* 1953, 43ff). P. A. Brunt, “Italian Aims at the Time of the Social War,” *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 55, No. 1/2, Parts 1 and 2 (1965), pp. 90-109.

Italy is evidence that Romanness was enacted in some specific ways in settlements outside Rome.

The peoples of Italy, including the Romans, did not exist in isolation prior to the period of Roman expansionism. The interactions of various Italian cultures with one another, as well as the adoption by some communities of Greek practices, are recognizable in the material culture of every region. The influence of the Etruscans, Rome's powerful neighbors to the north, is particularly visible, and the literary sources confirm that the late Republican Romans felt that they owed a substantial cultural debt to the Etruscans. By at least the sixth century, Roman architecture was being heavily influenced by Etruscan religious traditions and buildings styles, and the Romans followed the Etruscan religious practices that accompanied settlement foundation.<sup>37</sup> The most striking physical evidence of cultural change, however, is certainly the appearance of Roman-style public buildings around Italy. The remains of these buildings undoubtedly illustrate the Romans' promotion of their forms of civic life (in terms of religion and political participation), whether in colonies or in *municipia*. It is worth noting, however, first that there is not always evidence of a dramatic alteration of *domestic* architecture in the existing communities in which such public buildings were constructed, and second that each colony or *municipium* had its own unique pattern of development.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Boëthius 1978, 103-4. A. Boëthius, *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (Harmondsworth, 1978).

<sup>38</sup> For the patterns in Italian domestic architecture, see Michele George, *The Roman Domestic Architecture of Northern Italy* (BAR International Series 670, 1997); Shelley Hales, *The Roman House and Social Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). As Hales (2003, 100) concludes regarding post-Social War Pompeii,

the upheaval in Pompeian society, which certainly must have occurred with the imposition of a new population in 80 BC, and is reflected in a proliferation of building projects in the public arena, for instance the amphitheater, is hardly traceable in the domestic sphere, at least not to our modern eyes. Given the importance of the house in

Although the Romans themselves believed that their city planning as a whole came from the Etruscan tradition, there is no evidence to suggest that this was actually the case. The characteristic orthogonal arrangement visible in the colonies has its roots in Greek, rather than Etruscan, city planning; the Romans may have gotten this via the Etruscans, but the Etruscan towns of which any remains survive show signs of orthogonal planning only after the Etruscans had encountered Greek traders and the colonists of southern Italy and adopted had Greek practices.<sup>39</sup> Jamie Sewell argues that the placement of the forum within Roman colonies bears a striking resemblance to the placement of the agora within Greek cities, and that the Roman-style comitium was an adaptation of the Greek type of circular assembly-place.<sup>40</sup> Genuinely Etruscan temple architecture, however, was highly influential throughout Latium, with temples all around the region bearing strong resemblances to one another and to the temples of southern Etruria in the sixth through fourth centuries.<sup>41</sup> Rome had begun to build capitolia in its colonies during the third century, and in following the tradition of the Capitolium at Rome these temples, which so obviously represented Roman culture and power, were also prominent displays

---

conveying *Romanitas*, this must imply that the houses of Samnite Pompeii were considered Roman enough for their new roles, Roman enough to house the veterans, and, perhaps more importantly, Roman enough to allow Pompeian occupants to participate successfully in the life of the city.

<sup>39</sup> Anderson 1997, 188-9. James C. Anderson, *Roman Architecture and Society* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).

<sup>40</sup> Sewell 2010, chap. 2; 62. Jamie Sewell, *The Formation of Roman Urbanism, 338-200 BC: Between Contemporary Foreign Influence and Roman Tradition* (*Journal of Roman Archaeology Suppl.* 79), Portsmouth (RI): Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2010.

<sup>41</sup> See Glinister 2009 for a discussion of the syncretistic and Etruscan-influenced nature of Italian religious practice during this period, as evidenced by votive offerings. Fay Glinister, "Veiled and Unveiled: Uncovering Roman Influence in Hellenistic Italy," in M. Gleba and H.W. Becker (eds.), *Votives, Places and Rituals in Etruscan Religion: Studies in Honor of Jean MacIntosh Turfa* (Leiden: Brill, 2009). For an analysis of slightly earlier Italian religious syncretism, see Ugo Bianchi, "Aspetti Religiosi della Campania dal VI al III Secolo" in *La Campania fra il VI e il III Secolo A.C.: Atti del XIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi e Italici, Benevento, 24-28 giugno 1981* (Galatina: Congedo, 1992), pp. 203-216.

of Etruscan architecture.<sup>42</sup> Not until the second century, according to Edlund-Berry, did the Romans begin to break away from building what were essentially Etruscan temples.<sup>43</sup> Edlund-Berry also suggests, however, that the differences in colonial public buildings from location to location (and between Cosa and Paestum in particular) imply the existence of “Roman architectural sensitivity to the original settlers of these areas.”<sup>44</sup> There can be no doubt, at any rate, that great care went into the planning and shaping of Roman and Latin colonies; as Brown says of Alba Fucens (a Latin colony founded in 303), Cosa (a Latin colony founded in 273), and other communities constructed by the Romans from the ground up: “Each was a study in orthogonal planning, a premeditated design for what a functioning Roman environment ought to be. The unplanned, radial prototype was Rome itself.”<sup>45</sup>

Each Italian city that interacted with Rome, as they all did sooner or later, had a different experience. The interactions between Rome and these cities were influenced by a number of factors, including the proximity of a city to Rome, the topography of the settlement, the prior and contemporary cultural influences, which might include Greek or other Italian influences as well as the indigenous culture of the region, and the simple fact of how hostile or friendly the relationship had been over time. Over the past 20 years, scholars have increasingly recognized “the need to consider each area, almost each

---

<sup>42</sup> Bispham (2006, 117), no doubt correctly, points out that the cults of these early capitolia were probably focused on the local manifestations of the Capitoline deities (Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva), and so not identical to the Roman cult. This does not change the strong message conveyed by the architecture. Edward Bispham, “*Coloniam Deducere*: How Roman was Roman Colonization during the Middle Republic?” in Guy Bradley and John-Paul Wilson (eds.), *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2006).

<sup>43</sup> Edlund-Berry 2008. Ingrid Edlund-Berry, “The Language of Etrusco-Italic Architecture: New Perspectives on Tuscan Temples,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 112 (2008), pp.441-47.

<sup>44</sup> Edlund-Berry 2008, 444.

<sup>45</sup> Brown 1980, 12. Frank E. Brown, *Cosa: The Making of a Roman Town* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1980).

*civitas*, individually, leaving aside ... overarching models based on insufficient data.”<sup>46</sup>

The following case studies of three Roman colonies in Italy – Cosa, Paestum, and Pompeii – are not intended to represent a complete picture of Rome’s influence in Italy or the Italian reaction to Roman expansionism. Instead, they illustrate some of the different ways that Roman expansionism could be imposed on and/or accepted by non-Roman communities, as well as the types of evidence that are available in the study of Roman expansionism in Italy. These three sites are useful because there is comparatively substantial information about their development and the relationships their populations had with Rome.

### **Cosa**

The Latin colony of Cosa was founded in 273 BCE, the fifteenth colony to be established by Rome since 338. (By the late third century there would be thirty such colonies.)<sup>47</sup> It consisted of land taken from Vulci in 280 and combined with that already appropriated from Tarquinia.<sup>48</sup> This gave it a strong coastal position. The colony was laid out using an orthogonal plan, although some creativity with the grid pattern was required in order to account for the steepness of the ground.<sup>49</sup> A forum and *arx* (an elevated location on which religious activities took place) were integrated into the plan of

---

<sup>46</sup> Terrenato 1998, 94. Nicola Terrenato, “*Tam Firmum Municipium*: The Romanization of Volaterrae and Its Cultural Implications,” *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 88 (1998), pp.94–114. See also Mouritsen (2004). For an argument against abandoning overarching models altogether, see J. H. C. Williams, “Roman Intentions and Romanization: Republican Northern Italy, c. 200–100 BC” in *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato (eds.) (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001).

<sup>47</sup> Livy 27.9.7, 10.7.

<sup>48</sup> Brown 1980, 2.

<sup>49</sup> Anderson 1997, 200.

the town at a relatively central location.<sup>50</sup> A comitium (assembly place) and curia (senate house) were located on the short axis of the forum. The comitium was a square space containing a circular amphitheater, with the curia overlooking it; the floor of the curia was level with the top step of the amphitheater, so that, for example, a magistrate bringing a proposal from the senate to the assembled citizens would emerge at the top of the theater to make his presentation. The complex was patterned after Rome's; Paestum had a very similar complex, but the amphitheater there was much larger – the capacity of Cosa's amphitheater was about 600 people, while the amphitheater at Paestum would have held around 1,200.<sup>51</sup> Work on these projects was interrupted in the mid-third century by the First Punic War, but resumed immediately afterward. Another structure adjoining the forum was the *carcer* (jail); this *carcer* is one of the few to have been identified outside Rome, although Livy implies that every city had one.<sup>52</sup> The colony did not possess a capitolium, however, until around the mid second century; when a capitolium was ultimately constructed, it included obviously Etruscan features such as architectural terracottas and round base molding, which were traditional for Roman temples.<sup>53</sup> There was a high level of building activity at Cosa during the latter half of the second century, including the destruction and relocation of the forum, which Sewell attributes to a decision on the part of the colonists to orient their city less toward the port and more toward the overland routes into the city.<sup>54</sup> The temples and public buildings

---

<sup>50</sup> Edlund-Berry 2008, 444.

<sup>51</sup> Brown 1980, 22-24.

<sup>52</sup> This structure has also been identified by some scholars as an *aerarium* (city treasury); a similar structure at Paestum has likewise been identified as either *carcer* or *aerarium* (Sewell 2010, 63).

<sup>53</sup> Guidobaldi and Pesando (1989); Edlund-Berry 2008, 444. *Pace* Bispham (2006, 96ff.), who objects to the characterization of the temple as a capitolium.

<sup>54</sup> Sewell 2010, 31-2.



constructed at that time reflected Hellenistic influence, as was the case in most Italian cities; Torelli describes this civil architecture as “an example of the northwards expansion of the great architecture of Latium and Campania.”<sup>55</sup>

Cosa remained loyal to Rome during the Second Punic War (218-201), and sustained heavy losses; in 199 the city petitioned Rome for more colonists to make up the numbers, as did other Latin colonies. In 197 the Cosans received permission to enroll 1,000 new members who had not sided with the Carthaginians during the war. They were allowed to make this determination themselves, although Rome may have reserved the right to check the list.<sup>56</sup> Sewell sees this as “something approaching a re-foundation,” during which the Cosans realized that their strategic defensive position on the coast, the reason for the establishment of the colony in the first place, had become much less important with the defeat of Hannibal, and that they would have to redefine themselves.<sup>57</sup> Brown says of Cosa’s position during the Social War and around the passage of the *lex Iulia* of 90 (perhaps overemphasizing the physical aspects of the life of the city): “Cosa’s territory was not involved in the bitter fighting, and the change of status is not detectable in the ruins and rubbish of the town.”<sup>58</sup> During the 60s BCE, however, Cosa was sacked by pirates and almost entirely destroyed – which, ironically, would later enable scholars to study an unusually well preserved, unmodified, Latin colony.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Torelli 1995, 20. Mario Torelli, *Studies in the Romanization of Italy*, translated by Helena Fracchia and Maurizio Gualtieri (Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 1995).

<sup>56</sup> Livy 33.24.8; Brown 1980, 32.

<sup>57</sup> Sewell 2010, 31-2.

<sup>58</sup> Brown 1980, 72.

<sup>59</sup> This was one of the incidents that convinced the Senate to give Pompey his extraordinary command against the pirates.

## Paestum

Although Paestum and Cosa were founded in the same year (273) and both were Latin colonies, the two communities were markedly different in structure and character. Paestum was established in what had been Samnite territory (in modern Campania) on the site of an existing Greek city, Poseidonia, and when the Romans transformed it into a colony, they already had an orthogonal plan to work with.<sup>60</sup> In fact, the city of Poseidonia had seen a recent (late fourth-century) increase in public building activity. The agora (the Greek equivalent of the forum) was positioned between a sanctuary of Athena to the north and what is known as the “southern sanctuary.” During the building boom, a stoa was added to the agora and another connected to the southern sanctuary. These changes, as well as trends in the nearby necropolis, suggest the formation of a Rome-friendly oligarchy in the last decades of the fourth century.<sup>61</sup>

The changes that the colonists made to Poseidonia once it became Paestum are telling; as Greco points out, it is possible to see the way in which the Latin colony insinuated itself into the Greek city and the adaptation that entailed.<sup>62</sup> The forum, for example, extended between the agora and the southern sanctuary, while the agora became a “marginal space.”<sup>63</sup> Between approximately 275 and 250 BCE, the ekklesiasterion or

---

<sup>60</sup> There is some evidence to suggest that the name “Paestum” originated prior to the Roman colonial foundation (Wonder 2002, 40). John W. Wonder, “What Happened to the Greeks in Lucanian-Occupied Paestum? Multiculturalism in Southern Italy,” *Phoenix*, Vol. 56, No. 1/2 (Spring-Summer, 2002), pp.40-55.

<sup>61</sup> Greco 1988, 79: “una nuova strutturazione politico-sociale con classi dirigenti che mostrano atteggiamenti filoromani.” Emmanuele Greco, “Archeologia della Colonia Latina di Paestum,” *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 6.2 (1988), pp. 79-86.

<sup>62</sup> Greco 1988, 82:

la colonia latina si insediò all’interno di Poseidonia, con tutto quello che ciò comport in termini di adattamento del preesistente al nuovo (situazione, ovviamente, ben diversa da quella in cui l’impianto viene stabilito in terreno vergine).

<sup>63</sup> Greco 1988, 85. The late-first-century BCE architect Vitruvius wrote of designing a city center that both the agora and the forum should be lined with colonnades, but that the agora was constructed on a square

bouleuterion (the Greek assembly-place) was destroyed and the comitium was built.<sup>64</sup> An aerarium (or perhaps a carcer) was located to the east of the comitium, and a sanctuary was placed on top of the former ekklesiasterion-bouleuterion. The religious practices of the Poseidonians and the Romans and Paestans had much in common; the votive offerings from the fourth century reflect contemporary trends in Latin/Italian religious practice, and the temple to Asklepios south-east of the forum is equally likely to have been built before or after the establishment of the colony.<sup>65</sup> Some changes to religious architecture are evident, however, including the construction of a large temple complex to the north of the forum which Greco identifies as belonging to Fortuna Virilis and Venus Verticordia (a characteristically Roman cult).<sup>66</sup>

The Romans did not add a major temple of their own to the forum itself until some time in the second century. According to Edlund-Berry, the cyma reversa molding on the base of this temple, which may have been a capitolium, demonstrates “the development in Roman thinking from the old and old-fashioned generic Etrusco-Italic round to something that can be called Roman architecture proper.”<sup>67</sup> An intriguing factor in the development of Poseidonia/Paestum is that that Greek city had been invaded and

---

plan, while the forum should be rectangular in order to accommodate gladiatorial games called for by Roman tradition (5.1.1-2).

<sup>64</sup> The comitium at Paestum is the best preserved in the Roman world (Greco 1988, 83-5). Curti et al. (1996, 186) place the construction of the comitium and the destruction of the ekklesiasterion-bouleuterion at almost the same time; Crawford (2006, 65), however, argues for a later date for the destruction of the ekklesiasterion-bouleuterion on the basis of the fill excavated there. Emmanuele Curti, Emma Dench, and John R. Patterson, “The Archaeology of Central and Southern Roman Italy: Recent Trends and Approaches,” *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 86 (1996), pp.170-89; M. H. Crawford, “From Poseidonia to Paestum via the Lucanians” in Guy Bradley and John-Paul Wilson (eds.), *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2006).

<sup>65</sup> Greco 1988, 85.

<sup>66</sup> Greco 1988, 83.

<sup>67</sup> Edlund-Berry, 2008, 445.

conquered in the late fifth century by the Lucanians. Like the Romans more than a century later, the Lucanians were native Italians taking over the city of a foreign people and creating a new ruling class; unlike the Romans, they appear not to have made any changes to the architectural character of the city.<sup>68</sup> Building projects occurred during the Lucanian period of Poseidonia's history, but they are not recognizably non-Greek.<sup>69</sup> This highlights the importance that the Romans placed on establishing their claim to newly acquired territory and on creating a degree of unity throughout the cities they occupied or created.

## **Pompeii**

Pompeii, with its long history and coastal location on the Bay of Naples, is an excellent – and extremely well known – example of a city subject to a number of cultural influences. Greek colonists were present at the site beginning in the seventh century BCE, and Hellenistic culture was an important aspect of Pompeian life well into the Roman period, while the numerous examples of Etruscan inscriptions and pottery at Pompeii show that Etruscan influence was equally strong. In the late fifth century, Pompeii (along with other cities of southern Italy) experienced a wave of Samnite migration which led to the dominance of Oscan as the language of public life; the wealthy and powerful families of Pompeii from this period on are known as the “Oscan elite.” In the third century Pompeii became an ally of Rome, and Roman cultural and architectural influences are visible beginning in this period. Since the city did not

---

<sup>68</sup> This is not to say that the Lucanians did not have a major cultural impact; inscriptions in the Oscan language have been found in the city center, burial practices changed (painted tombs, in particular, became popular among the local elites), the total population of the city and surrounding countryside increased, and Aristoxenus of Tarentum in the fourth century famously described the inhabitants of the city as formerly Greek, but currently barbarous (Athenaeus XIV, 632a = Aristoxenus, fr. 124 Wehrli).

<sup>69</sup> Crawford 2006, 63.

become a Roman colony until 80 BCE, Pompeii is valuable in part as a city for which we have significant amounts of evidence from both before and after colonization.<sup>70</sup>

Like Cosa and Paestum, Pompeii was laid out on the orthogonal grid pattern typical of the Greek colonies of southern Italy. This was the case by at least the third century and possibly as early as the sixth; the city wall and gates may also have had their origins in the sixth century.<sup>71</sup> The city underwent significant growth during the third and especially the second century, possibly as a result of increased economic opportunities linked to its alliance with Rome. A dedication made by the Roman consul L. Mummius, who sacked Corinth in 146, on the temple of Apollo adjacent to the rectangular forum implies that Pompeians participated in his campaign, and at around the same time the city acquired a new architectural feature: finely constructed façades of gray tufo from Nocera. The temple of Apollo bearing Mummius' inscription (which, following the Pompeian practice, was written in Oscan), as well as the basilica, the portico to the south of the forum, the private houses leading down the street from the forum to the Stabian baths, and the baths themselves all shared in the new Nocera tufo façades. The vast scale of the remodeling implies that it was done on the initiative of the local senate and possibly at public expense, which would make sense if the city had benefited from Mummius' campaign. The baths also acquired fashionable new features developed by Romans aristocrats at nearby Baiae, suggesting that in planning their building program the local elites were influenced by familiarity with Roman high society.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Pompeii received a colonial settlement of Sullan veterans because it had revolted against Rome during the Social War ten years previously; other colonies were established in Campania at the same time.

<sup>71</sup> Fulford and Wallace-Hadrill 1999, 103-10. M. G. Fulford and A. Wallace-Hadrill, "Towards a History of Pre-Roman Pompeii. Excavations Beneath the House of Amarantus (I.9.11-12), 1995-8," in *Papers of the British School at Rome* 67 (1999), pp.37-144.

<sup>72</sup> Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 133.

The existence of a basilica in Pompeii at this period is both evidence of Roman influence and proof that this influence worked rather quickly, since this type of building, a colonnaded public space usually used for commercial purposes, evolved in Rome in the early second century. The Pompeians seem to have recognized the potential of this structure, with its functions as market center and auction house, for a major port city. The basilica was easily the most elaborate structure in the rectangular forum complex prior to the founding of the Roman colony, and it was the only one constructed as a single continuous project.<sup>73</sup> Construction on a temple (which may have been to Jupiter) at one end of the forum, for example, began in the middle of the second century, but the structure may not actually have been completed before it was removed in the first century, following the colonial foundation, in order to make way for a capitolium. Zanker has noted the dearth of elaborate building projects in this complex, remarking that “[t]he Oscan elite did not promote the embellishment of the forum with the same energy they expended on the cultural quarter and their own lavish homes.”<sup>74</sup> The cultural quarter to which he refers is the theater complex of the triangular forum, which was decidedly Hellenistic in character, featuring two theaters, a *gymnasium*, a *palaestra*, a temple to Isis, and a temple to Zeus Meilichios. As Wallace-Hadrill pointed out two decades later, in making use of these public spaces the Pompeians could express the Hellenistic aspects of their collective, Pompeian identity. The domestic architecture of Pompeii, however, just as certainly expresses the influence of Rome.

The “lavish homes” of Zanker’s comment are those famous today for being either absurdly outsized in relation to the typical home or very elaborately decorated. The

---

<sup>73</sup> Zanker 1988, 54-5. Paul Zanker, *Pompeii: Public and Private Life*, translated by Deborah Lucas Schneider (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).

<sup>74</sup> Zanker 1988, 54.

Pompeian fashions in domestic decoration are best illustrated by the development of wall painting styles over time. The First Style, which was most popular from the early second century until the foundation of the Roman colony, created the illusion of slabs of marble; this style is known to have been developed in Greece. Although First Style frescoes fell out of favor in the domestic context, they were still being used on public buildings such as the basilica until the eruption of Vesuvius. The Second Style, which became popular after the foundation of the colony and lasted until about the end of the Republic, involved the use of trompe-l'oeil techniques to create three-dimensional architectural illusions: the interior wall of a house became part of a palace, temple, or luxurious villa, or the backdrop of a stage. In any given fresco, either Hellenistic or Roman influence might have the upper hand; it was up to the artist or the homeowner to decide which type of building should be depicted.<sup>75</sup> It is possible to interpret the Second Style within the framework of Roman social interactions, by arguing that the greater number of options available to the decorator, as well as the opportunity to make rooms such as the atrium (where the greatest number of visitors, including client dependent on the homeowner, would have been received) look larger and more imposing, appealed to the late Republican aristocrat's desire for a grandiose public persona and were suited to the Roman patron-client system.<sup>76</sup> It would be difficult, however, to say definitively that such was the case. The physical structure of Pompeian houses, on the other hand, can safely be described as Roman. The atrium house, which was the form typical of Pompeian as well as Roman domestic architecture, originated in a combination of

---

<sup>75</sup> Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 23-9. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

<sup>76</sup> Wallace-Hadrill 1994; Clarke 1991, 48-9. John R. Clarke, *The Houses of Roman Italy, 100 BC–AD 250: Ritual, Space, and Decoration* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

Hellenistic and Italic elements, but the similarities between second-century atrium houses in Pompeii, Cosa, and elsewhere points to Rome as the agent responsible for disseminating the style.<sup>77</sup> Pompeii adopted the Roman way of structuring living space early in the relationship between the two cities, but a strong preference for the display of Hellenistic decorations persisted.

Pompeian identity during the Republican period was shaped by the two competing forces of Romanness and Hellenism. Overall, it is fair to say that between the third-century alliance and the establishment of the colony Pompeians adopted a physical, architectural structure suitable for enacting Romanness, but either they were reluctant to abandon their Hellenistic traditions, or they saw no reason to do so. They maintained the cultural apparatus of Hellenism in the triangular forum complex and decorated their Roman architecture with Hellenistic frescoes – while continuing to use Oscan as their primary language. After the arrival of the veteran colonists, Latin became the official public language and the comitium and capitolium became important in public life, but the Hellenistic public spaces did not disappear, and Greek-influenced decorative styles remained popular. The evidence of Pompeian material culture implies that Pompeians began to integrate elements of Roman identity into their own local identity (in which Hellenistic aspects played a major role) beginning in the third century, that the number of integrated elements increased over time, and that the process of integration was slightly accelerated by the foundation of the Roman colony.

---

<sup>77</sup> Wallace-Hadrill 2008; Sewell 2010.



## General Traits of the Three Civic Centers

In M. H. Crawford's words, "no sane person has ever supposed that there was a general *lex* regulating all the affairs of all Roman communities."<sup>78</sup> Crawford further suggests that the variations in the regulations established by the *leges* of different communities reflected a mixture of local and Roman practices (specifically, the differences between the limits of pecuniary liability).<sup>79</sup> Fentress and Mouritsen express very similar sentiments with regard to architecture and city planning.<sup>80</sup> In spite of the fact that colonial foundations shared a combination of public buildings which seem to have echoed the public buildings at Rome, Mouritsen points out an important discrepancy: a number of the colonial forum-curia-comitium complexes were built prior to 145 BCE, and at that time, the Romans had not yet begun to use the forum for public political assemblies.<sup>81</sup> Mouritsen goes on to discuss a particular feature of the fora excavated at Cosa, Paestum, Alba Fucens, and the Latin colony of Fregellae: a series of pits surrounding the fora, the purpose of which scholars have been unable to agree upon.<sup>82</sup> He concludes the colonial fora were not, at least initially, used in the same way as the Forum in Rome, and that the functions of fora in different colonies were not necessarily identical.<sup>83</sup> The fact remains, however (as Mouritsen freely acknowledges),

---

<sup>78</sup> Crawford 1998, 31.

<sup>79</sup> Crawford 1998, 35.

<sup>80</sup> Elizabeth Fentress, "Frank Brown, Cosa and the Idea of a Roman City" in E. Fentress (ed.), *Romanization and the City (Journal of Roman Archaeology Suppl. 38)*: 11-24, Portsmouth (RI): Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2000.

<sup>81</sup> Mouritsen 2004, 40-2.

<sup>82</sup> Fregellae was founded in 328 along the Via Latina; in 125 it revolted from Rome and was subsequently destroyed.

<sup>83</sup> Mouritsen 2004, 43-4.

that these structures were considered by the Romans, the colonists, or both, to be important in a way that transcended the needs or character of a particular location.<sup>84</sup>

As Louise Revell points out, scholars must differentiate between the “Romanization” of buildings and the “Romanization” of the people who used them: the latter drove the former, and simply having Roman public buildings did not make the people Roman.<sup>85</sup> In order to be *truly* Roman the people needed to know how to use Roman public spaces properly; in other words, the Roman-style buildings provided the physical context for the behaviors such as those detailed in chapters 2 and 3. This physical context for Roman or Roman-like behavior was significant because it provided new ways for individuals or groups to enact Romanness, but such actions were meaningless without an audience that could interpret them correctly. Thus, because buildings might have been used in different (and more or less Roman) ways over time, and because of the different circumstances of the foundations and the ethnic compositions of the local populations in various regions, the number of Roman public buildings in a particular place is not a reliable indicator of the adoption of Roman culture by the inhabitants. It is possible to say, however, that some attempts were being made to enact Romanness. The question, then, becomes whether the Romanness connected with the construction of public buildings was being enacted primarily by Romans who were attempting to homogenize the urban landscape of Italy, or by the local elites who wanted

---

<sup>84</sup> Mouritsen 2004, 63-4. Lolli Ghetti and Pagliardi (1980, 179), in their work on the Latin colony of Sora, insist on the symbolic significance of Roman-style public buildings:

Un impianto di tale importanza e impegno costruttivo ed economico, quale si è venuto così delineando, appare impossibile possa attribuirsi ad un momento diverso da quello della colonia romana del 303, in cui oltre tutto veniva ad assumere un fondamentale valore politico e propagandistico.

M. Lolli Ghetti and N. Pagliardi. “Sora: Scavo Presso la Chiesa Cattedrale di Santa Maria Assunta,” *Archeologia Laziale* 3 (1980), pp. 177-79.

<sup>85</sup> Revell 1999, 52-3.

to participate in Romanness for the sake of political expediency; the most plausible solution is that local elites, and local populations as a whole, enacted Romanness in order to associate themselves with Roman identity – or to create new, localized Roman identities for themselves – while relying on Rome or their new Roman neighbors to recognize and validate their “Roman” behavior.

As Wallace-Hadrill points out in *Rome’s Cultural Revolution*,

There is never a surprise to find the inhabitants of the *ager Romanus* or the citizens of the colonies speaking Latin, following Roman law, Roman political institutions or Roman customs. On the other hand, the colonies and the diaspora of Roman citizens in Italy were an essential part of the acculturative discourse. Internally, they found themselves in dialogue with the existing traditions and culture of the population of their area. Externally, they offered reference points for allied communities in their dialogue with Rome ...<sup>86</sup>

Modern scholars tend to take the fact that Romans who moved away from the city of Rome continued to enact Romanness for granted, but upon further consideration, the maintenance of Roman practices outside Rome, combined with the adoption of Roman building styles in Roman and Roman controlled settlements, is quite striking. This is particularly true if we agree with Roselaar that a large amount of *ager publicus* remained in the hand of Italian allies through the end of the second century; according to this view, many Roman communities of settlers were likely to have been smaller and more culturally isolated that scholars have tended to assume, “without much physical or cultural influence over the surrounding territory and its inhabitants.”<sup>87</sup> What the evidence of the continued practice of Roman culture by expatriate Romans and the construction of Roman public spaces suggests is that Roman identity (and, increasingly, the development of Roman *identities*) was seen as an essential component, not just of the everyday lives of

---

<sup>86</sup> Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 79.

<sup>87</sup> Roselaar 2010, 292.

Romans and those who interacted with them, but of the social and political changes taking place in Italy. The Roman-style public spaces outside Rome symbolize the fact that newly “Roman” civic centers did not simply owe military allegiance to Rome: they took on Roman identities. The ways of being Roman enumerated by Cicero were enacted in different ways in different cities, according to particular circumstances including the city’s relationship with Rome, the ethnic composition of the population, and the attitudes of individual local elites; while the construction of Roman-style public buildings in certain cities does not provide a complete picture of the adoption of Roman identities in these cities, it demonstrates conclusively that the public enactment of Romanness had a significant place in the communities. In places where large groups of Romans were settled, these Romans were the audience who validated the Romanness of public behavior; where such settlements are not known, however, the public building projects themselves are evidence of the existence a Roman audience, whether that audience consisted of neighboring Romans who frequented the city, or of local elites who had adopted Roman identities to the extent that they could view themselves and be viewed by the general population as arbiters of Romanness.

The foundation of colonies and establishment of *municipia* was certainly not the only way in which Rome transformed Italy during the second and first centuries. One of Rome’s greatest impacts on the physical landscape of Italy, along with colonization, the development of villa culture, and the devastation caused by war, was the construction of the system of roads. Coarelli argued persuasively for the acceptance of the dates established by the ancient authors, that is, that the Roman system of paved thoroughfares connecting the regions of Italy to one another were constructed in large part in the third

century.<sup>88</sup> Coarelli sees the construction of the roads as part and parcel of Roman expansionism, a powerful weapon ready to be deployed. Another effect of these new, Roman-dominated lines of communication was change in language use, though this varied greatly from region to region. It is clear from surviving inscriptions that Umbria, for example, was using Etruscan as well as its own regional Umbrian language by the time of the Roman incursions, and began to use the Latin script around 150; although the Latin script was the most common writing system in Umbrian inscriptions by the time of the Social War, the Latin language had yet to become dominant.<sup>89</sup> In Etruria the introduction of some degree of Latin linguistic influence, especially in naming practices, was linked to the colonial foundations, but here also the Latin language itself was not widely used until the Social War.<sup>90</sup> Of course, this evidence comes in large part from inscriptions erected for funerary and other familial purposes, so a special degree of conservatism may be expected; even so, the adoption of Latin seems to have accelerated greatly after the Social War. For example, almost all of the funerary inscriptions in the formerly Etruscan city of Volaterrae were in Latin by the end of the first century BCE.<sup>91</sup> It is reasonable to assume that in casual or business communications some form of spoken Latin was used more frequently in areas near the roads and colonies. Underlying and accompanying these alterations, moreover, was a gradual change in the way that the

---

<sup>88</sup> Filippo Coarelli, "Colonizzazione Romana e Viabilità," *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 6.2 (1988), pp.35–48.

<sup>89</sup> Bradley 2000, 113; Pfeilschifter 2007, 29. Rene Pfeilschifter, "The Allies in the Republican Army and the Romanization of Italy" in Roman Roth and Johannes Keller (eds.), *Roman by Integration: Dimensions of Group Identity in Material Culture and Text (Journal of Roman Archaeology Suppl. 66)*, Portsmouth (RI): Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2007.

<sup>90</sup> Vallat 2001, 105. Jean Pierre Vallat, "The Romanization of Italy: Conclusions" in Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato (eds.), *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001).

<sup>91</sup> Terrenato 1998, 105.

peoples of Italy, including Romans, thought about what it meant to be a citizen of a city, and of a supra-city state.

## The Extension of Roman Citizenship to Groups and Individuals

Sometimes the indigenous people who survived a Roman attack on their territory stayed on and lived with colonists on the site of the old town, but not, as Dionysius and Livy would later claim, with equal rights under the law.<sup>92</sup> In rare cases they might obtain the *civitas sine suffragio* and later municipal status, which was very different from being a colony. More often they were *incolae* (resident aliens), and perhaps even more often they were relegated to servile or semi-servile status. According to Càssola, the first case of people being fully integrated into the new community was that of Carteia (171 BCE), a Latin colony founded under unique circumstances: the nucleus of the colony consisted of the sons of Roman soldiers and Iberian women.<sup>93</sup>

Sometimes, however, the Roman senate and people chose to give the citizenship to a community, a group, or an individual by passing a law. Most of the information available on many of these citizenship grants comes from Livy and so must be treated with caution, but from his narrative it is possible to draw a sense of what the Romans of the late Republic and early Empire wanted to hear about the way in which they extended citizenship prior to the Social War. These citizenship grants belonged to the category of “public laws,” that is, laws proposed by a magistrate and offered to the popular assembly for a vote. During the most active period of public lawmaking (350 to 44 BCE), the great majority of public laws dealt with the behavior of the political leadership, but of the laws

---

<sup>92</sup> Càssola 1988, 5-6.

<sup>93</sup> Livy 43.3.1-4.

dealing with other matters, citizenship grants were the most common.<sup>94</sup> The most famous of these, of course, was the *lex Iulia* granting citizenship to the Latins and Italian allies in 90. While the precise motivations of the Romans and of those who fought with and against them in the Social War remain unknown and perhaps unknowable, the chronology of events surrounding the conflict, the participants, and what later writers had to say about it are available; much less information has survived about the majority of the citizenship grants prior to the Social War.

The citizenship grant to the Acerrani is the earliest recorded in surviving sources. As with many of the other grants by public law, the only surviving source for this is Livy, who simply stated: “*Romani facti Acerrani lege ab L. Papirio praetore lata, qua civitas sine suffragio data*” (“the Acerrani became Romans under a law proposed by L. Papirius the praetor, which granted them citizenship without suffrage”).<sup>95</sup> Livy gave no further context for this event, reporting it in his summary of what happened during the year 332. The next grant of citizenship he recorded, however, came with a complicated backstory that illustrates the complex system of alliances and rebellion in Latium in the late fourth century. In 8.19.4 to 8.21.10, Livy described the war Rome fought against Privernum; the Privernates were led by Vitruvius Vaccus, a general from the town of Fundi who actually maintained a house in Rome. The Romans marched against him and defeated him, and he fled with the army to Privernum. The consul (L. Plautius Venox) who had command of the Roman army marched against Fundi, and the Fundanian senate came out

---

<sup>94</sup> Williamson 2004, 9. Callie Williamson, *The Laws of the Roman People: Public Law in the Expansion and Decline of the Roman Republic* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004). See also Giovanni Rotondi, *Leges Publicae Populi Romani: Elenco cronologico con una introduzione sull'attività legislativa dei comizi romani* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966).

<sup>95</sup> Livy 8.17.12.

and asked for mercy, saying that Vitruvius was not acting on their behalf: “*Fundanis pacem esse et animos Romanos et gratam memoriam acceptae civitatis*” (“they said that they were peaceful, their sympathies were Roman, and they held the grant of citizenship in grateful recollection” (8.19.11)).<sup>96</sup> The consul complimented them on their loyalty and marched against Privernum.<sup>97</sup> The Romans took the city, razed the walls, left a garrison, and executed Vitruvius, after which Plautius pointed out that the Privernates were neighbors of the Samnites, with whom the Romans had an uneasy truce, and that Rome should make a serious effort to maintain amicable relations with Privernum. During its deliberations about what should be done with Privernum, the Senate asked the Privernates what they thought would be appropriate punishment; one of the Privernates responded that they deserved the “punishment of those who wish to be free,” and that if the Romans granted the Privernates fair terms they could expect a lasting peace, and if not, the Privernates would eventually return to the fight. The Senators who were arguing for clemency said that this made sense, “*neque eo loco ubi servitutem esse velint, fidem sperandam esse*” (“and that they should not hope for loyalty where they had wished to impose servitude” (8.21.7)). Plautius argued forcefully that this was an entirely appropriate attitude and one that was worthy of the Romans themselves; he was successful, and the end of the matter was that a public law was passed granting Roman citizenship to the Privernates.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> The citizenship they were referring to was apparently the *civitas sine suffragio*; Livy related at 38.36.7 that Fundi received full voting rights with a public law passed in 188 BCE, along with the town of Formiae and Cicero’s hometown, Arpinum.

<sup>97</sup> Livy reported that Q. Claudius Quadrigatus the annalist said that the consul executed the leaders of the plot and sent 350 Fundanians to Rome, but that the senate refused to accept their surrender because they thought that the Fundanians were just sending over their poor people.

<sup>98</sup> Livy 8.21.8-10:



In this fairly brief historical episode, we find illustrations of several aspects of Roman citizenship and its significance in fourth-century Italy. One community (Fundi) invokes Roman citizenship as a reminder of its claim to Roman friendship and protection and receives recognition of that claim. An individual who partook in that citizenship, and had a particularly close relationship with Rome, blatantly acts against Roman interests. The Romans respond to this act of disloyalty with an act of destruction, but are persuaded to award the citizenship to the rebellious community in recognition of that community's strength of character and demonstration of Roman values (that is, a love of freedom). The story bears obvious signs of the period in which it was written, especially in its emphasis on clemency and on citizenship merited through actions. The representation of Roman citizenship as a political tool to improve Rome's military security, however, does make a great deal of sense in the pre-Social War context.<sup>99</sup>

The story of the Privernates is an example of Rome's extension of citizenship, in what seems at first to be a counterintuitive policy, to cities which it had recently defeated. In fact, citizenship grants were frequently related to military conflict in one way or another. Humbert remarks on the consistency with which defeated enemies, in particular, were integrated into the Roman political sphere by the mechanism of *civitas sine*

---

*In hanc sententiam maxime consul ipse inclinavit animos, identidem ad principes sententiarum consulares, uti exaudiri posset a pluribus, dicendo eos demum qui nihil praeterquam de libertate cogitent dignos esse qui Romani fiant. Itaque et in senatu causam obtinere, et ex auctoritate patrum latum ad populum est ut Privernatibus civitas daretur.*

The consul himself greatly influenced others' minds in this direction, especially by saying to the consuls who were the leaders in opinion, in such a way as to be heard by many people, that only those who thought about nothing but liberty were worthy of being Romans. And so they carried their point in the Senate, and on the authority of the senators a measure was brought before the people that the Privernates should be given citizenship.

<sup>99</sup> See, e.g., Michel Humbert, *Municipium et Civitas sine Suffragio: L'Organisation de la Conquête jusqu'à la Guerre Sociale* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1978).

*suffragio* – and the apparent desire of cities not yet under Rome’s influence to avoid such a situation.<sup>100</sup> Regardless of the heroic “liberty or death” speeches recounted by Livy, however, it is difficult to imagine that many cities would truly have chosen destruction over a dependent political relationship. In other words, while it is not necessarily reasonable to conclude that Italian cities during this period regarded the *civitas sine suffragio* as a punishment in and of itself, they were manifestly not fighting *for* Roman citizenship rights.<sup>101</sup>

Citizenship grants to individuals, however, were certainly seen as rewards for service to the Roman state. Livy told the stories of three men who aided Rome by turning on the Carthaginians during the Hannibalic War: in 211 BCE Sosis the Syracusan and Moericus the Spaniard received citizenship and 500 *iugera* of land each for leading the Romans into Syracuse and betraying the Carthaginian garrison at Nasus, respectively, and Muttines, a Numidian prefect who had been robbed of his command in Sicily when his success became threatening to the Carthaginian general Hanno, received the citizenship a year later for betraying the Carthaginian garrison at Agrigentum.<sup>102</sup> The first-century CE author Valerius Maximus, who collected anecdotes on a wide range of subjects, wrote that when the Romans needed personnel to administer their cult of Ceres

---

<sup>100</sup> Humbert 1978, 419:

Avec une remarquable constance... on constate que l’entrée dans la citoyenneté est l’aboutissement d’un combat entre Rome e la liberté, qui se solde par la *deditio* des cites vaincues. D’où ces alliances des peuples libres encore qui tentent de déjouer une annexion qu’ils prévoient lucidement (le Latium et la Campanie; les Volsques)...

<sup>101</sup> Livy certainly represented these grants (or impositions) of citizenship as the more positive or generous choice. He quoted the great general Marcus Furius Camillus, for example, as having posed the question of violence or clemency to the Senate at the end of the war with the Latins in 338, with citizenship grants as the merciful option (8.13.16): “*Voltis exemplo maiorum augere rem Romanum victos in civitatem accipiendo?*” (“Do you want to follow the example of your ancestors in increasing the Roman state by accepting the conquered as citizens?”).

<sup>102</sup> Livy 26.21.11; 27.5.7.

they brought the priestess Calliphana from the city of Velia, which did not have Roman citizenship, and made her a citizen.<sup>103</sup> Cicero, in the *Pro Balbo*, went into more detail about the priestesses of Ceres, saying that it was a common practice for the Romans to import such priestesses because the cult was a Greek one, but that it was more appropriate for someone performing rituals on behalf of the state to be a citizen, so the priestesses received the citizenship; he specifies that a public law was passed in 98 (that is, when C. Valerius Flaccus was the urban praetor) making Calliphana, formerly of Velia, a citizen.<sup>104</sup> This story provides an excellent illustration of the fact that citizenship, even for such essential purposes as religious propriety, was seen as something that could be earned by and conferred upon individuals. Each of these stories describes a vital service to the Roman state that could not be performed by any current Roman citizen and required reciprocal trust between the state and the individual; Rome had placed its faith in each of these individuals in situations in which betrayal would have meant disaster, and when that faith proved justified, the individuals received public recognition of their actions. In a sense, individual grants of citizenship constituted fulfillment of a contract. This view is supported by the fact that the Gracchan *lex repetundarum* of 123/2 offered to compensate non-Romans who brought successful cases for the loss of property at the hands of Roman magistrates (a clear breach of faith on the part of the state) with grants of citizenship and exemptions from military service.

Citizenship could also be awarded in a military context. One of the most famous examples of this type of citizenship grant is that awarded by Cnaeus Pompeius Strabo to a group of cavalrymen in 89 (that is, after the Italian enfranchisement of the *lex Iulia* and

---

<sup>103</sup> Val. Max. 1.1.1.

<sup>104</sup> Cic. *Pro Balbo* 55.

the end of the Social War). Thirty Gauls from the territory of Saldubia in Gallia Cisalpina (referred to in the inscription as the *turma Salluitana*, the Salluitan troop), who had been serving under Pompeius Strabo as auxiliaries (soldiers in the Roman army who were not citizens), received Latin rights in recognition of extraordinary valor and service to Rome and their commander (*virtutis causa*) during the battle at Asculum. The inscription, recorded on bronze tablets, reads in part:

*Cn. Pompeius Sex. f. imperator virtutis causa/ equites Hispanos ceives Romanos fecit in castris apud Asculum a(n)te d(iem) XIV K(alendas) Dec(embres)/ ex lege Iulia.*

The commander Cnaeus Pompeius son of Sextus on account of their valor/ made the Spanish cavalymen Roman citizens in the camp at Asculum on the 14<sup>th</sup> day before the calends of December,/ in accordance with the *lex Iulia*.<sup>105</sup>

In order to confer the citizenship without relying on the Senate or the popular assembly, Pompeius Strabo needed the cooperation of a *consilium* (committee), whose names make up part of the inscription. (He did not need their participation in order to grant purely military honors, which are listed in a separate section of the inscription without mention of the *consilium*.) Cicero brought up all three of these types of individual citizenship grants (to former enemies, to the priestesses in order to make them officially part of the community, and to soldiers from Italy and elsewhere who had served Rome well) in his speech for Balbus, using them to make the point that citizenship was a desirable thing that would encourage faithful service to Rome when rationed out appropriately.<sup>106</sup>

It is important to recall that some offers of Roman citizenship were turned down.

Livy tells the story of the refusal of M. Anicius and the Praenestine soldiers under his

---

<sup>105</sup> For the full inscription and extensive analysis, see Nicola Criniti, *L'Epigrafe di Asculum di Gn. Pompeo Strabone* (Milan: Editrice Vita e Pensiero, 1970).

<sup>106</sup> Cic. *Pro Balbo* 24, 55.

command to accept Roman citizenship *virtutis causa* during the Hannibalic War.<sup>107</sup> (They did accept double pay and an exemption from future military service.) As Bradley notes, “[i]t is not until the expansion of Roman power in the second century that the attractiveness of Roman citizenship seems to have increased.”<sup>108</sup> Even toward the end of the second century, the Gracchan *lex repetundarum* offered an alternative for successful plaintiffs who did not wish to accept the citizenship: an exemption from military service and from public service in their home communities.<sup>109</sup> Livy (whose statements we must, of course, take with a grain of salt) wrote about the darker side of Roman-colonial relations in his description of the refusal of twelve colonies to continue supplying troops to Rome: during the Second Punic War, this collection of colonies sent delegations to Rome stating that they were unable to supply any more troops or money (perhaps with justification, considering Cosa’s need to replenish its numbers after the conclusion of the war), and Livy stated that the consuls took this as an act of revolt.<sup>110</sup> In Livy’s account, the refusal followed a meeting of the Latin colonies in which the colonists compared sending their men to fight in the Roman army to having them captured by the Carthaginians. The consuls, for their part, reminded the rebellious colonists that their origins were in Rome, and that Rome had given them the land on which they lived so that they might serve the state.<sup>111</sup> This demonstrates that in the Augustan period, at any rate,

---

<sup>107</sup> Livy 23.19.17-20.2: “*civitate cum donarentur ob virtutem, non mutaverunt.*” (“When they were offered the citizenship on account of their valor, they did not make the change.”)

<sup>108</sup> Bradley 2006, 166.

<sup>109</sup> Lintott 1993, 101. Andrew Lintott, *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993).

<sup>110</sup> Livy 27.9.7-10.10.

<sup>111</sup> Livy 27.9.10-11:

*Admonerent non Campanos neque Tarentinos esse eos sed Romanos, inde oriundos, inde in colonias atque in agrum bello captum stirpis augendae causa missos.*

there was a sense that the Latin colonies were in some way separate from the Roman citizen body; that is, that they did not automatically self-identify as Romans. The story also supports Humbert's argument that being part of Rome's citizen body without having full citizen rights was a heavy burden.

There has been a great deal of debate in the past century or so over the question of whether the Social War was in fact, as the ancient (Roman and Roman-influenced Greek) sources suggest, fought over the desire of the Italian allies for citizenship and the Romans' reluctance to grant it. The traditional model originated with the work of Appian, who wrote at a time when Italian rebellion from Roman control was unthinkable and so developed the literary theme of an allied desire for full political integration, and was promoted by the work of modern scholars, including Theodor Mommsen, who were influenced by the Italian nationalist movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.<sup>112</sup> Over time, however, it has become more common to look beyond the simple division between Romans, loyal Latin allies, and power-hungry Italians, and the supposedly universal appeal of Roman citizenship.

The enfranchisement proposals by three Roman politicians, Q. Fulvius Flaccus in 125, Gaius Gracchus in 122, and Livius Drusus in 91, constitute a particularly confusing factor in the debate, since it is impossible at this distance to determine with any precision what their motivations were. The simplest interpretation is that these proposals reflected the growing tension in Italy caused by the desire for citizenship (meaning full political participation), and that when the Roman people repeatedly refused to cooperate, the

---

They reminded them that they were not Campanians or Tarentines, but Romans sent out into colonies and onto land captured in war for the purpose of increasing the population.

<sup>112</sup> Henrik Mouritsen, *Italian Unification: A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Suppl. 70 (London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 1998).

Italians revolted, finally achieving their actual goal in spite of military defeat.<sup>113</sup> Mouritsen, however, argues persuasively that the causal, teleological connection between the proposals, or “linear model ... founders on the grounds that the process reached its logical conclusion only after a bloody and truly disastrous war, which fundamentally changed the relationship between Rome and the Italians.”<sup>114</sup> In other words, the proposed enfranchisement of all of Rome’s allies posed enormous logistical, as well as political and military, problems, and simply voting the measure through at any of the three points at which it was proposed would not have been feasible.<sup>115</sup> Mouritsen is correct that it seems likely that the proposed enfranchisements were intended for the Latins rather than for all Italians, and that the Italians were willing to accept citizenship (since complete independence was not an option) after the Social War, whereas the Latins had wanted full citizenship prior to the war.<sup>116</sup> This follows the pattern established in the preceding two centuries, during which citizenship was understood to be a military and political tool when granted on the community level, and *civitas sine suffragio* was held by the recipients to be a dubious honor. After their defeat, the Italians – with the exception of the Samnites and Lucani, traditionally militaristic peoples who were unwilling to give up their military and political independence – accepted a place in the Roman state. These groups did accept citizenship in 87, however, when it was offered as part of an inducement to come to Rome’s aid during the Marian conflict.

---

<sup>113</sup> The most obvious argument against this entirely citizenship-driven model is that the passage of the *lex Iulia* in 90 did not stop the fighting.

<sup>114</sup> Mouritsen 1998, 126.

<sup>115</sup> For example, a large proportion of Rome’s public finances came from the allies’ payments of *tributum*, from which Roman citizens were exempt. Thus, an extension of citizenship would simultaneously increase public spending and decrease the amount of money available.

<sup>116</sup> Mouritsen 1998, 118ff.

One of the most critical problems with the traditional model is that it presupposes a convergence of Roman and non-Roman Italian cultures leading up to the Social War, such that the only thing differentiating Romans and non-Romans was legal status. This was emphatically not the case, as should be obvious from the cultural diversity and the persistence of local identities throughout Italy, up to and even after the Social War. As I argue above, the architectural evidence of Italian colonies and allied cities shows a tendency on the part of many communities to adopt aspects of Romanness, but it also shows a high level of retention of local identities. Although the integration of Roman-style public buildings in particular suggests a desire to use the Roman administrative system and the enactment of Romanness to facilitate cooperation with the dominant power in Italy, there is nothing to indicate that the Italians were willing to surrender their identities completely. Even in the areas of administration and law, it is far from obvious that many allied cities wished to associate themselves fully with Rome. As W. V. Harris points out, the evidence indicates that the allied cities had the option, but not the obligation, to adopt Roman private or criminal law, and that Rome imposed its laws on the allies only in cases in which there were possible consequences for Rome itself, such as the perceived danger to the state that led to the *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* of 186 BCE, or when, as in the case of the *lex Sempronia* of 193, the behavior being regulated involved direct participation on the part of the allied cities or individuals.<sup>117</sup> In the *Pro Balbo*, for example, Cicero explained that, by custom (*semper*),

*cum iussisset populus Romanus aliquid, si id adscivissent socii populi ac Latini, et si ea lex, quam nos haberemus, eadem in populo aliquo tamquam in fundo resedisset, ut tum lege eadem is populus teneretur, non*

---

<sup>117</sup> W. V. Harris, "Was Roman Law Imposed on the Italian Allies?" *Historia* Vol. 21, No. 4 (4th Qtr., 1972), pp. 639-645.



*ut de nostro iure aliquid deminueretur, sed ut illi populi aut iure eo quod a nobis esset constitutum aut aliquo commodo aut beneficio uterentur.*

when the Roman people had decreed something, if the allies and the Latins had adopted it, and if the law itself, which we had, was equally settled among some [other] people, then that people was bound by the same law, not in such a way as to restrict any part of our legal power, but so that these peoples should enjoy some convenience or benefit from a law which was established by us.<sup>118</sup>

The clear implication is that, when Cicero was speaking (which is to say, after the Social War), the Latin and allied cities still retained some control over the extent of their participation in Roman law. Following the Social War, Rome had begun the process of establishing administrative control over its expanded citizen body through the recognition of Italian civic centers as *municipia*; the establishment of a uniform status for city-dwellers across many parts of Italy had the effect of homogenization, at least in a legal sense, across the territorial, ethnic, and political boundaries that continued to exist. As Bispham points out, it was not possible for Italy as a whole simply to adopt a single Roman identity: “An Italy had to grow up which could embrace uniformity on one level and heterogeneity on another.”<sup>119</sup> It does seem, however, that by the end of the Social War both Romans and Italians were ready to accept a combination of local identities overlaid by a form of Roman identity – that is, the existence of a “super-state.” In Sherwin-White’s words,

thanks to the way in which *civitas sine suffragio* developed, the Romans were able to conceive the idea that citizenship was not entirely incompatible with membership of another, secondary community.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> *Pro Balbo* 20.

<sup>119</sup> Bispham 2007, 48.

<sup>120</sup> Sherwin-White 1973, 57.

The idea of Rome had become something different from membership in a geographically or hereditarily defined group. By the end of the Social War, Romans and Italians had come to the understanding that Roman citizenship was exceptional: it supplemented, but did not take the place of, other ethnic and civic identities.

## Conclusion

The Social War represented a critical inflection point in the concept or perception of Romanness, or at least of Roman citizenship. In other words, it seems clear that the ways in which Romans and Italians in general viewed Roman citizenship before the Social War was very different from the way Romans and Italians viewed Roman citizenship *after* the Social War. Prior to the war, citizenship was conferred on individuals and groups as a reward for loyalty to the Roman state, and the integration of territory and of individuals into the state through colonization and the creation of *municipia* provided a means for the Romans to monitor these areas and people. By the late second century BCE, the Romans had succeeded in augmenting their power in Italy to the extent that Roman citizenship was a desirable commodity even to other powerful cities, but this resulted in a dilemma: if the Romans freely granted citizenship to everyone who wanted it, they ran the risk not only of becoming a minority within their own power structure (that is, of having Italians outvote them on decisions that would affect Rome itself), but of broadening the concept of “being Roman” to the point of meaninglessness. When the Social War forced the extension of citizenship to Italy as a whole, the Romans, and in particular the elites, responded with a new understanding of Romanness, based not just on legal status but on action and attitude as well.

The existence of the *ius migrationis*, or at least of a concept that was understood in that way, tells us that citizenship, that is, belonging to a certain place and participating fully in its political and social life, always had some degree of fluidity. In other words, citizenship was not an immutable characteristic, like family, but was a part of a person's identity that could change. According to Sherwin-White, the *ius migrationis* and the concept of *exilium*, whereby an individual could choose or be forced to abandon his home city and take up residence, with full rights, in another city, reflect an "early stage of social organization which allowed a man to change his domicile at will, and which, in an extreme form, precluded any distinct sense of territorial citizenship."<sup>121</sup> It is my position that over the fourth, third, second, and early first centuries, the Roman people developed, out of this "early stage of social organization," a sense of their own exceptionalism. At first Rome was simply one of the Latin states that could and did exchange citizens with one another, but the experience of conquering and maintaining domination over other regions of Italy generated a stronger sense of community. It also led to the introduction of settlements (*coloniae*) in which Romans maintained their Roman citizenship and identity while also having the identity of belonging to a particular colony. This new option, of being Roman while not residing at Rome or participating directly in the everyday life of the city, along with the power of Rome and the pride that attached to being Roman, made granting Roman citizenship to existing communities like Caere, as well as to individuals like the poet Ennius who could come to live in Rome itself, a plausible reward for loyalty to the Roman state.

---

<sup>121</sup> Sherwin-White 1973, 34.

By the late second century, as Brunt has discussed extensively, many Italians wanted Roman citizenship. What they wanted, and what they got with the *lex Iulia de civitate sociis danda*, however, was a particular *kind* of citizenship: the legal rights and responsibilities of Roman citizens, or in other words, a legal stake in the administration of Rome's empire. Under this definition, Roman citizenship was something that could be held in addition to a local identity. Meanwhile, for the original Romans (who lived in Rome and whose ancestors had been Romans), being a Roman was no longer simply a matter of citizenship status. They had two options: they could either surrender their uniqueness and sense of Roman identity, or develop a sub-definition of Romanness based on birth and on behaving in a particular way. As I have argued in chapters 1 and 2, this placed new men like Cicero in the position of having to manufacture a Romanness as close as possible to that of the hereditary Romans and distinct from that of the newly-Roman Italians. Following the Social War, therefore, there were three distinct ways of understanding Roman citizenship: hereditary Romans understood Romanness to be a combination of ancestry and social and political participation; new men understood it to consist entirely of behavior that conformed to Roman traditions of virtue and service to the state; and the new, Italian Romans saw it as a legal status to be acknowledged and enhanced by certain public behaviors.

## Chapter 5

### Romanness Abroad: Roman Identities beyond Italy

Thus far, I have written exclusively about the development of Romanness in the context of Roman activities within Italy. It is certainly true that the relationships established between Rome and the Italian cities were the most important ones for the purpose of defining and redefining what it meant to be a Roman from the fourth to the early first century. As I have argued in Chapter 3, by the period following the Social War, Romanness had gone from being a single, easily definable concept, linked first to heredity and next to geography, to comprising three basic definitions of Roman identity as understood by the hereditary Roman elite, the new men, and the newly-integrated citizens of the expanding Roman state. For the first two groups, whose interpretations of Romanness were based on heredity and behavior, respectively, being Roman was closely linked to the city of Rome itself. Participation in the community of Romans, which, for these groups in particular, meant those persons living in Rome and sharing the experiences of Roman civic life, was of paramount importance. The Italians who had gained citizenship during and after the Social War, however, were for the most part content to have Romanness be something in which they participated from a distance, modifying their own communities to the extent necessary to take full advantage of their adoptive identity or identities (notably including the construction of Roman-style public

spaces and the increased use of Latin at the expense of local languages). In spite of these changes, the majority of Italians clearly accepted Romanness as an additional identity consisting mainly of legal status rather than as a replacement for their preexisting culturally and geographically defined identities.

Because of the centuries of interaction due to their geographical proximity, Rome's relationship with the peoples of Italy was different from its relationships with non-Italians. Regardless of cultural and linguistic differences and even frequent warfare, the peninsula was seen as a geographical unit, and after the Social War, if not before, it was a political unit as well. Even though Rome had achieved military and political domination over areas beyond Italy prior to the Social War, some of which had much in common with the various regions of Italy, there were differences in how Romans perceived and interacted with Italian as opposed to extra-Italian territories. Thus, Romanness had yet another distinct shade of meaning for those Romans who found themselves in the *provinciae* (areas allotted to military commanders, without the administrative connotations that the term would acquire during the Imperial period) of Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Iberia, and Gaul. These Romans faced the difficulty of maintaining their identity without easy access to Roman civic life; in other words, they were confronted with the question of what it meant to be a Roman when surrounded by, and interacting with, non-Romans.

In this chapter, I discuss the ways in which Romans dealt with these issues in the cases of southern and eastern Iberia (the areas which would come to be defined as the provinces of Baetica and Tarraconensis) and of the Rhine frontier. These regions differed from each other in almost every way. By the time the Romans gained control of the area

during the Second Punic War, Iberia had had long experience with Phoenician and Greek cultures and a corresponding tradition of urbanism and mercantilism (including the existence of local urban elites). The third century date for the beginning of Roman influence in Iberia means that the process of Roman domination in the region happened at the same time as did the consolidation of Roman power in Italy. The Rhine frontier, on the other hand, had no urbanization whatsoever. Its socio-political organization was tribal, with a great deal of population movement and no centralized authority; the hierarchy of the tribes was determined through military confrontations. The conquest of the region began around 50 BCE with the campaigns of Julius Caesar, and it was not until the Augustan period that Rome established a permanent presence in the region. The conquest of the Rhine frontier thus took place well after the Social War, when Rome had established patterns of behavior that accompanied conquest and the new understandings of Romanness were firmly in place. As Greg Woolf points out, “it has become increasingly apparent that the imperial system, as reconstructed from epigraphy, legal sources and a few literary sources, emerged very late in the Republic, out of a chaotic series of *ad hoc* and local administrative expedients.”<sup>1</sup> The idea of Romanness which had evolved over the course of the preceding four centuries was a vitally important element in the emergence of this “imperial system.”

It was not enough for Rome simply to exert its military and economic influence over newly-conquered territory: there was a cultural component to belonging to the Roman empire. It was important for Romans (which initially meant the generals and their troops, and would later include new settlers and even indigenous people who chose

---

<sup>1</sup> Woolf 1995, 11. Greg Woolf, “The Formation of Roman Provincial Cultures” in Jeannot Metzler, Martin Millett, Nico Roymans, and Jan Slofstra, *Integration in the Roman West: The Role of Culture and Ideology* (Luxembourg: Musée National d’Histoire et d’Art, 1995).

or were made to accept Romanness) to behave like Romans. Roman values were essentially collective values, which were best practiced and appreciated in an organized social setting. Sherwin-White's statement about Roman colonization is particularly applicable here: in the early days of Roman expansionism, it was incomprehensible that one could be a Roman without performing specific civic duties (*munera*) and receiving recognition (*honores*) accordingly.<sup>2</sup> With the post-Social War acceptance that a form of Romanness could exist based entirely on legal status rather than on particular social behaviors, it was possible for Romans to call new and alien territory such as that on the Rhine frontier "Roman." In order for a place to be suitable for Roman or Roman-style inhabitation, however, some centralized social organization – which usually meant urbanism – had to be present. When this was not the case, Romans had to find other ways to express their Romanness in the context of these territories; Julius Caesar's *De Bello Gallico* is an excellent example of the ways Romans found to interpret their interactions with non-Romans in such a way as to make themselves as Roman as possible.

## The Significance of Urbanization

The Roman affinity for urbanization is well known. Scholars have long understood that places that were already urbanized before coming into contact (or conflict) with Rome were more quickly and easily absorbed into Roman territory than were non-urban areas.<sup>3</sup> This was due in part to the presence, in urban settings, of local

---

<sup>2</sup> Sherwin-White 1973, 36.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Jürgen Kunow, "Relations between Roman Occupation and the *Limesvorland* in the Province of Germania Inferior" in Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett (eds.), *The Early Roman Empire in the West*



elites who could be coopted by the Romans in exchange for social and economic privileges; in areas in which the socio-political organization was less stable, a Roman commander might conclude a treaty with a particular leader or group and later find that this person or persons had been overthrown and the new leadership did not recognize the treaty. It was also easier for the Romans to establish positive, long-term relationships with non-Roman settlements when stable economic arrangements could be reached; this, again, required some level of centralized organization and the ability of Romans and non-Romans to guarantee the safety of one another's representatives. It is also that case that by the time of the Social War most regions of Italy were urbanized to some degree; in some places this was partly due to Roman intervention, but in many areas urbanization had already begun before the foundation of Roman colonies.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the Romans had a great deal of experience dealing with urban communities and had seen the ways in which their own social and political institutions could be inserted into the fabric of pre-existing urban societies.

As Johan Galtung explained in his "Structural Theory of Imperialism," the territory controlled by imperial powers can be divided into two parts: the center and the

---

(Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990); Jonathan C. Edmondson, "Romanization and Urban Development in Lusitania" in Blagg and Millett (1990); Simon Keay, "Romanization and the Hispaniae" in Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato (eds.), *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001). Kunow (1990, 92-3) states explicitly that

[t]he reason that the occupation of Gaul could proceed so quickly was that Caesar found an adversary both socially and economically highly developed, showing a rigid social structure and a population living in proto-urban settlements... the low level of social development that existed among the German tribes when compared directly to the Celts protected them from annexation.

<sup>4</sup> The most notable exception is the Appennine region; see Dench 1995 for an analysis of Roman attitudes toward the under-urbanized peoples of this region, especially Roman portrayals of the Sabines as austere and ultimately worthy of imitation and of the Samnites as barbarous.

periphery.<sup>5</sup> Each of those can be further subdivided into center and periphery, with the power controlling the empire concentrated in the center of the center, and control of the periphery delegated in part to the center of the periphery. Since political and economic control typically rests with the elites of any particular region, the center of the center and the center of the periphery may have more in common with one another than either does with the periphery of the center and the periphery of the periphery. Imperialism is particularly effective when the center of the center (in this case Rome, within Italy) and the center of the periphery (the dominant, urbanized settlements in the extra-Italian territories) have achieved a harmonious relationship; this was emphatically the case by the end of the conquest of Iberia.

## Romans in Iberia

Rome's long-term involvement in the Iberian peninsula began with the Second Punic War (218-206 BCE), when Rome sought to limit the military and economic power of Carthage by driving the Carthaginians out of southeastern and northeastern Iberia. These areas included strategically valuable coastlines as well as fertile agricultural land and vast mineral wealth. The Western Phoenicians had established settlements and set up trade routes there centuries earlier, and archaeological evidence reveals that by the sixth century BCE these settlements had begun to develop the urban political structure of archaic city-states.<sup>6</sup> Carthaginians and Greeks played a similar role in various parts of

---

<sup>5</sup> Galtung 1971, 83. Johan Galtung, "A Structural Theory of Imperialism," *Journal of Peace Research* 8:2 (1971), pp. 81-117.

<sup>6</sup> López Castro 2007, 105. José Luis López Castro, "The Western Phoenicians under the Roman Republic: integration and persistence" in P. van Dommelen and N. Terrenato (eds), *Articulating Local Cultures: Power and Identity under the Expanding Roman Republic* (Portsmouth, RI: JRA Supplementary Series No. 63, 2007).

coastal Iberia. Rome successfully dissolved the Carthaginians' power in Iberia with the end of the Hannibalic War in 206, but Greek influence continued to be a part of the regional culture. In 197, when the inhabitants of the coastal areas found that the Romans had no intention of leaving, a series of rebellions occurred in southern Iberia. The Romans divided Iberia into two military commands (*provinciae*): Hispania Citerior (nearer Spain) ran from the Pyrenees down the eastern coast, while Hispania Ulterior (farther Spain) included the northern and western territory. While Rome was successful in quelling these initial revolts, more localized rebellions continued to occur in various parts of the peninsula for almost two centuries, until the Cantabrian Wars were concluded in 19 BCE. Several of Rome's greatest generals campaigned in Iberia, including Scipio Africanus, M. Claudius Marcellus, and M. Porcius Cato. These commanders and others established relationships of patronage with certain towns that chose to collaborate with Rome, and in particular with their local elites. While warfare was occurring somewhere in Iberia at almost any point, especially in the central part of the peninsula, there were always peaceful areas as well, and the coastal cities adapted fairly quickly to Roman domination. By the Augustan period, Iberia had been divided into three administrative units, or provinces: Tarraconensis (the north-eastern region, including much of what had been Citerior and northern Ulterior); Baetica (extending northward from the southern coast beyond the Guadalquivir valley); and Lusitania on the western coast. Baetica in particular was "one of the most urbanized provinces in the Roman west," including such well-known Republican military and economic centers as Corduba and Gades (the hometown of L. Cornelius Balbus).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Keay 1998, 55. Simon Keay, "The Development of Towns in Early Roman Baetica" in Simon Keay (ed.), *The Archaeology of Early Roman Baetica* (Portsmouth, RI: JRA Supplement 29, 1998).

While the resources of coastal Iberia remained the same, the Roman conquest brought with it new ways of exploiting those resources. One change that the Romans brought to the Iberian economy was taxation. Following the Second Punic War, most of the Carthaginian-allied communities were assigned the status of *civitates stipendariae*. The lands of the *civitates stipendariae* were assigned to the Roman *ager publicus*, and their resources (including mines and saltworks) were exploited by Rome, although the former owners continued to administer them while paying taxes.<sup>8</sup> Some form of systematic taxation had been established across the region by the 170s (and by 171, the Senate at Rome was dealing with complaints about abuses of the system).<sup>9</sup> The introduction of a centralized authority (the representatives of the Roman state) capable of collecting taxes in the region had a profound effect on the economy of coastal Iberia. The Roman army stationed in the peninsula was supported in part by the contribution of a fixed amount of grain from Iberian communities (regularized at one 20<sup>th</sup> of the crop during the governorship of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus in 179/8), which obviously necessitated an increase in agricultural production beyond the subsistence level. At the same time, the communities of Citerior began to issue silver and bronze coinage for the first time, presumably as part of the new system of payments to the Roman authorities.<sup>10</sup> The elites (both Roman and Iberian) of the urban centers, who were collecting the taxes and minting the coins, were simultaneously exposed to an influx of goods from Italy. As

---

<sup>8</sup> López Castro 2007, 107.

<sup>9</sup> Richardson 1986, 115. J. S. Richardson, *Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

<sup>10</sup> Keay 1990, 128, following Crawford 1985, 95ff. Simon Keay, "Processes in the Development of the Coastal Communities of Hispania Citerior in the Republican Period" in Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett (eds.), *The Early Roman Empire in the West* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990); M. H. Crawford, *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic: Italy and the Mediterranean Economy* (London: Methuen, 1985).

these imports became markers of status, agricultural producers were motivated to generate a greater surplus to convert into coinage in order to purchase them.<sup>11</sup>

In many cases, the elites of existing Iberian towns retained much of the influence they had enjoyed before the Hannibalic War. Leonard Curchin notes that “the wide variety of local offices attested on coins and inscriptions suggests that the pre-Roman towns were permitted to maintain their own systems of internal government during the early days of Roman rule.”<sup>12</sup> The relative importance of the existing settlements, however, had already changed; importance under Roman control was dictated by the availability of a good harbor and proximity to the new network of roads, as well as former economic strengths. Also, as Molina Vidal and López Castro point out, the years of warfare provided the Phoenician and Iberian elites with the opportunity to expand their economic ventures in the direction of agriculture and garum production on large, villa-style estates worked by slaves.<sup>13</sup>

The Romans also altered the landscape of Iberia, as they did that of Italy, by founding new settlements and changing the hierarchy of existing ones. The height of emigration from Italy to Iberia seems to have been the middle to late first century BCE, when the conquest of the peninsula was nearly complete, Rome’s Civil Wars were no

---

<sup>11</sup> Keay 1990, 128-30. Keay notes the “sharp increase in the quality of Italian ceramic imports (especially Dressel 1A wine amphorae) at all classes of Iberian settlement, from the middle of the second century BC onwards,” especially in what would become Tarraconensis. See also Molina Vidal 1997, Chapter VII. Jaime Molina Vidal, *La Dinámica Comercial Romana entre Italia e Hispania Citerior* (Alicante: Universidad di Alicante, 1997).

<sup>12</sup> Curchin 1990, 5. Leonard A. Curchin, *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1990).

<sup>13</sup> Molina Vidal 1997, Chapter VII; López Castro 2007, 107-8. José Luis López Castro, “The Western Phoenicians under the Roman Republic: integration and persistence” in P. van Dommelen and N. Terrenato (eds.), *Articulating Local Cultures: Power and Identity under the Expanding Roman Republic*, Portsmouth, RI: JRA Supplementary Series No. 63, 2007.

longer raging there, and colonies were being established by Caesar and Augustus.<sup>14</sup> In addition to the settlement types developed in Roman Italy (the *coloniae* and *municipia*), a type of settlement unique to extra-Italian territories emerged in Spain. *Conventus civium Romanorum* (associations of Roman citizens) came into being either when Roman citizens who lived abroad (for example, as traders) banded together, presumably for mutual support and defense, or when a representative of the Roman state in an extra-Italian territory decided that such a community was necessary.<sup>15</sup> In the latter case, these communities often provided homes for veterans who had completed their terms of service. Although the individual inhabitants possessed Roman citizenship, the communities as a whole did not have the status, or the administrative structure, of *coloniae*. There were six *conventus civium Romanorum* in Republican Spain (compared with one in southern Gaul and one on the Dalmatian coast); the relatively high incidence of this settlement type probably reflects the strong and continuous military presence in Iberia coupled with the region's economic productivity, which would have made relocation there a desirable option.

One example of the insertion of Roman settlements into Iberia is the port of Emporion; the port and garrison had been the site of Greek occupation and influence from the sixth or fifth century and acquired Roman monumental walls in the second century, most likely because the inhabitants had supported Rome in the Hannibalic War.<sup>16</sup> At the end of the second century the Greek garrison was destroyed and the town

---

<sup>14</sup> Keay 2001, 121: “[P]urely Roman or Latin settlements were extremely rare prior to the period of Caesar and Augustus.”

<sup>15</sup> Wilson 1966, 13-6. A. J. N. Wilson, *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1966).

<sup>16</sup> Keay 1990, 122; 127.

was rebuilt, possibly as a Latin colony. The town overlooked a port and possessed monumental walls and a regular street grid; a forum complex (including a capitolium) was constructed soon after the foundation. Keay describes it as “startlingly similar to contemporary monumental centers in central Italy” and “the earliest known example of true Roman urban planning in Iberia.”<sup>17</sup> Following the foundation of the town, there is evidence of new Roman farmsteads in the surrounding area as well as indigenous population movement away from hilltop settlements (which were originally preferred in this region, as in Italy and elsewhere, for their defensibility) to locations closer to the roads that could transport goods to and from Emporion.<sup>18</sup> The site of Emporion was probably selected in large part for its proximity to the Via Hercula, which would later be called the Via Augusta, from Narbo in the north to Gades in the south. By the time of Augustus, the colony of Emporion had become the municipium of Emporiae; the fact that the new name was a plural form may have been in recognition of the multicultural nature of the town, which included the Greek heritage of the port, the Roman colonists, the native Indiketes, and Caesarian veterans.<sup>19</sup>

Further south along the eastern coast lay the city of Tarraco, which played a major role in Roman strategy in Iberia and would eventually become the capital of the province of Tarraconensis. Cn. Cornelius Scipio chose this spot at his base of operations during the Hannibalic War, thus ensuring a constant flow of Roman troops through the town and a steady import business from Italy. Although the town had initially supported Pompey in the Civil War, after his defeat the inhabitants professed their loyalty to Caesar

---

<sup>17</sup> Keay 1990, 130-3.

<sup>18</sup> Keay 1990, 133-6.

<sup>19</sup> Keay 1990, 137.

convincingly enough that Caesar chose it as a meeting place with his Iberian allies soon thereafter.<sup>20</sup> In spite of the fact that there does not appear to have been a wave of Roman or Latin immigration at any point, the town had two fora, one for colonial and one for provincial business, and Roman architectural influences are visible beginning in the early first century BCE.<sup>21</sup> Augustus made the town one of his residences in Iberia (along with Carthago Nova on the southeastern coast), and Tarraco commemorated this fact by founding the first municipal cult of the Roman emperor in the west.<sup>22</sup>

Corduba was founded as a Latin colony by M. Claudius Marcellus, probably in 152, on the banks of the Baetis river (Guadalquivir), but the site had been occupied since the eighth century, and when the Romans first reached the area in the late third century this occupation could be described as proto-urban.<sup>23</sup> It was the first Latin colony to be founded in that area (the territory of the Turdetani, which spanned the Guadalquivir valley), and the choice of this site in particular was a strategic one: the settlement controlled the ford over the Guadalquivir, which made it a vital connection between north and south for the purposes of imports and exports as well as supplying the Roman troops in Hispania Ulterior.<sup>24</sup> The continued presence of the original inhabitants is clear from the retention of the indigenous name “Corduba,” and some portion of the pre-Roman site

---

<sup>20</sup> Keay 1990, 137.

<sup>21</sup> Fear 1996, 171; Keay 1990, 130. A. T. Fear, *Rome and Baetica: Urbanization in Southern Spain c. 50 BC – AD 150* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

<sup>22</sup> Mierse 1999, 138. William E. Mierse, *Temples and Towns in Roman Iberia: The Social and Architectural Dynamics of Sanctuary Designs from the Third Century B.C. to the Third Century A.D.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

<sup>23</sup> Ventura et al. 1998, 87. Angel Ventura, Pilar León, and Carlos Márquez, “Roman Cordoba in the Light of Recent Archaeological Research” in Simon Keay (ed.), *The Archaeology of Early Roman Baetica* (Portsmouth, RI: JRA Supplement 29, 1998).

<sup>24</sup> Dressel 1A amphorae and Campanian Black Gloss fineware were common at the site from about the beginning of Roman occupation (Ventura et al. 1998, 89).



was occupied alongside the Roman foundation throughout the second century BCE. Some monumentalization of the town occurred at the end of the second or beginning of the first century, including the construction of a forum and a basilica. By the time of the Civil Wars a *conventus civium Romanorum* (the *conventus Cordubensis*) existed there, although it is not clear when this community came into being.<sup>25</sup> Corduba was the capital of Hispania Ulterior and, subsequently, the seat of the provincial governor of Baetica. It retained this position in spite of being razed by Caesar's army in 45 in retaliation for having supported Pompey; the town was promptly reconstructed with the new official name of Colonia Patricia and an enlarged forum surrounded by public buildings. The architectural styles of the new buildings reflected the Hellenistic influence on Roman architecture in general, as well as emerging Italian styles of decoration.<sup>26</sup> These public spaces were probably used by the *conventus civium Romanorum* and by the provincial governor for public business on the provincial rather than the municipal level.<sup>27</sup>

One important way in which Romans applied Roman law to an extra-Italian region was to establish charters for colonies and municipia. The *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* (also known as the *Lex Ursonensis* or Urso charter), four bronze tablets of which survive, was the charter given to a new Roman colony in 44. The town of Urso, located in southern Iberia approximately halfway between Corduba and Gades, had supported Pompey in the Civil Wars, and so in 45 Caesar confiscated its land and used it to found a colony. Unfortunately, the text is, in Crawford's words, "conventionally regarded as an ill-drafted and ill-organized document," possibly due to the rush to make it official in the

---

<sup>25</sup> Fear 1996, 38.

<sup>26</sup> Márquez Moreno 1995, 82. Carlos Márquez Moreno, "Corrientes y Materiales en la Arquitectura de la Córdoba Romana," *Anales de Arqueología Cordobesa* 6 (1995), pp. 79-111.

<sup>27</sup> Fear 1996, 171.

aftermath of Caesar's murder and possibly exacerbated by the fact that the surviving text is a copy made in the Flavian period (more than a century after the foundation of the colony).<sup>28</sup> Fortunately, however, other Republican charters are available as bases of comparison; the *lex Tarantina*, established at Tarentum during or just after the Social War, is particularly interesting in this context because, although it comes from Italy and belonged to a city with which Rome had a complex relationship, it shares some significant characteristics with the *Lex Ursonensis*.

Tarentum, modern Taranto, is located in southern Italy, in the region known to the Romans as Magna Graecia. As the name implies, this region had been colonized over several centuries by Greeks; by the time of Roman expansionism these communities constituted a mixture of Greek and local Oscan culture. This cultural integration was best expressed by the poet Ennius, whose hometown of Rudiae lay within Tarentum's sphere of influence.<sup>29</sup> As a major port city on the southern coast (inside the heel of Italy), Tarentum clashed with Rome over economic interests in the early third century; over the next 200 years the two cities were at odds several times, notably during the Pyrrhic War, which the Tarentines officially began by bringing in Pyrrhus of Epirus as a mercenary general, and the Second Punic War, when an anti-Roman coup placed Tarentum in Carthaginian hands from 212 to 209 BCE.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Crawford 1996, 395.

<sup>29</sup> See Chapter 2, "Conclusion," for the Ennius' famous comment about his "three hearts."

<sup>30</sup> Even during the times when Tarentum was an ally of Rome, as Kathryn Lomas has pointed out, Roman literature reflected the conflicts by tending to portray the Tarentines as degenerate, weak in war, and at the same time aggressive (such that the Romans could be absolved of blame for starting the Pyrrhic War in the first place). Kathryn Lomas, "Constructing 'the Greek': Ethnic Identity in Magna Graecia" in *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, Tim Cornell and Kathryn Lomas (eds.) (Accordia Specialist Studies on Italy, Vol. 6: University of London, 1997).

Toward the end of the second century, Rome used Tarentine *ager publicus* to establish the Roman colony of Neptunia as part of the Gracchan land reforms, and the city and colony coexisted until they were merged following the dismantling of the Gracchan program in 122;<sup>31</sup> the city must have continued to exist as a city, because it was able to grant citizenship to the poet Archias in 100.<sup>32</sup> In about 90 BCE (during or after the Social War), Tarentum acquired municipal status; at some point, probably in the next decade, the *Lex Municipii Tarentini*, or *Lex Tarentina*, was composed, inscribed on bronze tablets, and erected in the city. Although only fragments of the tablets have survived, the *Lex Tarentina* provides us with some important information about the structuring of *municipia*. For example, it illustrates the adaptation of a standard set of regulations to specific communities by mentioning two bodies of magistrates which would not have existed simultaneously in a *municipium* (IIviri and IIIviri – *municipia* had IIIviri, while colonies had IIviri).<sup>33</sup> Also, as Bispham notes,

“[t]he repeated mention of Tarentum must be explicable by local attempt to emend a general law (or laws) so as to relate it specifically to Tarentum. Whoever was responsible for particularizing the general law so that it became the Tarentine ‘charter’ was over-anxious at some points, but curiously lax at others.”<sup>34</sup>

Most of the surviving portions of the statute dealt with the conduct of the magistrates and other elite citizens of the *municipium*, and their relationship to the town itself. It is implied in lines 7–14, for example, that some of the first magistrates to hold office in the community would not be from Tarentum; the men from outside the *municipium* were

---

<sup>31</sup> Crawford 1996, 302. M. H. Crawford, *Roman Statutes*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Suppl. 64, Vol. 1 (London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 1996).

<sup>32</sup> See Chapter 3, “Case Studies: Archias and Balbus.”

<sup>33</sup> Crawford 1996, 302, 309; Crawford 1998, 36.

<sup>34</sup> Bispham 2007, 209.

required to provide sureties, whereas this was not required of magistrates who were from Tarentum. Lines 15–26 give the process for the taking of sureties and the handling of public funds. Lines 26–31 require decurions (members of the local elite) to maintain houses of a specific size inside the boundaries of the *municipium*, and lines 32–33 state that no one is to tear down a building without then restoring it to at least its original condition. These lines are clearly intended to regulate the condition of the city center, while lines 39–42 (which are among those clearly adapted from a standard form, and even appear in other surviving statutes) authorize the magistrates to build or restore any roads, ditches, or drains at their discretion.<sup>35</sup>

Curchin is inclined to believe that, like the *Lex Tarantina* and other Italian charters, the Urso charter derived from a standard form; this would have been a form used for Caesarian colonies, however, so it is impossible to prove absent the discovery of another Caesarian charter. In any case, as Crawford points out, this charter is clearly tailored to the specific colony.<sup>36</sup> Like the *Lex Tarentina*, the Urso charter refers to the appointment and the duties of the magistrates (in this case, *Ilviri* and aediles), especially their management of public funds, forbids the destruction of buildings in the town without guarantees that they will be replaced, specifies the proper size for residential buildings by number of roof tiles, and provides for the construction and repair of roads, ditches, or drains according to the judgment of the magistrates. The charter also deals with matters of religious practice, including the appointment of pontiffs and augurs and burial of the dead; that specifically Roman religious practices were imported along with

---

<sup>35</sup> Crawford 1996, 304-8.

<sup>36</sup> Curchin 1990, 13; Crawford 1996, 397. For the text and translation of the charter, see Crawford 1996, 400ff.

the colonists is clear from the fact that dramatic games (*ludi scaenici*) were to be performed during the tenure of each aedile in honor of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva – the Capitoline triad. Water rights appear three times in the charter: in the first place stating that the rights of access to all sources of water in the territory of the colony should be identical to those enjoyed by the former owners of the land; in the second place stating that a water-course should not be constructed without the deliberation of a certain number of decurions or in such a way as to impact a structure not designed as part of a water-course; and in the third place stating that anyone who wanted to collect overflow from a water source had to bring a proposal before the magistrates a certain number of decurions.<sup>37</sup> Water rights were hotly contested in many areas of Iberia, as is also shown by the *Tabula Contrebiensis*. The similarities between the charters of Tarentum and Urso, composed about fifty years apart and intended to apply to communities which were completely different in background and geographical location, demonstrate the importance to the Roman state of maintaining consistency in the communities under its control. In fact, the very idea of establishing a constitution for a community by inscribing a set of laws is a Roman one.<sup>38</sup> The customization of each charter, however, proves that the Roman authorities did not take an unthinking, “one size fits all” approach to the governance of newly-Roman communities. As the situation in first-century Pompeii demonstrates so well, the fact that a community became officially Roman did not eliminate the local aspects of group identity. In addition to dealing with mundane details of city maintenance, a charter, like the construction of Roman-style public

---

<sup>37</sup> Sections LXXIX, XCVIII, and C.

<sup>38</sup> Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 94.

buildings, provided a context in which to enact Romanness; the Roman behaviors actually *mandated* by the charters, however, were few.

The *Tabula Contrebiensis* (the “plaque of Contrebia,” a town in the interior of the peninsula, west of Tarraco), explains and commemorates the resolution of a water rights dispute between two Iberian communities (the Salluvienses and Allavonenses) in 87 BCE; the plaintiff community had brought the matter before the Roman commander in the region, C. Valerius Flaccus, who empowered the senate of Contrebia Balaisca to settle the question. The commander’s decision is not only recorded in Latin, rather than in the local Celtiberian language, but is entirely Roman in character and language, even to the point of employing a legal fiction in the imperfect subjunctive tense (a feature typical of Roman legal formulations). It is clear that all parties involved were conscious of the Romanness of the process of dispute resolution they were employing.<sup>39</sup> It was certainly in the interest of the Roman state that its representative act to defuse a conflict between two local communities before that conflict escalated, but that the communities themselves sought Roman arbitration demonstrates that they also saw the advantages of centralized authority. As Lintott points out “[t]he Spaniards are expected at this time to understand the way that Romans conceptualized and verbalized issues in litigation, including the use of the imperfect subjunctive to express a fiction; they are not expected to know the substance of Roman private law.”<sup>40</sup> This, in addition to Flaccus’ determination that the dispute would be best settled by the local Iberians themselves, suggests that the fact that a decision came with the stamp of Roman authority was key,

---

<sup>39</sup> J. S. Richardson, “The *Tabula Contrebiensis*: Roman Law in Spain in the Early First Century B.C.: I,” *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 73 (1983), pp.33-41; Peter Birks, Alan Rodger, and J. S. Richardson, “Further Aspects of the *Tabula Contrebiensis*,” *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 74 (1984), pp.45-73.

<sup>40</sup> Lintott 1993, 155.

rather than any sense that the Romans had better or clearer regulations regarding boundaries and water rights. Roman intervention in this situation was seen as beneficial rather than intrusive, and perhaps even as a mark of status, as would be the case when a patron rendered assistance to a client. The publication of the decision in Latin rather than the local language may have been intended for this purpose, or to make the new regulations appear more impressive and official.

A. T. Fear, noting that there is little information available about any specifically Roman features of Corduba and other towns founded around the same time by other Roman generals, suggests that, “[a]s the act of foundation was carried out for propaganda purposes at Rome, what was actually laid out on the ground was of little importance, especially as few, if any, of the target audience would go to verify the claims made.”<sup>41</sup> Keay states that the Iberian towns of the early imperial period were shaped in large part by the desire of local elites to spend money on monuments and inscriptions emphasizing their patronage connections with imperial Rome, and in particular with the Julio-Claudian dynasty.<sup>42</sup> Both of these views recognize an important feature of the Roman domination of Iberia: while the settlements that were vital to Rome’s military, political, and economic interest received some identifiably Roman markers such as fora or colonial status and had to conform to certain administrative procedures such as tax collection, there is no indication that the changes in the culture of Iberia were driven by Roman policy. Roman immigrants to Iberia brought Roman practices with them, but as is plain

---

<sup>41</sup> Fear 1996, 15.

<sup>42</sup> Keay 1995, 293-4. Simon Keay, “Innovation and Adaptation: The Contribution of Rome to Urbanism in Iberia” in B. Cunliffe and S. Keay (eds.), *Social Complexity and the Development of Towns in Iberia: From the Copper Age to the Second Century AD. Proceedings of the British Academy* 86 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

from cases such as those of Corduba and Emporiae, even in the presence of a significant Roman community participation in Roman culture was not necessarily a requirement.

## The Rhine Frontier

Julius Caesar's campaigns in the 50s BCE introduced Romans to the Rhine frontier, but a permanent Roman impact on the landscape and culture of the region was a long time in coming. The tribal socio-political structure prevalent throughout Gaul was the rule along the Rhine as well, but Caesar distinguished between these tribes and those he had dealt with elsewhere. These were the peoples of whom Caesar wrote that they had more *virtus* (with the connotation of "fighting spirit") than the tribes closer to Rome, on account of their proximity to the warlike Germans on the other side of the Rhine.<sup>43</sup> The economy was predominately pastoral rather than agricultural, and the various tribes frequently fought one another over territorial boundaries. When Caesar encountered the Ubii, a tribe which was to become an important Roman ally, it appears that their aristocracy had been wiped out in battle against the neighboring Suebi, to whom they were paying tribute (hence, probably, their willingness to enter into an alliance with Rome).<sup>44</sup> It is unsurprising, first that it took the Romans several decades to gain a significant foothold in this area, and second that, when this was accomplished, the usual Roman settlement styles failed to take hold. The villa type, which was common in Iberia as well as in Italy, only accounted for about five percent of known native settlements up through the first century AD, when villas were extremely common elsewhere. There are

---

<sup>43</sup> Caesar, *BG* 1.1.3.

<sup>44</sup> Caesar, *BG* 4.11.3; Gechter 1990, 99-100. Michael Gechter, "Early Roman Military Installations and Ubian Settlements in the Lower Rhine" in Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett (eds.), *The Early Roman Empire in the West* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990).



indications that the economy began to become more market-oriented in the early imperial period, and towns began to appear, but the identification and interdependence between town and countryside which existed elsewhere in Gaul does not seem to have been present in the Lower Rhine area.<sup>45</sup>

The region does not seem to have shared in the administrative programs of the Augustan period, which guided the development of urban settlements (*civitates*) in the territories of the southern Gallic tribes. Tracing the development of Roman cultural influence in the Lower Rhine area through archaeological evidence is complicated by the fact that the settlements of the Augustan period and earlier tend to be military in nature. The existence of camps (*castra*) or fortified towns based around these camps (*oppida*) is an indication of Roman presence at a particular spot, but it is less helpful in conveying the extent of native participation in the settlement. *Castra* were typically laid out on the same principles as other urban foundations – they were, after all, essentially miniature cities – but they served the specific function of providing living space for Roman and auxiliary troops rather than an integrative space for Roman and local cultural exchange.<sup>46</sup> The Lower Rhine was itself a major provider of auxiliaries, but as Pfeilschifter argues, the cultural exchange carried out between Romans and non-Romans on active duty seems to have been limited both explicitly and implicitly by the need for a common language and the placement of auxiliary units in separate living quarters from the Roman citizen troops. Even after urban settlements became more common, in the first century CE, the evidence of dedicatory inscriptions suggests that the local elites preferred to put their disposable income into rural sanctuaries rather than the monumentalization of towns (in

---

<sup>45</sup> Roymans 1990, 54-5.

<sup>46</sup> Anderson 1997, 191.

stark contrast to much of Italy and Iberia).<sup>47</sup> Nico Roymans goes so far as to say that “[t]he emphasis on martial and pastoral traditions resulted in a specific interpretation of Roman values and life-style that blocked out the successful development of Roman-style urbanism and the associated villa-based mode of production.”<sup>48</sup>

Roymans has suggested that the most important way in which the Rhine frontier differed from areas such as southern Iberia was not its lack of urbanism *per se*, but the fact that the tribes of the Lower Rhine were ideologically distinct from the other Gallic tribes. Roymans argues that two components were necessary for the “Romanization” of any region: the inhabitants had to accept Romans as bringers of civilization, which they would demonstrate by adopting Roman cultural forms and values; and the local elites in particular had to accept the norms and values of the Roman way of life, which they demonstrated through various emulative strategies such as the adoption of luxury goods or monumental building.<sup>49</sup> “Civilization,” however, is a loaded term. It cannot be the case that Roman domination could not be complete and Roman influence could not be felt without a wholehearted decision on the part of the conquered that their conquerors’ cultural was superior to their own. Nor is there much, if any, indication that the Romans saw complete adoption of Roman material culture and daily routine (as opposed to political behavior) as necessary in the territory they possessed; for example, Marcia L. Okun’s study of the archaeological evidence on the Upper Rhine frontier indicates that, instead of adopting Roman ways of life, the indigenous people in that region combined parts of Roman culture with part of their own culture to create new practices within the

---

<sup>47</sup> Roymans 1995, 58.

<sup>48</sup> Roymans 1995, 60.

<sup>49</sup> Roymans 1995, 47.

existing social structure.<sup>50</sup> Evidence ranging from the survival of local languages in Roman-controlled areas of Italy to the compromise embodied in the Tabula Contrebiensis demonstrates, or at least strongly suggests, that Roman rule could allow for local differences.

## Julius Caesar and the Frontier

Julius Caesar is famous as a historical figure in large part because he took Rome further from the center than it had ever gone before, and because he was critical in transforming the Roman Republic into the Roman Empire. Caesar, critically, was also intensely interested in Romanness, in identifying and acting in the correct Roman manner, and even in exporting Romanness to the peripheries of the Roman world. Even during his lifetime, Caesar was known as an exemplar of the Roman virtue of linguistic performance (in speech and in writing), and, of course, as an exemplar of the Roman virtue of military success. The way in which Caesar fused those two skill sets to create a public image for himself reveals a great deal about how the Romans of the late Republic viewed the role of their state in the context of extra-Italian expansion. A few decades earlier, Cicero had held up Verres to explain by negative examples what a provincial governor should and should not do in dealing with Rome's allies and subjects; a few decades later, Caesar changed the focus and, instead of using a *negative* example, used himself as a *positive* example of how a commander should deal with Rome's enemies, allies, and subjects-in-the-making on behalf of the Roman people.

---

<sup>50</sup> Okun 1989, 125-7. Marcia L. Okun, *The Early Roman Frontier in the Upper Rhine Area: Assimilation and Acculturation on a Roman Frontier* (Oxford: BAR International Series 547, 1989).

As T. P. Wiseman explains, it is most logical to read the books of the *Bellum Gallicum* as having been published sequentially over the seasons of Caesar's campaigns.<sup>51</sup> This reading allows scholars to concentrate on the composition of the books rather than trying to follow an overarching storyline. Caesar was not only promoting himself with his commentaries on the Gallic War: he was promoting a certain way of understanding Romanness, which in turn would draw the community of Romans together. In his monograph on the nature of "community," Anthony P. Cohen notes that words or behaviors that are seen as characteristic of a particular group ("symbols") act as common referents for members of the group and thus help to solidify group identity, although in the minds of the individual group members the same word or behavior may have very different meanings. This being the case, he argues, "the consciousness of community has to be kept alive through manipulation of its symbols. The reality and efficacy of the community's boundary – and, therefore, of the community itself – depends upon its symbolic construction and embellishment."<sup>52</sup> This is what Caesar attempted to do for Rome with the publication of the *Bellum Gallicum*. As a consummate politician, Caesar knew not only that political unity was important, but that identification with a group was essential to political unity. Thus, when he constructed (or elaborated on) stereotypes of Gauls and Germans, and when he emphasized the Romanness of certain characteristics such as *virtus* and *clementia*, he was constructing a careful picture of Rome and the Romans. The understanding that the books of the *Bellum Gallicum*

---

<sup>51</sup> T. P. Wiseman, "The Publication of *De Bello Gallico*" in *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*, Kathryn Welch and Anton Powell (eds.), (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 1998), pp. 1-10.

<sup>52</sup> Cohen 1985, 15. Anthony P. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community* (Chichester: E. Horwood, 1985).

were published sequentially also implies that this constructed image (to the extent to which it *was* internally consistent, especially in terms of vocabulary and stereotyping) was not designed for one particular moment in time, but reflected an interpretation of what it meant to be Roman or non-Roman on the frontier that was acceptable both to Caesar himself and to his audience throughout the 50s.

One of the most notable aspects of Caesar's description of his interactions with the Gauls and Germans in the *Bellum Gallicum* is his insistence on doing things "the Roman way," particularly in the negotiation of settlements. It is entirely predictable that Caesar would emphasize (or create) ways in which he had upheld traditional Roman values, since his works were, after all, heavily focused on self-promotion. Even so, it is striking that, along with demonstrations of *virtus*, *fides*, and other virtues, Caesar – or at least the character of Caesar portrayed in the *Bellum Gallicum* – closely adhered to Roman military and diplomatic procedures. The acceptance of hostages as part of a treaty or surrender is a conspicuous example of Caesar's choice to follow Roman, rather than Gallic, practice even though the Gallic way was clearly more effective in the short term.<sup>53</sup> Providing hostages as a guarantee of good behavior was an important part of the traditional Roman process of surrender (*deditio*), and Caesar often mentioned it in this context.<sup>54</sup> As M. James Moscovich points out, however, Caesar never reported that the Gauls were actually deterred by the fact that their hostages were in Roman hands, while he did mention several instances in which Gallic groups proceeded with their attacks in

---

<sup>53</sup> M. James Moscovich, "Obsidibus Traditis: Hostages in Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*," *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 75, No. 2 (Dec. 1979 – Jan. 1980), pp. 122-8.

<sup>54</sup> Livy (28.34.7) explained that it was the ancient custom of the Romans (*mos vetustus erat Romanis*) not to accept a surrender unless the opposite side "gave up all things divine and human and hostages were taken, arms handed over, and garrisons were established in their towns" (*quam omnia divina humanaque dedidisset, obsides accepti, arma adempta, praesidia urbibus imposita forent*).

spite of having given hostages to the Romans.<sup>55</sup> When the Gauls took hostages from one another, it was an effective deterrent because the various tribes believed that their enemies would torture or kill the hostages;<sup>56</sup> judging by the fact that revolts by tribes which had given hostages continued to occur, and it seems relatively clear that throughout Caesar's campaigns the Gauls remained unconvinced that the Romans could be equally ruthless.<sup>57</sup>

Like Cicero, Caesar used the invocation of quintessentially Roman virtues to catch the audience's ear and a public image of himself, not just as a man behaving in a Roman way, but as an arbiter of traditional Roman identity. The term *virtus* appears a remarkable 70 times in the *Bellum Gallicum*, compared with 35 occurrences of *fides*, four of *iustitia*, two of *clementia*, and only one each of *pietas*, *temperantia*, and *prudentia*.<sup>58</sup> That *virtus* should be Caesar's Roman virtue of choice is hardly surprising, since it was closely associated with martial valor, and *fides* is similarly a logical choice, since it was frequently applied to inter-state relations. *Temperantia*, and *prudentia*, on the other hand, are virtues associated with Roman behavior as practiced in a peaceful setting, so it is similarly unsurprising that Caesar should not have used them very often.<sup>59</sup> It is striking,

---

<sup>55</sup> Cf. *BG* 3.10, where Caesar gives the following reasons for a campaign against the Veneti: *iniuria retentorum equitum Romanorum, rebellio facta post deditionem, defectio datis obsidibus, tot civitatum coniuratio, in primis ne hac parte neglecta reliquae nationes sibi idem licere arbitrarentur* ("the offence of their detention of the Roman equites [who had been sent to them as ambassadors], rebellion following a surrender, revolt after hostages had been given, a conspiracy of so many communities, and above all that, should this situation be overlooked, the rest of the [Gallic] peoples might decide that [such behavior] was permissible for them as well").

<sup>56</sup> Cf. *BG* 1.31, 5.27, 7.63.

<sup>57</sup> Moscovich 1980, 127.

<sup>58</sup> I have not included the appearances of these words in Book 8 of the *Bellum Gallicum*, since it was not written by Caesar.

<sup>59</sup> *Modestia* and *temperantia*, for example, appear with some frequency in the Ciceronian works I discussed in chapters 2 and 3 (twelve and sixteen times, respectively). It is likewise interesting to note that the related

however, that Caesar used *clementia* and *iustitia* so infrequently, and that *pietas* only receives one mention. One would think that these terms, which connote nobility of spirit and important aspects of Roman public behavior (such as respect for the gods), would be more common. The way in which Caesar deployed these terms says a great deal about his presentation of Romans and non-Romans.

One crucial aspect of the presentation was that Caesar assigned virtues typically associated with Romanness to both non-Romans as well as Romans. He used *virtus* and *fides*, for example, to describe both Romans and non-Romans throughout the *Bellum Gallicum*, while the only instances of *temperantia*, *prudentia*, and *pietas* belong to descriptions of Gallic leaders.<sup>60</sup> This practice served several purposes: it made Caesar appear moderate and fair-minded; it implied that the Gauls and Germans understood Roman virtues and thus could be dealt with on Roman terms; and it allowed Caesar to set up his opponents as both difficult to subdue (thus making his eventual victories more impressive) and, ultimately, not quite as good at enacting Roman virtues as the Romans were. Thus, the use of positive descriptors of Gauls and Germans in fact flattered Caesar without ultimately outweighing the negative aspects of Caesar's presentation of non-Romans.

An important example of Caesar's use of the concept of *virtus* in setting Romans and non-Romans in opposition to one another is his description in Book 3 of the campaign against Veneti, a people whose seafaring expertise enabled them to stave off

---

virtues of *moderatio* and *decorum*, which appear ten and 28 times in the same works of Cicero, do not appear at all in the *Bellum Gallicum*.

<sup>60</sup> Caesar praised the *temperantia* of Diviciacus, an ally of the Romans, in *BG* 1.19 and learned the Galba, the king of the Suessiones, was leading the Belgae against the Romans because of his reputation for *prudentia* in *BG* 2.4. In *BG* 5.27, Ambiorix warned Caesar's representatives of an impending Gallic attack, noting that he was able to give the warning because he had already fulfilled the requirements of *pietas* toward his fellow Gauls by cooperating with them thus far.

Roman domination successfully, if temporarily. In spite of their technical skill, the Veneti ultimately crumbled before the superior character of their Roman opponents. As Brice Erickson points out, Caesar's refusal to use the word *virtus* in describing the Veneti is unusual; other Gallic tribes, such as the Helvetii, are allowed to possess *virtus*, as are the Germans. The Veneti, Caesar implied, depended too much on their ships. The ships (and the skill it took to build them) took the place of *virtus* in Venetic warfare by enabling the Veneti to avoid a pitched battle with the Romans, in which they would have been heavily outclassed because of their congenitally Gallic lack of resolve.<sup>61</sup> When Caesar's troops had managed to develop their seafaring capabilities enough to counter those of the Veneti, the contest was essentially over: "*reliquum erat certamen positum in virtute, qua nostri milites facile superabant*" ("the rest of the battle was depended upon *virtus*, in which our soldiers were easily the better").<sup>62</sup>

The tone of Caesar's writing is especially conspicuous when contrasted with another, closely related type of report from the borders: Cicero's letters to the magistrates and Senate during his governorship of Cilicia in 51.<sup>63</sup> Since these letters were addressed to a relatively small, elite audience and since Cicero was actually making specific, urgent requests of the Senate and explicitly justifying his decisions, rather than simply relating events, a difference in tone is expected. It is worth noting, however, that Cicero's own, characteristic attitudes did come through even in a formal dispatch. For example, his attitude regarding the proper way of interacting with overseas Roman subjects (which I discussed in Chapter 2) appears in the first of the two letters, in which Cicero reported his

---

<sup>61</sup> Brice Erickson, "Falling Masts, Rising Masters: The Ethnography of Virtue in Caesar's Account of the Veneti," *American Journal of Philology* 123, no. 4 (Winter 2002), pp. 601-622.

<sup>62</sup> *BG* 3.14.

<sup>63</sup> Cicero *Ad Fam.* 15.1 = SB 104; 15.2 = SB 105.



reasons for believing that the security of Cilicia was about to be threatened by a Parthian invasion of Syria. He wrote of his confidence in the Cilicians themselves, although they were uneasy about the military developments:

*sperabam tamen eos ad quos iam accesseram quique nostram mansuetudinem integritatemque perspexerant amicos populo Romano esse factos, Ciliciam autem firmiorem fore si aequitatis nostrae particeps facta esset.*

I was confident, however, that those with whom I had already interacted and who had perceived our clemency and integrity had become friends of the Roman people, and that Cilicia would be even more steadfast if it was made a participant in our equality.<sup>64</sup>

Cicero's position differed from Caesar's in that Cicero's project was to manage a province that was already integrated into Rome's empire, whereas Caesar was entering territory alien to Rome and beginning the process of integration. Cicero was also dealing with peoples who were organized on a regional rather than on a tribal level, so that diplomatic relations were already established and diplomatic channels could usefully be pursued, and the threat of Roman military action was understood and respected. Caesar had to develop ways of interacting with tribal leaders (both allies and enemies) extemporaneously. The letter quoted above, however, illustrates the potential of dispatches to Rome to serve as propaganda both for the author/commander personally and for his view of Roman expansionism; it also hints at what Caesar's formal reports to the Senate might have looked like before they became the commentaries.

In a letter to Cato written soon after the events he described to the Senate, Cicero described another of his military adventures in Cilicia in a way much more reminiscent of Caesar. Cicero wrote of the people of an independent, mountainous area of Cilicia: "*ad*

---

<sup>64</sup> *Ad Fam.* 15.1.3.

*existimantionem imperi pertinere arbitratus sum comprimere eorum audaciam, quo facilius etiam ceterorum animi qui alieni essent ab imperio nostro frangerentur*” (“I concluded that it was in the interest of the reputation of [Roman] power to curb their boldness, so that the spirits of other peoples outside our control might more easily be shattered”).<sup>65</sup> He went on to devastate the town, accept the surrender of the people, and take hostages from their neighbors, whose attitude was similarly objectionable. In this case, Cicero was dealing with a situation much like those encountered by Caesar on the Gallic frontier: the independent settlements of extra-Italian, Roman-controlled territory were unwilling to cooperate with a centralized authority (Cicero described his mountain-dwellers as “*qui ne regibus quidem umquam paruissent*” (“those who had never even obeyed the kings [of the region]”).<sup>66</sup> This made Cicero’s success against them all the sweeter, and he wrote to Cato in hopes of having it formally recognized by the state whose interests he had defended. This episode, in conjunction with Cicero’s earlier remarks on the Cilicians, suggests two things: first, that Cicero saw a clear distinction between Rome’s obligation to its subject peoples and what was proper when dealing with people outside Roman control; and second, that he believed that the reaction of the Senate and the people to his aggressive action against the mountain-dwellers would be highly congratulatory.

The idea that there was a distinction between peoples inside and outside of Rome’s sphere of influence was most likely part of Caesar’s motivation for creating an ethnic frontier between Gauls and Germans, where one did not actually exist: it made sense, in an orderly world, for the Rhine to be the physical manifestation of a cultural

---

<sup>65</sup> Cicero *Ad Fam.* 15.4.5 = SB 110.

<sup>66</sup> Cicero *Ad Fam.* 15.4.5.

barrier. Caesar enumerated supposed differences between Gauls and Germans, especially in his ethnography at the beginning of Book 6, but it is evident from the population movements he also noted (as well as from other sources) that the boundaries were not as solid as Caesar liked to think. The representation of the Germans (that is, the people living beyond the Rhine) as more aggressive and intimidating was in Caesar's interest, as it might help to convince the audience to dismiss Caesar's campaigns beyond the Rhine as unwinnable rather than simply ineffective.

Lindsay G. H. Hall suggests that Caesar's supremely well-ordered writing style is a manifestation of the way in which he thought about Rome's role in the world: as Caesar's task in writing the *De Analogia* was to impose order on the sometimes undisciplined Latin language by virtue of his superior education, intelligence, and taste, so Rome's task in the world was to impose order on its disorderly neighbors by virtue of its superior military strength and organizational capabilities.<sup>67</sup> Similarly, Riggsby sees certain aspects of the *Bellum Gallicum*, such as the lists or catalogs of the names of tribes, as explicitly taking control of the foreign and confusing geography and peoples of Gaul by imposing verbal order on them: "Caesar's aggressive naming is a gesture of possession," Riggsby argues.<sup>68</sup> It is entirely possible, as Wiseman suggests, that the deliberate simplicity of Caesar's vocabulary and the consistency of his sentence structure would have made the narrative particularly accessible to the non-elite audience, who would probably have heard it read aloud; amid this singular clarity, the profusion of

---

<sup>67</sup> Lindsay G. H. Hall, "Ratio and Romanitas in the *Bellum Gallicum*" in Kathryn Welch and Anton Powell, *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 1998), pp. 11-43.

<sup>68</sup> Riggsby 2006, 71.

names in the catalog-sentences would have been especially effective.<sup>69</sup> Caesar undoubtedly intended to further his own political ends by identifying himself so heavily with “the people,”<sup>70</sup> but the desire for the regularization of all things Roman which Caesar epitomized in the *De Analogia* is likewise present throughout the *Bellum Gallicum*, this time in the form of regularization of the world. The Gaul of Caesar’s commentaries existed in a framework of Romanness, within which Caesar presented himself as the great organizer of people and ideas.

## Conclusion

As Jonathan C. Edmondson says in his work on Lusitania,

Rome preferred, whenever possible, to maintain the status quo and not to cause widespread dislocation in areas that Rome wanted subsequently to exploit. If urban development had already taken place, that formed the ideal basis for the Roman organization of that territory. It was only in those areas of less well-defined territories that she had to impose a new urban matrix.<sup>71</sup>

This is certainly the case, but in making this political and economic argument Edmondson perhaps overlooks another, very real motivation behind the Roman desire to impose Roman identity on an existent urban matrix, or to build a Roman urban matrix where there was none to absorb: it was clearly vital to the Romans’ understanding of their collective identity that Romans should continue to enact Romanness, or export Romanness to, wherever they were. This need remained constant even while the understanding was evolving during the second and first centuries. The Roman civic

---

<sup>69</sup> Wiseman 1998, 5.

<sup>70</sup> As Wiseman (1998, 3) notes, Caesar uses the phrase *populus Romanus* forty-one times in Book 1 alone.

<sup>71</sup> Edmondson 1990, 173.

virtues of *fides*, *honor*, *pietas*, and obedience to the rule of law were crucial to maintaining Romanness, but such behavior could not occur in a vacuum. As I argue in Chapter 3, the performance of Romanness by individuals was a vital component of Roman identity. When a Roman was not living in the city of Rome, recognition that that Roman was acting as a Roman should could come about in one of two ways: either the place in which he was living could be equipped to appreciate Roman public virtues (that is, it could have a Roman understanding of what it meant to be part of an urban community); or reports of his actions could be carried to Rome. As I argue in Chapter 4, following the Social War the hereditary Romans understood it to be possible for territory to be a Roman possession without being occupied by a completely Roman culture. This was a necessary modification to the older view of Romanness as consisting only of those people and places that participated fully in Roman culture, since Rome was entering the age in which its foreign policy and internal politics would be defined by expansionism. With the development of “supra-state” Romanness, Roman territory could expand infinitely without making the inhabitants of the city of Rome any less Roman. One of Julius Caesar’s contributions to this development (in addition to his actual acquisition of territory for the state) was to demonstrate in a very public way what it could mean for a Roman to carry Romanness with him to boundaries of the empire.

Nicholas Purcell is only partly right when he argues that “the Roman perception of the place to be conquered and the process of conquest are so closely related as to be aspects of the same *mentalité*, and there is no need to disjoin them or seek more elaborate

explanation.”<sup>72</sup> Certainly the process of changing the landscape was an essential part of the process of integrating land and its inhabitants into Roman territory, but the Roman need to perceive the new territory as effectively integrated was just as closely tied to the Roman understanding of what it meant to be the creators of an empire. In places where urbanization was not the norm, it was necessary to generate an atmosphere of Romanness in which Romans could behave appropriately. By the end of the Republic, the hereditary Romans who oversaw Rome’s territorial expansion had come to see Rome’s role, as the creator of a supra-state system, as defined in part by the behavior of Romans in the territory they controlled. As I pointed out in Chapter 2, this is readily apparent as early as Cicero’s speeches against Verres. For Romans, a corollary of the need to behave in a Roman way was the need to resist the temptation to fall out of Roman habits when surrounded by, and living among, non-Romans. Put another way: a Roman could *lose* his Roman identity should he assimilate into the outside-of-Rome culture in which he found himself. At the same time, the possession of territory occupied by non-Romans had become an integral part of what it meant to *be* a Roman; Romans had to develop a way of living with non-Romans. The Roman version of “going native,” then, was to retain all important characteristics of Romanness while reaching a compromise with the non-Roman surroundings. In part to safeguard against this eventuality, then, Romans explicitly shaped extra-Italian territory in order to make it possible for Romans to live there in a Roman ways. That by so shaping these territories Roman leaders like Cicero and Caesar, who set the policies for Roman expansionism, could further demonstrate

---

<sup>72</sup> Purcell 1990, 21. Nicholas Purcell, “The Creation of the Roman Provincial Landscape: The Roman Impact on Cisalpine Gaul” in Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett (eds.), *The Early Roman Empire in the West* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990).

their own Romanness, not just in Rome but throughout the Roman empire, was a very useful side benefit.

## Chapter 6

### Conclusion

In the modern-day United States, there is an ongoing, critically important debate about what it means to be an “American.” It seems that, in approaching debates on patriotism, immigration policy, and even national and cultural leadership, we are first supposed to determine who is, and who is not, a “real” American, or a “true” American. At the extremes, this is easy: someone born in the United States to American parents, who speaks English, and who was raised, educated, and acculturated in the United States is probably an American; a French citizen, born in France, to French parents, on the other hand, probably is not. On the margins, however, this question quickly becomes tricky: not everyone agrees about the identity of an undocumented alien, who was brought to the United States as a baby and who has lived and worked in the United States for thirty or forty years. This difficult question about national identity is not merely an American one: throughout the world, individuals and governments are increasingly facing the question of what it means *to be* something, especially when that something comes with a host of obligations, responsibilities, and privileges. Clearly, however, this is not simply a question for modern times; it is one that was faced in the ancient world as well, where it similarly had critical consequences.

In this dissertation, I have argued that, between the fourth and the first centuries BCE, the very concept of what it meant for an individual or a community to be “Roman”



shifted in important ways. In the most basic form, the notion of Romanness evolved from a sense among Roman elites that Romanness was an immutable characteristic, like family, to a broader understanding that there could be different *kinds* of Romanness: hereditary, legal, and cultural. With that being understood, it is possible to take this argument a step further, and to at least ask how this changing concept of identity fits into a larger theoretical framework.

Understanding the nature of Roman identity is vitally important to understanding the development of Roman expansionism from the fourth to the first century BCE. As expansionism became an increasingly powerful force in the life of Rome, the attitudes that Romans had about themselves changed, and a new concept of identity was created. I have called this new form of Romanness a “supra-state identity”; one might even go so far as to call it a “world-system,” within the meaning of Immanuel Wallerstein’s phrase. A world-system is “a spatial/temporal zone which cuts across many political and cultural units, one that represents an integrated zone of activity and institutions which obey certain systematic rules.”<sup>1</sup> The idea of supra-state Romanness provided a framework within which the institutions of community and state-level interactions operated. When Wallerstein writes about “the social reality within which we live and which determines what our options are” he is referring to the economic system of modern capitalism, but a shared identity is certainly a social reality, and the omnipresence of the concept of “Romanness” in Italy and the extra-Italian territories under the Republic was at least as powerful a force in shaping the ways in which people and communities interacted on the military, political, and cultural levels as was the mere fact of Roman power.

---

<sup>1</sup> Wallerstein 2004, 16. Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

Paul Zanker and Claude Nicolet have written about the development of a symbolic language of Romanness and empire during the Augustan period.<sup>2</sup> I argue that the ideas behind this development are perceptible beginning around the time of the Social War. These concepts were not yet fully articulated, and the reign of Augustus did bring about major ideological changes, but the “imagined community” or Rome had begun to take shape, and as Michael Dietler points out, such communities “require the construction of emotionally charged traditions of identity with evocative symbols marshaled to evoke authenticity.”<sup>3</sup> The emotionally charged traditions of Roman identity already existed in the early first century BCE, and although the evocative visual symbols had yet to achieve the prominence they would attain in Augustan Rome, literary ones were in constant use. The rhetoric of Cicero and Caesar clearly demonstrates the belief in a specifically “Roman” collection of behavioral characteristics, which in turn implies the existence of a “Roman” community.

---

<sup>2</sup> Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, translated by Alan Shapiro (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1990); Claude Nicolet, *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1991).

<sup>3</sup> Dietler 1995, 64. Michael Dietler, “Early ‘Celtic’ Socio-Political Relations: Ideological Representation and Social Competition in Dynamic Comparative Perspective” in *Celtic Chieftdom, Celtic State: The Evolution of Complex Social Systems in Prehistoric Europe*, edited by Bettina Arnold and D. Blair Gibson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

## Bibliography

- Adams, J. N. "Bilingualism at Delos." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, edited by J. N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Adams, J. N. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003 = Adams 2003a.
- Adams, J. N. "'Romanitas' and the Latin Language." *Classical Quarterly* 53.1 (2003): 184-205 = Adams 2003b.
- Adams, J. N., and Simon Swain. "Introduction." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, edited by J.N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Alföldi, A. *Early Rome and the Latins*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, (1983) 1991.
- Anderson, James C. *Roman Architecture and Society*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Asmis, Elizabeth. "A New Kind of Model: Cicero's Roman Constitution in 'De republica.'" *The American Journal of Philology* 126, No. 3 (Autumn 2005): 377-416.
- Barth, Fredrik, ed. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.
- Berry, D. H. "Literature and Persuasion in Cicero's *Pro Archia*." In *Cicero the Advocate*, edited by Jonathan Powell and Jeremy Paterson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Bianchi, Ugo. "Aspetti Religiosi della Campania dal VI al III Secolo." In *La Campania fra il VI e il III Secolo A.C.: Atti del XIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi e Italici, Benevento, 24-28 giugno 1981*. Galatina: Congedo, 1992.

- Birks, Peter, Alan Rodger, and J. S. Richardson. "Further Aspects of the Tabula Contrebiensis." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 74 (1984): 45-73.
- Bispham, Edward. "Coloniam Deducere: How Roman was Roman Colonization during the Middle Republic?" In *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*, edited by Guy Bradley and John-Paul Wilson. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2006.
- Bispham, Edward. *From Asculum to Actium: The Municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Biville, Frédérique. "The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: A Terminological Framework for Cases of Bilingualism." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, edited by J.N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Boëthius, A. *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1978.
- Bradeen, Donald W. "Roman Citizenship per magistratum." *The Classical Journal* 54, no. 5 (February 1959): 221-28.
- Bradley, Guy. "Tribes, States and Cities in Central Italy." in *The Emergence of State Identities in Italy in the First Millennium BC*, edited by Edward Herring and Kathryn Lomas. London: Accordia Research Institute, University of London, 2000.
- Bradley, Guy. "Colonization and Identity in Republican Italy." In *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*, edited by Guy Bradley and John-Paul Wilson. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales. 2006.
- Broadhead, William. "Rome's Migration Policy and the So-Called *Ius Migrandi*," *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 12 (2001): 69-89.
- Brown, Frank E. *Cosa: The Making of a Roman Town*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1980.
- Brunt, P. A. "Italian Aims at the Time of the Social War." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 55, no. 1/2, Parts 1 and 2 (1965): 90-109.
- Brunt, P. A. *Italian Manpower, 225 BC–AD 14*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Brunt, P. A. "The Legal Issue in Cicero, Pro Balbo." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series 32, no. 1 (1982): 136-147.

Brunt, P. A. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Càssola, Filippo. "Aspetti Sociali e Politici della Colonizzazione." *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 6.2 (1988): 5-17.

Clackson, James and Geoffrey Horrocks. *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Clarke, John R. *The Houses of Roman Italy, 100 BC–AD 250: Ritual, Space, and Decoration*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Coarelli, Filippo. "Colonizzazione Romana e Viabilità." *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 6.2 (1988): 35-48.

Cohen, Anthony P. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. Chichester: E. Horwood, 1985.

Crawford, M. H. *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic: Italy and the Mediterranean Economy*. London: Methuen, 1985.

Crawford, M. H. *Roman Statutes*. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* Supplement 64, Vol. 1. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 1996.

Crawford, M. H. "How to Create a *Municipium*: Rome and Italy after the Social War." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 42, Supplement 71 (1998): 31-46.

Crawford, M. H. "From Poseidonia to Paestum via the Lucanians." In *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*, edited by Guy Bradley and John-Paul Wilson. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2006.

Criniti, Nicola. *L'Epigrafe di Asculum di Gn. Pompeo Strabone*. Milan: Editrice Vita e Pensiero, 1970.

Curchin, Leonard A. *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Curti, Emmanuele, Emma Dench, and John R. Patterson. "The Archaeology of Central and Southern Roman Italy: Recent Trends and Approaches." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 86 (1996): 170-89

Dench, Emma. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Dietler, Michael. "Early 'Celtic' Socio-Political Relations: Ideological Representation and Social Competition in Dynamic Comparative Perspective." In *Celtic Chieftdom, Celtic State: The Evolution of Complex Social Systems in Prehistoric Europe*, edited by Bettina Arnold and D. Blair Gibson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Dubuisson, M. "Y a-t-il une politique linguistique romaine?" *Ktéma* 7 (1982): 178-210.

Dugan, John. "How to Make (And Break) a Cicero: 'Epideixis,' Textuality, and Self-Fashioning in the 'Pro Archia' and 'In Pisonem.'" *Classical Antiquity* 20, no. 1 (April 2001): 35-77.

Edlund-Berry, Ingrid. "The Language of Etrusco-Italic Architecture: New Perspectives on Tuscan Temples." *American Journal of Archaeology* 112 (2008): 441-47.

Edmondson, Jonathan C. "Romanization and Urban Development in Lusitania." In *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, edited by Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990.

Elwyn, Sue. "Interstate Kinship and Roman Foreign Policy." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123 (1993): 261-86.

Epstein, David F. *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics 218-43 BC*. London, New York, Sydney: Croom Helm, 1987.

Erickson, Brice. "Falling Masts, Rising Masters: The Ethnography of Virtue in Caesar's Account of the Veneti." *American Journal of Philology* 123, no. 4 (Winter 2002): 601-622.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. "Ethnic Identity, National Identity, and Intergroup Conflict: The Significance of Personal Experiences." In *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*, edited by Richard D. Ashmore, Lee Jussim, and David Wilder. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Fantham, Elaine. *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Farney, Gary D. *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Farrell, Joseph. *Latin Language and Latin Culture from Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Fear, A. T. *Rome and Baetica: Urbanization in Southern Spain c. 50 BC – AD 150*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Fentress, Elizabeth. "Frank Brown, Cosa and the Idea of a Roman City" in *Romanization and the City*, edited by E. Fentress. Portsmouth RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement 38, 2000.

Frazel, Thomas D. *The Rhetoric of Cicero's "In Verrem."* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.

Fulford, M. G. and A. Wallace-Hadrill. "Towards a History of Pre-Roman Pompeii. Excavations beneath the House of Amarantus (I.9.11–12), 1995–8." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 67 (1999): 37-144.

Galtung, Johan. "A Structural Theory of Imperialism." *Journal of Peace Research* 8:2 (1971): 81-117.

Gardner, R., ed. *Cicero XIII*, Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Gechter, Michael. "Early Roman Military Installations and Ubian Settlements in the Lower Rhine." In *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, edited by Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990.

George, Michele. *The Roman Domestic Architecture of Northern Italy*. Oxford: BAR International Series 670, 1997.

Glinister, Fay. "Veiled and Unveiled: Uncovering Roman Influence in Hellenistic Italy." In *Votives, Places and Rituals in Etruscan Religion: Studies in Honor of Jean MacIntosh Turfa*, edited by M. Gleba and H.W. Becker. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Greco, Emmanuele. "Archeologia della Colonia Latina di Paestum." *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 6.2 (1988): 79-86.

Gruen, Erich S. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1974.

Gruen, Erich S. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Guidobaldi, Maria Paola, and Fabrizio Pesando. "La Colonia *Civium Romanorum*." In *Minturnae*, edited by Filippo Coarelli. Rome: Nuova Editrice Romana, 1989.

Hackworth Petersen, Lauren. *The Roman Freedman in Art and Art History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Hales, Shelley. *The Roman House and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Hall, Lindsay G. H. "Ratio and Romanitas in the *Bellum Gallicum*." In *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*, edited by Kathryn Welch and Anton Powell. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 1998.

Harris, W. V. *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Harris, W. V. "Was Roman Law Imposed on the Italian Allies?" *Historia* Vol. 21, no. 4 (4th Qtr. 1972): 639-645.

Hendrickson, G. L. "The *De Analogia* of Julius Caesar; Its Occasion, Nature, and Date, with Additional Fragments." *Classical Philology* 1, no. 2 (April 1906): 97-120.

Horsfall, Nicholas. *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Humbert, Michel. *Municipium et Civitas sine Suffragio: L'Organisation de la Conquête jusqu'à la Guerre Sociale*. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1978.

Isaac, Benjamin. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Jonkers, E. J. *Social and Economic Commentary on Cicero's De Lege Agraria Orations Tres*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Keay, Simon. "Processes in the Development of the Coastal Communities of Hispania Citerior in the Republican Period." In *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, edited by Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990.

Keay, Simon. "Innovation and Adaptation: The Contribution of Rome to Urbanism in Iberia." In *Social Complexity and the Development of Towns in Iberia: From the Copper Age to the Second Century AD. Proceedings of the British Academy 86*, edited by B. Cunliffe and S. Keay. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Keay, Simon. "The Development of Towns in Early Roman Baetica." In *The Archaeology of Early Roman Baetica*, edited by Simon Keay. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement 29, 1998.

Keay, Simon. "Romanization and the Hispaniae." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.



- Kim, Hyun Jin. *Ethnicity and Foreigners in Ancient Greece and China*. London: Duckworth, 2009.
- Kunow, Jürgen. "Relations between Roman Occupation and the *Limesvorland* in the Province of Germania Inferior." In *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, edited by Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990.
- Lintott, Andrew. *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Lolli Ghetti, M., and N. Pagliardi. "Sora: Scavo Presso la Chiesa Cattedrale di Santa Maria Assunta." *Archeologia Laziale* 3 (1980): 177-79.
- Lomas, Kathryn. *Rome and the Western Greeks, 300 BC-AD 200: Conquest and Acculturation in Southern Italy*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Lomas, Kathryn. "Urban Elites and Cultural Definition: Romanization in Southern Italy." In *Urban Society in Roman Italy*, edited by Tim Cornell and Kathryn Lomas. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Lomas, Kathryn. "A Volscian Mafia? Cicero and His Italian Clients in the Forensic Speeches." In *Cicero the Advocate*, edited by Jonathan Powell and Jeremy Paterson. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004.
- López Castro, José Luis. "The Western Phoenicians under the Roman Republic: integration and persistence." In *Articulating Local Cultures: Power and Identity under the Expanding Roman Republic*, edited by P. van Dommelen and N. Terrenato. Portsmouth, RI: JRA Supplementary Series No. 63, 2007.
- Lucy, Sam. "Ethnic and Cultural Identities." In *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion*, edited by Margarita Diaz-Andreu, Sam Lucy, Stasa Babic, and David N. Edwards. Oxon: Routledge, 2005.
- Márquez Moreno, Carlos. "Corrientes y Materiales en la Arquitectura de la Córdoba Romana." *Anales de Arqueología Cordobesa* 6 (1995): 79-111.
- May, James M., and Jakob Wisse. *Cicero: On the Ideal Orator*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Mierse, William E. *Temples and Towns in Roman Iberia: The Social and Architectural Dynamics of Sanctuary Designs from the Third Century B.C. to the Third Century A.D.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

- Molina Vidal, Jaime. *La Dinámica Comercial Romana entre Italia e Hispania Citerior*. Alicante: Universidad di Alicante, 1997.
- Moscovich, M. James. "Obsidibus Traditis: Hostages in Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*." *The Classical Journal* 75, no. 2 (December 1979 – January 1980): 122-8.
- Mouritsen, Henrik. *Italian Unification: A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 42, Supplement 70. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 1998.
- Mouritsen, Henrik. "Pits and Politics: Interpreting Colonial Fora in Republican Italy." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 72 (2004): 37-67.
- Nicolet, Claude. *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1991.
- Okun, Marcia L. *The Early Roman Frontier in the Upper Rhine Area: Assimilation and Acculturation on a Roman Frontier*. Oxford: BAR International Series 547, 1989.
- Pfeilschifter, Rene. "The Allies in the Republican Army and the Romanization of Italy." In *Roman by Integration: Dimensions of Group Identity in Material Culture and Text*, edited by Roman Roth and Johannes Keller. Portsmouth (RI): Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement 66, 2007.
- Piper, Deryck. "Latins and the Roman Citizenship in Roman Colonies: Livy 34, 42.5-6: Revisited." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 36, H. 1 (1<sup>st</sup> Quarter, 1987): 38-50.
- Purcell, Nicholas. "The Creation of the Roman Provincial Landscape: The Roman Impact on Cisalpine Gaul." In *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, edited by Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990.
- Ramage, Edwin S. "Cicero on Extra-Roman Speech." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 92 (1961): 481-94.
- Revell, Louise. "Constructing Romanitas: Roman Public Architecture and the Archaeology of Practice." In *TRAC 98: Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeological Conference*, edited by Patricia Baker, Colin Forcey, Sophia Jundi, and Robert Witcher. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1999.
- Richardson, J. S. "The Tabula Contrebiensis: Roman Law in Spain in the Early First Century B.C.: I." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 73 (1983): 33-41.

- Richardson, J. S. *Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Riggsby, Andrew M. *Caesar in Gaul and Rome: War in Words*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Roselaar, Saskia T. *Public Land in the Roman Republic: A Social and Economic History of Ager Publicus in Italy, 398-89 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Rotondi, Giovanni. *Leges Publicae Populi Romani: Elenco cronologico con una introduzione sull'attività legislativa dei comizi romani*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, (1912) 1966.
- Roymans, Nico. "Romanization, Cultural Identity and the Ethnic Discussion: The Integration of Lower Rhine Populations in the Roman Empire." In *Integration in the Roman West: The Role of Culture and Ideology*, edited by Jeannot Metzler, Martin Millett, Nico Roymans, and Jan Slofstra. Luxembourg: Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art, 1995.
- Salmon, E. T. "Rome and the Latins: I." *Phoenix* 7, no. 3 (Autumn 1953): 93-104.
- Salmon, E. T. *Roman Colonization under the Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970.
- Sewell, Jamie. *The Formation of Roman Urbanism, 338-200 BC: Between Contemporary Foreign Influence and Roman Tradition*. Portsmouth (RI): Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement 79, 2010.
- Shaw, Brent D. "Bandits in the Roman Empire." In *Studies in Ancient Greek and Roman Society*, edited by Robin Osborne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Sherwin-White, A. N. *The Roman Citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Smith, Christopher. "Italian Unification: A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography by H. Mouritsen." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 89 (1999): 227.
- Smith, R. E. "Latins and the Roman Citizenship in Roman Colonies: Livy 34, 42.5-6." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 44 (1954): 18-20.
- Söderlind, Martin. "Romanization and the Use of Votive Offerings in the Eastern Ager Vulcentis." *Opuscula Romana* 25-26 (2000-2001): 89-102.
- Steel, C. E. W. *Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

- Swain, Simon. "Bilingualism in Cicero? The Evidence of Code-Switching." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, edited by J.N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Taylor, John H. "Political Motives in Cicero's Defense of Archias." *The American Journal of Philology* 73, no. 1 (1952): 62-70.
- Terrenato, Nicola. "*Tam Firmum Municipium*: The Romanization of Volaterrae and Its Cultural Implications." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 88 (1998): 94-114.
- Torelli, Mario. *Studies in the Romanization of Italy*. Translated by Helena Fracchia and Maurizio Gualtieri. Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 1995.
- Torelli, Mario. *Tota Italia: Essays in the Cultural Formation of Roman Italy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Treggiari, Susan. "Ancestral Virtues and Vices: Cicero on Nature, Nurture and Presentation." In *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome*, edited by David Braund and Christopher Gill. Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2003.
- Vallat, Jean Pierre. "The Romanization of Italy: Conclusions." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.
- Van Der Blom, Henriette. *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Vasaly, Ann. "Cicero, Domestic Politics, and the First Action of the Verrines." *Classical Antiquity* 28, Issue 1 (2009): 101-137.
- Ventura, Angel, Pilar León, and Carlos Márquez, "Roman Cordoba in the Light of Recent Archaeological Research" in *The Archaeology of Early Roman Baetica*, edited by Simon Keay. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement 29, 1998.
- Versteegh, Kees. "Dead or Alive? The Status of the Standard Language." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, edited by J.N. Adams, Mark Janse and Simon Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Warmington, E. H., trans. *Remains of Old Latin III: Lucilius, Twelve Tables*, Loeb Classical Library. Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk: St. Edmundsbury Press, Ltd., 1938.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*, vol. 2, edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, translated by Ephraim Fischof. Berkeley: University of California Press, (1922) 1978.
- West, Cornel. *Race Matters*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1993.
- Williams, J. H. C. "Roman Intentions and Romanization: Republican Northern Italy, c. 200-100 BC" in *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.
- Williams, J. H. C. *Beyond the Rubicon: Romans and Gauls in Republican Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Williamson, Callie. *The Laws of the Roman People: Public Law in the Expansion and Decline of the Roman Republic*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- Wilson, A. J. N. *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1966.
- Wiseman, T. P. "The Publication of *De Bello Gallico*." In *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*, edited by Kathryn Welch and Anton Powell. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 1998.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Translated by G.E. Anscombe. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2009.
- Wonder, John W. "What Happened to the Greeks in Lucanian-Occupied Paestum? Multiculturalism in Southern Italy." *Phoenix* 56, no. 1/2 (Spring-Summer, 2002): 40-55.
- Woolf, Greg. "The Formation of Roman Provincial Cultures." In *Integration in the Roman West: The Role of Culture and Ideology*, edited by Jeannot Metzler, Martin Millett, Nico Roymans, and Jan Slofstra. Luxembourg: Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art, 1995.
- Zanker, Paul. *Pompeii: Public and Private Life*. Translated by Deborah Lucas Schneider. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Zanker, Paul. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1990.

Zetzel, James E.G. "Citizen and Commonwealth in *De Re Publica* Book 4." In *Cicero's Republic*, edited by J. G. F. Powell and J.A. North. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2001.